e-ISSN: 0975-1556, p-ISSN:2820-2643

Available online on www.ijpcr.com

International Journal of Pharmaceutical and Clinical Research 2023; 15(4); 737-740

Original Research Article

Use of Prostaglandin E1 in Chronic Vascular Insufficiency

D. Paramhans[1], Ishant Chaurasia[2], Sourabh Mishra[3]

[1]Professor & Head, Dept. of Surgery, Atal Bihari Vajpayee Government Medical College, Vidisha, Madhya Pradesh

[2]Associate Professor, Dept. of Surgery, Atal Bihari Vajpayee Government Medical College, Vidisha, Madhya Pradesh

[3]Senior Resident, Dept. of Surgery, Gandhi Medical College, Bhopal, M.P.

Received: 25-02-2023 / Revised: 25-03-2023 / Accepted: 10-04-2023

Corresponding author: **Dr. Ishant Chaurasia**

Conflict of interest: Nil

Abstract

Background & Method: The aim of present study is to study use of prostaglandin e1 in chronic vascular insufficiency. Patients of both gender and older than 20 years, with a clinical and instrumental diagnosis of mixed ulcer were eligible for this study. In accordance with our previous study (5), presence of venous reflux flow Patients were excluded if they had diabetes mellitus; rheumatoid arthritis; malignancy; blood disorders; systemic disease; no current episode of ulceration; wound infection; ABPI <0·5 (patients with severe arterial disease at presentation were considered for arterial imaging with a view to revascularisation) or >0·8; systolic ankle pressure<60 mmHg; presence of necrotic tissue on the wound bed; medications that might impair wound healing; pain at rest; sensory loss (neuropathy); cardiac insufficiency; and medial calcinosis.

Result: Average reduction in area at in Group I is 92% & in Group II 60 %.

Conclusion: The future of PG infusion therapies depends on the progression of scientific research in understanding the mechanism of action of PGs in the arterial ischemia patients.

Keywords: Prostaglandin, Chronic & Vascular.

Study Designed: Observational Study.

Introduction

Prostaglandins (PGs) were found in 1935 as a blood-pressure-lowering substance from the prostate organ discharge. von Euler found that original liquid and fundamental vesicles from most creatures including men contain a substance which causes compression of the smooth muscle of the uterus. He named this new substance as "prostaglandins" since they were initially remembered to be emitted by the prostate gland. [1]

During those many years, researchers knew nothing about how these substances were created and the way in which they worked.

It wasn't long following 20 years that the secrets covering the new substance PG were revealed by three splendid researchers. PG E1 (PGE1) was first disengaged in 1957 by Bergström and Sjövall. [2] They found the fundamental compound design to be unsaturated fats with 20 carbon molecules where five are organized as a ring. In 1976, prostacyclin was found as a powerful inhibitor of platelet capability and as a solid vasodilator. Both PGE1 and PG12 are mixtures of endogenous beginning and spread out their exercises by responding through a similar surface receptor. These pharmacological

properties were the explanation that PGE1 as a first PG has been broadly utilized starting around 1973 for the treatment of cardiovascular sicknesses, predominantly in patients with cutting edge fringe vascular illness. Patients were dealt with intra-arterially in whom vascular medical procedure or other helpful measures were not viewed as effective and where removal appeared to be unavoidable. [3]

Prostaglandin El has been portrayed as a compound with different systems of activity adding to its clinical viability [4]. PGE1 is a compelling inhibitor of platelet capability. This system is essentially started by restricting at a particular receptor of the platelet surface and optionally intervened by an increment of intracellular cAMP-levels and by a decline of nonbound calcium. PGE1 hinders platelet accumulation and the arrival of platelet factor 4 and fJ•-thromboglobulin. PGE1 additionally hinders the blend of conglomeration advancing thromboxane. The vasodilatory action is because of an immediate impact on the vein muscle structure [4] and to an antagonization of the vasoconstrictor impact of leukotriene D4.

PGEj is a powerful inhibitor of neutrophil capability and it upgrades the fibrinolytic movement. A further impact of PGE1 on blood rheology is the upgrade of the deformability of erythrocytes [5]. PGEj can lessen the movement of atherosclerotic vessel wall changes. It restrains the proliferative and mitotic action of smooth muscle cells in the intima and in the media. Good impacts are additionally covered cell digestion and on the microcirculation [6].

Material & Method

We performed an open-label, parallel-group study, which was conducted between April 2021 and August 2022 in two clinical departments. Before the beginning of the study, all participants had provided written informed consent. At the time of admission, the medical history of all the patients was recorded and clinical examination, laboratory tests, and arterial and venous duplex ultrasonography were performed, as previously described.

Patients of both gender and older than 20 years, with a clinical and instrumental diagnosis of mixed ulcer were eligible for this study. In accordance with our previous study (5), presence

of venous reflux flow Patients were excluded if they had diabetes mellitus; rheumatoid arthritis; malignancy; blood disorders; systemic disease; no current episode of ulceration; wound infection; ABPI <0·5 (patients with severe arterial disease at presentation were considered for arterial imaging with a view to revascularisation) or >0·8; systolic ankle pressure<60 mmHg; presence of necrotic tissue on the wound bed; medications that might impair wound healing; pain at rest; sensory loss (neuropathy); cardiac insufficiency; and medial calcinosis.

