

“The Induction Dose with Ketamine and Midazolam Co-Induction to Propofol”

Md. Mahbub Ur Rahman^{1*}, Md. shafiqul Islam², SM Masum Billah³

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Anesthesiology, Sher-e-bangla Medical College, Barishal, Bangladesh

²Associate Professor, Department of Anesthesiology, Sher-e-bangla Medical College, Barishal, Bangladesh

³Anesthesiologist, Sher-e-bangla Medical College Hospital, Barishal, Bangladesh

DOI: [10.36348/sjmps.2022.v08i03.006](https://doi.org/10.36348/sjmps.2022.v08i03.006)

| Received: 19.02.2022 | Accepted: 15.03.2022 | Published: 18.03.2022

*Corresponding author: Md. Mahbub Ur Rahman

Assistant Professor, Department of Anesthesiology, Sher-e-bangla Medical College, Barishal, Bangladesh

Abstract

Background: Propofol is a commonly used intravenous (IV) induction agent. The induction dose of propofol is 1.5 to 2.5 mg/kg in healthy adults producing unconsciousness, depending upon concomitant medications (i.e. opioid analgesics), the patient's age and physical status, and the extent of surgical stimulation. **Objective:** To assess the induction dose with ketamine and midazolam co-induction to propofol. **Methods:** This was a prospective, randomized, double-blind and interventional study conducted at Department of Anesthesiology, Sher-e-bangla Medical College Hospital, Barishal, Bangladesh from January to June 2019. Sixty adult patients undergoing elective surgery to be performed under general anesthesia were randomized to receive 0.3 mg/kg of Ketamine or 0.03 mg/kg of Midazolam intravenously as co-induction agent. A minute after administration of co-induction agent, anesthesia was induced with Propofol 40 mg bolus then 10 mg every 10 seconds until the loss of verbal response. The hemodynamic response at 0, 1, 2, 5 minutes respectively and the induction dose of Propofol were noted. **Results:** The mean arterial pressure heart rates were significantly lower at 1, 2 and 5 minutes in midazolam group. However, mean arterial pressure and heart were within the physiological range in both the groups. Propofol dose requirement for induction between the two groups was similar ($p>0.05$) but co-induction significantly decreased the induction dose of Propofol as compared to standard recommended dose for induction. **Conclusion:** Our study showed that hemodynamic variables were maintained within the physiological range with midazolam and ketamine co-induction. However, lesser degree of decrease in mean arterial pressure was seen with ketamine but the heart rate was higher. A similar reduction of induction dose of propofol was achieved with both the drugs.

Keywords: Mutual anesthetic, Ketamine, Midazolam, Propofol.

Copyright © 2022 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited.

INTRODUCTION

The term ‘co-induction’ has been used to describe the practice of administering a small dose of a sedative or other anaesthetic agent to reduce the dose of induction agent [1, 2]. So far, the commonest co-induction agent to propofol has been midazolam [3, 4]. Ketamine has also been used for the same purpose. The advantages of using ketamine include more haemodynamic stability [5, 6]. Propofol is an intravenous sedative hypnotic which produces unconsciousness within 30 seconds after intravenous injection. The more rapid return of consciousness with minimal residual central nervous affects is one of the most important advantages of Propofol. The induction dose of Propofol is 1.5 to 2.5 mg/kg intravenous with blood level of 2 to 6 mg/ml. It also depends on the

associated medications and the patient's age [7]. It produces the decrease in systemic blood pressure with bradycardia or no change in heart rate [8] Ketamine is a phencyclidine derivative that produces dissociative anesthesia. Systemic and pulmonary arterial blood pressure, heart rate, cardiac output, cardiac work and myocardial oxygen requirement are increased after intravenous administration [9] Midazolam is a benzodiazepine with potent amnesic effect than sedation. Induction dose causes greater decrease in systemic blood pressure and increase in heart rate. Most significant side effect of Midazolam is depression of ventilation caused by decrease in the hypoxic drive [10]. Since Midazolam is commonly used as a co-induction agent with Propofol, thinking of an alternative choice, the prospective study was designed

to compare Ketamine with Midazolam as a co-induction agent with Propofol.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This was a prospective, randomized, double-blind and interventional study conducted at Department of Anesthesiology, Sher-e-bangla Medical College Hospital, Barishal, Bangladesh from January to June 2019. Sixty patients of age 17 to 65 years of ASA I and ASA II, undergoing elective surgery to be performed under general Anesthesia were randomly selected and divided into two groups. Patients in group K received 0.3 mg/kg of Ketamine and group M received 0.03 mg/kg of Midazolam intravenously before induction agent propofol was administered.

