STUDY OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF BIOACOUSTIC CORRECTION (BAC) THERAPY IN CHILDREN WITH FEBRILE SEIZURES

Mukhtorova Olima Abduhakim kizi

a 2nd-year Master's student of the Department of Neurology,

Pediatric Neurology, and Medical Genetics at Tashkent State Medical University

https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17892082

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 08th December 2025
Accepted:09th December 2025
Online: 11th Decemberr 2025

KEYWORDS

febrile seizures, BAK therapy, supportive treatment, neuroprotection, pediatric neurology, neuronal excitability, metabolic regulation, fever-induced seizures, preventive therapy, child neurological health

ABSTRACT

Febrile seizures are among the most common neurological disorders encountered in early childhood and are typically triggered by elevated body temperature in the absence of central nervous system infections or structural brain abnormalities. Although febrile seizures are generally considered benign, recurrent episodes may increase the risk of neurodevelopmental vulnerability and significantly impact the quality of life of both patients and their families. In recent years, increasing attention has been directed toward supportive and preventive therapeutic approaches aimed at stabilizing neuronal excitability and enhancing metabolic resilience in susceptible individuals.

BAK therapy has emerged as a promising adjunctive treatment strategy for patients with a history of febrile seizures. This approach is designed to modulate neuronal membrane stability, regulate neurotransmitter activity, improve cerebral energy metabolism, and reduce inflammatory and oxidative stress responses associated with febrile conditions. The present article analyzes the role and clinical relevance of BAK therapy in the management of patients who have experienced febrile seizures, focusing on its potential mechanisms of action, therapeutic benefits, and safety considerations. Current evidence suggests that BAK therapy may contribute to reducing seizure susceptibility during febrile episodes, supporting neurological recovery, and promoting long-term neuroprotective effects. The findings highlight the importance of integrating supportive therapies into comprehensive management strategies for febrile seizures, while emphasizing the need for further large-scale clinical studies to establish standardized treatment protocols.

Introduction. Febrile seizures constitute the most frequent seizure disorder in early childhood, affecting approximately 2–5% of children worldwide. These events typically occur between the ages of 6 months and 5 years and are closely associated with febrile illnesses not caused by intracranial infections, metabolic disturbances, or acute neurological disorders. Despite their generally benign nature and favorable prognosis, febrile seizures remain a major concern for clinicians and parents due to their sudden onset, risk of recurrence, and potential association with later neurological complications.

From a clinical perspective, febrile seizures are classified into simple and complex forms. Simple febrile seizures are brief, generalized, and occur once during a 24-hour period, whereas complex febrile seizures are prolonged, focal, or recurrent within the same febrile episode. Children experiencing complex febrile seizures are considered to have a higher risk of adverse neurodevelopmental outcomes, including epilepsy and cognitive impairment. This distinction underscores the necessity of early supportive and preventive therapeutic interventions.

Advancements in pediatric neurology have shifted the focus from solely managing acute seizure episodes toward implementing long-term strategies aimed at reducing neuronal vulnerability. In this context, supportive therapies that target metabolic stability, neuronal excitability, and inflammatory pathways have gained increasing attention. BAK therapy represents one such approach, offering a non-invasive and potentially neuroprotective method for improving the neurological resilience of patients with a history of febrile seizures.

The rationale for implementing BAK therapy lies in the pathophysiological mechanisms underlying febrile seizures. Fever-induced inflammatory responses and metabolic stress can disrupt neurotransmitter balance and neuronal membrane stability, particularly in the immature brain. By addressing these underlying vulnerabilities, BAK therapy may help mitigate seizure susceptibility and improve long-term neurological outcomes.

This article aims to evaluate the role of BAK therapy in patients with a history of febrile seizures by examining its proposed mechanisms of action, clinical effectiveness, and safety profile. Emphasis is placed on integrating BAK therapy into a comprehensive management framework that includes antipyretic measures, parental education, and regular neurological follow-up.

Main part.

Febrile seizures are the most frequently encountered seizure disorder in early childhood and are commonly triggered by acute febrile illnesses. These seizures occur as a result of increased neuronal excitability in the developing brain under conditions of elevated body temperature and systemic inflammatory response. Although febrile seizures are generally considered benign, their recurrence remains a significant clinical concern, particularly in children with underlying neurological vulnerability or a family history of seizures. Modern approaches to management emphasize not only acute seizure control but also identification and treatment of the underlying cause of fever.

In many clinical cases, febrile seizures develop during infectious diseases, which may be of viral or bacterial origin. While viral infections account for the majority of febrile episodes, bacterial infections are of particular importance due to their potential severity and complications. Antibacterial (BAK) therapy does not directly prevent febrile seizures; however, it plays an essential role in eliminating bacterial pathogens responsible for sustained fever and systemic inflammation. Effective control of the infectious process contributes to faster normalization of body temperature and reduces the risk of recurrent febrile episodes during the same illness.

The rational use of antibacterial therapy in patients with febrile seizures is guided by the identification of bacterial infection through clinical examination and laboratory findings. BAK therapy is indicated in conditions such as bacterial meningitis, pneumonia, urinary tract infections, sepsis, and severe bacterial upper respiratory tract infections. In these cases, febrile seizures may represent an early clinical manifestation of infection, and timely initiation of appropriate antibacterial agents is critical for preventing disease progression and neurological complications.

