MAK HILL Publications Research Journal of Medical Sciences

Research Article
doi: 10.36478/makrjms.2024.11.532.536

OPEN ACCESS

Key Words
Early intervention, neurodevelopmental outcomes, premature infants

Corresponding Author
Gajanan M. Sirsat,
Department of Pediatrics, Dr. Ulhas Patil Medical College, Jalgaon (MH)., India
gajanansirsat@yahoo.com

Author Designation
[1,2]Assistant Professor

Received: 17 September 2024
Accepted: 23 October 2024
Published: 11 November 2024

Citation: Rajesh Saraf and Gajanan M. Sirsat, 2024. Comparative Study of Neurodevelopmental Outcomes in Premature Infants with and without Early Intervention Programs. Res. J. Med. Sci., 18: 532-536, doi: 10.36478/makrjms. 2024.11.532.536

Comparative Study of Neurodevelopmental Outcomes in Premature Infants With and Without Early Intervention Programs

[1]Rajesh Saraf and [2]Gajanan M. Sirsat
[1,2]Department of Pediatrics, Dr. Ulhas Patil Medical College, Jalgaon (MH)., India

ABSTRACT
Premature infants are at increased risk for neurodevelopmental delays. Early intervention programs (EIPs) are designed to address and potentially mitigate these delays, but the extent of their effectiveness is still being evaluated. This study aims to compare the neurodevelopmental outcomes of premature infants participating in early intervention programs to those without such intervention. In this retrospective cohort study, 140 premature infants were divided into two groups: those who received early interventions (n=70) and those who did not (n=70). Developmental outcomes in cognitive, motor and socio-emotional domains were assessed using standardized developmental scales. Statistical analysis involved chi-squared tests for categorical data and t-tests for continuous variables. Infants in the early intervention group demonstrated significantly higher rates of normal development in cognitive (74.3% vs. 48.6%, p=0.001), motor (68.6% vs. 42.9%, p=0.004), and socio-emotional domains (81.4% vs. 55.7%, p=0.002) compared to the non-intervention group. Additionally, long-term outcomes showed that infants in the intervention group had higher regular school attendance and fewer behavioral issues and special education needs. The study supports the efficacy of early intervention programs in improving both immediate and long-term neurodevelopmental outcomes for premature infants. Tailored interventions that consider demographic and biological variables could optimize developmental trajectories for this at-risk population.

INTRODUCTION

Premature birth is a significant concern worldwide, affecting approximately 11% of all pregnancies and leading to a variety of short and long-term complications. Among these, neurodevelopmental issues are particularly concerning, as they can affect cognitive, motor and emotional development. Early intervention programs (EIPs) have been proposed as a means to mitigate these developmental delays. Such programs typically involve multi disciplinary approaches that include physical therapy, speech therapy, occupational therapy and psychological support, tailored to the needs of each child[1,2]. The efficacy of early intervention in improving the neurodevelopmental outcomes of premature infants is supported by a growing body of literature. However, discrepancies in the degree of improvement, possibly due to variations in program design, demographic factors and baseline health conditions of the infants, call for a more detailed investigation. This comparative study aims to fill gaps in existing research by examining the outcomes of premature infants enrolled in EIPs versus those who did not receive such interventions[3,4]. Research has shown that early interventions can lead to significant improvements in IQ scores, motor skills and language development among premature infants. For instance, studies have demonstrated that children who participated in EIPs exhibited better performance in school and higher IQ levels compared to their non-participating peers. Furthermore, the neuro plasticity of the infant brain makes early postnatal life a critical period for such interventions. The rationale behind this is that early, structured stimulation may enhance the development of neural pathways that are crucial for various aspects of development[5,6]. Conversely, infants who do not receive early intervention might experience a range of developmental challenges, including poorer cognitive outcomes and motor skills deficits. The absence of early therapeutic interaction is hypothesized to result in less optimal brain development, particularly in the domains of language and sensory-motor integration[7,8]. This study also considers socioeconomic, demographic and biological factors that could influence the effectiveness of early interventions. Such factors include the severity of prematurity, the presence of neonatal illnesses, family income, parental education, and access to healthcare services, which have all been shown to impact developmental outcomes independently[9,10].

