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ABSTRACT

BACKGROUND
Awake craniotomy is an important technique used for brain tumour excision from eloquent cortex, epilepsy foci removal surgery, deep brain stimulation, less commonly for myocytic aneurysms, A-V malformation near cortical areas.

Aims and Objectives- To access quality of brain mapping, haemodynamic stability, perioperative airway security, & observation of adverse effects in propofol, dexmedetomidine groups for awake craniotomies.

Group Allocation- (Maintenance of anaesthesia in both groups was different as follows :)
Group A (Propofol Group): inj. propofol 6 mg/kg/hour for 10 min, then 4 mg/kg/hour. (n=25)
Group B (Dexmedetomidine group): Inj. dexmedetomidine 0.5 mg/kg/hour (n=25).

MATERIALS & METHODS
This randomised double-blind comparative study of premedication- Inj. glycopyrrolate 0.04 mg/kg, inj. ondansetron 0.08 mg/kg & in fentanyl 1 mcg/kg. Scalp block: scalp block was given with inj. ropivacaine 0.5% 30 ml to block supraorbital, supratrochlear, zygomatic temporal, auriculotemporal nerves, greater auricular, lesser auricular nerves in General Hospital, NHLM medical college, Ahmedabad, Gujarat, India.

Induction- Induction was done with inj. thiopentone 5 to 7 mg/kg IV.

Airway security- By i-gel (second generation laryngeal mask airway)

Maintenance- In group A: inj. propofol 6 mg/kg/hour for first 10 min then 4 mg/kg/hour

In group B: inj. dexmedetomidine 1 mcg/kg/hour for first 10 min then 0.5 mcg/kg/hour

When neurosurgeon wanted to perform brain mapping, patient’s i-gel was removed & patients were managed with low dose of propofol & dexmedetomidine in awake period, then further dose was increased in 3rd phase, that is asleep period.

RESULTS
NRS score of cortical mapping was comparable in both groups-
• In both groups haemodynamic variables were stable & comparable.
• In group B better airway management & less complications observed.

CONCLUSION
In AAA method for awake craniotomies, use of dexmedetomidine is a good alternative to propofol.
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BACKGROUND
Awake craniotomy is popular since 2 decades. It is usually performed for epilepsy surgery, temporal lobectomy, which encroaches eloquent cortex, motor, speech areas, Deep brain stimulation, for AV malformation which needs intraoperative functional testing. Cortical mapping, which requires patient to be awake.1,2 Main advantage of awake surgery is to define limits of resection & avoid Postoperative neurological deficits.

Maintaining patient’s cooperation by provision of optimal analgesia, sedation, anxiolysis and comfortable position, achieving homeostasis with safe airway, adequate ventilation and hemodynamic stability, Ensure minimal interference with electrocortico graph recording during mapping.

Main Objective of the study was to access Brain mapping by NRS scale, Haemodynamic Stability, & adverse effects with both study drugs dexmedetomidine or propofol.

MATERIALS AND METHODS
This Randomised double-blind comparative study of 50 adult elective patients with mass near the eloquent area with ASA
grade I & II, Age group 18 to 60 years were selected for awake craniotomy. Patients were informed in detail about procedure. Proper counselling of each patient was done VS hospital, NHLM medical college, Ahmedabad, Gujarat, India

Preoperative Assessment
Through preoperative assessment & psychological counselling was done day before surgery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Propofol - 10 mg/kg/hour for first 10 mins &amp; then 4 mg/kg/hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group B</td>
<td>Dexmedetomidine -1/2/kg/hour for first 10 mins and then 0.5/2 mg/kg/hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group Allocation
Group Allocation was done by using Randomisation table. Allocation concealment done by sealed opaque envelope. Envelope was opened just before General Anaesthesia administration to the patient.

Sample Size
The sample size for the study was taken for convenience.

Premedication
It was given in form of Inj. Glycopyrrolate 0.04 mg/kg, Inj. Ondansetron 0.08 mg/kg, and Inj. Fentanyl were given Intravenously. Benzodiazepine premedication was avoided because of its residual sedative and amnestic effects during intra operative assessment phase.

Pre-Oxygenation
O2 mask was applied with O2 flow 4 L/min. Urinary catheter was inserted for patients comfort for long operative procedure and for diuretic administration. INJ. Cefazolin 1 gm was given for infection prophylaxis.

Scalp Block
It was given by using Ropivacaine 0.5 %, 30 ml (max) to block supraorbital, supratrochlear, zygomaticotemporal, Auriculotemporal, greater & lesser occipital, greater auricular nerves for better analgesia & perioperative Haemodynamic stability. Patients were managed by ASLEEP AWAKE ASLEEP technique in following manner.

