

Local Anesthetics: Review of Pharmacological Considerations

Abdumanobov Mashhurbek Mansur o'g'li

Student of group 304-B, Faculty of Pediatric Stomatology, TDSI

research advisor: **Tastanova Gulchexra Yeshtayevna**

Tulemetov Sobirjon Kalikovich

Ashurov To'lqin Abdullayevich

Gadayev Asliddin Mamarasulovich

Abstract.

Local anesthetics have an impressive history of efficacy and safety in medical and dental practice. Their use is not so regular, and the negative effects are so low, that providers can overlook a lot of their pharmacotherapeutic principles understandable. The purpose of this continuing education article is important for various local anesthesia formulas in current use. Local anesthetics inhibit nerve conduction by inhibiting the passage of sodium ions through channels or ionophores within neural membranes. Usually these channels are present at rest, during which access to sodium ions is prohibited. When the neuron is excited, the channel adopts an activated or open state, in which sodium ions spread to the cell and begin depolarization. After a sharp change in membrane voltage, the sodium channel adopts an inactive state, at which point the active transport mechanisms return sodium ions outward. After this repolarization, the canal receives a normal state of rest. Valuing these sodium channel States helps explain the privileged sensitivity of local anesthetics for different classes of neuronal fibers. Local anesthetics have a greater affinity for receptors within sodium channels in their activated and inactive states than in resting states. Therefore, nerve fibers with a faster firing rate are most susceptible to the effects of local anesthesia. In addition, smaller fibers are usually more sensitive, as a certain amount of local anesthetic solution can block the required amount of sodium channels to completely stop impulse transmission. For these reasons, small, fast-firing autonomous fibers are the most sensitive, then sensitive fibers and finally somatic motor fibers. an anesthesiologist who blocks mixed spinal nerves knows this differential sensitivity very well. Once patients recover from spinal anesthesia, they first restore voluntary motor function, then the sensation returns, and finally they can micture (autonomic control). The dentist is usually overlooked because the trigeminal nerve branches that are anesthetized for dental procedures consist only of small, quick-firing sensitive fibers. However, many classes of sensitive fibers also differ in diameter and firing rate. For example, pain fibers are more sensitive than those that carry pressure and proprioception. Despite the complete Anesthesia of the pain fibers, the patient may be disturbed by the feeling of pressure

Keywords: Local anesthetics, Pharmacology, Drug toxicity, Dentistry

Objective

MATERIALS & METHODS

Anesthetic Potency

Local anesthetics vary in their potency, allowing for concentrations that range typically from 0.5 to 4%. This is largely the result of differences in lipid solubility, which enhances diffusion through nerve sheaths and neural membranes. This property is determined by the aromatic ring and its substitutions, along with those added to the tertiary amine. For example, bupivacaine is more lipid soluble and potent than articaine, allowing it to be formulated as a 0.5% concentration (5 mg/mL) rather than a 4% concentration (40 mg/mL).

Metabolism and Elimination

The intermediate chain or linkage provides a convenient basis for classification of local anesthetics, and also determines their pattern of elimination. Amides are biotransformed in the liver but esters are hydrolyzed in the bloodstream by plasma esterases. Ester local anesthetics are no longer packaged in dental cartridges and

are used infrequently, with the exception of benzocaine, found in several topical anesthetic preparations. Articaine is unique in this regard. It is classified as an amide according to its intermediate linkage, but also contains an ester side chain on its aromatic ring. Hydrolysis of this side chain renders the molecule inactive, and it is therefore eliminated in a manner identical to ester anesthetics.

Despite countless factors that affect the amount of local anesthesia that reaches the nerve fibers, the most important factor that determines the onset of anesthesia is the proportion of lipid-soluble molecules, not in the water-soluble state

Although bupivacaine and articaine are both highly lipid soluble, the 4% concentration of articaine provides for a much faster onset.

Drug	Brand Name	MSD (plain)
Bupivacaine HCl	Marcaïn	2mg/kg Bupivacaine 2mg/kg Bupivacaine 2mg/kg Bupivacaine 2mg/kg Bupivacaine 2mg/kg 2mg/kg
Bupivacaine HCl with adrenaline	Marcaïn with adrenaline	As plain soln.
Levobupivacaine HCl	Chirocaine	2mg/kg
Lidocaine HCl	Xylocaine	3mg/kg
Lidocaine HCl with adrenaline	Xylocaine with Adrenaline	7mg/kg
Ropivacaine HCl	Naropin	4.3mg/kg
Prilocaine HCl	Citanest	6mg/kg
Mepivacaine HCl	Scandonest	6mg/kg

