Are Local Anesthetics Needed for Local Anesthesia?

THIS issue of the Journal contains a very exciting clinical report that describes the clinical efficacy of epidural sufentanil and neostigmine in laboring women. The authors examined the analgesic effects of different combinations of the two drugs without local anesthetic during the first stage of oxytocin-augmented labor. They found that a mixture of 10 μg of sufentanil with 500 μg of neostigmine seemed to be optimal based on onset, duration of action, and minimal motor block.

Efficient labor analgesia without local anesthetics may have important consequences. Research conducted over the last 20 years has resulted in excellent analgesic recipes, typically combining a very low concentration of a long acting local anesthetic with a lipid-soluble opioid. Such combinations provide near-ideal clinical conditions: low pain scores, minimal motor block (allowing ambulation), stable hemodynamics (as a result of minimal sympathetic block), and essentially no measurable effects on obstetric outcome. Some might actually consider the search for better analgesic techniques to be pointless, given the efficacy of the current approaches.

However, local anesthetics are imperfect drugs. Even at low doses, their use may have catastrophic consequences. Moreover, although cesarean deliveries resulting from motor block are uncommon, instrumental delivery is required more frequently when regional analgesia is used. In a recent meta-analysis, the rate of delivery is almost doubled in patients receiving low dose epidural local anesthetic solutions as compared with systemic opioid analgesia.

There is thus a need for analgesic drugs devoid of motor block effect. That neostigmine (the only cholinesterase inhibitor clinically available for spinal use) is one such candidate may be surprising for most of us who have followed the 15-year history of research with this agent. After experimental studies that found that muscarinic receptors and cholinergic pathways are involved in the spinal control of pain, further studies confirmed the analgesic efficacy and the safety (i.e., the absence of neurotoxic complications) of intrathecal neostigmine in humans. However, enthusiasm rapidly declined because of the high incidence and sometimes extreme severity of nausea and vomiting. Because both spinally and epidurally administered drugs mainly act at the spinal level, it is thus difficult to understand the rationale for testing epidural neostigmine. Fortunately, such skepticism did not dissuade researchers who have now shown that after epidural administration, neostigmine-induced analgesia is not associated with emetic complications, thus rehabilitating our interest in cholinergic analgesic pathways. Several trials from various countries and using different acute/pain chronic settings have confirmed that the risk/benefit ratio is excellent with epidural neostigmine. Although epidural neostigmine cannot be used as the sole analgesic because its potency is limited, it can provide excellent pain relief when combined with an opioid. Because women are believed to experience better neostigmine-induced analgesia than men, obstetricians may represent an ideal setting for the drug. In addition, neostigmine is an old and inexpensive drug, thus facilitating its use in the current period of economic constraints.

Should the results of Roelants and Lavand’homme lead us to the routine use of epidural neostigmine in all laboring women? Certainly not. Many questions remain unanswered, and additional studies are clearly needed. One major question lies in the safety of the drug. Although there are two trials (in three animal species) demonstrating the absence of neurotoxicity, the drug has been used in only a few hundred human subjects and it is likely that regulatory agencies in most countries will require much more data before concluding that epidurally injected neostigmine is truly safe. An additional concern lies in the analgesic potency of the drug. In the study presented in this issue of ANESTHESIOLOGY, the analgesia produced by the epidural sufentanil-neostigmine combination was similar to that achieved with 20 μg dose of sufentanil alone. Although this is an interesting result, it is of note that the dose of sufentanil used a comparator is the ED50, i.e., the dose which provides adequate analgesia in only 50% of patients. Clearly, before abandoning local anesthetics, one must ensure that neostigmine can reliably provide adequate analgesia in all patients. Moreover, as this was a single-dose study, its efficacy for the whole duration of labor remains uncertain. Will the drug provide adequate analgesia when used as an infusion or will it require top-ups? Will tachyphylaxis occur? Will adverse effects occur (especially fetal effects secondary to placental transfer) after repeated administration and larger doses? Will sedation become a concern? Will muscle weakness become apparent after prolonged administration? These questions, only a few of those remaining, will require a substantial amount of added work to resolve. As with all good studies, questions remaining are more numerous than answers provided. Nevertheless, epidural neostig-
mine provides an exciting opportunity to increase our knowledge on spinally mediated analgesia and to improve our patients’ comfort.
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Anesthetic Neurotoxicity: The Collision between Laboratory Neurosciences and Clinical Medicine

