Original Article

ISSN (O): 2456-7388; ISSN (P): 2617-5479

A Comparitive Study of Sugammadex Vs Neostigmine, Reversal of Residual Neuro-Muscular Blockade

Ahsan Mustafa[1], **Atif Mohammed**[2], **Shaher Banu**[3], **Rana Khatoon**[3]

[1]Associate Professor, Department of Anesthesiology, Deccan College of Medical Sciences, Hyderabad, Telangana, India, [2]Senior Resident, Department of Anesthesiology, Deccan College of Medical Sciences, Hyderabad, Telangana, India, [3]Post Graduate, Department of Anesthesiology, Deccan College of Medical Sciences, Hyderabad, Telangana, India.

Abstract

Background: In postoperative re-curarization, The use of standard neuromuscular blockers remains a significant problem. Furthermore, deep blockages cannot be reversed efficiently by traditional reverse agents, including neostigmines or edrophonium. Incomplete neuromuscular therapy can be considered an objectively regulated neuromuscular process. Sometimes there is a link to residual fatigue, residual curarization, and neuromuscular obstruction. Indeed, the recent opinion reveals that the notion of an incomplete four-way recovery train is below 0.9 (TOF<0.9). The objective is to compare sugammadex vs Neostigmine and Reversal of Neuro Muscular blockade. **Subjects and Methods:** A general procedure of anesthesia requiring reversal of pharmacological obstructions and admission for 1 night, in 189 adult patients were enrolled for the study. **Results:** In comparison, the clinical signs of medium-block recovery were reported in the sugammadex group and 69 percent in the neostigmine-glycopyrrolate groups before being moved to the recovery room. In both procedures, most patients have reported that they felt positive, were able to lift their heads for 5 seconds, and had no muscle weakness before and after discharge. **Conclusion:** Sugammadex can revert mild or deep NMB caused by rocuronium in contrast to neostigmine/glycopyrrolate, and further studies are required for evaluating sugammadex effect on patient welfare, prospects for NMB recovery, and the optimum use of resources.

Keywords: Residual Neuromuscular Obstruction, Curarization, Sugammadex, Neostigmine

Corresponding Author: Ahsan Mustafa, Associate Professor, Department of Anesthesiology, Deccan College of Medical Sciences, Hyderabad, Telangana, India.
E-mail: drahsandcms@gmail.com

Received: 20 June 2020 **Revised: 01 August 2020** **Accepted: 09 August 2020** **Published: 22 December 2020**

Introduction

The inadequate recuperation of the neuromuscular residual blockade by a neuromuscular objective control can be identified.[1] Identified as a residual neuromuscular blockade and residual paralysis.[2] Neurotransparent blockages (NMBs) are routinely used to smooth the intubation of Endotracheal and during rehabilitation, to keep patients immobilized as a managed anesthesia process.[3] Postoperative regularization is evidently likely for those with medium durations following the use of neuromuscular blocking agents, considering their few adverse effects (mainly allergic reactions).[4]

An alert, the cooperative patient would not be required for the perfect test of neuromuscular rehabilitation and would be quick, efficient, and cost-effective. These are poor neuromuscular recuperation predictors. A subjective assessment is typically done as a train-of-four neuromuscular control, either by a simple four-count train (TOFC) or a Train four ratio (TOF).[5] Another type of neuromuscular monitoring requires dual burst-stimulation (DBS) but is generally measured subjectively.[6]

The cost-effectiveness of restoring mild to extreme NMB induced Rocuronium, compared with Sugammadex neostigmine, time is inevitably utilized in clinical trials and effective usage in practice.[7] Further research is required to analyze the patient safety impact, NMB recovery predictability, patient performance, and resource efficiency of sugammadex. Residual neuromuscular blocks are a frequent problem during the early postoperative period. The purpose of this analysis is to determine the successful reversal of NMB by sugammadex versus neostigmine.

Subjects and Methods

Type of Study: Random prospective study.

Place of Study: Department of Anesthesia, Deccan College of Medical Sciences

Duration of Study: 1 year from January 2019 to December 2019

Sample Size: 189 Patients

Inclusion Criteria:

Patients >20 and <75 was included in our study

Exclusion Criteria:

The study excluded patients with hepatic or renal history, neuromuscular abnormalities, documented pharmacological hypersensitivity or diagnosis of malignant hyperthermia

Statistical Analysis:

SPSS 20 software was used to represent statistical data in tables.