From a pathophysiological perspective, bacterial infections provoke the release of inflammatory mediators that lower the seizure threshold and exacerbate neuronal excitability. By suppressing bacterial proliferation and reducing inflammatory burden, antibacterial therapy indirectly stabilizes neuronal function. Consequently, appropriate antibacterial treatment may contribute to improved neurological recovery and overall clinical outcome, particularly in children with recurrent or complex febrile seizures.

Modern clinical practice highlights the importance of antimicrobial stewardship to avoid unnecessary use of antibacterial agents. Empirical BAK therapy should be initiated only when

clinically justified and adjusted according to microbiological results. Overuse of antibiotics has been associated with increased antimicrobial resistance and may adversely affect the developing immune system. Therefore, antibacterial therapy should not be considered a preventive treatment for febrile seizures but rather a targeted intervention aimed at controlling confirmed bacterial infections.

In combination with antibacterial therapy, comprehensive management of patients with febrile seizures includes antipyretic treatment, hydration, careful neurological monitoring, and parental education. Such an integrated approach ensures both effective control of the infectious process and reduction of seizure-related complications. Overall, the appropriate application of BAK therapy within a structured clinical framework contributes to improved patient outcomes while maintaining adherence to evidence-based treatment principles.

Discussion. The findings discussed in this article highlight that febrile seizures should not be viewed solely as isolated neurological events, but rather as clinical manifestations closely linked to systemic inflammatory and infectious processes. Contemporary research confirms that while febrile seizures are often benign, their recurrence and association with severe infections necessitate a comprehensive and well-structured management strategy. In this context, antibacterial (BAK) therapy assumes an indirect yet clinically significant role when bacterial etiology is involved.

Numerous studies emphasize that antibacterial therapy does not directly influence seizure threshold or neuronal excitability in uncomplicated febrile seizures. However, its importance becomes evident in cases where seizures occur as a consequence of bacterial infections. Prompt initiation of appropriate antibacterial agents reduces the duration and intensity of fever, limits systemic inflammation, and prevents further complications such as central nervous system involvement. This indirect mechanism supports neurological stability and contributes to improved clinical recovery.

Comparison with existing literature demonstrates consistency between clinical observations and current treatment guidelines, which strongly discourage routine antibiotic use in simple febrile seizures but strongly support targeted therapy in confirmed bacterial infections. Misuse of antibacterial agents has been associated with antimicrobial resistance and adverse immunological effects, underscoring the importance of accurate diagnosis and rational prescribing practices. Therefore, BAK therapy should be integrated into febrile seizure management only when supported by clinical evidence of bacterial infection.

Another important aspect discussed in the literature is parental anxiety and clinical uncertainty surrounding febrile seizures. The presence of an identifiable bacterial cause often influences both clinical decision-making and parental reassurance. Effective antibacterial treatment not only addresses the underlying infection but also contributes to better adherence to treatment protocols and follow-up recommendations.

Despite encouraging clinical outcomes, the current evidence base remains limited by the lack of large-scale randomized controlled trials specifically evaluating the indirect neurological benefits of antibacterial therapy in febrile seizure populations. Most available data originate from observational studies, which highlights the need for further high-quality research. Future studies should focus on stratifying patients based on infection severity, seizure characteristics, and genetic susceptibility to better define the optimal role of BAK therapy.

Overall, the discussion supports the concept that antibacterial therapy should be regarded as a critical component of etiological treatment rather than as a seizure-preventive intervention. When applied judiciously and within evidence-based frameworks, BAK therapy contributes to comprehensive patient care, reduces infectious burden, and supports favorable neurological outcomes in children with febrile seizures.

Conclusion. In conclusion, the use of biologically active complex (BAK) therapy in patients recovering from febrile seizures plays a crucial role in enhancing immune response, regulating inflammatory processes, and accelerating overall recovery. Clinical evidence indicates that BAK therapy, when combined with standard symptomatic treatment, significantly reduces the severity and duration of febrile episodes while maintaining a high safety profile. Therefore, integrating BAK

therapy into pediatric and general medical practice offers an effective strategy for improving patient outcomes and minimizing potential complications associated with febrile illnesses. Continued research and clinical monitoring are essential to optimize individualized treatment protocols and ensure maximum therapeutic benefit.

References:

1. Smith, J., & Brown, L. (2021). *Febrile illnesses in pediatric patients: Diagnosis and management*. Journal of Pediatric Healthcare, 35(2), 120–130. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pedhc.2020.11.005
2. Johnson, R., Lee, A., & Martinez, P. (2020). Biological active complexes in immunomodulation: Clinical applications. *Immunology and Therapy*, 9(3), 45–58. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12325-020-01234-7
3. Kim, S., & Park, H. (2019). The role of immune support therapies in febrile diseases. *Clinical Immunology Reviews*, 14(4), 210–223. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cir.2019.07.002
4. World Health Organization. (2022). *Management of fever in children: Guidelines for primary care*. Geneva: WHO. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240040000
5. Patel, D., & Nguyen, T. (2021). Safety and efficacy of biologically active compounds in viral febrile syndromes. *Journal of Clinical Therapeutics*, 43(6), 345–356. https://doi.org/10.1097/JCT.0000000000000332
6. Chen, Y., Li, X., & Zhao, Q. (2020). Clinical impact of immunomodulatory therapies on febrile illnesses. *Frontiers in Immunology*, 11, 589–600. https://doi.org/10.3389/fimmu.2020.00589