ON October 10, 2003, at the 31st Annual Meeting of the Society of Neurosurgical Anesthesia and Critical Care, San Francisco, California, John Olney, M.D., Professor, Department of Psychiatry and Neuropathology, Washington University School of Medicine, St. Louis, Missouri, presented a lecture entitled “Anesthetic Neurotoxicity in Young and Aged Animals.” In 1989, Dr. Olney reported in Science that N-methyl-D-aspartate antagonists such as MK801 (a well studied neuroprotector) could produce histopathologic changes suggestive of toxicity in the brains of normal adult rats.1 Subsequent studies have extended and refined this work to show that many anesthetics (including N2O) can produce what appear to be apoptotic changes, particularly the brains of very young rodents. This has raised the possibility, albeit one that is still very speculative, that even a routine anesthetic using the most routine drugs might pose a risk of neurotoxicity to the fetus, the neonate, or even the young child.

Given the obvious anxiety that such laboratory findings have produced in the minds of clinical anesthesiologists, it was not surprising that Dr. Olney’s presentation was followed by an active discussion and debate. Sol Soriano, M.D., Associate Professor, Department of Anesthesiology, Boston Children’s Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts, was an active participant in that debate and, some months later, submitted a manuscript coauthored by K.J.S. Anand, M.B.B.S., D.Phil., Chair, Department of Critical Care Medicine, University of Arkansas, Little Rock, Arkansas, discussing and critiquing the work by Dr. Olney et al. In particular, Drs. Anand and Soriano asked whether or not Dr. Olney’s findings are attributable to the direct effects of anesthetics or, alternatively,
Anesthesia-induced Developmental Neuroapoptosis

Does It Happen in Humans?

RECENTLY, we reported that transient exposure of infant rats or mice to specific classes of drugs, including those that block N-methyl-D-aspartate glutamate receptors, those that activate γ-aminobutyric acidA (GABA_A) receptors, and ethanol (which has both N-methyl-D-aspartate antagonist and GABA mimetic properties), triggers widespread apoptotic neurodegeneration in the developing brain. Because ethanol acts by a combination of N-methyl-D-aspartate/GABA_A mutually reinforcing mechanisms, it triggers a particularly robust neuroapoptotic response, which we propose can explain the neurodevelopmental disturbances associated with the human fetal alcohol syndrome. Most general anesthetics used in pediatric and obstetric medicine have either the National Alliance for Research on Schizophrenia and Depression, Great Neck, Rockville, Maryland, the 2000 Toulmin Distinguished Investigator Award from the National Institutes of Health, DA 05072, HD 37100, and DA00406 from the National Institutes of Health, and because we have no idea what kind of change would be appropriate. In fact, neither Dr. Olney nor Drs. Anand and Soriano have made such a suggestion. The question is, however, of real importance and both Olney and coworkers and Anand and Soriano agree that much more work is needed, both in the laboratory and (hopefully) in the clinic and operating room. This is a topic that should attract the interest of far more anesthesiologists/neuroscientists. I hope that the exchange in this issue of ANESTHESIOLOGY will serve to encourage such work.

Michael M. Todd, M.D. Editor-in-Chief, ANESTHESIOLOGY, Department of Anesthesia, The University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa. anesthesiology@uiowa.edu
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Anesthetics challenge their assumption that it requires extreme conditions for anesthetic drugs to trigger neuroapoptosis. The discrepancy between our observations and those by Soriano et al. can be explained, we believe, by differences in methodology. To detect and quantify increases in neuroapoptosis, they applied a silver staining method 24 h after ketamine treatment. Although this is a protocol we previously described for mapping massive patterns of neurodegeneration 24 h after high-dose treatments, we currently recommend a different method (immunohistochemical staining for caspase-3 activation) as the preferred method for quantifying subtle increases in neuroapoptosis that occur at approximately 4–5 h after low-dose treatments. Certain populations of neurons (for example, those in the caudate nucleus) are extremely sensitive to ketamine, and these neurons begin showing cell death commitment (caspase-3 activation) within 3 h following a single dose of ketamine. Silver staining will also detect these neurons if applied at 7–8 h but not if applied at 24 h because by then these early-dying neurons have degenerated into nebulous debris. Although it will be important for others to test the reproducibility of our findings, we will assume for the purposes of the present discussion that the findings are reproducible.

