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

Available online on www.ijpcr.com

International Journal of Pharmaceutical and Clinical Research 2024; 16(3); 1028-1031

Original Research Article

Influence of Patient Anatomical Variability on the Pharmacodynamics of Intravenous Anaesthetics: An Observational Study

Sharanya Vootla[1], Edward Indla[2], Ravikiran Morampudi[3], Prashanth Kumar Patnaik[4]

[1]Senior Resident, Department Of Anaesthesiology, Government Medical College, Khammam, Telangana, India

[2]PhD Scholar, Department of Anatomy, Meenakshi Academy of Higher Education and Research, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India

[3]PhD Scholar, Department of Anatomy, Meenakshi Academy of Higher Education and Research, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India

[4]Associate Professor, Department Of Pharmacology, RVM Institute of Medical Sciences and Research Centre, Laxmakkapally Village, Siddipet District, Telangana, India

Received: 25-12-2023 / Revised: 23-01-2024 / Accepted: 26-02-2024

Corresponding Author: Dr. Prashanth Kumar Patnaik

Conflict of interest: Nil

Abstract:

Background: The efficacy and safety of intravenous anaesthetics can be significantly influenced by patient-specific anatomical variations. Understanding these influences is crucial for optimizing anaesthetic management and improving patient outcomes in surgical settings.

Objectives: This study aims to assess the impact of anatomical variability, including body mass index (BMI), liver size, and vascular complexity, on the pharmacodynamics of intravenous anaesthetics, and to evaluate how these factors affect hemodynamic responses, recovery times, postoperative pain management, adverse effects, and patient satisfaction.

Methods: We conducted an observational study involving 100 patients undergoing elective surgeries. Patients were categorized based on BMI, liver size (assessed via ultrasound), and vascular complexity. We measured the onset of anaesthesia, duration of action, clearance rates, hemodynamic stability, recovery times, opioid requirements, incidence of adverse effects, and patient satisfaction scores.

Results: Patients with higher BMI and larger liver sizes experienced delayed onset and prolonged duration of anaesthetic effects, along with slowed clearance rates. Those with higher vascular complexity exhibited more significant variability in hemodynamic responses and increased incidence of intraoperative hypotension. Recovery times and opioid requirements were also influenced by these anatomical factors, with higher BMIs and larger liver sizes leading to prolonged recovery and increased pain management needs. Adverse effects and patient satisfaction varied significantly across the different anatomical groups, highlighting the importance of individualized anaesthetic management.

Conclusions: Anatomical variability significantly influences the pharmacodynamics and clinical outcomes of intravenous anaesthetics. Tailoring anaesthetic management to individual patient characteristics can enhance efficacy, safety, and satisfaction.

Keywords: Intravenous Anaesthetics, Anatomical Variability, Pharmacodynamics, Hemodynamic Responses, Recovery Times, Postoperative Pain, Patient Satisfaction.

Introduction

The administration of intravenous anaesthetics is a cornerstone in modern anaesthesiology, facilitating the induction and maintenance of anaesthesia during surgical procedures [1]. These agents act swiftly to produce loss of consciousness, amnesia, and analgesia; ensuring patients undergo surgeries with minimal discomfort and stress [2].

However, the pharmacodynamics and pharmacokinetics of intravenous anaesthetics can be significantly influenced by a myriad of patient-specific factors, including but not limited to body mass index (BMI), liver size, and the complexity of vascular anatomy [3,4]. These anatomical variations can affect the distribution, metabolism, and elimination of anaesthetic agents, leading to variability in drug efficacy, safety profiles, and patient outcomes.

Anatomical variability, such as differences in BMI, can influence the volume of distribution for lipophilic drugs, altering their onset and duration of action. Similarly, liver size and function directly

impact the metabolism of most intravenous anaesthetics, with implications for drug clearance and the risk of prolonged sedation or toxicity [5]. Additionally, vascular complexity, which affects drug delivery to the central nervous system, can lead to variations in the onset time and effectiveness of anaesthetic agents6.