Induction
Patients were induced by Inj. thiopentone 5 to 7 mg/kg intravenously.

Airway Security
After induction, 2nd generation LMA (i-gel) of appropriate size was inserted, cuff inflated, bilateral air entry checked and after confirming air entry i-gel was fixed.

Mode of Ventilation
1. Patients were put on spontaneous plus assistance mode on ventilator Of Dragger Fabius GS work station
2. With i-gel EtCO2 sample line was attached to monitor EtCO2 intra operatively.

Patients were maintained by (A sleep Period)
By i-gel O2 (2 L/min) + N20 (2 L/min) + Sevoflurane (0.5-2%) was started.

Maintenance was Different in Both Groups
- In-Group A - Propofol infusion was started with loading dose of 6 mg/kg/hour over 10 min, followed by 4 mg/kg/hour
- In Group B - Dexmedetomidine infusion was started with loading dose of 1/2/kg over 10 min, followed by 0.5 mcg/kg/hour.

Position
Patients were positioned in Right or Left Lateral position according to site of lesion in Sujita frame.

Sniffing position was achieved to help facilitate and patent airway. A tent was made under the drape to allow direct communication with patients when mapping was done & they were awake.

Intra Operative Period: (Awake Period)
After position, operation was started, perioperative Haemodynamic, respiratory, EtCO2, SpO2 monitoring done periodically with interval of 15 mins and surgeons were told to inform 15 min before the craniotomy was expected to over, all inhalational agents were stopped in both groups, i-gel was removed and nasal prongs applied for oxygenation. At the end of prongs EtCO2 line (Side arm) was attached. In awake phase patients were oxygenated by nasal prongs. Sedation was managed in following ways: During awake phase patients were managed in different ways.

- In Group A (Propofol group) infusion was decreased to 2 mg/kg/ hour.
- In Group B (Dexmedetomidine group), it was decreased to 0.3 mcg/kg/hr.

In both groups, within 15 minutes after stopping inhalation agent patients were awake, conscious, and comfortable, i-gel was removed & nasal prongs were applied for oxygenation. Patients were put on nasal prongs with 02 flow rate of 3 l/min.

Perioperative Haemodynamic respiratory variables noted periodically in form of HR, Mean Arterial pressure (MAP), SpO2, ETCO2.

Perioperative awareness was assessed by PRST score (Pressure, Heart Rate, Sweating, Tears) in each parameter there is sub score of 0, 1, 2)0-4 score is good as patient has depth of anaesthesia, >4 grade suggest awareness. BIS was only available for 5 patients of group B & 5 patients of group A technique. It was managed between 60-70.

Rescue fentanyl 50 mcg was given for further analgesia. After patients were fully awaked, when neuro surgeon performed speech testing and cortical mapping (language, motor tone of limbs, speech testing). Motor strength was tested by asking patients to move their fingers, dorsiflexion of toes against resistance. Patients advised to note change in sensation. Language was tested by asking patients to count or name list of objects & observe their speech arrestor hesitation.

Cortical Mapping
- It was done according to NRS scale. NRS scale of 0 is worst mapping, & 10 is excellent. NRS scale >7 was considered satisfactory.
- Patients were watched for adverse reactions like convulsion, respiratory depression, tight brain at the site of operation, hypercapnia, and bradycardia, Nausea, Vomiting.
RESULTS

Postoperative Monitoring of Recovery

- It was assessed with Modified Aldrete score. (MAS)\(^5\)
- When patients in both groups MAS of more then 7 they were shifted to postoperative recovery ward.
- Post operative course of patients was noticed in form of vitals, complications, mean hospital stay in days. Patient satisfaction score (Satisfactory, Good, Excellent), surgeon satisfaction score (Satisfactory, Good, Excellent) were noticed by Linkert scale.

Primary Outcome

It was ability to perform cortical Mapping.

Secondary Outcome

It was complications, patient satisfaction score, surgeon satisfaction score regarding Anaesthesia technique.

Statistical Analysis

- Observations were entered into Microsoft Excel, & analysed by SPSS SOFTWARE 16(IBM, Armonk, NY, USA)
- Data were expressed as mean, range, standard deviations. Categorial data were expressed as their measures (no., N, %).
- Unpaired t test used for Numerical values.
- Chi - square test, was used for assessment of categorical data.
- \(p>0.05\) is non-significant (NS)
- \(p<0.05\) is significant(S).
- \(p<0.001\) is highly significant (HS)

RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Group A (n=25)</th>
<th>Group B (n=25)</th>
<th>p-Value (Inference)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (Years)</td>
<td>44+/12</td>
<td>42+/14</td>
<td>&gt;0.05 (NS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (M/F)</td>
<td>18.7 (72.82%:28%)</td>
<td>17.8 (69.32%:32%)</td>
<td>&gt;0.05 (NS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASA Grade ( I/II)</td>
<td>15.10 (60%:40)</td>
<td>14.11 (56%:44)</td>
<td>&gt;0.05 (NS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of surgery (mins)</td>
<td>125+/−10</td>
<td>120+/−15</td>
<td>&gt;0.05 (NS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Shows comparable Demographic data in each group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>HR mean+/−SD (Group A) (n=25)</th>
<th>HR mean+/−SD (Group B) (n=25)</th>
<th>P value (Inference) For HR</th>
<th>MAP mean+/−SD (Group A) (n=25)</th>
<th>MAP mean+/−SD (Group B) (n=25)</th>
<th>p value (Inference) For MAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 min</td>
<td>100+/−12</td>
<td>100+/−14</td>
<td>&gt;0.05 (NS)</td>
<td>100+/−6</td>
<td>100+/−2</td>
<td>&gt;0.05 (NS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 min.</td>
<td>90+/−14</td>
<td>88+/−14</td>
<td>&gt;0.05 (NS)</td>
<td>98+/−4</td>
<td>96+/−4</td>
<td>&gt;0.05 (NS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>88+/−12</td>
<td>86+/−14</td>
<td>&gt;0.05 (NS)</td>
<td>96+/−2</td>
<td>94+/−2</td>
<td>&gt;0.05 (NS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 min</td>
<td>78+/−12</td>
<td>76+/−14</td>
<td>&gt;0.05 (NS)</td>
<td>96+/−4</td>
<td>96+/−2</td>
<td>&gt;0.05 (NS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>77+/−13</td>
<td>78+/−12</td>
<td>&gt;0.05 (NS)</td>
<td>92+/−6</td>
<td>92+/−4</td>
<td>&gt;0.05 (NS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 min</td>
<td>88+/−14</td>
<td>86+/−12</td>
<td>&gt;0.05 (NS)</td>
<td>90+/−2</td>
<td>90+/−2</td>
<td>&gt;0.05 (NS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 min</td>
<td>84+/−16</td>
<td>84+/−14</td>
<td>&gt;0.05 (NS)</td>
<td>90+/−4</td>
<td>90+/−2</td>
<td>&gt;0.05 (NS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 min</td>
<td>86+/−16</td>
<td>84+/−16</td>
<td>&gt;0.05 (NS)</td>
<td>90+/−2</td>
<td>88+/−4</td>
<td>&gt;0.05 (NS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 min</td>
<td>82+/−14</td>
<td>80+/−14</td>
<td>&gt;0.05 (NS)</td>
<td>92+/−4</td>
<td>92+/−2</td>
<td>&gt;0.05 (NS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180 min</td>
<td>80+/−12</td>
<td>80+/−14</td>
<td>&gt;0.05 (NS)</td>
<td>100+/−4</td>
<td>100+/−2</td>
<td>&gt;0.05 (NS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Haemodynamic Parameters

*Table 2. Perioperative haemodynamics were stable and comparable in both groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Group A (n=25)</th>
<th>Group B (n=25)</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SpO2</td>
<td>95+/−4</td>
<td>98+/−2</td>
<td>&lt;0.05 (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETCO2</td>
<td>38+/−8</td>
<td>32+/−6</td>
<td>&lt;0.05 (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRS scale</td>
<td>9.2+/−0.3</td>
<td>9.4+/−0.2</td>
<td>&gt;0.05 (NS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Perioperative Respiratory & Cortical Mapping Monitoring (p<0.05)

* Patients ETCO2 remain within limit ranging from 26 to 32 mm of Hg during entire operation in group B.
In group A ETCO2 was slight elevated. 4(16 %) patients of A group developed shortness of breath, anxiety, hypercapnia 4.67 mm of Hg(mean) and desaturation of 91% they were managed by increase oxygenation, ask the patient to deep breath, rescue fentanyl 50 mcg, and decreasing infusion rate of propofol
* There was not a single episode of hypercarbia and respiratory depression, or desaturation in any of patients during entire group B.
* NRS scale was more in dexmedetomidine group than propofol group, but it was statistically non-significant. (p>0.05)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4. Adverse Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adverse Effects</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypercarbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seizures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nausea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradycardia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tight brain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Intraoperative seizures were present in 4(16%) patients in group B, 7 patients (28%) in group A, which was present during mapping due to touching of functional areas of cortex, stopped by cold saline irrigation.

*Nausea and Bradycardia was present Perioperatively in 2 (8%) patients in each group which was due to deep cortical resection near midline treated accordingly. by coordinating with surgeon to reduce tration, administration of anticholinergic more effective than antiemetic.

