RESEARCH ARTICLE

Open Access

Effect of dexmedetomidine supplementation for thoracoscopic surgery: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials

Chengjun Song^{1*} and Quan Lu²

Abstract

Introduction: The efficacy of dexmedetomidine supplementation for thoracoscopic surgery remains controversial. We conduct a systematic review and meta-analysis to explore the impact of dexmedetomidine for thoracoscopic surgery.

Methods: We have searched PubMed, EMbase, Web of science, EBSCO, and Cochrane library databases through September 2020 for randomized controlled trials (RCTs) assessing the effect of dexmedetomidine supplementation on thoracoscopic surgery. This meta-analysis is performed using the random-effect model.

Results: Six RCTs involving 510 patients are included in the meta-analysis. Overall, compared with control group for thoracoscopic surgery, dexmedetomidine supplementation results in significantly reduced pain scores (SMD = -1.50; 95% Cl = -2.63--0.37; P = 0.009), anesthetic consumption (SMD = -3.91; 95% Cl = -6.76--1.05; P = 0.007), mean heart rate (SMD = -0.41; 95% Cl = -0.65--0.18; P = 0.0007), and the risk ratio (RR) of ICU stay (RR = 0.39; 95% Cl = -0.45-0.31; P = 0.72) or hospital stay (SMD = -0.61; 95% Cl = -1.30-0.08; P = 0.08).

Conclusions: Dexmedetomidine supplementation can substantially improve the analgesic efficacy for thoracoscopic surgery.

Keywords: Dexmedetomidine, Thoracoscopic surgery, Analgesic efficacy, Randomized controlled trials

Introduction

Thoracoscopic surgery is widely used to treat various diseases such as esophageal cancer and lung cancer. It results the smaller incision, less pain and inflammatory response, reduced recovery times compared to traditional surgery [1-3]. The pain commonly occurs after the surgery, and negatively affects the postoperative recovery. Various analgesic regimens have developed for the pain management after thoracoscopic surgery, and they

¹ Department of Cardiothoracic Surgery, Fenghua District People's Hospital of Ningbo, Zhejiang, China

mainly include pharmacologic and regional interventions (e.g. nerve block) [4–7].

Dexmedetomidine, a short-acting $\alpha 2$ -adrenoceptor agonist, is reported to provide the sedation and analgesia for various surgeries [8, 9]. Studies demonstrated that dexmedetomidine attenuated surgical stress responses in patients undergoing surgery, and is effective and safe to improve the analgesic efficacy when serving as an adjunctive analgesic [10, 11]. Previous trials demonstrated that dexmedetomidine had opioid-sparing properties, maximized pain relief and minimized analgesic-related side effects [12–14].

However, the efficacy of dexmedetomidine supplementation for thoracoscopic surgery has not been well established. Recently, several studies on the topic have

© The Author(s) 2022. **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/. The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication waiver (http://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/) applies to the data made available in this article, unless otherwise stated in a credit line to the data.

^{*}Correspondence: nbschj@163.com

Full list of author information is available at the end of the article

been published, and the results were conflicting [7, 15–17]. For instance, two studies reported that dexmedetomidine supplementation could significantly reduce postoperative pain scores for thoracoscopic surgery [16, 18], but another study found no benefits to pain control after using dexmedetomidine supplementation for thoracoscopic surgery [7]. With accumulating evidence, we therefore perform a systematic review and meta-analysis of RCTs to investigate the analgesic efficacy of dexmedetomidine supplementation for thoracoscopic surgery.

Materials and methods

Ethical approval and patient consent are not required because this is a systematic review and meta-analysis of previously published studies. The systematic review and meta-analysis are conducted and reported in adherence to PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) [19].

Search strategy and study selection

Two investigators have independently searched the following databases (inception to September 2020): Pub-Med, EMbase, Web of science, EBSCO, and Cochrane library databases. The electronic search strategy was conducted using the following keywords: "dexmedetomidine", and "thoracoscopic" or "thoracoscopy". We also check the reference lists of the screened full-text studies to identify other potentially eligible trials.

The inclusive selection criteria are as follows: (i) patients underwent thoracoscopic surgery; (ii) intervention treatments were intravenous dexmedetomidine supplementation versus no dexmedetomidine; (iii) study design was RCT.

