ISSN: 0975-8585

Research Journal of Pharmaceutical, Biological and Chemical Sciences

A Comparative Analysis of Propofol and Sevoflurane for Induction and Maintenance of General Anesthesia.

Nilima Mustapure[1], Jayashree Sali[2]*, Yogesh Magan Suryavanshi[3] and Sunita Sankalecha[4].

[1]MD Anaesthesiologist, Working As Specialist Medical Officer, Bytco Hospital, Nashik, Maharashtra, India.
[2]MD Anaesthesiology, Associate Professor, Department Of Anaesthesia, GMC And Maharashtra Postgraduate Institute Of Medical Education And Research, Nashik, Maharashtra, India.
[3]Professor And HOD Department Of Anaesthesia, SMBT Institute Of Medical Sciences And Research Centre Dhamangaon, Igatpuri, Nashik, Maharashtra, India.
[4]Professor and HOD, Department of Anaesthesia, GMC, MPGIMER and MUHS, Nashik, Maharashtra, India.

ABSTRACT

Propofol and Sevoflurane are widely used for induction and maintenance of general anesthesia. This study aims to compare their efficacy, safety, and recovery profiles to determine the optimal anesthetic agent for various surgical contexts. A one-year randomized controlled study was conducted with 50 patients scheduled for elective surgery, divided into two groups: Group P (Propofol, n=25) and Group S (Sevoflurane, n=25). Induction times, hemodynamic stability, recovery profiles, and adverse effects were recorded and analyzed. Propofol was administered intravenously, while Sevoflurane was administered via inhalation. Propofol demonstrated a faster induction time (75.3 ± 10.5 seconds) compared to Sevoflurane (95.2 ± 12.1 seconds, P=0.001). Recovery times, including time to eye opening, verbal response, and orientation, were significantly shorter in the Propofol group (P<0.01). Incidence of PONV was lower with Propofol (8% vs. 24%), though not statistically significant (P=0.12). Both agents maintained stable hemodynamics and had comparable incidences of other adverse effects. Propofol offers advantages in rapid induction and faster recovery, making it suitable for outpatient procedures. Sevoflurane is advantageous in pediatric and uncooperative patients due to its non-pungent nature. Individualized anesthetic plans should be based on patient-specific and procedural factors.

Keywords: General Anesthesia, Propofol, Sevoflurane

https://doi.org/10.33887/rjpbcs/2024.15.3.43

Corresponding author

ISSN: 0975-8585

INTRODUCTION

General anesthesia is a crucial component in modern surgical procedures, ensuring patients are unconscious and pain-free during operations [1]. Two widely used anesthetic agents for induction and maintenance of general anesthesia are Propofol and Sevoflurane. Propofol, a short-acting intravenous anesthetic, is renowned for its rapid onset and recovery characteristics, making it highly effective for both induction and maintenance [2]. It is particularly favored for its antiemetic properties and the smooth, controlled induction it provides. On the other hand, Sevoflurane, a volatile inhalational anesthetic, is distinguished by its pleasant odor, low blood-gas solubility, and minimal irritation to the respiratory tract, facilitating a swift and smooth induction, especially in pediatric and uncooperative patients [3-5].

The choice between Propofol and Sevoflurane often hinges on various factors including patient-specific considerations, surgical context, and the clinical objectives of the anesthesiologist [6]. Each agent has its unique pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic profiles, influencing their respective advantages and limitations. Propofol is often preferred for its clear-headed recovery and reduced incidence of postoperative nausea and vomiting (PONV), whereas Sevoflurane is valued for its ease of administration and non-pungent nature. This comparative analysis aims to delve into the nuances of Propofol and Sevoflurane, evaluating their efficacy, safety profiles, and overall impact on perioperative outcomes to inform optimal anesthetic practices [7].

METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted over a one-year period, involving a sample size of 50 patients who were scheduled for elective surgical procedures requiring general anesthesia. The patients were randomly assigned into two groups of 25 each: Group P (Propofol) and Group S (Sevoflurane). Randomization was achieved using a computer-generated random number sequence to ensure unbiased allocation. Inclusion criteria included patients aged 18-65 years with an ASA (American Society of Anesthesiologists) physical status of I or II. Exclusion criteria comprised patients with known allergies to Propofol or Sevoflurane, significant cardiovascular or respiratory conditions, and those requiring emergency surgeries.

For induction of anesthesia in Group P, patients received an intravenous bolus of Propofol at a dosage of 2-2.5 mg/kg. Maintenance was achieved with a continuous infusion of Propofol at 100-200 µg/kg/min. In Group S, induction was performed using Sevoflurane at a concentration of 8% in oxygen, administered via a face mask. Maintenance involved Sevoflurane at 1-2% delivered through a calibrated vaporizer. Standard monitoring included electrocardiography, non-invasive blood pressure, pulse oximetry, and end-tidal CO2. Hemodynamic parameters, induction and recovery times, and incidence of adverse effects were recorded for comparative analysis.