Despite the critical role of these anatomical factors in anaesthetic management, there remains a gap in comprehensive understanding and integration of these variables into clinical practice. This study aims to bridge this gap by systematically observing and analyzing the influence of patient anatomical variability on the pharmacodynamics of intravenous anaesthetics.

By exploring how these individual differences affect drug action, hemodynamic responses, recovery processes, and the incidence of adverse effects, we seek to underscore the importance of tailored anaesthetic strategies. This approach aims to optimize anaesthetic efficacy, enhance patient safety, and improve overall satisfaction, providing valuable insights for the advancement of personalized anaesthesiology.

Methodology

Study Design and Setting: This observational study was conducted at the RVM Institute of Medical Sciences and Research Centre, Siddipet, Telangana, from February 2023 to January 2024. The research aimed to investigate the impact of patient anatomical variability on the pharmacodynamics of intravenous anaesthetics and its subsequent effects on clinical outcomes in a surgical setting.

Population and Sample Size: A total of 100 patients scheduled for elective surgeries under general anaesthesia during the study period were enrolled. Inclusion criteria comprised adult patients (aged 18 years and above) undergoing various elective surgical procedures.

Exclusion criteria included patients with known allergies to the study anaesthetics, chronic liver or kidney diseases, and those undergoing emergency surgeries [7].

Data Collection and Grouping: Patients were categorized based on anatomical variability factors: BMI (<18.5, 18.5-24.9, 25-29.9, >30), liver size (small, medium, large, extra-large assessed via ultrasound), and vascular anatomy complexity (low, moderate, high, very high). These categorizations facilitated the evaluation of pharmacodynamics across different anatomical profiles.

Anaesthetic Administration: The intravenous anaesthetics examined included Propofol, Etomidate, and Ketamine. Selection of the anaesthetic agent was based on the anaesthesiologist's discretion, taking into account the patient's medical history and surgical requirements. Dosage and administration followed standard clinical guidelines, with adjustments made for individual patient factors as necessary.

Outcome Measures: The primary outcomes included the onset of anaesthesia, duration of action, clearance rates, and hemodynamic stability. Secondary outcomes focused on recovery times, postoperative pain management (opioid requirements), adverse effects (e.g., hypotension, postoperative nausea and vomiting), and patient satisfaction scores [8].

Data Analysis: Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the demographic and clinical characteristics of the study population.

Comparative analyses among different anatomical groups were conducted using ANOVA or Kruskal-Wallis tests for continuous variables and Chi-squared or Fisher's exact tests for categorical variables, depending on the distribution of the data.

A p-value of less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Ethical Considerations: The study was carried out in compliance with norms and recommendations for ethics. We acquired informed consent from each individual.

The protocol for the study was examined, and the relevant authorities were consulted for prior authorization.

Results

Pharmacodynamics Observations: Our study analyzed the impact of patient anatomical variability on the pharmacodynamics of intravenous anaesthetics among 100 patients undergoing elective surgeries. The observations were categorized based on body mass index (BMI), liver size, and vascular complexity (Table 1).

Patients with a higher BMI (>30) experienced a delayed onset of anaesthesia (mean = 70 seconds) compared to those with a lower BMI (<18.5, mean = 40 seconds). Similarly, those with very high vascular complexity had a longer onset time (mean = 80 seconds) versus patients with low complexity (mean = 40 seconds).

The duration of action was notably prolonged in patients with large liver sizes (mean = 55 minutes) and very high vascular complexity (mean = 70 minutes).

Additionally, clearance rates were significantly slowed in individuals with very high vascular complexity.

Hemodynamic Responses: Hemodynamic stability varied across different levels of vascular complexity (Table 2). Patients with very high vascular

complexity showed a greater variability in blood pressure response (15%) and a higher incidence of intraoperative hypotension (30%) compared to those with low vascular complexity (5% incidence of hypotension).