Aims: To assess the impact of early intervention programs on the neurodevelopmental outcomes of premature infants.

Objectives:

- To compare cognitive, motor and socio-emotional developmental scores between premature infants with and without participation in early intervention programs.
- To evaluate the influence of demographic and biological variables on the efficacy of early intervention programs.
- To determine the long-term educational and behavioral outcomes of premature infants receiving early intervention.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Source of Data: Data was collected from the neonatal intensive care units (NICUs) of participating hospitals and associated follow-up clinics.

Study Design: This was a retrospective cohort study, comparing two groups of premature infants based on their exposure to early intervention programs.

Study Location: The study was conducted at multiple tertiary care hospitals with dedicated NICU facilities.

Study Duration: Data collection encompassed a period from January 2020 to December 2022.

Sample Size: A total of 140 premature infants were included, with 70 infants in the early intervention group and 70 in the non-intervention group.

Inclusion Criteria: Infants included were those born before 37 weeks of gestation, admitted to the NICU and subsequently discharged. Infants in the intervention group were those enrolled in hospital-affiliated early intervention programs.

Exclusion Criteria: Infants with congenital anomalies, genetic disorders affecting neurodevelopment, or those whose parents declined participation were excluded.

Procedure and Methodology: Infants were followed up periodically at adjusted ages of 6, 12 and 24 months. Developmental assessments were conducted using standardized tools like the Bayley Scales of Infant and Toddler Development.

Sample Processing: Developmental assessments were scored according to standard protocols, with scores adjusted for prematurity.

Statistical Methods: Data were analyzed using SPSS software. Comparisons between groups were made using t-tests and chi-squared tests for continuous and categorical variables, respectively. Multivariable regression was used to adjust for potential confounders.

Data Collection: Data were collected through review of medical records for baseline demographics, medical

Table 1: Impact of Early Intervention Programs on Neuro Developmental Outcomes

Outcome	Early Intervention (n=70)	No Intervention (n=70)	Total (n=140)	Test Statistic	P-value	95% CI
Normal Cognitive Development	52 (74.3%)	34 (48.6%)	86 (61.4%)	χ^2 = 10.74	0.001	60.1- 84.5%
Delayed Cognitive Development	18 (25.7%)	36 (51.4%)	54 (38.6%)			
Normal Motor Development	48 (68.6%)	30 (42.9%)	78 (55.7%)	χ^2= 8.22	0.004	54.2- 78.6%
Delayed Motor Development	22 (31.4%)	40 (57.1%)	62 (44.3%)			
Normal Socio-Emotional Development	57 (81.4%)	39 (55.7%)	96 (68.6%)	χ^2= 9.96	0.002	70.3- 88.7%
Delayed Socio-Emotional Development	13 (18.6%)	31 (44.3%)	44 (31.4%)			

Table 2: Comparison of Developmental Scores Between Groups

Developmental Area	Early Intervention (n=70)	No Intervention (n=70)	Test Statistic	P-value	95% CI
Cognitive Scores	88.7±7.5	82.3±8.1	t=4.58	<0.001	84.2-93.2
Motor Scores	85.4±9.3	78.1±10.2	t=4.03	<0.001	81.1-89.7
Socio-Emotional Scores	90.2±6.4	75.6±11.9	t=7.92	<0.001	87.2-93.2

Table 3: Influence of Demographic and Biological Variables

Variable	Early Intervention Positive Outcome	No Intervention Positive Outcome	Total (n=140)	Test Statistic	P-value	95% CI
Maternal Education (>12 years)	49/55 (89.1%)	28/58 (48.3%)	77 (55%)	χ^2 = 22.75	<0.001	78.4-96.8%
Household Income (>median)	47/51 (92.2%)	25/52 (48.1%)	72 (51.4%)	χ^2 = 24.63	<0.001	82.1-98.3%
Birth Weight (>2500g)	50/52 (96.2%)	33/55 (60.0%)	83 (59.3%)	χ^2 = 26.18	<0.001	89.5-99.9%

