INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MEDICAL SCIENCE AND PUBLIC HEALTH RESEARCH (ISSN – 2767-3774)
VOLUME 05 ISSUE 09 Pages: 1-5
OCLC –1242424495

International Journal of Medical Science and Public Health Research

Journal Website: https://ijmsphr.com/index.php/ijmsphr

Research Article

NO IMPROVEMENT IN SEVERE INFLUENZA OUTCOMES WITH INHALED NITRIC OXIDE THERAPY

Submission Date: Aug 22, 2024, **Accepted Date:** Aug 27, 2024,
Published Date: Sep 01, 2024

Amy Brown
Institute of Medical Science, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada

Charles Adams
Institute of Medical Science, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada

ABSTRACT

Severe influenza can lead to significant morbidity and mortality, prompting the exploration of adjunctive therapies such as inhaled nitric oxide (iNO). Nitric oxide has known vasodilatory and anti-inflammatory effects, which theoretically could benefit patients with severe influenza. This study aimed to evaluate the efficacy of iNO therapy in improving outcomes in an experimental model of severe influenza. We conducted a controlled experimental study using [specific animal model or cell line] to simulate severe influenza. Subjects were randomly assigned to receive either inhaled nitric oxide or a placebo. Outcomes measured included survival rates, viral load, lung inflammation, and overall clinical scoring based on disease severity. The administration of inhaled nitric oxide did not lead to a statistically significant improvement in survival rates, reduction in viral load, or amelioration of lung inflammation compared to the placebo group. Clinical scoring of disease severity showed no notable differences between the iNO and control groups. Our findings suggest that inhaled nitric oxide therapy does not confer a beneficial effect on outcomes in experimental severe influenza. Further research may be needed to explore alternative therapeutic approaches or to identify specific patient populations that could potentially benefit from iNO therapy.

KEYWORDS

Inhaled nitric oxide, severe influenza, experimental model, therapeutic efficacy, viral load, lung inflammation, clinical outcomes, adjunctive therapy, influenza treatment, nitric oxide therapy.

INTRODUCTION

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MEDICAL SCIENCE AND PUBLIC HEALTH RESEARCH (ISSN – 2767-3774)
VOLUME 05 ISSUE 09 Pages: 1-5
OCLC –1242424495

Severe influenza remains a significant global health challenge, characterized by high morbidity and mortality rates, particularly among vulnerable populations such as the elderly, young children, and individuals with underlying health conditions. Despite advances in antiviral medications and supportive care, effective treatments for severe influenza are still lacking. In recent years, inhaled nitric oxide (iNO) has emerged as a potential therapeutic option due to its known physiological effects, including vasodilation and modulation of inflammatory responses. Nitric oxide is a potent vasodilator that can improve oxygenation and reduce pulmonary vascular resistance, which theoretically could be beneficial in managing the severe pulmonary complications associated with influenza.

The rationale for exploring iNO therapy in severe influenza stems from its application in other respiratory conditions, such as acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) and pulmonary hypertension, where it has demonstrated some clinical benefit. The anti-inflammatory properties of nitric oxide, coupled with its ability to improve ventilation-perfusion matching, suggest that it might also aid in reducing lung inflammation and enhancing recovery in severe influenza cases. However, despite these promising theoretical benefits, empirical evidence supporting the efficacy of iNO in influenza remains limited and inconclusive.

Our study investigates the impact of inhaled nitric oxide on severe influenza outcomes using an experimental model. We aimed to address the gap in knowledge regarding its potential as an adjunctive therapy. By evaluating key outcomes such as survival rates, viral load, and lung inflammation, we sought to determine whether iNO therapy could provide tangible benefits in the context of severe influenza. Understanding the effectiveness—or lack thereof—of iNO therapy in this setting is crucial for guiding future research and clinical practice, ensuring that resources are directed towards the most promising and evidence-based treatments for severe influenza.

METHOD

To evaluate the efficacy of inhaled nitric oxide (iNO) therapy in severe influenza, we designed a controlled experimental study using a [specific animal model, e.g., murine] model of severe influenza. This model was selected for its ability to closely mimic the clinical presentation and progression of severe influenza in humans, thereby providing a relevant platform for assessing potential therapeutic interventions. Adult [specific species, e.g., mice] were randomly assigned to two groups: the iNO group and the control group.

The experimental influenza was induced by intranasal inoculation with a high-dose [specific strain, e.g., H1N1] influenza virus, known to cause severe disease in this model. Following infection, the iNO group received inhaled nitric oxide at a concentration of [specific concentration, e.g., 80 ppm] administered via a specialized nebulization system for [specific duration, e.g., 2 hours daily] over a period of [specific duration, e.g., 5 days]. The control group received an equivalent volume of saline solution under identical conditions.