Recovery Times and Postoperative Pain Management: Recovery times and opioid requirements were influenced by BMI and liver size (Table 3). Recovery Times and Postoperative Pain Management: Patients with a BMI >30 had significantly longer recovery times (mean = 50 minutes) and required a 20% increase in postoperative opioid dosing. Conversely, those with a small liver size showed quicker recovery (mean = 25 minutes) and had a lower increase in opioid needs.

Adverse Effects: Adverse effects such as hypotension during surgery and postoperative nausea and vomiting varied with anatomical variability (Table 4). A higher rate of hypotension was observed in patients with very high vascular complexity (30%) and a BMI >30 (25%). Postoperative nausea and vomiting were most common in patients with a BMI >30 (40%).

Patient Satisfaction: Patient satisfaction scores decreased with increasing vascular complexity, with the highest scores reported in patients with low complexity (8.2) and the lowest in those with very high complexity (6.5) (Table 5). These results underscore the significant influence of anatomical variability on the pharmacodynamics of intravenous anaesthetics, hemodynamic responses, recovery profiles, adverse effect incidences, and overall patient satisfaction. Our findings suggest that individual anatomical factors should be considered in the dosing and administration of intravenous anaesthetics to optimize outcomes and enhance patient satisfaction.

Table 1: Pharmacodynamics Observations

Parameter	BMI <18.5	BMI >30	Small Liver Size	Large Liver Size	Low Vascular Complexity	Very High Vascular Complexity
Onset of Anaesthesia (seconds)	40	70	50	60	40	80
Duration of Action (minutes)	45	60	35	55	50	70
Clearance Rates (%)	Normal	Slowed	Normal	Slowed	Normal	Significantly slowed

Table 2: Hemodynamic Responses

Parameter	Low Complexity	High Complexity	Very High Complexity
Variability in Blood Pressure Response (%)	5	10	15
Intraoperative Hypotension Incidence (%)	5	20	30

Table 3: Recovery Times and Postoperative Pain Management

Parameter	BMI <18.5	BMI >30	Small Liver Size	Extra-Large Liver Size
Recovery Times (minutes)	20	50	25	35
Postoperative Opioid Requirement Increase (%)	0	20	10	25

Table 4: Adverse Effects

Parameter	Low Vascular Complexity	Very High Vascular Complexity	BMI <18.5	BMI >30
Hypotension During Surgery (%)	5	30	10	25
Postoperative Nausea and Vomiting (%)	20	35	22	40

Table 5: Patient Satisfaction

Vascular Complexity	Average Satisfaction Score
Low	8.2
High	7.5
Very High	6.5

Discussion

The findings of this study underscore the significant influence of anatomical variability on the pharmacodynamics of intravenous anaesthetics and subsequent clinical outcomes in elective surgical procedures. The variability in onset times, duration of action, and clearance rates across different BMI categories, liver sizes, and vascular complexities highlights the critical need for personalized anaes-

thetic management. These results are in line with existing literature that suggests pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of drugs can be markedly affected by physiological and anatomical patient factors [9].

Patients with a higher BMI experienced delayed onset and prolonged duration of anaesthetic effects, aligning with studies that indicate adipose tissue affects the volume of distribution and metabolism of lipophilic drugs like Propofol. This necessitates consideration of body composition in dosing strategies to prevent prolonged sedation or inadequate anaesthesia. Similarly, the extended duration of action observed in patients with larger liver sizes can be attributed to the liver's central role in drug metabolism. These findings suggest that liver function assessments could enhance the predictability of anaesthetic effects, ensuring safer surgical outcomes [10,11].

Moreover, the study highlighted how vascular complexity can impact the pharmacodynamics of anaesthetics, influencing not only the onset and duration but also the clearance rates of these drugs. This has important implications for the administration and monitoring of anaesthesia in patients with complex vascular anatomies, where standard dosing may lead to suboptimal outcomes [12].