Patients enrolled into the study were randomly divided into one of the two groups by lottery method. Group M scheduled to receive Midazolam 0.03mg/kg body weight before induction with propofol. Group K scheduled to receive Ketamine 0.3 mg/kg body weight before induction with propofol. On the day of surgery, in the operation theatre, peripheral venous access was secured and monitors for vital parameters (heart rate, Electrocardiogram, Blood pressure, pulse oximeter) were attached. The co-induction agent was prepared in a 5ml syringe by another Anesthesiologist or Anesthetic assistant who did not take part in the study. Pethidine 0.5mg/kg and the co-induction agent were given intravenously. The patient in group M received 0.03mg/kg of Midazolam and the patient in group K received 0.3 mg/kg of Ketamine. One min after the co-induction agent patients were induced with Propofol 40mg bolus then 10 mg every 10seconds until the loss of eye lash reflex and verbal response. Face mask was applied tightly at this point and with any response to the placement of mask additional bolus of Propofol 10mg was given. The study was completed at this point before

the maintenance of anesthesia starts and further anesthetic technique did not influence the study.

Anaesthesia was continued with the standard practice, with Vecuronium 0.1mg/kg as muscle relaxant intubated with cuffed orotracheal tube of proper size. Anesthesia was maintained with Isoflurane/Halothane in oxygen, Vecuronium for muscle relaxation and intermittent positive pressure ventilation. At the end of the surgery patients were reversed with Neostigmine 0.05mg/kg and Atropine 0.025mg/kg. Patients were shifted to post anesthetic care unit after extubation of trachea. Demographic variables were noted. Heart rate (HR) and Mean Arterial Pressure (MAP) were recorded preoperatively, 1, 2 and 5 minutes.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Sample size was calculated considering type I error of 0.05 and power 0.80, assuming a percentage change in mean of 20% and percentage coefficient of variation of 30% in dose of propofol between two groups, the calculated sample size was a total of 50 patients divided into two groups of 30 patients each. Statistical test: student's T-test and χ^2 tests were applied for the comparison and P value <0.05 was considered as significant.

RESULTS

A total of 60 patients (n=30 in each group) who met the inclusion criteria were included in this study. The patients were between age group of 17 years to 65 years and weight of 40 kg to 80 kg and had ASA physical status 1. As there were no significant differences in age, sex, weight and ASA physical status of patients, between the two groups, both of the groups were comparable (Table-1).

Table-1: Demographic distribution (N=60)

Group	Midazolam	Ketamine	P value
Age in years (mean \pm SD)	37.48 \pm 9.33	38.48 \pm 11.06	0.731
Sex (M/F)	5/25	6/24	1.0
ASA-I	30	30	1.0
Weight in kg	56.92 \pm 12.27	55.76 \pm 10.001	0.96

There was significant decrease in heart rate in the Midazolam group after induction of anesthesia at 1, 2, and 5 minutes. But, it initially increased from

baseline in the ketamine group at one and two minutes. Heart rate in the ketamine group remained significantly higher at all times of observation (Table 2).

Table-2: Heart rate in beats/ minutes (N=60)

Group	Midazolam		Ketamine		P value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Baseline (Mean \pm SD)	87.48	16.008	87.92	19.40	0.93
1 minute after co-induction (Mean \pm SD)	76.84	15.98	91.68	13.93	0.001
2 minute after co-induction (Mean \pm SD)	74.80	13.48	89.48	13.98	0.000
5 minute after co-induction (Mean \pm SD)	75.56	12.53	84.88	15.73	0.025

The baseline Mean arterial blood pressure (MAP) was measured and also recorded at 1, 2 and 5

minutes after induction. There was a significant decrease in MAP at 1, 2 and 5 minutes after induction

of anesthesia in the Midazolam group (Table 3).

Table-3: Mean arterial pressure in mm of Hg (N=60)

Group	Midzolam		Ketamine		P value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Base line MAP	94.68	13.06	93.04	12.12	0.648
MAP at 1 minute	82.40	12.92	89.28	8.93	0.034
MAP at 2 minute	75.40	10.41	83.32	9.23	0.007
MAP at 5 minute	78.12	10.146	85.04	9.145	0.015

For induction of Anesthesia 40 mg of Propofol was given as a bolus dose in both of the groups irrespective of weight and age of the patient followed by additional dose of 10 mg Propofol every 10 seconds

until there was loss of verbal response. The induction dose of Propofol required in the two groups did not differ significantly and is shown in the following (table 4).