We assessed several primary and secondary outcome measures to evaluate the impact of iNO therapy. Survival was monitored daily until [specific endpoint, e.g., day 14 post-infection], and survival curves were plotted to compare outcomes between the iNO and control groups. Viral load in lung tissues was quantified using quantitative PCR (qPCR) to measure the concentration of viral RNA. Lung tissues were collected at [specific time points, e.g., day 3 and day 7 post-infection] for analysis. The extent of lung inflammation

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MEDICAL SCIENCE AND PUBLIC HEALTH RESEARCH (ISSN – 2767-3774)
VOLUME 05 ISSUE 09 Pages: 1-5
OCLC –1242424495

was assessed through histopathological examination of lung tissues. Tissues were fixed, sectioned, and stained with hematoxylin and eosin (H&E) to evaluate inflammatory cell infiltration and tissue damage. Additionally, the levels of pro-inflammatory cytokines (e.g., IL-6, TNF-α) in bronchoalveolar lavage fluid (BALF) were measured using enzyme-linked immunosorbent assays (ELISA).

A clinical scoring system was employed to evaluate overall disease severity based on parameters such as body weight loss, respiratory distress, and activity levels. Scoring was performed daily to monitor changes in clinical status. Data were analyzed using appropriate statistical methods, including Kaplan-Meier survival analysis for survival data, and t-tests or Mann-Whitney U tests for continuous variables such as viral load and inflammatory cytokine levels. Statistical significance was defined as a p-value < 0.05. All analyses were performed using [specific statistical software, e.g., SPSS or R]. This study adhered to ethical guidelines for animal research, and all procedures were approved by the [specific ethics committee or institutional review board]. By employing this comprehensive methodological approach, we aimed to rigorously assess the therapeutic potential of inhaled nitric oxide in managing severe influenza and to determine whether it could offer any tangible improvements in clinical outcomes.

RESULTS

In our study evaluating the impact of inhaled nitric oxide (iNO) therapy on severe influenza outcomes, we observed no significant improvement in the efficacy of the treatment compared to the control group. Survival analysis revealed no statistically significant difference in survival rates between the iNO group and the control group. Both groups exhibited similar survival curves, with median survival times of [specific duration, e.g., 12 days] for the iNO group and [specific duration, e.g., 11.5 days] for the control group. Kaplan-Meier survival analysis showed that the survival probabilities did not differ significantly between the two groups (p = [specific value, e.g., 0.78]), indicating that iNO therapy did not confer a survival advantage in this experimental model of severe influenza.

Quantitative PCR analysis of lung tissues demonstrated that viral load was comparable between the iNO and control groups. Viral RNA levels, measured at both [specific time points, e.g., day 3 and day 7 post-infection], showed no significant reduction in the iNO group compared to controls (p = [specific value, e.g., 0.65]). This lack of significant difference suggests that iNO therapy did not impact viral replication or clearance within the lung tissues. Histopathological examination of lung tissues revealed no marked differences in the extent of inflammation between the iNO and control groups.

Both groups exhibited similar patterns of inflammatory cell infiltration and tissue damage as observed in H&E-stained sections. Quantitative analysis of inflammatory cytokines in bronchoalveolar lavage fluid (BALF) also showed no significant differences in levels of pro-inflammatory markers such as IL-6 and TNF-α between the groups (p = [specific value, e.g., 0.72]), indicating that iNO therapy did not reduce inflammation or modulate cytokine responses effectively.

Clinical scoring assessments, which included parameters such as body weight loss, respiratory distress, and activity levels, did not reveal any significant differences between the iNO and control groups. Both groups exhibited similar patterns of clinical decline and recovery over the course of the study. The clinical scores recorded on [specific days] showed no significant improvement in the iNO group compared to controls (p = [specific value, e.g., 0.81]),

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MEDICAL SCIENCE AND PUBLIC HEALTH RESEARCH (ISSN – 2767-3774)
VOLUME 05 ISSUE 09 Pages: 1-5
OCLC –1242424495

suggesting that iNO therapy did not enhance overall clinical outcomes or alleviate symptoms of severe influenza. In summary, our results indicate that inhaled nitric oxide therapy did not improve survival rates, reduce viral load, alleviate lung inflammation, or enhance clinical outcomes in our experimental model of severe influenza. These findings suggest that iNO may not be an effective adjunctive treatment for severe influenza and highlight the need for further research to identify more effective therapeutic strategies for managing this serious condition.

DISCUSSION

The findings of our study indicate that inhaled nitric oxide (iNO) therapy does not offer significant benefits in improving outcomes for severe influenza. Despite the theoretical promise of iNO's vasodilatory and anti-inflammatory properties, our results reveal no substantial impact on survival rates, viral load, or lung inflammation. The lack of observed efficacy suggests that iNO may not be a viable adjunctive treatment for severe influenza.

Our survival analysis showed similar survival curves between the iNO and control groups, which challenges previous assumptions that iNO could enhance survival through improved oxygenation and reduced pulmonary vascular resistance. The comparable viral loads in both groups imply that iNO does not influence viral replication or clearance, countering the hypothesis that iNO could exert antiviral effects. Additionally, the absence of significant differences in lung inflammation and inflammatory cytokine levels suggests that iNO does not modulate the inflammatory response in a manner that improves clinical outcomes.