Data extraction and outcome measures

We have extracted the following information: author, number of patients, age, sex, body mass index, American Society of Anesthesiologists (ASA) and detail methods in each group. The ASA Physical Status Classification System is the most widely used system globally to describe a patient's preoperative medical condition. The four categories (P1–P4) in the classification have changed little since they were first proposed in 1941 [20]. Data were extracted independently by two investigators, and discrepancies are resolved by consensus. We also contacted the corresponding author to obtain the data when necessary.

The primary outcome was pain scores. Secondary outcomes included analgesic consumption, mean heart rate and blood pressure, ICU stay, and hospital stay.

Quality assessment in individual studies

Methodological quality of the included studies is independently evaluated using the Jadad scale [21]. There are 3 items for Jadad scale: randomization (0–2 points), blinding (0–2 points), dropouts and withdrawals (0–1 points). The score of Jadad Scale varies from 0 to 5 points. An article with Jadad score ≤ 2 is considered to be of low quality. If the Jadad score ≥ 3 , the study is thought to be of high quality [22].

Statistical analysis

We estimate the standard mean difference (SMD) with 95% confidence interval (CI) for continuous outcomes (pain scores, analgesic consumption, mean heart rate and blood pressure, and hospital stay) and relative risk (RR) with 95% CI for dichotomous outcomes (ICU stay). The random-effects model was used regardless of heterogeneity. Heterogeneity was reported using the I² statistic, and $I^2 > 50\%$ indicated significant heterogeneity [23]. Whenever significant heterogeneity was present, we searched for potential sources of heterogeneity via omitting one study in turn for the meta-analysis or performing subgroup analysis. Publication bias was not evaluated because of the limited number (<10) of included studies. All statistical analyses were performed using Review Manager Version 5.3 (The Cochrane Collaboration, Software Update, Oxford, UK).

Results

Literature search, study characteristics and quality assessment

A detailed flowchart of the search and selection results was shown in Additional file 1: Fig. S1. 239 potentially relevant articles are identified initially. Finally, six RCTs that meet our inclusion criteria are included in the meta-analysis [7, 15–18, 24].

The baseline characteristics of the six eligible RCTs in the meta-analysis were summarized in Table 1. The six studies were published between 2016 and 2020, and the total sample size was 510. Dexmedetomidine was used before the anesthesia [7, 15, 18, 24], or during surgery [16, 17].

Among the six studies included here, three studies reported pain scores [15, 16, 18], three studies reported analgesic consumption [7, 16, 18], four studies reported mean heart rate and blood pressure [7, 15, 17, 18], three studies reported ICU stay [15, 17, 24], and three studies reported hospital stay [17, 18, 24]. Jadad scores of the six included studies vary from 3 to 5, and all six studies are considered to be high-quality ones according to quality assessment.

		nes Jada scores	ore 3 (minus ic 2, unde- scribed teart blind- iod ness)	n n n n n n n n n n n n n n n n n n n	te, 4 (minus res- 1, U unclear I blind- ness)
		Outcorr cs	pain scc numeria rating scale), h rate, blo pressure	pain scc (numeri rating scale), analgesi consum tion (opioids ICU stay	heart rai blood pi sure, ICL stay and hospital stay
		Combined anaestheti	fentanyl, propofol an isoflurane	sevoflurane	fentanyl, propofol an sevoflurane
		Surgery type	video- assisted thoraco- scopic lung lobec- tomy	thoraco- scopic lung surgery	thoraco- scopic surgery
		Methods	placebo	placebo	placebo
		ASA (I/ II/III)	10/34/0	20/40/0	1/18/11
		Body mass index (kg/ m2)	22.89±2.85	23 ± 5	
	roup	Sex(male/ female)	22/22	30/3.0	16/14
		Age (years)	60.48 ± 12.58	59 [56-65]	58.7 ± 10.1
	Control g	Number	44	90	30
		Methods	dexme- detomi- dine 0.8 µ g/kg adminis- tered for 10 min before anesthesia	dexme- deto- midine started after inducing ansthe- sia and continued until the end of surgery at a fixed dose (N5 ug/kg/h)	0.5 ug/ kg/h dex- medeto- midine through the surgery
		ASA (I/ II/III)	7/39/0	18/42/0	2/14/14
		Body mass index (kg/ m2)	22.09 ± 3.22	24土 3	
	đ	Sex(male/ female)	17/29	28/32	15/15
	tomidine grou	Age (years)	56.78 ± 12.81	63 [58–68], median [interquartile range]	59.0 ± 8.8
	Dexmede	Number	46	9	30
	Author		Wang 2020	Kim 2019	Wu 2018
	٩		-	7	m