Table-4: Total induction dose of Propofol (in mg) (N=60)

Group	Midzolam		Ketamine		P value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Total induction dose of Propofol (Mean \pm SD)	56.60	17.81	55.80	15.84	0.867

DISCUSSION

Rapid emergence from anesthesia and post-operative recovery of cognitive function as well as hemodynamic stability is important requirement of modern anesthesia. The development of intravenous agents has been an important component of anesthetic management. Propofol meets the former two requirements but is known to produce hemodynamic disturbances. In our study 60 patients undergoing routine surgical procedures under general anesthesia were selected and randomly divided into two groups as group M- Midazolam and K-Ketamine group of 30 patients each. The two groups were comparable in terms of age, and base line hemodynamics. All patients received Pethidine 0.5 mg/kg as an analgesic. Then patients in group M received 0.03 mg/kg of Midazolam and patients in group K received 0.3 mg/kg of Ketamine as a co-induction agent. One minute after co-induction the patients were given 40 mg of Propofol irrespective of weight. 10 mg bolus of Propofol was added every 10 seconds according to the loss of verbal response or any movement with face mask ventilation. This dose of Propofol was based on our pilot study. We had done a pilot study with 30 mg bolus of Propofol as used by U Srivastava in the study done in 2006 [11]. But we found the dose to be inadequate, so we increased the dose to 40 mg in our present study. This higher dose requirement for induction in our study may be due to the use of Pethidine in our study while they used Fentanyl (one microgram per kg). The hemodynamics was observed at 1, 2, 5 minutes respectively and this was the end point of the study before maintenance of anesthesia and endotracheal intubation was performed. We observed the hemodynamics at these intervals because we used non-invasive blood pressure monitoring. A more frequent noninvasive blood pressure monitoring interval may lead to less reliable reading of blood pressure. The

result of our study showed that there was significantly lower in Heart rate in Midazolam group as compared to Ketamine group at all times of observations that is 1, 2, and 5 minutes following co-induction (p value <0.05). The highest fall in Heart rate was noticed at 2 minutes in Midazolam group as compared with Ketamine. In a similar study done by Sirvastava *et al.* in 2006 [11] among 68 ASA I and II patients undergoing elective surgery under general anesthesia they found that there was a fall in heart rate and MAP in all groups but there was a significant fall in heart rate and mean arterial blood pressure in saline group compared to Ketamine group whereas there was no significant difference in heart rate and mean arterial blood pressure between Midazolam and saline group. They had used a similar co-induction dose of Midazolam and Ketamine as in our study but they had induced with a lower dose of Propofol (30 mg in their study vs 40 mg in our study). The induction dose was given 1 minute after co-induction in our study but they induced 2 minutes following co-induction. Their study did not compare between Midazolam and Ketamine group as compared to our study. Our study showed that there was a significant decrease in blood pressure and heart rate in the midazolam group but it remained within the physiological range. Ong and Osborne [12] in 2001 studied the effect of Ketamine co-induction to Propofol on Propofol induction dose and hemodynamics. In our study we found significant difference in heart rate and mean arterial blood pressure at all time of observation between the two groups with higher heart rate and MAP with the use of Ketamine. We have used similar dose of Ketamine as in their study but they have given the induction dose of Propofol 80 seconds following co-induction. The dose of Propofol used in their study was 300 ml/hr but in our study we have used 40 mg bolus dose of Propofol. Salah Mostafa Asida [13] in the year 2004 did a study to compare the effect of Midazolam co-induction and propofol pre-dosing on the induction

dose requirements of propofol. Their study did not find any significant difference in heart rate and mean arterial blood pressure following induction in Midazolam group compared to saline group. They compared Midazolam with saline group but our study compared Ketamine with Midazolam group. In our study we found Midazolam significantly decreased heart rate and mean arterial blood pressure compared to Ketamine. Propofol is a choice for intravenous induction of anesthesia because of its faster onset and quick recovery. The recommended induction dose of Propofol is 1.0 to 2.5 mg/ kg [2]. The average weight of the patients in our study was 56.92 kg in Midazolam group and 55.76 kg in Ketamine group. If we use propofol in a recommended dose of 2 mg/ kg, they would require 111.84 mg of Propofol in Midazolam group and 111.52 mg in Ketamine group. However in our study we found that in Midazolam group, the patients required 56.60 ± 17.81 mg of Propofol for induction and in Ketamine group, they required 55.80 ± 15.84 mg of Propofol. Dose reduction of Propofol following Midazolam conduction is probably due to synergistic interaction between both of the drugs. Synergism has been reported between agents with known functional link in the central nervous system with Midazolam and Propofol activity on a same receptor, the GABA receptor [11]. Reduction dose of Propofol requirement following Ketamine is explained by an additive sedation effect of both of the drugs [14]. Co-induction reduces the dose of induction agent required to achieve hypnosis and any forms of premedication is likely to have similar effect. Bookmark not defined [15]. Propofol is known to cause significant reduction in MAP and heart rate. As co-induction was found to decrease the dose requirement of Propofol for induction, the hemodynamic stability seen can also be due to the lower dose of Propofol used for induction of anesthesia.