Table 4: Long-term Educational and Behavioral Outcomes

Outcome	Early Intervention (n=70)	No Intervention (n=70)	Total (n=140)	Test Statistic	P-value	95% CI
Attended Regular School	65 (92.9%)	48 (68.6%)	113 (80.7%)	χ^2 = 13.44	<0.001	86.1-96.7%
Behavioral Issues	8 (11.4%)	29 (41.4%)	37 (26.4%)	χ^2 = 14.58	<0.001	4.9-17.9%
Special Education Needs	5 (7.1%)	22 (31.4%)	27 (19.3%)	χ^2 = 12.79	<0.001	2.2-12.0%

history and details of NICU care, while follow-up data were obtained from clinic visits and standardized developmental assessments.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

(Table 1) evaluates the effectiveness of early intervention programs on various neurodevelopmental outcomes in premature infants. It reveals significant differences between infants who received early intervention and those who did not. For example, 74.3% of infants in the early intervention group exhibited normal cognitive development compared to 48.6% in the no intervention group. This difference was statistically significant, with a p-value of 0.001. Similar patterns were observed in motor and socio-emotional development, where early intervention recipients consistently showed better outcomes. The table uses chi-squared tests to analyze these categorical data, highlighting the strong impact of early interventions on improving neurodevelopmental outcomes in these infants. (Table 2) provides a quantitative comparison of cognitive, motor and socio-emotional scores between the two groups of infants. Infants in the early intervention group scored higher in all three developmental areas, with mean scores significantly higher than those of the no intervention group. For instance, the cognitive scores averaged 88.7 in the intervention group versus 82.3 in the control group, with a statistically significant t-test result ($p<0.001$). The motor and socio-emotional scores showed similar trends. The table effectively underscores the quantitative improvements in development due to early interventions, supported by tight confidence intervals and low p-values. (Table 3) examines the influence of demographic and biological variables on the outcomes of early intervention programs. It indicates that higher maternal education, greater household income and higher birth weight significantly correlate with positive developmental outcomes in the intervention group. For example, infants whose mothers had more than 12 years of education and who received early intervention had an 89.1% rate of positive outcomes, compared to 48.3% in the no intervention group. These differences are underscored by very low p-values and wide confidence intervals, suggesting strong and significant effects of these variables on the effectiveness of early interventions. (Table 4) assesses the long-term educational and behavioral outcomes of premature infants participating in early intervention programs. The data show a higher percentage of infants in the early intervention group attending regular school and lower instances of behavioral issues and special education needs compared to the no intervention group. The statistical tests reveal significant differences with p-values >0.001, demonstrating the lasting benefits of early interventions on educational achievements and behavioral development in these children. (Table 1) highlights the significant benefits of early intervention in enhancing cognitive, motor and socio-emotional development in premature infants. According to the results, children who received early interventions demonstrated notably better outcomes in all developmental domains compared to those who did not receive such interventions. This aligns with studies such as Cheong[11], which found that structured early intervention programs significantly improve motor and cognitive outcomes in premature infants up to school age. Another study by Zhang[12] supports the notion that early developmental interventions can lead to sustained improvements in socio-emotional skills during early childhood, thus validating the findings from our study. In (table 2), the significant differences in cognitive, motor and socio-emotional scores between the intervention and control groups reflect the quantitative benefits of early intervention. These

findings resonate with the results from Fontana[13], which documented that early intervention for preterm infants resulted in higher IQ levels at school age. Furthermore, the improvement in motor scores is consistent with McGowan[14], who reported enhanced motor outcomes in children who participated in early physiotherapy and occupational therapy. (Table 3) suggests that higher maternal education, higher household income and greater birth weight enhance the effectiveness of early interventions. The link between socio-economic status (including maternal education and household income) and better developmental outcomes is well-established in literature, as noted by You[15], suggesting that socio-economic factors play a crucial role in the efficacy of early interventions. Additionally, the impact of birth weight is in line with findings by Adams-Chapman[16], indicating that infants with higher birth weights respond more positively to early interventions, likely due to fewer initial health complications. The data in (table 4) illustrating long-term benefits such as higher school attendance rates and lower incidences of behavioral issues and special education needs among those who received early interventions echo broader research themes. A longitudinal study by McGowan[17] found that early intervention not only improves immediate developmental metrics but also leads to better educational trajectories and reduced behavioral problems in later childhood.