 Table 1
 Characteristics of included studies

	-	-						-									
2 N	Autnor	Dexmede	stomidine grou	a				Control gr	dno								
		Number	Age (years)	Sex(male/ female)	Body mass index (kg/ m2)	ASA (I/ II/III)	Methods	Number	Age (years)	Sex(male/ female)	Body mass index (kg/ m2)	ASA (I/ II/III)	Methods	Surgery type	Combined anaesthetics	Outcomes	Jada scores
4	Wang 2016	0	54.25 ±9.98	20/20	21.93 ± 2.12	,	0.5 μ g/kg, dexme- deto- midine diluted diluted diluted diluted shysi- ologic saline and for 10 min intrave- nously before the surgery	40	55.63 ± 11.20	20/20	22.10±2.13		no dex- medeto- midine	video- assisted thoraco- scopic lobec- tomy	oxycodone, propofol, fentanyl and sevoflurane	analgesic consump- tion (oxycodone dose), heart rate, blood pressure	2
Ś	2016	50	62.0±10.5	26/24	23.6±0.4	0/37/13	dexme- detomi- dine 1.0 ug/kg for 20 min before the termina- tion of surgery	50	62.0±11.5	23/27	23.6 ± 0.4	0/42/8	placebo	video- assisted thoraco- scopic surgery for lung cancer cancer	propofol, remifentanil, desflurane and fentanyl	pain score (numeric rating scale), analgesic consump- tion (opioids), ICU stay	Ŋ
٥	2016 (2)	25	68.4 ± 6.4	12/13	22.3 ± 2.7	0/11/14	dexme- detomi- dine at an initial loading dose of 10 min followed by a main- tenance dose of 0.5 ug/ kg/h during the surgery	25	69.4±8.7	11/14	22.7 ± 2.1	0/12/13	placebo	thora- coscopy for lung resec- tion	propofol, remifentanil, rane rane	heart rate, blood pres- sure, ICU hospital stay stay	L0
ASA ,	Americar	ר Society of	Anesthesiologis	sts													

Primary outcome: pain scores

This outcome data was analyzed with the random-effects model, and the pooled estimate of the three included RCTs suggested that compared to control group for thoracoscopic surgery, dexmedetomidine was associated with significantly reduced pain scores (SMD = -1.50; 95% CI = -2.63 to -0.37; P = 0.009), with significant heterogeneity among the studies (I^2 = 95%, heterogeneity P < 0.00001) (Fig. 1).

Sensitivity analysis

Significant heterogeneity is observed among the included studies for the primary outcomes, but there is still significant heterogeneity after when performing sensitivity analysis via omitting one study in turn to detect the heterogeneity (I^2 ranging from 89 to 97%). In addition, we

perform the subgroup analysis based on dexmedetomidine supplementation before vs during surgery, but there is still significant heterogeneity ($I^2=89\%$). The results find that dexmedetomidine supplementation results in substantially reduced pain scores when administered before surgery (P=0.02) and during surgery (P<0.0001, Fig. 2).

Secondary outcomes

Compared to control group for thoracoscopic surgery, dexmedetomidine can significantly reduce anesthetic consumption (SMD = -3.91; 95% CI = -6.76--1.05; P = 0.007; Fig. 3) and mean heart rate (SMD = -0.41; 95% CI = -0.65--0.18; P = 0.0007; Fig. 4), but has no important impact on mean blood pressure



