## EDITORIAL

## Analgesia and sedation in high-risk critically ill patients: still waiting for evidence about remifentanil

G. MISTRALETTI, B. CERRI

Dipartimento di Anestesiologia, Terapia Intensiva e Scienze Dermatologiche, Università degli Studi di Milano, A. O. San Paolo - Polo Universitario, Milano, Italy

Critically ill patients requiring invasive vital support such as mechanical ventilation almost uniformly show anxiety, agitation and pain during their Intensive Care Unit (ICU) stay. The use of analgesic and sedative drugs is essential to improve comfort, reduce anxiety and facilitate nursing care, despite the fact that these drugs present several side effects.

In the past decades, liberal doses of propofol and benzodiazepines were used to adapt patients to the harsh ICU environment through deep levels of sedation. Recently, evidence based medicine has shown that heavy sedation may increase mortality and morbidity:1 new protocols have been proposed to change this cultural approach.<sup>2</sup> Spontaneous awakening and breathing trial,<sup>3</sup> early mobility and physical therapy,<sup>4</sup> analgesia-based sedation,<sup>5</sup> the use of newer drugs with favorable pharmacokinetics <sup>6</sup> and the use of an enteral approach 7 are the most important recent innovations. They all share the new target of maximizing comfort and adaptation to invasive procedures while patients remain awake, interactive, and oriented.1,8

High-risk critically ill patients are the most difficult ICU population to take care of, for which any therapeutic intervention could have a significant role in changing the outcome.<sup>9</sup> Both inadequate and excessive analgesic use has been associated with several disadvantages: nosocomial pneumonia, delirium, long-term psychological disorder, prolonged mechanical ventilation, higher risk of tracheostomy, higher risk of requiring diagnostic imaging to clarify abnormal neurological status, and unnecessary prolonged ICU and hospital stay.<sup>10</sup> Currently, morphine, sufentanil and fentanyl are the most commonly used analgesics in high-risk critically ill patients: the 2010 "Evidence and consensus-based German guidelines for the management of analgesia, sedation and delirium in intensive care" still suggest their use for analgesia extending beyond 72 hours. However, the duration of their effect may become unpredictable because of redistribution and accumulation with prolonged infusion, especially in patients with organ failure. In this context, the use of remifentanil for analgesiabased sedation 5 has been a significant innovation in recent years, "awakening" several intensivists to wake up their critical patients thanks to its manageability.

Remifentanil is a strong selective µ-opioid receptor agonist, rapidly metabolized by nonspecific plasma and tissue esterases into inactive metabolites; it has very short context-sensitive half-life (2-3 minutes) even after prolonged infusion or in patients with organ failure. Remifentanil is easy to titrate and provides excellent analgesia: it allows higher doses administration than are normally used with traditional opioids without concerns about accumulation or delayed recovery.<sup>11</sup> However, more than the known side effects of opiates like hypotension, bradicardia, decreased respiratory drive, delirium, nausea and vomiting, ileus, sleep disruption, itch, and urinary retention, remifentanil determined use to download and save only one file and print only one copy of this Article. It is not permitted to make additional copies (either ronic copy of the article through online internet and/or intranet file sharing systems, electonic mailing or any other means which if derivative works from the Article is not permitted. The production of reprints for personal or commercial use is not permitted. It is by bost on the Article, it is not permitted to frame or use framing bechniques to enclose any trademark, logo, or other proprietary.

wws. No additional reproduction is authorized. It is permitted for personal us c) of the Article for any purpose. It is not permitted to distribute the electro ato of the Article for any Commercial Use is not permitted. The creation of or change any copyright notices or terms of use which the Publisher may.

s document is protected by international copyright laws. oraclically or systematically, either printed or electronic) or y allow access to the Article. The use of all or any part of permitted to remove, cover, overlay, obscure, block, or cl of the Publisher.

This spor may not I thoracic rigidity after bolus administration; for this reason, it is used in continuous infusion. On the other hand, the very fast offset could lead to a greater incidence of pain, suddenly reported from patients, when its administering is not sufficiently tapered off.<sup>12</sup>

Several retrospective studies reported the clinical superiority of remifentanil-based analgosedation, when compared to protocols using other opiates for analgesia plus propofol-based or midazolam-based sedation. However, when it was prospectively compared to other opiates in continuous infusion (sufentanil, fentanyl), it failed to show substantial improvements of clinical outcomes, especially when considering patients ventilated for more than 72 hours.<sup>10, 13</sup> Up to now, we lack the evidence that clinical improvements are due to the specific molecule rather than (more likely) to the "critically ill awakening".

In the present issue of Minerva Anestesiologica, Futier et al. present a retrospective study 14 including 1544 patients who required invasive mechanical ventilation in the ICU. In a beforeafter design, they compared the outcomes of opiates used according to local guidelines, particularly regarding the impact on mechanical ventilation days and ICU length of stay. The strengths of this paper are the high number of patients enrolled, the case-mix involving both medical and surgical patients, the comparison between the newly introduced remifentanil with an opiate of relatively short half-life, like sufentanil. On the contrary, the before-after design is an intrinsic limitation, at least for the refinement in staff skills, as well as for a change in the use of sedatives (higher percentage of midazolam in the sufentanil phase). The main result coming from introducing remifentanil was the decrease in mechanical ventilation days and ICU length of stay, with a higher achievement of sedation goals and similar costs for analgesic and sedative drugs. Once again, as already shown in the literature,<sup>15</sup> these differences were significant only for short-stay ICU patients (<4 days).