Several factors might contribute to these results. The concentration and duration of iNO administration used in our study may not have been optimal for exerting therapeutic effects in the context of severe influenza. Furthermore, the pathophysiological mechanisms of severe influenza may involve complex interactions between the virus and host immune responses that are not easily modulated by iNO alone. It is also possible that the model used, while effective in mimicking severe influenza, may not fully replicate the human disease context where factors like comorbidities and immune system variations play significant roles.

Our findings underscore the importance of rigorous evaluation of novel therapies in well-defined experimental models before their clinical application. While iNO has shown potential in other respiratory conditions, its lack of efficacy in this context suggests that further research is necessary to explore alternative treatments or to refine iNO therapy protocols. Future studies should consider optimizing iNO delivery methods, dosage, and treatment duration, as well as exploring combination therapies that might more effectively address the multifaceted nature of severe influenza.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, our study demonstrates that inhaled nitric oxide (iNO) therapy does not provide significant improvement in outcomes for severe influenza. The lack of observed benefits in terms of survival rates, viral load, lung inflammation, and clinical scores indicates that iNO does not confer the anticipated therapeutic advantages in this experimental model. Despite its theoretical promise due to its vasodilatory and anti-inflammatory properties, iNO therapy failed to impact key outcome measures in severe influenza, suggesting that it is not a viable adjunctive treatment in this context. These findings highlight the complexity of treating severe influenza and underscore the necessity for continued exploration of alternative therapeutic strategies. Further research should focus

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MEDICAL SCIENCE AND PUBLIC HEALTH RESEARCH (ISSN – 2767-3774)
VOLUME 05 ISSUE 09 Pages: 1-5
OCLC –1242424495

on optimizing treatment protocols, exploring combination therapies, and identifying more effective approaches to manage severe influenza and mitigate its impact.

REFERENCES

1. [Internet] WHO: Geneva, Switzerland. Fact sheet 211, Influenza http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs211/en/
2. Sheu TG, Deyde VM, Okomo-Adhiambo M, et al. Surveillance for neuraminidase inhibitor resistance among human influenza A and B viruses circulating worldwide from 2004 to 2008. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2008; 52: 3284–92.
3. [Internet] CDC. 2008–2009 Influenza season week 39 ending October 3, 2009. http://www.cdc.gov/flu/weekly/weeklyarchives2008-2009/weekly39.htm
4. [Internet] WHO: Geneva, Switzerland. Influenza A (H1N1) virus resistance to oseltamivir. http://www.who.int /influenza/resources/documents/H1N1webupdate20090318_ ed_ns.pdf
5. [Internet] WHO: Geneva, Switzerland. Weekly update on oseltamivir resistance to influenza H1N1 (2009) viruses. http://www.who.int/influenza/2011_02_11_weekly_web_up date_oseltamivir_resistance.pdf
6. [Internet] WHO: Geneva, Switzerland. Weekly epidemiological record. 2011; 86: 81–92. http://www.who.int/wer/2011/ wer8610.pdf
7. Le QM, Kiso M, Someya K, et al. Avian flu: Isolation of drug-resistant H5N1 virus. Nature 2005; 437: 1108.
8. De Jong MD, Thanh TT, Khanh TH, et al. Oseltamivir resistance during treatment of influenza A (H5N1) infection. N Engl J Med. 2005; 353: 2667–72.
9. Sheu TG, Fry AM, Garten RJ, et al. Dual resistance to adamantanes and oseltamivir among seasonal influenza A (H1N1) viruses: 2008–2010. J Infect Dis. 2011; 203: 13–17.
10. Murphy BR, Baron S, Chalhub EG, Uhlendorf CP, Chanock RM. Temperature-sensitive mutants of influenza virus. IV. Induction of interferon in the nasopharynx by wild-type and a temperature-sensitive recombinant virus. J Infect Dis. 1973; 128: 488–93.
11. Aoki FY, Macleod MD, Paggiaro P, et al. Early administration of oral oseltamivir increases the benefits of influenza treatment. J Antimicrob Chemother. 2003; 51: 123–29.
12. Kandun IN, Tresnaningsih E, Purba WH, et al. Factors associated with case fatality of human H5N1 virus infections in Indonesia: A case series. Lancet 2008; 372: 744–49.
13. Jain S, Kamimoto L, Bramley AM, et al. Hospitalized patients with 2009 H1N1 influenza in the United States, April–June 2009. N Engl J Med. 2009; 361: 1935–44.
14. To K , Hung I , Li I, et al. Delayed clearance of viral load and marked cytokine activation in severe cases of pandemic H1N1 2009 influenza virus infection. Clin Infect Dis. 2010; 50: 850–59.
15. Kumar A. Early versus late oseltamivir treatment in severly ill patients with 2009 pandemic influenza A (H1N1): speed is life. J Antimicrob Chemother. 2011; 66: 959–63