Journal of Cardiovascular Disease Research

ISSN: 0975-3583, 0976-2833 VOL12, ISSUE04, 2021

Comparison of hemodynamic and respiratory effects of clonidine combined withpropofol versus fentanyl propofolfor insertion of AMBU LMA

Dr Vinuth K Murthy[1], Dr Pavankumar P[2], Dr Venugopal K[3]

[1]Senior resident, Department of Anesthesiology ,Kempegowda Institute of Medical Sciences, Bengaluru

[2]Senior resident, Department of Anesthesiology ,VIMS, Ballary-583104

[3]Assistant Professor, Department of Anesthesiology ,Kidwai Memorial Institute of Oncology, Bengaluru.

[1]Email: vinuthkmurthy@gmail.com

Abstract

Background: AMBU LMA is an airway device that requires adequate depth of anaesthesia and suppression of upper airway reflexes thereby providing optimal insertion conditions.

Aim: To compare clonidine and fentanyl for coinduction with propofol with respect to AMBU LMA insertion conditions, haemodynamicvariation,respiratory effect and the total dose requirement of propofol.

Materials and methods: This was a prospective randomized study, a total of 90 patients belonging to the American Society of Anesthesiologists (ASA 1 and 2) Patients were randomized into three groups to receive either propofol with clonidine or propofol with fentanyl and propofol only during insertion of AMBU LMA, Ninety seconds after propofol injection, AMBU LMA of appropriate size was inserted. Proper placement was confirmed by capnography. Conditions of AMBU LMA insertion were recorded and assessed, haemodynamic parameters, namely Heart rate(HR), mean blood pressure (MAP) ,spontaneous respiratoy rate were recorded and assessed before and after the insertion of AMBU LMA, at the end of 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 5th and 10th minute after the insertion. Informed consent and IEC clearance obtained. Statistical Analysis was done using SPSS 19.0.

Result: The mean Heart rate in patients who received combination of Clonidine with Propofol drugs has better hemodynamically stable over in patients who received antanyl-Propofol and patients who received only Propofol and this difference observed statistically significant at the 3min, 5min and 10min. The Mean Arterial pressure is initially increased, who received combination of Clonidine and Propofol drugs at pre operatively. During AMBU LMA insertion and later from 1min, 3min, 5min and 10min, Clonidine-propofol group has lesser Mean Arterial pressure compared to those who received Fentanyl Propofol and Propofol only, this difference is statistically significant at all-time intervals. The mean basal RR were comparable ($p>0.05$) in three groups. There was statistically significant ($p<0.001$) increase in the RR in Group D from 5 min onwards after insertion of AMBU LMA which got stabilized at 10 min. There was a fall in

ISSN: 0975-3583, 0976-2833 VOL12, ISSUE04, 2021

RR after induction with propofol followed by a rise. The magnitude of fall in RR from the base line value to that after induction with propofol was significantly more ($p<0.05$) in the fentanyl group than clonidine group.

Conclusion: Clonidine-Propofol is better and more effective, and provides stable hemodynamic profile and superior to Propofol-fentanyl and only propofol, in preserving respiration.

Key Word: AMBU LMA.

Address for correspondence:
DrVenugopal K,Assistant Professor, Department of Anesthesiology ,Kidwai Memorial Institute of Oncology, Bengaluru.

Email: venugopala246@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

The AMBU LMA is a device with a lumen that provides a seal around the laryngeal inlet. It allows spontaneous ventilation, as well as positive pressure ventilation with an airway pressure <15 cm H2O.[1] An AMBU LMA can be used safely in operations allowing spontaneous ventilation, instead of a face mask[2]. It has been shown that insertion of AMBU LMA requires lighter anaesthesia levels than endotracheal intubation.[1] AMBU LMA insertion requires adequate mouth opening and minimal upper airway reflexes such as coughing, gagging or laryngospasm[3]. Because of these reasons, there have been many studies to find the optimum anaesthetics to provide excellent conditions for AMBU LMA insertion. Since the time required for AMBU LMA insertion was reported to be longer with inhalational anaesthetics, intravenous (i.v.) agents have been preferred[4]. Also patient satisfaction was found better with i.v. anaesthetics[5]. Among the i.v. agents, propofol has been preferred the most because of its potential suppressor effects on upper airway reflexes[3]. When used alone without premedication, propofolprovides conditions for AMBU LMA insertion that is far from satisfactory[6] and causes cardiorespiratory depression[7]. In order to decrease the adverse effects of propofol, opioids or muscular relaxants were added to reduce the propofol dose requirement[8]. Muscle relaxants were not found to be effective[9] and even found to increase the risk of aspiration. Fentanyl and remifentanil were studied. Unfortunately, these medications increased the incidence and duration of apnoea[6,10]. Clonidine, a highly selective *a*2-adrenoceptor agonist, was shown to have sedative and analgesic properties. *a*2-adrenoceptors have many locations in the central nervous system (CNS). *a*2-adrenoceptor agonists were reported to exert their sedative effects via the receptors in locus coeruleus, known to have a role in respiratory control and function as an alarm system. Hsu and colleagues[11] reported clonidine, even when used at supramaximal plasma levels, to be clinically safe for respiration. Clonidine was also shown to diminish airway and circulatory responses during intubation and extubation[12].In this study, we aimed to provide successful AMBU LMA insertion