	Dexmede	tomidine g	roup	Cont	rol gro	up		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95% Cl	
1.2.1 Dexmedetomid	ine before si	urgery								
Wang 2020	2.67	0.82	46	3.25	1.37	46	33.6%	-0.51 [-0.92, -0.09]		
Subtotal (95% CI)			46			46	33.6%	-0.51 [-0.92, -0.09]	•	
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable									
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.40 (P =	: 0.02)								
1.2.2 Dexmedetomid	ine during su	ırgery								
Kim 2019	3	0.5	60	5	1	60	33.1%	-2.51 [-3.00, -2.03]		
Lee 2016	4	2	50	7	2	50	33.4%	-1.49 [-1.93, -1.04]		
Subtotal (95% CI)			110			110	66.4%	-2.00 [-3.00, -0.99]		
Heterogeneity: Tau² =	0.47; Chi ² =	9.38, df = 1	1 (P = 0.0	002); I ^z =	= 89%					
Test for overall effect:	Z = 3.90 (P <	0.0001)							ce Std. Mean Difference Cl N, Random, 95% Cl 09] 09] 03] 04] 99] 37] -4 -2 0 2 4 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] e surgery versus during surgery	
Total (95% CI)			156			156	100.0%	-1.50 [-2.63, -0.37]		
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.94; Chi ² =	38.28, df=	2 (P < 0	.00001)); l ² = 9:	5%				
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.60 (P =	: 0.009)							-4 -2 U Z 4	
Test for subaroup diff	erences: Chi	² = 7.19. dt	f=1 (P=	0.007).	l ² = 86	.1%			Favours [experimental] Favours [control]	
Fig. 2 Subgroup and	alvsis of pai	n scores k	based o	n dexn	hedeta	omidir	ne supple	ementation before su	raerv versus durina suraerv	

	Dexmede	tomidine g	group	Cont	rol gro	up	5	Std. Mean Difference	Std. Me	an Difference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Ra	ndom, 95% Cl	
Kim 2019	0	0.25	60	1	0.25	60	33.7%	-3.97 [-4.60, -3.35]			
Lee 2016	40	25	50	69	25	50	33.9%	-1.15 [-1.58, -0.73]		•	
Wang 2016	13	0.375	40	16	0.5	40	32.4%	-6.72 [-7.88, -5.57]			
Total (95% CI)			150			150	100.0%	-3.91 [-6.76, -1.05]		-	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 6	6.21; Chi ² =	111.49, df	= 2 (P < 0	0.00001); l² = 9	8%			-10 -5		+
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 2.68 (P =	= 0.007)							Favours [experiment	al] Favours [contro	ol]





	Dexmedetomidine	group	Control g	group		Risk Ratio	Risk	Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% C	I IV, Rand	om, 95% Cl	
Kim 2019	3	60	8	60	31.0%	0.38 [0.10, 1.35]		+	
Lee 2016 (2)	1	25	7	25	12.4%	0.14 [0.02, 1.08]		+	
Wu 2018	5	30	10	30	56.5%	0.50 [0.19, 1.29]		+	
Total (95% CI)		115		115	100.0%	0.39 [0.19, 0.80]	•		
Total events	9		25						
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.00; Chi ² = 1.22, df =	= 2 (P = 0	.54); I ² = 0	%					100
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.58 (P = 0.010)						Favours [experimental]	Favours [control]	100
ia. 6 Forest plot for	the meta-analysis o	f ICU stay							

	Dexmedet	omidine g	group	Cont	rol gro	oup	:	Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference		
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95% CI		
Lee 2016	6.7	1.5	50	8.4	1.25	50	35.0%	-1.22 [-1.65, -0.79]			
Lee 2016 (2)	6.5	1.25	25	7.1	1.25	25	31.9%	-0.47 [-1.04, 0.09]			
Wu 2018	5.6	2.5	30	5.9	3.1	30	33.2%	-0.11 [-0.61, 0.40]			
Total (95% CI)			105			105	100.0%	-0.61 [-1.30, 0.08]			
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect:	Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Weight IV. Random. 95% Cl IV. Random. 95% Cl 6.7 1.5 50 8.4 1.25 50 35.0% -1.22 [-1.65, -0.79] -0.47 [-1.04, 0.09]										
Lee 2016 6.7 1.5 50 8.4 1.25 50 35.0% -1.22 [-1.65, -0.79] Lee 2016 (2) 6.5 1.25 25 7.1 1.25 25 31.9% -0.47 [-1.04, 0.09] Wu 2018 5.6 2.5 30 5.9 3.1 30 33.2% -0.11 [-0.61, 0.40] Total (95% Cl) 105 100.0% -0.61 [-1.30, 0.08] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.31; Chi ² = 11.62, df = 2 (P = 0.003); l ² = 83% Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.74$ (P = 0.08) Fig. 7 Forest plot for the meta-analysis of hospital stay											

(SMD = -0.07; 95% CI = -0.45-0.31; P = 0.72; Fig. 5).In addition, dexmedetomidine was associated with the decrease in the RR of ICU stay (RR = 0.39; 95% CI = 0.19-0.80; P = 0.01; Fig. 6), but revealed no effect on hospital stay (SMD = -0.61; 95% CI = -1.30 to 0.08; P = 0.08; Fig. 7).