CONCLUSION

Propofol is a commonly used intravenous induction agent because of its fast onset and quick recovery but a well-known side effect is unstable hemodynamics. Co-induction with ketamine was associated with lesser change in mean arterial pressure and heart rate. However, the decrease in the heart rate and mean arterial pressure was also within the physiological range. A lesser degree of decrease in mean arterial pressure was seen with ketamine but the heart rate was higher. Co-induction significantly decreased the induction dose of Propofol as compared to standard recommended dose but, the dose reduction of Propofol for induction of anesthesia was not significant between the groups.

REFERENCES

1. Amrein, R., Hetzel, W., & Allen, S. R. (1995). Co-induction of anaesthesia: the rationale. *European journal of anaesthesiology. Supplement*, 12, 5-11.
2. Cressey, D. M., Claydon, P., Bhaskaran, N. C., & Reilly, C. S. (2001). Effect of midazolam pretreatment on induction dose requirements of propofol in combination with fentanyl in younger and older adults. *Anaesthesia*, 56(2), 108-113.
3. Anderson, L., & Robb, H. (1998). A comparison of midazolam co-induction with propofol predosing for induction of anaesthesia. *Anaesthesia*, 53(11), 1117-1120.
4. Elwood, T., Huchcroft, S., & MacAdams, C. (1995). Midazolam coinduction does not delay discharge after very brief propofol anaesthesia. *Canadian journal of anaesthesia*, 42(2), 114-118.
5. Ong, L. B., Plummer, J. L., Waldow, W. C., & Owen, H. (2000). Timing of midazolam and propofol administration for co-induction of anaesthesia. *Anaesthesia and intensive care*, 28(5), 527-531.
6. Furuya, A., Matsukawa, T., Ozaki, M., Nishiyama, T., Kume, M., & Kumazawa, T. (2001). Intravenous ketamine attenuates arterial pressure changes during the induction of anaesthesia with propofol. *European journal of anaesthesiology*, 18(2), 88-92.
7. Bryson, H. M., Fulton, B. R., & Faulds, D. (1995). Propofol. *Drugs*, 50(3), 513-559.
8. Cressey, D. M., Claydon, P., Bhaskaran, N. C., & Reilly, C. S. (2001). Effect of midazolam pretreatment on induction dose requirements of propofol in combination with fentanyl in younger and older adults. *Anaesthesia*, 56(2), 108-113.
9. Tweed, W. A., Minuck, M., & Mymin, D. (1972). Circulatory responses to ketamine anesthesia. *The Journal of the American Society of Anesthesiologists*, 37(6), 613-619.
10. Collins, L. M., Cooney, C. M., & Fitzpatrick, G. (1997). Propofol induction characteristics after fentanyl or midazolam and fentanyl. *Br J Anaesth*, 79, 676-7P.
11. Srivastava, U., Sharma, N., Kumar, A., & Saxena, S. (2006). Small dose propofol or ketamine as an alternative to midazolam co-induction to propofol. *Indian J Anaesth*, 50(2), 112-114.
12. Ong, E. L., & Osborne, G. A. (2001). Ketamine for co-induction of anaesthesia in oral surgery. *Ambulatory surgery*, 9(3), 131-135.
13. Asida, S. M. (2004). Midazolam co-induction in the elderly. *El-Minia Med. Bull*, 15(1), 300-307.
14. Hui, T. W., Short, T. G., Hong, W., Suen, T., Gin, T., & Plummer, J. (1995). Additive interactions between propofol and ketamine when used for anesthesia induction in female patients. *The Journal of the American Society of Anesthesiologists*, 82(3), 641-648.
15. Adachi, Y. U., Uchihashi, Y., Watanabe, K., & Satoh, T. (2000). Small dose midazolam or droperidol reduces the hypnotic dose of propofol at the induction of anaesthesia. *European journal of anaesthesiology*, 17(2), 126-131.