ISSN: 0975-3583, 0976-2833 VOL12, ISSUE04, 2021

conditions by using clonidine with propofol and to compare its effect with fentanyl combined with propofol.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This was a prospective randomized study that was conducted in the Department of Anesthesiology at our institution during the period of 2020 to 2021. The study was approved by the hospital ethics committee and obtaining informed consent from patients. A total of 90 patients age group 18-60 years belonging to the American Society of Anesthesiologists (ASA) grade I or II were included in the study. Patients were randomized into three groups to receive either propofol with clonidine (group D; n = 30) or propofol with fentanyl (group F; n = 30)andpropofol (group P; n = 30)only during insertion of AMBU LMA. Patients with significant cardiopulonary, respiratory, endocrinal, hepatic, Renal and metabolic disorders, Pregnant and breast feeding woman, who have undergone recent surgeries(within 7 days) and allergy to above the drugs were excluded in the study. Preparation of patients included period of overnight fasting, premedication with single dose of oral alprazolam 0.25 mg and ranitidine 150 mg, metoclopramide 10 mg, with sips of water ,2 hours before the procedure on the day of surgery, Patients were shifted to the operating room and the following parameters were monitored; electrocardiogram '(ECG), arterial oxygen saturation by pulse oximetry (SpO2) and noninvasive blood pressure monitoring. An intravenous line was secured with 18G cannula under local anaesthesia. Pre oxygenation was done for 3 min with a face mask at 8 L/min of oxygen flow. In Group F, 1 /ó kg fentanyl diluted in 10 ml normal saline (NS) was given over 2 min. In Group D, 1 ó g/kg clonidine diluted in 10 mL NS was given over 2 min. After, 30 sec, inj. propofol 2 mg/kg was administered to both the groups. Anesthesia was maintained by 50% nitrous oxide and oxygen and1 to1.5% sevoflurane titrated accordingly, with a fresh gas flow of 8 L/min and patient was ventilated manually via face mask when required, otherwise, spontaneous ventilation was allowed. Ninety seconds after propofol injection, AMBU LMA of appropriate size was inserted .Proper placement was confirmed by capnography. If the first attempt of AMBU LMA insertion failed, a second attempt was tried after administering an additional dose of intravenous propofol (0.5mg/kg).

RESULTS

The Mean Age of patients who received Clonidine and Propofol is 30±7 Years, the Mean Age of patients who received Fentanyl and Propofol is 31 ±7 Years and the Mean Age of patients who received only Propofol is 30±6 Years. Male female ratio was 1:0.9.The mean Heart rate in patients who received combination of Clonidine and Propofol drugs has better control over in patients who received Fentanyl and Propofol and patients who received only Propofol and this difference observed is statistically significant at the 3min, 5 min and 10 min though at the beginning it is not statistically significant.The Mean Arterial pressure is initially high who received combination of Clonidine and Propofol drugs at pre operatively later on dip at AMBU

ISSN: 0975-3583, 0976-2833 VOL12, ISSUE04, 2021

LMA insertion and later on during 1min, 3 min , 5min and 10 min time frame this group has lesser Mean Arterial pressure compared to those who received Fentanyl and Propofol and this difference is statistically significant at all-time intervals. The saturation remained nearly similar at all-time intervals with Clonidine and Propofol group, Fentanyl and Propofol group and patients who received only Propofol.