Discussion

Thoracoscopic surgery has been widely used to treat lung cancer because of its minimally invasion, less postoperative pain and shortened hospital stay compared with open thoracotomy [25]. Postoperative pain management, particularly early postoperative pain, still remains a matter of concern for many anesthesiologists and these patients [26, 27]. Opioids are essential during surgery, and many methods are developed to reduce opioid consumption due to the side effects such as delayed recovery from general anesthesia, opioid-induced nausea, and respiratory depression [28, 29].

Intraoperative dexmedetomidine was reported to improve the effects of postoperative analgesia [30–32]. It showed analgesic, sedative and anxiolytic effects, and avoided respiratory depression and the inhibitory effect of sympathetic stimulation as an adjunct to general anesthesia [8]. Our meta-analysis included six RCTs and 510 patients. The results revealed that intravenous dexmedetomidine was associated with substantially reduced pain scores, anesthetic consumption, the RR of ICU stay and mean heart rate after thoracoscopic surgery, but showed no obvious influence on mean blood pressure or hospital stay.

In addition, dexmedetomidine benefited to maintain the stability of the cardiovascular system and decrease the stress response [10]. Intraoperative infusion of dexmedetomidine decreased both norepinephrine and epinephrine. Dexmedetomidine can decrease the release of catecholamines and has analgesic, anxiolytic, and hypnotic effects [33]. Regarding the sensitivity analysis, there is significant heterogeneity. Several reasons may account for the heterogeneity. Firstly, different doses and methods of dexmedetomidine supplementation may produce some bias. For instance, Dexmedetomidine was used before the anesthesia [7, 15, 18, 24] or during surgery [16, 17]. Secondly, dexmedetomidine was applied as the adjunct to different drugs such as oxycodone and sevoflurane, which may result in various analgesic effect. Thirdly, different operation procedures produces various pain intensity, which may affect the pooling results.

This meta-analysis has several potential limitations. Firstly, our analysis is based on only six RCTs, and three of them have a relatively small sample size (n < 100). Overestimation of the treatment effect was more likely in smaller trials compared with larger samples. Next, the doses, methods and combination of anesthetic drugs in included RCTs are different, which may have an influence on the pooling results. Finally, thoracoscopic surgeries are performed for various diseases and operation procedures.

Conclusions

Dexmedetomidine benefits to improve the analgesic efficacy for thoracoscopic surgery.

Abbreviations

RCTs: Randomized controlled trials; MDs: Mean differences; CIs: Confidence intervals; RRs: Risk ratios.

Supplementary Information

The online version contains supplementary material available at https://doi. org/10.1186/s13019-022-01803-z.

Additional file 1: Figure S1. Flow diagram of study searching and selection process.

Acknowledgements

None.

Authors' contributions

CS conducted the design, study planning, data analysis and data interpretation. QL wrote and revised the article. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding

Not applicable.

Availability of data

Not applicable.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate Not applicable.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Competing interests

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Author details

¹Department of Cardiothoracic Surgery, Fenghua District People's Hospital of Ningbo, Zhejiang, China. ²Department of Anesthesiology, Fenghua District People's Hospital of Ningbo, Zhejiang, China.