Offering to the critically ill the best care for their pain is mandatory: nurses and physicians have to gauge it and provide effective measures to reach an adequate level of pain relief. Up to now it has not been conclusively determined whether analgesia-based sedation is a more effective alternative compared to other sedative approaches (dexmedetomidine, propofol, enteral hydroxyzine) to adapt patients to the necessary invasive procedures and to the ICU environment.

It seems incorrect to analyze together shortand long-ICU-stayers. The former could be more adequately treated with approaches coming from the operating theatre (short time from stop of drug infusion to patient awakening), where remifentanil saves lives avoiding the unexpected late increases of sedative and respiratory depressant effects seen with longer half-life opiates. However, it could be pointless or even dangerous for the long-ICU-stayers, where analgesics have to be used only in case of pain or to decrease the respiratory drive, whereas agitation and anxiety should be treated with lower-side-effect sedatives. In any case, remifentanil is a "high-performance-drug", with ultra-short onset and offset time and with unchanged context-sensitive halflife even after prolonged infusion. It has to be considered as an effective and manageable drug when facing the breakthrough pain in scheduled ICU procedures, or when patients need repeated/rapid assessment of their neurological status (e.g. neurosurgical or comatose patients). Since recent literature has highlighted the need to keep patients awake, remifentanil could represent an interesting alternative among the other analgesic and sedative drugs; anyway, even considering the paper published in the present issue of Minerva Anestesiologica, we still need evidence about the care of high-risk long-stay critically ill.

## References

- 1. Wunsch H, Kress JP. A new era for sedation in ICU patients. JAMA 2009; 301:542-4.
- Payen JF, Chanques G, Mantz J, Hercule C, Auriant I, Leguillou JL *et al.* Current practices in sedation and analgesia for mechanically ventilated critically ill patients: a prospective multicenter patient-based study. Anesthesiology 2007;106:687-95; quiz 891-2.
- 3. Girard TD, Kress JP, Fuchs BD, Thomason JW, Schweickert WD, Pun BT *et al.* Efficacy and safety of a paired sedation and ventilator weaning protocol for mechanically ventilated patients in intensive care (Awakening and Breathing Controlled trial): a randomised controlled trial. Lancet 2008;371:126-34.
- Vasilevskis EE, Ely EW, Speroff T, Pun BT, Boehm L, Dittus RS. Reducing iatrogenic risks: ICU-acquired delirium and weakness--crossing the quality chasm. Chest 2010;138:1224-33.

8

## MINERVA MEDICA COPYRIGHT®

ANALGESIA AND SEDATION IN HIGH-RISK CRITICALLY ILL PATIENTS

- 5. Carrer S, Bocchi A, Candini M, Donega L, Tartari S. Short term analgesia based sedation in the Intensive Care Unit: morphine vs. remifentanil amorphine. Minerva Anestesiol 2007:73:327-32.
- 6. Morandi A, Watson PL, Trabucchi M, Ely EW. Advances in sedation for critically ill patients. Minerva Anestesiol 2009;75:385-91.
- Cigada M, Pezzi A, Di Mauro P, Marzorati S, Noto A, 7. Valdambrini F et al. Sedation in the critically ill ventilated patient: possible role of enteral drugs. Intensive Care Med 2005-31-482-6
- 8. Cigada M, Corbella D, Mistraletti G, Forster CR, Tommasino C, Morabito A et al. Conscious sedation in the critically ill ventilated patient. J Crit Care 2008;23:349-53. 9. Iapichino G, Mistraletti G, Corbella D, Bassi G, Borotto
- E, Miranda DR et al. Scoring system for the selection of high-risk patients in the intensive care unit. Crit Care Med 2006:34:1039-43.
- 10. Spies C, Macguill M, Heymann A, Ganea C, Krahne D, Assman A et al. A prospective, randomized, double-blind, multicenter study comparing remifentanil with fentanyl in mechanically ventilated patients. Intensive Care Med 2011;37:469-76.

- 11. Dahaba AA, Grabner T, Rehak PH, List WF, Metzler H. Remifentanil versus morphine analgesia and sedation for mechanically ventilated critically ill patients: a randomized double blind study. Anesthesiology 2004;101:640-6.
- 12 Muellejans B, Lopez A, Cross MH, Bonome C, Morrison L, Kirkham AJ. Remifentanil versus fentanyl for analgesia based sedation to provide patient comfort in the intensive care unit: a randomized, double-blind controlled trial [IS-RCTN43755713]. Crit Care 2004;8:R1-R11.
- 13 Tan JA, Ho KM. Use of remifentanil as a sedative agent in critically ill adult patients: a meta-analysis. Anaesthesia 2009:64:1342-52.
- 14 Futier E, Chanques G, Cayot Constantin S, Vernis L, Barres A, Guerin R *et al.* Influence of opioid choice on mechanical ventilation duration and ICU length of stay. Minerva Anestesiologica 2012;78:46-53.
- 15. Muller L, Chanques G, Bourgaux C, Louart G, Jaber S, Fabbro-Peray P et al. Impact of the use of propofol remifentanil goal-directed sedation adapted by nurses on the time to extubation in mechanically ventilated ICU patients: the experience of a French ICU. Ann Fr Anesth Reanim 2008;27:481 e1-8.

Received on October 24, 2011 - Accepted for publication on October 24, 2011.

Corresponding author: G. Mistraletti, MD, Department of Anesthesiology, Intensive Care and Dermatological Sciences, University of Milan, San Paolo Hospital, via A. Di Rudini 8, 20142 Milan, Italy. E-mail: giovanni.mistraletti@unimi.it

This article is freely available at www.minervamedica.it