Conclusions

Local anesthetics are drugs that are used in order to temporarily and inversely eliminate painful sensations in certain areas of the body by blocking the transmission of nerve fiber impulses. Local anesthesia is any way to make part of the body indifferent to pain without affecting the mind. In clinical cases, local anesthetics are used in different ways and in different situations that require local pain relief. Local anesthetics are used to relieve pain, pain, itching and irritation associated with violation of the integrity of the skin and mucous membranes, such as cuts, bites, wounds, rashes, allergic conditions, fungal infections, skin wounds and ruptures. From a medical point of view, local anesthesia can be distinguished by the method of clinical use as local anesthesia, infiltrative anesthesia, block or regional anesthesia, spinal anesthesia and epidural anesthesia.

Local anesthesia of the aminoether series includes procaine, chlorprocaine, tetracaine and cocaine. Local anesthesia of the aminoamide series is lidocaine, mepivacaine, bupivacaine, etidocaine, and prilocaine. Topical anesthetics are benzocaine and cyclomethicaine. This chapter describes the chemical structure and synthesis of these chemicals, emphasizing their specific uses. At therapeutic concentrations, local anesthetics inversely block nerve transmission and relieve local sensations while relieving local pain and preventing muscle activity in the process.

References

1. Berde CB, Strichartz GR. Local anesthetics. In: Miller RD, Eriksson LI, Fleisher LA, et al., editors. *Miller's Anesthesia*. 7th ed. Philadelphia, Pa: Elsevier, Churchill Livingstone; 2009.
2. Katzung BG, White PF. Local anesthetics. In: Katzung BG, Masters SB, Trevor AJ, editors. *Basic and Clinical Pharmacology*. 11th ed. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Companies Inc; 2009.
3. Goodson JM, Moore PA. Life-threatening reactions after pedodontic sedation: an assessment of narcotic, local anesthetic and antiemetic drug interactions. *J Am Dent Assoc*. 1983;107:239–245.
4. Scott DB, Jebson PJR, Braid DP, et al. Factors affecting plasma levels of lignocaine and prilocaine. *Brit J Anaesth*. 1972;44:1040–1049.
5. Hersh EV, Giannakopoulos H, Levin LM, et al. The pharmacokinetics and cardiovascular effects of high-dose articaine with 1 : 100,000 and 1 : 200,000 epinephrine. *J Am Dent Assoc*. 2006;137:1562–1571.
6. Benz EJ. Disorders of hemoglobin. In: Longo DL, Kasper DL, Jameson JL, et al., editors. *Harrison's Principles of Internal Medicine*. 18th ed. New York, NY: McGraw Hill; 2012.
7. Schatz M. Adverse reactions to local anesthetics. *Immunol Allergy Clin North Am*. 1992;12:585–609.
8. Gell PGH, Coombs RRA. Classification of allergic reactions responsible for clinical hypersensitivity and disease. In: Gell PGH, Coombs RRA, Hachmann PJ, editors. *Clinical Aspects of Immunology*. 3rd ed. Oxford, England: Blackwell Scientific; 1975.
9. Adkinson NF, Jr . Drug allergy. In: Adkinson NF Jr, Yunginger JW, Busse WW, et al., editors. *Middleton's Allergy: Principles and Practice*. 6th ed. Philadelphia, Pa: Mosby Inc; 2003.
10. Gall H, Kaufmann R, Kalveram CM. Adverse reactions to local anesthetics: analysis of 197 cases. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. 1996;97:933–937.
11. Berkun Y, Ben-Zvi A, Levy Y, Galili D, Shalit M. Evaluation of adverse reactions to local anesthetics: experience with 236 patients. *Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol*. 2003;91:342–345.
12. Specia SJ, Boynes SG, Cuddy MA. Allergic reactions to local anesthetic formulations. *Dent Clin North Am*. 2010;54:655–664.
13. deShazo RD, Kemp SF. Allergic reactions to drugs and biologic agents. *JAMA*. 1997;278:1895–1906.
14. Haas DA, Lennon D. A 21 year retrospective study of reports of paresthesia following local anesthetic administration. *J Can Dent Assoc*. 1995;61:319–330.
15. Garisto GA, Gaffen AS, Lawrence HP, Tenenbaum HC, Haas DA. Occurrence of paresthesia after dental local anesthetic administration in the United States. *J Am Dent Assoc*. 2010;141:836–844.
16. Hillerup S, Jensen RH, Ersboll BK. Trigeminal nerve injury associated with injection of local anesthetics: needle lesion or neurotoxicity. *J Am Dent Assoc*. 2011;142:531–539.
17. Hillerup S, Bakke M, Larsen JO, Thomsen CE, Gerds TA. Concentration-dependent neurotoxicity of articaine: an electrophysiological and stereological study of the rat sciatic nerve. *Anesth Analg*. 2011;112:1330–1338.
18. Morris R, McKay W, Mushlin P. Comparison of pain associated with intradermal and subcutaneous infiltration with various local anesthetic solutions. *Anesth Analg*. 1987;66:1180–1182.
19. Wahl MJ, Overton D, Howell J, Siegel E, Schmitt MM, Muldoon M. Pain on injection of prilocaine plain vs. lidocaine with epinephrine. A prospective double-blind study. *J Am Dent Assoc*. 2001;132:1396–1401.
20. Wahl MJ, Schmitt MM, Overton DA, Gordon MK. Injection pain of bupivacaine with epinephrine vs. prilocaine plain. *J Am Dent Assoc*. 2002;133:1652–1656.
21. Yagiela JA. Local anesthetics. In: Dionne RA, Phero JP, Becker DE, editors. *Management of Pain & Anxiety in the Dental Office*. St Louis, Mo: WB Saunders/Elsevier Science; 2002.