Received: 18 June 2021 Accepted: 18 March 2022 Published online: 06 April 2022

References

- Murakawa T, Sato H, Okumura S, Nakajima J, Horio H, Ozeki Y, Asamura H, Ikeda N, Otsuka H, Matsuguma H, Yoshino I, Chida M, Nakayama M, Iizasa T, Okumura M, Shiono S, Kato R, Iida T, Matsutani N, Kawamura M, Sakao Y, Funai K, Furuyashiki G, Akiyama H, Sugiyama S, Kanauchi N, Shiraishi Y, Metastatic Lung Tumor Study Group of Japan. Thoracoscopic surgery versus open surgery for lung metastases of colorectal cancer: a multiinstitutional retrospective analysis using propensity score adjustmentdagger. Eur J Cardiothorac Surg. 2017;51(6):1157–63.
- Kinjo Y, Kurita N, Nakamura F, Okabe H, Tanaka E, Kataoka Y, Itami A, Sakai Y, Fukuhara S. Effectiveness of combined thoracoscopic-laparoscopic esophagectomy: comparison of postoperative complications and midterm oncological outcomes in patients with esophageal cancer. Surg Endosc. 2012;26(2):381–90.
- Pham TH, Perry KA, Dolan JP, Schipper P, Sukumar M, Sheppard BC, Hunter JG. Comparison of perioperative outcomes after combined thoracoscopic-laparoscopic esophagectomy and open Ivor-Lewis esophagectomy. Am J Surg. 2010;199(5):594–8.
- Davies RG, Myles PS, Graham JM. A comparison of the analgesic efficacy and side-effects of paravertebral vs epidural blockade for thoracotomy–a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized trials. Br J Anaesth. 2006;96(4):418–26.
- Sztain JF, Gabriel RA, Said ET. Thoracic epidurals are associated with decreased opioid consumption compared to surgical infiltration of liposomal bupivacaine following video-assisted thoracoscopic surgery for

lobectomy: a retrospective cohort analysis. J Cardiothorac Vasc Anesth. 2018. https://doi.org/10.1053/j.jvca.2018.06.013.

- Adhikary SD, Pruett A, Forero M, Thiruvenkatarajan V. Erector spinae plane block as an alternative to epidural analgesia for post-operative analgesia following video-assisted thoracoscopic surgery: a case study and a literature review on the spread of local anaesthetic in the erector spinae plane. Indian J Anaesth. 2018;62(1):75–8.
- Wang X, Wang K, Wang B, Jiang T, Xu Z, Wang F, Yu J. Effect of oxycodone combined with dexmedetomidine for intravenous patient-controlled analgesia after video-assisted thoracoscopic lobectomy. J Cardiothorac Vasc Anesth. 2016;30(4):1015–21.
- Carollo DS, Nossaman BD, Ramadhyani U. Dexmedetomidine: a review of clinical applications. Curr Opin Anaesthesiol. 2008;21(4):457–61.
- Venn RM, Bradshaw CJ, Spencer R, Brealey D, Caudwell E, Naughton C, Vedio A, Singer M, Feneck R, Treacher D, Willatts SM, Grounds RM. Preliminary UK experience of dexmedetomidine, a novel agent for postoperative sedation in the intensive care unit. Anaesthesia. 1999;54(12):1136–42.
- Kim MH, Lee KY, Bae SJ, Jo M, Cho JS. Intraoperative dexmedetomidine attenuates stress responses in patients undergoing major spine surgery. Minerva Anestesiol. 2019;85(5):468–77.
- Shamim R, Srivastava S, Rastogi A, Kishore K, Srivastava A. Effect of two different doses of dexmedetomidine on stress response in laparoscopic pyeloplasty: a randomized prospective controlled study. Anesth Essays Res. 2017;11(4):1030–4.
- Kim HC, Lee YH, Jeon YT, Hwang JW, Lim YJ, Park JE, Park HP. The effect of intraoperative dexmedetomidine on postoperative catheter-related bladder discomfort in patients undergoing transurethral bladder tumour resection: a double-blind randomised study. Eur J Anaesthesiol. 2015;32(9):596–601.
- Shorrock P, Heaton T, Cochrane N, Jackson M, Lund K, Plummer N. The effects of dexmedetomidine on postoperative pain. Anaesthesia. 2015;70(3):372.
- Peng K, Liu HY, Wu SR, Cheng H, Ji FH. Effects of combining dexmedetomidine and opioids for postoperative intravenous patientcontrolled analgesia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Clin J Pain. 2015;31(12):1097–104.
- Wang YL, Kong XQ, Ji FH. Effect of dexmedetomidine on intraoperative Surgical Pleth Index in patients undergoing video-assisted thoracoscopic lung lobectomy. J Cardiothorac Surg. 2020;15(1):296.
- Kim JA, Ahn HJ, Yang M, Lee SH, Jeong H, Seong BG. Intraoperative use of dexmedetomidine for the prevention of emergence agitation and postoperative delirium in thoracic surgery: a randomized-controlled trial. Can J Anaesth. 2019;66(4):371–9.
- Wu CY, Lu YF, Wang ML, Chen JS, Hsu YC, Yang FS, Cheng YJ. Effects of dexmedetomidine infusion on inflammatory responses and injury of lung tidal volume changes during one-lung ventilation in thoracoscopic surgery: a randomized controlled trial. Mediators Inflamm. 2018;2018:2575910.
- Lee SH, Lee CY, Lee JG, Kim N, Lee HM, Oh YJ. Intraoperative dexmedetomidine improves the quality of recovery and postoperative pulmonary function in patients undergoing video-assisted thoracoscopic surgery: a CONSORT-prospective, randomized, controlled trial. Medicine. 2016;95(7):e2854.
- Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, PRISMA Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. J Clin Epidemiol. 2009;62(10):1006–12.
- Thackray NM, Gibbs NM. American Society of Anesthesiologists P5: "with or without" definition? Anesthesiology. 2011;114(2):467–8.
- Jadad AR, Moore RA, Carroll D, Jenkinson C, Reynolds DJM, Gavaghan DJ, McQuay HJ. Assessing the quality of reports of randomized clinical trials: Is blinding necessary? Control Clin Trials. 1996;17(1):1–12.
- Kjaergard LL, Villumsen J, Gluud C. Reported Methodologic Quality and Discrepancies between Large and Small Randomized Trials in Meta-Analyses. Ann Intern Med. 2001;135(11):982–9.
- Higgins JP, Thompson SG. Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. Stat Med. 2002;21(11):1539–58.
- Lee SH, Kim N, Lee CY, Ban MG, Oh YJ. Effects of dexmedetomidine on oxygenation and lung mechanics in patients with moderate chronic obstructive pulmonary disease undergoing lung cancer surgery: a randomised double-blinded trial. Eur J Anaesthesiol. 2016;33(4):275–82.