Postoperatively, patients were monitored in the recovery room until they achieved a Modified Aldrete Score of 9 or higher, indicating readiness for discharge from the recovery area. Data on recovery profiles, including time to eye opening, time to verbal response, and orientation, were meticulously documented. Additionally, the incidence of postoperative nausea and vomiting (PONV) and other complications were tracked for 24 hours following surgery. Statistical analysis was performed using appropriate tests to compare the efficacy and safety profiles of Propofol and Sevoflurane, with results aimed at determining the optimal anesthetic agent for induction and maintenance of general anesthesia.

RESULTS

Table 1: Demographic and Baseline Characteristics

Characteristic	Group P (Propofol) (n=25)	Group S (Sevoflurane) (n=25)	P-value
Age (years)	45.2 ± 12.3	43.8 ± 13.1	0.72
Gender (M/F)	12/13	14/11	0.60
Weight (kg)	70.5 ± 15.4	68.7 ± 14.8	0.68
ASA Status (I/II)	15/10	16/9	0.79
Surgery Duration (min)	90.3 ± 25.1	92.7 ± 24.6	0.74

ISSN: 0975-8585

Table 2: Induction and Maintenance Characteristics

Parameter	Group P (Propofol) (n=25)	Group S (Sevoflurane) (n=25)	P-value
Induction Time (seconds)	75.3 ± 10.5	95.2 ± 12.1	0.001
Maintenance Dose/Concentration	125 ± 20 µg/kg/min	1.5 ± 0.3 %	-
Hemodynamic Stability (Mean BP deviation from baseline)	±8.4%	±10.2%	0.35
Time to Stable Anesthesia (min)	3.5 ± 0.5	4.0 ± 0.6	0.04

Table 3: Recovery Profile

Parameter	Group P (Propofol) (n=25)	Group S (Sevoflurane) (n=25)	P-value
Time to Eye Opening (min)	8.5 ± 2.3	11.4 ± 2.7	0.002
Time to Verbal Response (min)	10.2 ± 3.1	14.1 ± 3.6	0.001
Time to Orientation (min)	15.5 ± 4.0	19.8 ± 4.5	0.001

Table 4: Incidence of Adverse Effects

Adverse Effect	Group P (Propofol) (n=25)	Group S (Sevoflurane) (n=25)	P-value
Postoperative Nausea and Vomiting (PONV)	2 (8%)	6 (24%)	0.12
Respiratory Complications	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	1.00
Hypotension	3 (12%)	4 (16%)	0.68
Bradycardia	2 (8%)	1 (4%)	0.55

Table 5: Patient Satisfaction and Overall Outcomes

Parameter	Group P (Propofol) (n=25)	Group S (Sevoflurane) (n=25)	P-value
Patient Satisfaction Score (1-10)	8.7 ± 1.1	8.1 ± 1.3	0.14
Length of Stay in Recovery Room (min)	35.4 ± 10.2	40.5 ± 12.0	0.15
Readiness for Discharge (Aldrete Score ≥ 9) (min)	38.5 ± 11.5	45.3 ± 12.7	0.08

DISCUSSION

The results of this comparative study on Propofol and Sevoflurane for induction and maintenance of general anesthesia provide significant insights into their respective efficacy and safety profiles. Our

findings highlight several critical differences in induction times, recovery profiles, and the incidence of adverse effects, contributing to the ongoing discourse on optimizing anesthetic practices [8].

Induction and Maintenance Characteristics

One of the primary distinctions between Propofol and Sevoflurane observed in this study was in the induction time. Propofol demonstrated a significantly faster induction time (75.3 ± 10.5 seconds) compared to Sevoflurane (95.2 ± 12.1 seconds) with a P-value of 0.001. This rapid onset is a well-documented advantage of Propofol, making it particularly suitable for procedures requiring swift establishment of anesthesia. The faster induction time can be attributed to Propofol's pharmacokinetic profile, characterized by high lipid solubility and rapid penetration into the brain.

In terms of maintenance, the two agents were administered differently: Propofol through a continuous intravenous infusion and Sevoflurane via inhalation. Both groups maintained stable hemodynamics, with no significant differences in mean blood pressure deviations from baseline. This suggests that both agents are equally effective in maintaining anesthesia with minimal hemodynamic disruption. However, the time to stable anesthesia was slightly shorter for Propofol (3.5 ± 0.5 minutes) compared to Sevoflurane (4.0 ± 0.6 minutes), with a P-value of 0.04. Although this difference is statistically significant, its clinical relevance may be minimal given the short overall duration to reach stable anesthesia with both agents [9, 10].

Recovery Profile

The recovery profile is a critical factor in the choice of anesthetic agents, as it impacts postoperative care and patient turnover. Our study found that patients in the Propofol group had significantly faster recovery times. Time to eye opening, verbal response, and orientation were all shorter in the Propofol group (8.5 ± 2.3 minutes, 10.2 ± 3.1 minutes, and 15.5 ± 4.0 minutes, respectively) compared to the Sevoflurane group (11.4 ± 2.7 minutes, 14.1 ± 3.6 minutes, and 19.8 ± 4.5 minutes, respectively), with all P-values less than 0.01. This rapid recovery is a known benefit of Propofol, often attributed to its rapid redistribution and metabolism, leading to a quick clearance from the body.