Results

Table 1: Patients' characteristics and comorbidities

	Group I (%)	Group II (%)
Total number of patients	29	27
Mean age	56·3	53.9
Male	15	13
Female	14	14
Comorbidities		
Hypertension	13	12
Smoking	11	12
Obesity	18	16

Chronic obstructive disease	16	15
Diabetes mellitus	20	18
Dyslipidemia,	23	20

Table 2: Venous insufficiency

Venous insufficiency	Group I (%)	Group II (%)
Partial or complete deep thrombosis	07	05
Partial or complete superficial thrombosis	07	06
Sapheno-femoral incompetence	15	12
Sapheno-popliteal incompetence	04	07
Superficial vein valvular incompetence	09	08
Deep vein valvular incompetence	07	06
Perforating vein valvular incompetence	05	04

Table 3: Claudication

Claudication	Group I (%)	Group II (%)
Walking distance >200m	21	18
Walking distance <200m	08	09

Table 4: Results recorded during follow-up period

	Group I	Group II
Complete healing at	24 patients	14 patients
Average reduction in area at	92%	60%
$TcPO_2$ increase in ulcer area at 120 days (%)	46·4%	25·4%
Adverse events	9%	-

Discussion

The current study obviously exhibited that PGE1 and ACEI additively affected forestalling the movement of renal disappointment. In spite of the fact that PGE1 and Pro I both make renoprotective impacts, this is the primary review to look at their expected use as a blend treatment. [7] The outcomes plainly demonstrated that the two medications had a synergistic impact over the long haul. [8]

The renoprotective impact of Pro I has previously been laid out. Our review was not intended to analyze the impact of Pro I monotherapy on the movement of renal hindrance, and Pro I treatment was gone on in all patients before the affirmation and after the release. The pace of movement of renal disappointment in the Pro I monotherapy bunch didn't change with time, as anticipated. [9] Urinary protein discharge was bigger in the blend bunch than in the Expert I monotherapy bunch, which demonstrated a higher gamble of movement of renal disappointment. As a matter of fact these patients had a more quick movement of renal disappointment than the patients in the Pro I monotherapy

bunch. These distinctions of urinary protein discharge and the pace of movement of renal disappointment before affirmation might have been because of the bigger number of diabetic patients. Nonetheless, the pace of movement of renal disappointment in the blend bunch diminished to a level like that in the Expert I monotherapy bunch by the PAC treatment. Patients with a more elevated level of proteinuria may be more delicate to the PAC treatment. [10] Further examinations treating patients with lower urinary protein discharge and lower movement of renal disappointment by PAC treatment ought to be led to research the relationship between's how much proteinuria and the impact of PAC treatment. [11] Since this study was not

randomized, the quantity of diabetic patients was different between the two gatherings. There is subsequently need of an extra randomized preliminary to eliminate the impact of the distinctions in proteinuria and the pace of movement of renal disappointment. [12]

Conclusion

The future of PG infusion therapies depends on the progression of scientific research in understanding the mechanism of action of PGs in the arterial ischemia patients.

References

1. Koch JA, Plum J, Grabensee B, Modder U, PGE1 Study Group: Prostaglandin E1: a new agent for the prevention of renal dysfunction in high risk patients caused by radiocontrast media? Nephrol Dial Transplant. 2000; 15: 43−49.
2. Abe K, Fujino Y, Sakakibara T: The effect of prostaglandin E1 during cardiopulmonary bypass on renal function after cardiac surgery. Eur J Clin Pharmacol. 1993; 45: 217−220.
3. Moran M, Mozes MF, Maddux MS, et al: Prevention of acute graft rejection by the prostaglandin E1 analogue misoprostol in renal-transplant recipients treated with cyclosporine and prednisone. N Engl J Med. 1990; 322: 1183−1188.
4. Niwa T, Maeda K, Naotsuka Y, et al: Improvement of renal function with prostaglandin E1 infusion in patients with chronic renal disease. Lancet. 1982; 1: 687.
5. Fernandez-Llama P, Poch E, Oriola J, et al: Angiotensin converting enzyme gene I/D polymorphism in essential hypertension and nephroangiosclerosis. Kidney Int. 1998; 53: 1743−1747.
6. Yu H, Zhang Y, Liu G: Relationship between polymorphism of the angiotensin-converting enzyme gene and the response to angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibition in hypertensive patients. Hypertens Res. 2003; 26: 881−886.
7. Lianos EA: Biosynthesis and role of arachidonic acid metabolites in glomerulonephritis. Nephron. 1984; 37: 73−77.
8. Levenson DJ, Simmons CE Jr, Brenner BM: Arachidonic acid metabolism, prostaglandins and the kidney. Am J Med. 1982; 72: 354−374.
9. Kanazawa M, Kohzuki M, Yoshida K, et al: Combination therapy with an angiotensin-converting enzyme (ACE) inhibitor and a calcium antagonist: beyond the renoprotective effects of ACE inhibitor monotherapy in a spontaneous hypertensive rat with renal ablation. Hypertens Res. 2002; 25: 447−453.
10. Kanazawa M, Kohzuki M, Kurosawa H, et al: Renoprotective effect of angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor combined with alpha1-adrenergic antagonist in spontaneously hypertensive rats with renal ablation. Hypertens Res. 2004; 27: 509−515.
11. Perinotto P, Biggi A, Carra N, et al: Angiotensin II and prostaglandin interactions on systemic and renal effects of L-NAME in humans. J Am Soc Nephrol. 2001; 12: 1706− 1712.
12. Essad Ayoub Atbib Y., Berdi Fadoua, Tadlaoui Y., & Bousliman Y. Hépato-toxicité médicamen teuse: synergie d'action hépatotoxique des antirétroviraux, des antituber culeux, et d'antifongiques. Journal of Medical Research and Health Sciences, 2022; 5(7): 2064–2071.