189 Adult patients with general anesthesia, involving a pharmacological blockage and 1-night admission were entitled to treatment. The neuromuscular blockade has been controlled with acceleromyographs. After the last dose of NMBD in 1-2 post-tetanic amounts, One dosage has been given with sugammadex 0.5mg/kg, 1.0 mg/kg, 2.0 mg/kg, 4.0 mg/kg and 8.0 mg/kg. From the beginning of the sugammadex administration, the key measure for effectiveness was to restore the T4/T1 ratio to 0.9.

Results

A comparative study of the mild block trials (two-way analysis) shows that sugammadex is recuperated considerably faster than with neostigmine/glycopyrrolate after rocuronium or vecuronium. An important difference was also found in moderate block recovery between rocuronium and sugammadex and neostigmine/glycopyrrolate. Linked models of mild block recovery were also stated to be TOFR=0.8 and P<0.00001. The time description (min) for reverting moderate NMBs to 0.7/0.8/0.9 in sugammadex active control trials from the beginning of sugammadex or neostigmine Glycopyrrolate administration.

In contrast, 65% of the sugammadex group and 69% of the neostigmine-glycopyrrolate groups showed clinical symptoms of the medium-block recuperation before they were transferred into the post-anesthesia care unit. Most patients reported that they were feeling positive in both procedures, were able to lift their heads for 5 seconds and had no muscle weakness before and after discharge.

Sugammadex was taken 4 mg/kg after rocuronium or vecuronium exceeded PTC 1–2. In groups of rocuronium and vecuronium, recovery times were higher with sugammadex than after reverse effects with glycopyrrolate neostigmine. However the regeneration time of vecuronium in sugammadex was compared to rocuronium in sugammadex with more interindividual differences.

A time (min) list of deep NMB (return to PTC 1-2) to 0.9 in successful control studies from the commencement of sugammadex or neostigmine/glycopyrrolate administrative reversals. No patient has a recurrence block or residual block based on an acceleromyograph test for a mild or extreme NMB reversal in the randomized testing compared with sugammadex or neostigmine. There has been no scientific evidence of recurrence block.

Discussion

Firstly, in the sugammadex trials the participants were relatively young and in classes I to II ASA and could not completely be suggested by patients who obtained sugammadex in standard clinical practice. Secondly, maximal depletion time for sugammadex seen in clinical research is reached and without further approval and assessment for sugammadex the findings in general clinical practice remain uncertain.

Third, the available experiments were not related to either of the combinations of sugammadex-rocuronium or sugammadex vecuronium in any standard NMBA / reversal agent. While no experiments for these direct comparisons were performed, analytical methods were identified which would allow us to use the combined study of the results of tests for sugammadex on the inclusion of other drug / reverse agent combinations. However because of the inability to access data from the subsequent sugammadex studies and the lack of access to necessary data on sugammadex, we were unable to include previous studies in our investigation because we only had minimal data on previous studies available.[8–10]

Evidence suggests that sugammadex has shown considerably quicker and more robust recovery from mild NMBs induced by rocuronium or vecuronium compounds than with neostigmine or glycopyrrolate.[11]

Sugammadex is therefore an important and potentially beneficial new NMB overturning agent. However, the results are minimal, and there are big concerns regarding clinical efficacy and cost-effectiveness in particular.

Conclusions

Sugammadex can revert mild or deep NMB caused by rocuronium in contrast to neostigmine/glycopyrrolate, and further studies are required for evaluating sugammadex effect on patient welfare, prospects for NMB recovery, and the optimum use of resources.

Table 1: ?

Population Age	Gender	Weight	n = 189 treated	Treatment In (mg/kg)	Outcome Intervention
65	79/189 (42%	Mean 75 kgs	48	R* (0.6) + S* (2)	Time for TOFR - 0.9
			48	R* (0.6) + N* (0.05)/G* (0.01)	
			48	V* (0.1) + S* (2 mg)	
			45	V* (0.1) + N* (0.05)/G*(0.01)	

*S-Sugammadex, V-Vecuronium, R-Rocuronium, N-Neostigmine, G- Glycopyrrolate

Table 2: ?