Faster recovery times with Propofol can enhance patient throughput in surgical centers, reduce the duration of postoperative care, and increase overall patient satisfaction. This is particularly beneficial in outpatient and day-case surgeries, where minimizing recovery room time is crucial. Furthermore, Propofol's ability to reduce postoperative nausea and vomiting (PONV) also contributes to its favorable recovery profile.

Incidence of Adverse Effects

The incidence of adverse effects is another crucial consideration in evaluating anesthetic agents. Our study found a lower incidence of PONV in the Propofol group (8%) compared to the Sevoflurane group (24%), though this difference did not reach statistical significance (P=0.12). However, this trend aligns with existing literature that consistently shows lower PONV rates with Propofol due to its inherent antiemetic properties.

Other adverse effects such as respiratory complications, hypotension, and bradycardia were similarly low and comparable between the two groups. This suggests that both agents are generally safe, with a low incidence of serious complications when used in appropriate clinical contexts. The choice between the two may therefore be influenced more by their differing recovery profiles and the specific needs of the patient and surgical procedure rather than concerns over safety.

Patient Satisfaction and Overall Outcomes

Patient satisfaction scores were slightly higher in the Propofol group (8.7 ± 1.1) compared to the Sevoflurane group (8.1 ± 1.3), though this difference was not statistically significant (P=0.14). This minor difference in satisfaction could be attributed to the quicker recovery and lower incidence of PONV with Propofol, which are important factors in the overall patient experience. Length of stay in the recovery room and readiness for discharge also favored Propofol, with shorter times observed in this group, though again, these differences were not statistically significant.

Clinical Implications and Recommendations

The choice between Propofol and Sevoflurane should be guided by the specific clinical context and patient factors. Propofol's advantages in terms of rapid induction, faster recovery, and lower incidence of PONV make it a preferred choice for outpatient procedures and situations where quick patient turnover is essential. On the other hand, Sevoflurane's ease of administration and non-pungent nature make it particularly useful in pediatric and uncooperative patients, where inhalational induction is more practical.

Moreover, Sevoflurane's low blood-gas solubility and minimal respiratory irritation are beneficial in maintaining anesthesia, particularly in longer surgeries where intravenous maintenance might be less convenient or feasible. Therefore, the selection of an anesthetic agent should consider the individual patient's medical history, the type and duration of surgery, and the specific advantages each agent offers [11].

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, both Propofol and Sevoflurane are effective and safe for induction and maintenance of general anesthesia, each with unique benefits that can be leveraged to optimize patient care. Our study underscores the importance of individualized anesthetic plans that align with patient and procedural needs, enhancing outcomes and overall satisfaction.

REFERENCES

[1] Hudaib M, Malik H, Zakir SJ et al. Efficacy and safety of ciprofol versus propofol for induction and maintenance of general anesthesia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Anesth Analg Crit Care 2024; 4:25.
[2] Schraag S, Pradelli L, Alsaleh AJO et al. Propofol vs. inhalational agents to maintain general anaesthesia in ambulatory and in-patient surgery: a systematic review and meta-analysis. BMC Anesthesiol 2018; 18:162.
[3] Walker EMK, Bell M, Cook TM, Grocott MPW, Moonesinghe SR. Patient reported outcome of adult perioperative anaesthesia in the United Kingdom: a cross-sectional observational study. Br J Anaesth 2016; 117:758–66.
[4] Lien CA, Hemmings HC, Belmont MR, Abalos A, Hollmann C, Kelly RE. A comparison: the efficacy of sevoflurane-nitrous oxide or propofol-nitrous oxide for the induction and maintenance of general anesthesia. J Clin Anesth 1996;8(8):639-43.
[5] Kleif J, Waage J, Christensen KB, Gögenur I. Systematic review of the QoR-15 score, a patient-reported outcome measure measuring quality of recovery after surgery and anaesthesia. Br J Anaesth 2018; 120:28–36.
[6] Brioni JD, Varughese S, Ahmed R et al. A clinical review of inhalation anesthesia with sevoflurane: from early research to emerging topics. J Anesth 2017; 31:764–778.
[7] Weiser TG, Regenbogen SE, Thompson KD, Haynes AB, Lipsitz SR, Berry WR, et al. An estimation of the global volume of surgery: a modelling strategy based on available data. Lancet 2008; 372:139–44.
[8] Patel SS, Goa KL. Sevoflurane. A review of its pharmacodynamic and pharmacokinetic properties and its clinical use in general anaesthesia. Drugs 1996;51(4):658–700.
[9] Chen G, Zhou Y, Shi Q, Zhou H. Comparison of early recovery and cognitive function after desflurane and sevoflurane anaesthesia in elderly patients: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. J Int Med Res 2015;43(5):619–28.
[10] Sahinovic MM, Struys MMRF, Absalom AR. Clinical pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of propofol. Clin Pharmacokinet 2018;57(12):1539–1558.
[11] Doenicke AW, Roizen MF, Rau J, Kellermann W, Babl J. Reducing pain during propofol injection: the role of the solvent. Anesth Analg 1996;82(3):472–474.