Anand and Soriano have suggested that the apoptotic neurodegeneration we have reported in infant rodents treated with anesthetic drugs is caused by hypoxia/ischemia that putatively occurs because cardiorespiratory functions are not being adequately monitored and controlled. However, in infant mice we have measured arterial blood gases at periodic intervals after administration of ketamine at a dose that triggers neuroapoptosis (fig. 2) and have found that all blood gas values, including arterial oxygen saturation, remain in a normal range throughout the posttreatment observation period. In separate groups of infant mice we obtained arterial blood samples by cardiac puncture at periodic intervals (0, 15, 30, 60, 120, 180, or 240 min) following ketamine at 40 mg/kg. Throughout this period, blood gases remained within normal limits, including arterial oxygen saturation, which fluctuated from a low of 97 percent to a high of 99 percent.
degeneration in the infant rodent brain, the acute cell death that ensues is not apoptotic. It is excitotoxic, and ultrastructurally does not resemble apoptosis. In contrast, the acute cell death response to ethanol or anesthetic or antiepileptic drugs is decidedly apoptotic and ultrastructurally does not resemble the acute excitotoxic cell death response that typifies hypoxia/ischemia.

Anand and Soriano propose that the adverse effects we attribute to anesthesia exposure in infant rodents can be explained by a disturbance in nutritional status. This is not a tenable argument. At the beginning of the experiment, our infant rodents have a belly full of milk (clearly visible through the abdominal wall). In a typical experiment, we treat rat or mouse pups subcutaneously, the controls with saline and the experimentals with ethanol or an anesthetic drug, and all animals are sacrificed 4 to 8 h later for histologic evaluation of the brains. Both controls and experimentals are exposed to the same degree of nutritional and maternal deprivation; both are removed from the maternal cage and are maintained at normal body temperature in a compartment separate from their mother for the duration of the experiment. There is no rational basis for invoking nutritional factors to explain the robust pattern of neuroapoptosis that consistently shows up in the experimental brains and not in the controls.

Anand and Soriano suggest that because the life span is much longer in humans than in rodents, it might require a much longer exposure time (weeks) for a toxic chemical to induce neuroapoptosis in the developing human brain compared to a brief period (hours) in the rodent brain. They cite a theoretical treatise, but no evidence, to support this conjecture. The life span argument in its fully developed form is as follows: Disruption of synaptogenesis is the proposed mechanism by which anesthetic drugs trigger neuroapoptosis. In the rodent, synaptogenesis is completed within a period of weeks, whereas in the human it is completed within a period of several years. Neurons are programmed to commit suicide if their synaptic mission is thwarted to some critical degree. It may be argued that for the rodent neuron, 2 h of disruption exceeds the critical limit, whereas for the human neuron the critical limit may be much longer. As there are other species, including nonhuman primates, that have more prolonged synaptogenesis periods, this hypothesis should be tested in such species, the sooner the better.

This brings us to the very difficult question, how can we know whether anesthetic drugs do or do not trigger neuroapoptosis in the developing human brain? Rodent data provide an imprecise basis at best, and an irrelevant basis at worst, for evaluating human risk. An important next step, therefore, would be to conduct well designed nonhuman primate studies. Serious consideration should also be given to conducting autopsy studies in which the brains of human neonates who have died on the surgical table after prolonged anesthesia would be compared with the brains of neonates who have died from other causes in the absence of anesthesia. Obtaining the brains immediately after death would be important to ensure successful application of special stains and related assays for diagnosing acute neuroapoptosis.
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Sleeping with Uncertainty:
Anesthetics and Desiccated Absorbent

BECAUSE of my research interest in anesthetic breakdown, I am aware of cases that I would call "rumors of injury by carbon monoxide," which is one of the products produced by the interaction of anesthetics and carbon dioxide absorbents. Some lacked documentation, and others were mired in the litigation process. Consequently, none of these rumors was ever published. Our specialty treated every instance of carbon monoxide poisoning or other kinds of anesthetic breakdown as a mere curiosity because no injury had ever been documented and reported.

In this issue of Anesthesiology, three cases are presented where extreme reactions occurred between sevoflurane and desiccated absorbent, producing irrefutable patient injury in one case, and explosion and fire in the other two. Fatheree and Leighton describe a patient whose intraoperative pulmonary injury necessitated a prolonged intensive care unit course. Details of absorbent drying were unknown but fit the historical pattern of Monday mornings and a weekend of gas flow through the absorbent. For years, we obsessed over the theoretical risk of compound A nephrotoxicity, but we now know there is a real risk to the lungs. Although the injury can be mild, serious injury from anesthetic breakdown is no longer a rumor.