DISCUSSION

Endotracheal intubation is the most widely accepted general anesthesia technique but has complications, most of which arise from the need to visualize and penetrate the laryngeal opening. Increasing emphasis on day care anesthesia, lead to greater use of the SGA in place of facemask and endotracheal intubation during anesthesia.In1981 Dr Archie Brain began looking at the anatomy of upper airway and he began to develop laryngeal mask airway[13].It was primarily designed to provide some advantage over endotracheal intubation, by avoiding visualization of the vocal cords or damaging it. Satisfactory insertion of SGA insertion requires suppression of airway reflexes. A popular method of providing anesthesia for AMBU LMA insertion is with use of IV propofol, which has the advantage of inducing anesthesia rapidly and depressing upper airway reflexes. The AMBU LMA is a device, with a lumen that provides a seal around the laryngeal inlet. It allows spontaneous ventilation as well as positive pressure ventilation with an airway pressure of <15cm of water. Heart rate does not change significantly after an induction dose of propofol. Propofol either may reset or inhibit the baroreflex, reducing the tachycardic response to hypotension. In the present study comparing with Blake *et al*[14],there is significant increased in heart rate with propofol which has increased from 3rd minute to 10th minute compared to propofol clonidine and propofol fentanyl On the contrary, clonidine causes decrease in the HR by 25% after induction and returns to normal by 10thmin. This might probably be because insertion of a bulky device like AMBU LMA could have caused some sympathetic response increasing the effects of clonidine (inhibits the sympathetic activity by agonizing the postsynaptic membrane alpha2 receptor).Causing bradycardia on HR compared to previous study by Ramaswamy*et al*[15]and F.Uzumcugil*et al*[16], present study, as expected shows increase in RR in clonidine group compared to fentanyl group and propofol group. Clonidine, when used before propofol induction provides successful laryngeal mask insertion comparable to fentanyl, while preserving respiratory functions more than fentanyl.[17] No episodes of apnea were recorded, supported by the studies done by Venn *et al*[18] who had shown that hypercapnic arousal phenomenon was not affected by Clonidine, thus its sedation mimicking the natural sleep. The respiratory effects of Clonidine is due to its various sites of action, mainly on the locus caerulus, which is known to play a role in both respiratory control and sleep modulation. Clonidine converges on the natural sleep pathway to exert its sedative effects, whereas natural sleep does result in ventilation modulation.[19]The mean basal

ISSN: 0975-3583, 0976-2833 VOL12, ISSUE04, 2021

respiratory rate(RR) were comparable with minimum variations($p<0.05$).There was statically significant ($p< 0.001$) increase in respiratory rate in group D (clonidine-propofol) from 3 minutes onwards after insertion of laryngeal mask airway which got stabilized at 10 minutes. In the previous study by SowmyaJayaram*et al*[20] on respiratory rate were found similar in both groups. The respiratory depression in Group F was found to be greater than that in group D when compared in terms of number of patients developing apnoea. Clonidine is unique among sedatives as it is clinically safe from a respiratory point of view, even during doses high enough to cause unresponsiveness to vigorous stimulation and exhibiting hypercarbic arousal phenomenon similar to the ones described during natural sleep.[19]There was a statistically significant reduction from the base line in all the pressures measured especially Mean arterial pressure. Previous study by Scheinin B *et al*[21] were found similar results to the present study. The use of clonidine was associated with a decrease in MAP and HR, which might result from decrease in noradrenaline release, a decrease in centrally mediated sympathetic tone and an increase in vagal activity. Clonidine is reported to produce severe bradycardia, hypotension, hypertension and arrhythmias as side-effects. We never encountered severe hypertension or arrhythmias in our study. Moderate hypotension was managed by IV fluid administration. In accordance with the studies by and Uzumcugil*et al*,[16] and Belleville *et al*[22] dose of clonidine used for intraoperative sedation, was 1 mcg/kg given over 2 min. The intention was both to achieve rapid sedation and avoid alpha-1 side-effect such as hypertension and tachycardia. The obstructive respiration pattern and irregular breathing seen with such doses are probably related to deep sedation as well as anatomical features of the patient[15]. We did not encounter this problem to a major extent as our study was centered on insertion conditions of laryngeal mask insertion.

CONCLUSION

Our study concluded that Clonidine-Propofol is better and more effective, and provides stable hemodynamic profile and superior to Propofol-fentanyl and only propofol, in preserving respiration. Propofol is the suitable induction agent of choice for insertion of AMBU LMA. When used singly, can give rise to haemodynamic instability.
Limitations: This present study was designed only on the insertion conditions of AMBU LMA, emphasis was not given to sedation, pain, recovery and postoperative follow-up.