*10 patients in group A (40%) have tight brain which was relieved by increased propofol infusion rate, rescue fentanyl bolus 50 mcg and frusemide.

*There was no awareness in each group, as in both groups depth of anaesthesia was adequate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th><strong>Group A (n=25)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Group B (n=25)</strong></th>
<th><strong>p-Value</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modified Aldrete Score</td>
<td>8 +/- 0.8</td>
<td>9 +/- 0.2</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Hospital Stay (days)</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient Satisfaction Score</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgeon Satisfaction Score</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescue Fentanyl Requests (50 mcg/ number)</td>
<td>2 +/- 1</td>
<td>1 +/- 1</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No Patient in each group had awareness during Asleep period (By PRST score/BIS). PRST score up to 4&BIS up to 60-70 were maintained in each group by rescue fentanyl requests 50 mcg per number. More Analgesic requests were in Propofol group. (*P<0.05)

*Post operative recovery in form of Modified Aldrete score in group A (propofol) was 8 +/- 0.8, & in group B (Dexmedetomidine) it was 9 +/- 0.2. (P>0.05)

*In Postoperative period, vitals were with in normal limits in both groups & no complications noted (*P>0.05)

*Mean hospital stay was more 3.98 days in group A whereas 3.50 days in group B. (*P<0.05)

*Patients satisfaction score was good with group B (Dexmedetomidine ) & satisfactory with group A (propofol)

*Surgeon satisfaction score was excellent with dexmedetomidine (group B) & good with propofol (group A)

DISCUSSION
Management of anaesthesia for awake craniotomy varied as evolution in various anaesthetic drugs, technique, as well as gazettes available for Anaesthesia.

Awake craniotomy poses unique challenges especially for the anaesthetist who is faced with an unprotected airway and limited access to the patient due to positioning and pinning of the head. (6)

So, appropriate patient selection, counselling is important for this method. (7)

Patient require sedation or general anaesthesia until the brain is exposed and again at the end of surgery while the cranium is closed.

In present study, both groups patient's premedication was done in same manner.

Goettal N, Bhardwaj S(6) have also compared Dexmedetomidine & Propofol for conscious sedation for awake craniotomies.

We have used IV Dexmedetomidine/ propofol as they provide sedation without cognitive impairments. (9)

Scalp block was given with 0.5% Ropivacaine (max. 30 ml) to decrease pain. (10) & maintaining hemodynamic Stability. (11)

Intraoperative sedation was assessed by Ramsey sedation score RSS was managed around 3 At time of mapping, and 2 after mapping, sedation should be titrated as under sedation cause anxiety, hypertension, tight Brain & over sedation causes desaturation, problem of correspondence during mapping. (12,3)

In both groups airway was managed by second generation LMA (i-gel) as it can be removed with minimum access & with out causing Laryngeal irritability. (13,14,11)

Scalp Block
It provides Perioperative & post operative analgesia. No patient had emergence hypertension. We have to modify our management in 4 patients in Group A (Propofol) as they have desaturation, but they were normal with in 2 min. (7,15)

In both groups Haemodynamic stability was there in asleep, Awake &Asleep all 3 phases, it shows that dexmedetomidine & propofol provide minimum change in cardiac parameters in lower doses, as well as scalp block with Ropivacaine provide good quality of analgesia so that patient didn't have tachycardia or hypertension although they were awake arousable, surgery was going on in awake phase & patients had stable haemodynamics.

NRS Scale
It was good (>8 in each group) & comparable in both groups.

Goettal N, Bhardwaj S also record more complications in Group A (propofol) & had stable haemodynamics.

Goettal N, Bhardwaj S also record more complications in Propofol group.

Complications observed in our study were comparable with study of Esenonu CL(16) in terms of complications, haemodynamics stability, hospital stay.

Postoperative vital & postoperative recovery (Modified Aldrete score) was comparable & with in normal limits in both groups.

Mean hospital stay was less in group B, which was statistically significant (P<0.05)

Scientists are inventing method for outdoor awake craniotomy.(15)

Esenonu have similar mean hospital stay.

Patients satisfaction score & Surgeon satisfaction score Mean hospital stay, less complications incidences were more in favour of dexmedetomidine group.

Limitations
1. Limitations of our study were- we have done study in limited number of cases, large scale study required.
2. Study design for day care surgery or early ambulation surgery for uneventful tumour resection should be done.
3. BIS monitoring for depth of Anaesthesia is more useful than RSS, which was available for only 5 patients of each group.

CONCLUSION
AAA technique for awake craniotomies was successful with propofol or dexmedetomidine. Few adverse effects were noted with propofol group that can be corrected easily.

In a nutshell, AAA technique with dexmedetomidine is more effective than Propofol group for maintenance during awake craniotomies.
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