	R*+ S* (2 mg/kg)	R* + N*/G* (0.05 mg/kg)	V*+ S* (2 mg/kg)	V*+N*/G* (0.05 mg/kg)
n	**48**	**48**	**48**	**45**
Time For TOFR - 0.9				
Mean 95% CI	1.6 (1.3 to1.7)	18.5 (14.3 to 23.9)	2.7 (2.3 to 3.4)	17.0 (12.9 to 21.9)
Median (range)	1.5 (0.9 to 5.4)	17.6 (3.7 to106.9)	2.3 (1.2 to 64.2)	18.9 (2.9 to76.2)

*S-Sugammadex, V-Vecuronium, R-Rocuronium, N-Neostigmine, G- Glycopyrrolate

Table 3: ?

No. of patients		Time for TOFR=0.9	
	n	Mean (SD)	Median (min to max)
R* (0.6 mg/kg) + S*	48	2.9 (2.5 to3.4)	2.9 (1.2 to 16.1)
R* (0.6 mg/kg) + N*/G*	48	50.3 (43.5 to 58.4)	49.2 (13.3 to 145.7)
V* (0.1 mg/kg) + S*	48	4.4 (3.3 to 6.0)	3.4 (1.4 to 68.4)
V* (0.1 mg/kg) + N* / G*	45	66.3 (55.6 to 78.9)	49.7 (46.0 to 312.7)

*S-Sugammadex, V-Vecuronium, R-Rocuronium, N-Neostigmine, G- Glycopyrrolate

References

1. Gray TC, Halton J. A milestone in anaesthesia? (d-Tubocurarine Chloride). Proc R Soc Med. 1946;34(7):400–410. Available from: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/pmc2181758/.
2. Beecher HK, Todd DP. A study of the deaths associated with anesthesia and surgery: based on a study of 599, 548 anesthesias in ten institutions 1948-1952, inclusive. Ann Surg. 1954;140(1):2–33. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1097/00000658-195407000-00001.
3. Utting JE. The era of relaxant anaesthesia. Br J Anaesth. 1992;69(6):551–553. Available from: https://dx.doi.org/10.1093/bja/69.6.551.
4. Payne JP, Hughes R, Azawi SA. Neuromuscular blockade by neostigmine in anaesthetized man. Br J Anaesth. 1980;52(1):69–76. Available from: https://dx.doi.org/10.1093/bja/52.1.69.
5. Jones JE, Parker CJ, Hunter M. Antagonism of blockade produced by atracurium or vecuronium with low doses of neostigmine. Br J Anaesth. 1988;61(5):560–564. Available from: https://dx.doi.org/10.1093/bja/61.5.560.
6. Naguib M, Kopman AF, Ensor JE. Neuromuscular monitoring and postoperative residual curarisation: a meta-analysis. Br J Anaesth. 2007;98(3):302–316. Available from: https://dx.doi.org/10.1093/bja/ael386.
7. Donati F. Neuromuscular monitoring: more than meets the eye. Anesthesiology. 2012;117(5):964–72. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1097/aln.0b013e31826f9143.
8. Viby-Mogensen J, Jørgensen BC, Ørding H. Residual Curarization in the Recovery Room. Anesthesiology. 1979;50(6):539–541. Available from: https://dx.doi.org/10.1097/00000542-197906000-00014.
9. Viby-Mogensen J, Jensen NH, Engbaek J, Ording H, Skovgaard LT, Chraemmer-Jørgensen B. Tactile and Visual Evaluation of the Response to Train-of-four Nerve Stimulation. Anesthesiology. 1985;63(4):440–442. Available from: https://dx.doi.org/10.1097/00000542-198510000-00015.
10. Brull SJ, Silverman DG. Visual and tactile assessment of neuromuscular fade. Anesth Analg. 1993;77(2):352–

357. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1213/00000539-199308000-00024.
11. Khirwadkar R, Hunter JM. Neuromuscular physiology and pharmacology: an update. Continuing Education in Anaesthesia Critical Care & Pain. 2012;12(5):237–244. Available from: https://dx.doi.org/10.1093/bjaceaccp/mks030.

How to cite this article: Mustafa A, Mohammed A, Banu S, Khatoon R. A Comparitive Study of Sugammadex Vs Neostigmine, Reversal of Residual Neuro-Muscular Blockade. Acad. Anesthesiol. Int. 2020;5(2):100-103.

DOI: dx.doi.org/10.21276/aan.2020.5.2.21

Source of Support: Nil, **Conflict of Interest:** None declared.