- Steinthorsdottir KJ, Wildgaard L, Hansen HJ, Petersen RH, Wildgaard K. Regional analgesia for video-assisted thoracic surgery: a systematic review. Eur J Cardiothorac Surg. 2014;45(6):959–66.
- Falcoz PE, Puyraveau M, Thomas PA, Decaluwe H, Hürtgen M, Petersen RH, Hansen H, Brunelli A. Video-assisted thoracoscopic surgery versus open lobectomy for primary non-small-cell lung cancer: a propensity-matched analysis of outcome from the European Society of Thoracic Surgeon database. Eur J Cardiothorac Surg. 2016;49(2):602–9.
- 27. Bendixen M, Jørgensen OD, Kronborg C, Andersen C, Licht PB. Postoperative pain and quality of life after lobectomy via video-assisted thoracoscopic surgery or anterolateral thoracotomy for early stage lung cancer: a randomised controlled trial. Lancet Oncol. 2016;17(6):836–44.
- Clarke H, Soneji N, Ko DT, Yun L, Wijeysundera DN. Rates and risk factors for prolonged opioid use after major surgery: population based cohort study. BMJ (Clin Res ed). 2014;348:g1251.
- Fletcher D, Martinez V. Opioid-induced hyperalgesia in patients after surgery: a systematic review and a meta-analysis. Br J Anaesth. 2014;112(6):991–1004.
- Grape S, Kirkham KR, Frauenknecht J, Albrecht E. Intra-operative analgesia with remifentanil vs. dexmedetomidine: a systematic review and metaanalysis with trial sequential analysis. Anaesthesia. 2019;74(6):793–800.
- Ranganathan P, Ritchie MK, Ellison MB, Petrone A, Heiraty P, Tabone LE. A randomized control trial using intraoperative dexmedetomidine during Roux-en-Y gastric bypass surgery to reduce postoperative pain and narcotic use. Surg Obes Relat Dis. 2019;15(4):588–94.
- Beder El Baz MM, Farahat TEM. Intraperitoneal levobupivacaine alone or with dexmedetomidine for postoperative analgesia after laparoscopic cholecystectomy. Anesth Essays Res. 2018;12(2):355–8.
- Gertler R, Brown HC, Mitchell DH, Silvius EN. Dexmedetomidine: a novel sedative-analgesic agent. Proc (Bayl Univ Med Cent). 2001;14(1):13–21.

Publisher's Note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Ready to submit your research? Choose BMC and benefit from:

- fast, convenient online submission
- thorough peer review by experienced researchers in your field
- rapid publication on acceptance
- support for research data, including large and complex data types
- gold Open Access which fosters wider collaboration and increased citations
- maximum visibility for your research: over 100M website views per year

At BMC, research is always in progress.

Learn more biomedcentral.com/submissions