The variations in hemodynamic responses further illustrate the interconnectedness of anatomical features and drug effects, emphasizing the importance of vigilant monitoring and potential preoperative assessment of vascular anatomy to anticipate and manage hemodynamic instabilities. The influence of anatomical variability on recovery times and opioid requirements highlights the necessity for individualized postoperative pain management plans. Additionally, the higher incidence of adverse effects in certain anatomical profiles points to the need for tailored anaesthetic protocols to minimize risks. Patient satisfaction being correlated with anatomical variability and clinical outcomes suggests that patient-centered care, which considers individual anatomical and physiological characteristics, can significantly improve patient experiences and satisfaction levels post-surgery.

Conclusion

This study highlights the significance of incorporating anatomical and physiological characteristics of patients into anesthetic management and surgical planning. It illuminates the potential for enhanced safety, efficacy, and patient satisfaction via personalized medicine in anesthesiology.

Future research endeavors should aim at creating predictive models that include a broader spectrum of anatomical and physiological parameters. Such models could further refine anesthetic dosing and management strategies, offering a tailored approach to patient care.

References

1. Morse JD, Cortinez LI, Anderson BJ. Pharmacokinetic Pharmacodynamic Modelling Contributions to Improve Paediatric Anaesthesia Practice. J Clin Med. 2022 May 26; 11(11):3009.
2. Wujtewicz M, Owczuk R. Heart rate variability in anaesthesiology - narrative review. Anaesthesiol Intensive Ther. 2023;55(1):1-8.
3. Valk BI, Struys MMRF. Etomidate and its Analogs: A Review of Pharmacokinetics and Pharmacodynamics. Clin Pharmacokinet. 2021 Oct; 60(10):1253-1269.
4. Malagutti N, McGinness G, Nithyanandam DA. Real-Time Personalised Pharmacokinetic-Pharmacodynamic Modelling in Propofol Anesthesia through Bayesian Inference. Annu Int Conf IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc. 2023 Jul; 2023:1-6.
5. Gambús PL, Trocóniz IF. Pharmacokinetic-pharmacodynamic modelling in anaesthesia. Br J Clin Pharmacol. 2015 Jan;79(1):72-84.
6. Lee S, Cho JS, Kim E, Kim Y, Lee J. Effects of Inhalation versus Total Intravenous Anesthesia on Postoperative Pulmonary Complications after Anatomic Pulmonary Resection. J Chest Surg. 2022 Feb 5; 55(1):30-36.
7. Proekt A., Kelz M. Schrödinger's cat: anaesthetised and not! Br J Anaesth. 2018; 120:424–428.
8. Flores-Pérez C, Flores-Pérez J, Moreno-Rocha LA, Chávez-Pacheco JL, Noguez-Méndez NA, Ramírez-Mendiola B, et al. Influence of Age and Sex on the Pharmacokinetics of Midazolam and the Depth of Sedation in Pediatric Patients Undergoing Minor Surgeries. Pharmaceutics. 2023 Jan 29; 15(2):440.
9. Struys M.M.R.F., De Smet T., Glen J.B., Vereecke H.E.M., Absalom A.R., Schnider T.W. The history of target-controlled infusion. Anesth Analg. 2016; 122:56–69.
10. Musizza B, Ribaric S. Monitoring the depth of anaesthesia. Sensors (Basel). 2010; 10(12):10896-935.
11. Proekt A, Kelz MB. Explaining anaesthetic hysteresis with effect-site equilibration. Br J Anaesth. 2021 Jan; 126(1):265-278.
12. Colin P.J., Kuizenga M.H., Vereecke H.E., Struys M.M. Pharmacokinetic pharmacodynamic perspective on the detection of signs of neural inertia in humans. Anesthesiology. 2018; 129:373–375.