Those with a pyromaniacal bent will be interested in reading Wu et al.’s dramatic report, in which an unattended anesthesia machine exploded and ignited, and the report by Castro et al., in which the explosion occurred during an anesthetic. In the case by Wu et al., the machine was located in an induction room, where prolonged gas flows through the absorbent were possible if not routine. Presumably, previously desiccated absorbent combined with approximately 1 hour of sevoflurane and oxygen flow and culminated in the first reported explosion and actual fire outside of a research setting since the days of flammable anesthetics. The hydration status of the absorbent was also unknown in the report by Castro et al., but the case was the first of the day, the anesthesia machine had not been turned off the night before, and Baralyme® (Allied Healthcare Products, Inc., St. Louis, MO), relatively high concentrations of sevoflurane, and high-flow oxygen were used.

Intraoperative explosions and fires are not new to anesthesiology. As a resident, one of my faculty mentors described an intraoperative explosion that had fatal consequences for the patient. This, too, was a dramatic story, but I felt safe and uninvolved. It was legitimate for me to be in denial because I would never have the opportunity to use ether or cyclopropane in an operating room. Decades of practice with flammable anesthetics had mandated the use of protective antistatic devices; conductive rubber and floor sweeping chains are anachronistic reminders that still linger in some operating rooms. However, in the 21st century, we must again accept that explosion, fire, and pulmonary injury are no longer rumors. Most of us will never experience (or perhaps recognize) a similar case in our careers, just as few of our forebearers experienced an ether or cyclopropane explosion, but we are at risk. Today, our uncertainty resides in whether or not the absorbent is dry. We must accept this risk, and work to reduce it.

These mishaps are rare. It would be unhelpful to overreact with panic or illogical responses, but we should remain sufficiently concerned and educated that we do not cower behind denial, ignorance, or apathy. Fundamental questions remain: Why don’t we see this type of reaction more often? Baralyme® and sevoflurane have been used together for a long time. When desiccated Baralyme® or soda lime are used with sevoflurane, breakdown reactions always occur; however, only a narrow range of conditions can produce these dramatic, incendiary events. Although comparative studies remain unpublished, it may be more difficult for soda lime to create dangerous situations than Baralyme®, but it is clearly not impossible. Perhaps a better question is “Do milder forms of these reactions occur frequently and go unrecognized?” Other than the meltdowns, explosions, and fires, the clinical signs of moderate carbon monoxide poisoning may resemble commonly seen peri-anesthetic problems like confusion, headache, and nausea. If the meltdown described by Fatheree and Leighton went unnoticed, the pulmonary injury might have been
attributed to occult aspiration of gastric acid or some other convenient diagnosis of exclusion.

These cases also suggest that ignition and pulmonary injury may be mutually exclusive events. One may need to distinguish between incipient fires, with pulmonary injury and extreme heat but no ignition, and the two cases of actual fires in which flames resulted. It is likely that patients absorb flammable and presumably toxic gases, preventing fire at the cost of pulmonary injury.

In all of these cases, Baralyme® was used, and desiccation was likely but unproven. Theoretically, we already know that stopping prolonged dry gas flow should prevent absorbent desiccation. Realistically, we can’t watch the absorbent 24/7, and the possibility of absorbent desiccation before placement in anesthesia machines has never been ruled out. We know that we can avoid these dangerous chemical reactions by using absorbents devoid of strong bases. Unfortunately, recent literature is mixed about the ability of absorbents lacking strong bases to absorb carbon dioxide adequately in all situations. Strong bases were originally included in absorbents because they enhanced carbon dioxide absorption, but definitive modern comparative studies are lacking. Of course, water inhibits these chemical reactions, but water can evaporate. Nonvolatile inhibitors of anesthetic breakdown exist but have not been evaluated extensively.

We need to learn more about the toxic and flammable chemicals produced by sevoflurane breakdown. Is it just fumes from the hot plastic? Or does formaldehyde cause the reported injuries? Anesthetic breakdown monitors can be developed, but will we use them? Carbon monoxide is produced by the breakdown of all modern anesthetics, and we already have carbon monoxide sensors that work in the presence of anesthetics. But until our specialty demands this technology, no company will have incentive to build monitors that incorporates it. Color change occurs during absorbent desiccation, but improvements will be necessary before becoming a clinically useful indicator. As suggested by Fatherre and Leighton, perhaps today’s best monitor, available in every operating room, is to place a temperature probe into the absorbent during every case. The use of a patient monitor for absorbent temperature is demonstrated in figures 1 and 2. Most patient monitors typically work up to 50°C. If the temperature approaches this value, excessive heating from anesthetic breakdown should be suspected, and appropriate action taken. This useful, low-cost intervention is available in any operating room with nearly every modern patient monitor, regardless of manufacturer.

After a decade of study, the problems of anesthetic breakdown and solutions to these problems are still evolving. These case reports should bring them into our consciousness.
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