CONCLUSION

This comparative study of neurodevelopmental outcomes in premature infants, both with and without participation in early intervention programs, clearly demonstrates the profound impact these programs have on the developmental trajectories of this vulnerable population. The findings from our analysis provide compelling evidence that early intervention programs are essential in fostering better cognitive, motor and socio-emotional development. Specifically, the study revealed that premature infants enrolled in early intervention programs consistently achieved superior outcomes in normal cognitive, motor and socio-emotional development compared to those who did not receive such interventions. These differences were statistically significant and were reflected in higher developmental scores across all measured domains. Furthermore, the long-term benefits of these interventions, as evidenced by higher rates of regular school attendance and lower incidences of behavioral issues and special education needs, underscore the enduring value of early intervention. The influence of demographic and biological variables-such as maternal education, household income and birth weight-further highlighted that while early interventions are broadly beneficial, their effectiveness can be enhanced or diminished by socio-economic and biological factors. This underscores the necessity for tailored intervention strategies that consider these variables to optimize outcomes for all premature infants. In conclusion, the study supports the implementation of structured, comprehensive early intervention programs as a critical component of neonatal care for premature infants to mitigate the risks associated with prematurity and to enhance their developmental outcomes. These findings advocate for healthcare policies that support early intervention services and encourage research that continues to refine these programs to maximize their effectiveness.

Limitations of Study:

- **Retrospective Design:** As a retrospective cohort study, the research inherently faces limitations related to the accuracy and completeness of medical records. Potential biases in record -keeping and data retrieval may influence the reliability of the outcomes measured.
- **Sample Size and Selection Bias:** The study involved 140 infants, which, while substantial, may still not fully represent the broader population of premature infants. The selection of participants from specific hospitals may also introduce selection bias, affecting the generalizability of the findings.
- **Control of Confounding Variables:** While efforts were made to control for various demographic and biological variables, other potential confounders such as the severity of prematurity, neonatal complications and parental involvement in interventions were not fully explored. These factors could significantly impact the developmental outcomes and may not have been evenly distributed between the intervention and non-intervention groups.
- **Lack of Standardization in Intervention Programs:** The early intervention programs may vary significantly in intensity, quality and duration, which can affect their efficacy. This study did not standardize or detail the specific components of the early intervention programs, potentially leading to variability in the effectiveness of different programs.
- **Longitudinal Follow-Up:** The follow-up period was limited to early childhood and while the study notes long-term educational and behavioral outcomes, the full spectrum of potential effects into later childhood and adolescence remains unexamined. Developmental trajectories can change over time and longer follow-up periods are necessary to fully understand the enduring impacts of early interventions.
- **Socio-Economic and Cultural Factors:** The study may not have adequately accounted for the full impact of socio-economic status and cultural differences on the availability and efficacy of early

intervention programs. These factors can influence access to care and parental engagement, which are crucial for the success of such programs.

- **Measurement Tools and Methods:** The developmental assessments used were based on standardized tools., however, the administration of these tools and the interpretation of their results may vary. Inter-rater reliability and the subjective nature of some assessments could influence the accuracy of the developmental scores reported.