REFERENCES

1. Gal TJ. Airway management. In: Miller RD, ed. Miller's Anesthesia, 6th edn, vol. 2. Philadelphia, USA: Elsevier, Churchill Livingstone, 2005: 1617-53.
2. Janssens M, Lamy M. Laryngeal mask. Intensive Care World 1993; 10(2): 99-102.
3. Wilkins CJ, Cramp PG, Staples J, Stevens WC. Comparison of the anesthetic requirement fortolerance of laryngeal mask airway and endotracheal tube. AnesthAnalg 1992; 75(5): 794-7.

ISSN: 0975-3583, 0976-2833 VOL12, ISSUE04, 2021

4. Leong WM, Ong EL. Laryngeal mask airway can be inserted with inhaled desflurane induction. J Anesth2005; 19(2): 112-7.
5. Suzuki KS, Oohata M, Morı N. Multiple-deep-breath inhalation induction with 5% sevoflurane and 67% nitrous oxide: comparison with intravenous injection of propofol. J Anesth2002; 16(2): 97-101.
6. Yazicioglu H, Muslu S, Yamak B, Erdemli O. Laryngeal mask airway insertion with remifentanyl. ActaAnesthBelg2005; 56(2): 171-6.
7. Tayler N, Kenny GNC. Requirements for target-con- trolled infusion of propofol to insert the laryngeal mask airway. Anesthesia1998; 53: 222-6.
8. Mahajan VA, Ni Chonghaile M, Bokhari SA, Harte BH, Flynn NM, Laffey JG. Recovery of older patients undergoing ambulatory anesthesia with isoflurane or sevoflurane. Eur J Anesth2007; 24: 505–510.
9. Hemmerling TM, Beaulieu P, Klaus EJ, Babin D, Schmidt J. Neuromuscular blockade does not change the incidence or severity of pharyngolaryngeal discomfort after I GEL LMAanesthesia. Can J Anaesth 2004; 51(7): 728-2.
10. Goyagi T, Tanaka M, Nishikawa T. Fentanyl decreases propofol requirement for laryngeal mask airway insertion. ActaanesthScand2003; 47(6):771-4.
11. Hsu YW, Cortinez LI, Robertson KM *et al*. Clonidine pharmacodynamics: Part I, Crossover comparison of the respiratory effects of clonidine and remifentanil in healthy volunteers. Anesthesiology2004; 101: 1066-76.
12. Guler G, Akın A, Tosun Z, Ors S,Esmaoglu A, Boyacı A. Single-dose clonidine reduces agitation and provides smooth extubation after pediatricadenotosillectomy. PediatrAnesth2005; 15: 762-6.
13. Brain AJ. The Laryngeal mask: anew concept in airway management. Br J Anaesthesia1983;55:801-5.
14. Blake DW, Dawson P, Donnan G, BlorstenA.Propofol induction for laryngeal mask airwayinsertion:dose requirement and cardiorespiratory effects. Anaesth intensive care 1992;20:479-83.
15. A H Ramaswamy, Safiya Sheik comparison of combination of PropofolClonidine with Propofol Fentanyl in laryngeal mask insertion year:2015/31(2):217-20.
16. Uzumcugil F, Canbay O, Celebi N, KaragozAH.Ozgen S. Comparison of clonidinepropofolvs. Fentanylpropofol for laryngeal maskinsertion. Eur J Anaesthesiol 2008;25:675-80.
17. Ali AR, El Ghoneimy MN. Clonidine versus fentanyl as adjuvant to propofol: comparative study in children undergoing extracorporeal shock wave lithotripsy. European Journal of Anaesthesiology (EJA) 2010;27(12):1058-64.
18. Venn RM, Grounds RM. Comparison between clonidine and propofol for sedation in the intensive care unit: patient and clinical perceptions.Br J Anaesth 2001;87:684-90.
19. Maroof M, Khan RM, Jain D, Ashraf M.Clonidineis a useful adjunct for awake intubation.

ISSN: 0975-3583, 0976-2833 VOL12, ISSUE04, 2021

Can J Anesth 2005;52:776-7.
20. SowmyaJayaram, P. JanakiSubhadra, M. Hanumantha Rao. Comparison of clonidinepropofol vs. fentanylpropofol for laryngeal mask insertionClinSci Res 2014;3:228-36.
21. Scheinin B, Lindgren L, Randell T, Scheinin H, Scheinin M. Clonidine attenuates sympathoadrenal responses to tracheal intubation and reduces the need for thiopentone and peroperative fentanyl. Br J Anaesth. 1992;68:126-31.
22. Belleville JP, Ward DS, Bloor BC, Maze M. Effects of intravenous clonidine in humans. I. Sedation, - ventilation, and metabolic rate. Anesthesiology 1992; 77:1125-33.