22. Brandt RG, Anderson PF, McDonald NJ, Sohn W, Peters MC. The pulpal anesthetic efficacy of articaine versus lidocaine in dentistry: a meta-analysis. *J Am Dent Assoc.* 2011;142:493–504.
23. Malamed SF, Gagnon S, Leblanc D. Efficacy of articaine: a new amide local anesthetic. *J Am Dent Assoc.* 2000;131:635–642.
24. Mikesell P, Nusstein J, Reader A, Beck M, Weaver J. A comparison of articaine and lidocaine for inferior alveolar nerve blocks. *J Endod.* 2005;31:265–270.
25. Robertson D, Nusstein J, Reader A, Beck M, McCartney M. The anesthetic efficacy of articaine in buccal infiltration of mandibular posterior teeth. *J Am Dent Assoc.* 2007;138:1104–1112.
26. Abdulwahab M, Boynes S, Moore P, et al. The efficacy of six local anesthetic formulations used for posterior mandibular buccal infiltration anesthesia. *J Am Dent Assoc.* 2009;140:1018–1024.
27. Moore PA, Hersh EV, Papas AS, et al. Pharmacokinetics of lidocaine with epinephrine following local anesthesia reversal with phentolamine mesylate. *Anesth Prog.* 2008;55:40–48.
28. Montamat SC, Cusack BJ, Vestal RE. Management of drug therapy in the elderly. *N Engl J Med.* 1989;321:303–309.
29. Dagher FB, Yared GM, Machtou P. An evaluation of 2% lidocaine with different concentrations of epinephrine for inferior alveolar nerve block. *J Endod.* 1997;23:178–180.
30. Tofoli GR, Ramacciato JC, de Oliveira PC, et al. Comparison of effectiveness of 4% articaine associated with 1 : 100,000 or 1 : 200,000 epinephrine in inferior alveolar nerve block. *Anesth Prog.* 2003;50:164–168.
31. Westfall TC, Westfall DP. Adrenergic agonists and antagonists. In: Brunton LL, Chabner BA, Knollmann BC, editors. *Goodman and Gilman's The Pharmacological Basis of Therapeutics. 12th ed.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Companies Inc; 2011.
32. Dionne RA, Goldstein DS, Wirdzek PR. Effects of diazepam premedication and epinephrine-containing local anesthetic on cardiovascular and catecholamine responses to oral surgery. *Anesth Analg.* 1984;63:640–646.
33. Guglielmo A, Reader A, Nist R, Beck M, Weaver J. Anesthetic efficacy and heart rate effects of the supplemental intraosseous injection of 2% mepivacaine with 1 : 20,000 levonordefrin. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod.* 1999;87:284–293.
34. Lawaty I, Drum M, Reader A, Nusstein J. A prospective, randomized, double-blind comparison of 2% mepivacaine with 1 : 20,000 levonordefrin versus 2% lidocaine with 1 : 100,000 epinephrine for maxillary infiltrations. *Anesth Prog.* 2010;57:139–144.
35. Becker DE. Adverse drug interactions. *Anesth Prog.* 2011;58:31–41.
36. Foster CA, Aston SJ. Propranolol-epinephrine interaction: a potential disaster. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 1983;72:74–78.
37. Gandy W. Severe epinephrine-propranolol interaction. *Ann Emerg Med.* 1989;18:98–99.
38. Mito RS, Yagiela JA. Hypertensive response to levonordefrin in a patient receiving propranolol: report of a case. *J Am Dent Assoc.* 1988;116:55–57.