REFERENCES

1. Aita, M., G.D.C. Faugère, A. Lavallée, N. Feeley, R. Stremler, *et al*., 2021. Effectiveness of interventions on early neurodevelopment of preterm infants: A systematic review and meta-analysis. BMC Pediatr.s, Vol. 21, No. 1 .10.1186/s12887-021-02559-6.
2. Bernabe, Z.J.E., M.I.L. Rodriguez, A.J.C. Alias, L.R. Rueda and P. Roman, *et al*., 2024. Early interventions with parental participation and their implications on the neurodevelopment of premature children: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Eur. Child amp Adolesc. Psy., 1-3.
3. Hutchon, B., D. Gibbs, P. Harniess, S. Jary and S. Crossley *et al*., 2019. Early intervention programmes for infants at high risk of atypical neurodevelopmental outcome. Dev. Med. amp Child Neurol., 61: 1362-1367.
4. Caporali, C., C. Pisoni, C. Naboni, L. Provenzi and S. Orcesi, 2020. Challenges and opportunities for early intervention and neurodevelopmental follow-up in preterm infants during the COVID-19 pandemic. Child: Care, Health Dev., Vol. 47, No. 1 .10.1111/cch.12812.
5. Hadders-Algra, M., 2021. Early diagnostics and early intervention in neurodevelopmental disorders-age-dependent challenges and opportunities. Journal of clinical medicine., Vol. 10, No. 4 .0.
6. Duncan, A.F. and M.A. Matthews, 2018. Neurodevelopmental Outcomes in Early Childhood. Clin. Perinatology, 45: 377-392.
7. Chung, E.H., J. Chou and K.A. Brown, 2020. Neurodevelopmental outcomes of preterm infants: A recent literature review. Transl. Pediatr.s, 9.
8. Puthussery, S., M. Chutiyami, P.C. Tseng, L. Kilby and J. Kapadia, 2018. Effectiveness of early intervention programs for parents of preterm infants: A meta-review of systematic reviews. BMC Pediatr.s, 18: 1-8.
9. Fontana, C., A.D. Carli, D. Ricci, F. Dessimone and S. Passera *et al.*, 2020. Effects of Early Intervention on Visual Function in Preterm Infants: A Randomized Controlled Trial. Front. Pediatr.s, Vol. 8 .10.3389/fped.2020.00291.
10. Silveira, R.C., E.W. Mendes, R.N. Fuentefria, N.C. Valentini and R.S. Procianoy, 2018. Early intervention program for very low birth weight preterm infants and their parents: A study protocol. BMC Pediatr.s, 18: 1-1`.
11. Cheong, J.L.Y., A.C. Burnett, K. Treyvaud and A.J. Spittle, 2019. Early environment and long-term outcomes of preterm infants. J. Neural Transmission, 127: 1-8.
12. Zhang, X., M. Kurtz, S.Y. Lee and H. Liu, 2014. Early Intervention for Preterm Infants and Their Mothers. J. Perinatal amp Neonatal Nurs., 35: 69-82.
13. Fontana, C., C. Menis, N. Pesenti, S. Passera and N. Liotto *et al.*, 2018. Effects of early intervention on feeding behavior in preterm infants: A randomized controlled trial. Early Hum. Dev., 121: 15-20.
14. McGowan, E.C., J.A. Hofheimer, T.M. O'Shea, H. Kilbride and B.S. Carter *et al.*, 2022. Analysis of Neonatal Neurobehavior and Developmental Outcomes Among Preterm Infants. JAMA Network Open, Vol. 5, No. 7 .10.1001/jamanetworkopen. 2022.22249.
15. You, J., B.H. Shamsi, M.C. Hao, C.H. Cao and W.Y. Yang., 2019. A study on the neurodevelopment outcomes of late preterm infants. BMC neurology., 19: 1-6.
16. Adams-Chapman, I., R.J. Heyne, S.B. DeMauro, A.F. Duncan, S.R. Hintz and A. Pappas, *et al.,* 2018. . Neurodevelopmental impairment among extremely preterm infants in the neonatal research network. Pediatrics., Vol. 141, No. 5 .0.
17. McGowan, E.C. and B.R. Vohr, 2019. Neurodevelopmental Follow-up of Preterm Infants. Pediatr. Clin. North Am., 66: 509-523.