Comparative split-mouth study of the anesthetic efficacy of 4% articaine versus 0.5% bupivacaine in impacted mandibular third molar extraction
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Abstract

Objective: The purpose of this study was to compare the clinical efficacy of articaine at 4% (epinephrine 1:100,000) with bupivacaine at 0.5% (epinephrine 1:200,000) for surgical extraction of impacted mandibular third molars.

Study Design: This was a randomized, double blind, split-mouth, clinical trial. Thirty-six patients took part and underwent extraction of 72 lower third molars. The variables studied were: anesthetic latency time, intra-operative bleeding, anesthetic quality, hemodynamic changes during the surgical intervention, anesthetic duration in the soft tissues, post-operative analgesia and post-operative pain at 2, 6, 12 and 24 hours using a visual analogue scale, as well as any need for additional rescue medication.

Results: Latency time was 2.0 minutes for articaine and 3.1 minutes for bupivacaine, with statistically significant difference (p<0.05). Bleeding was greater when bupivacaine was used (p<0.05) and anesthetic quality was greater with articaine (p<0.05). The duration of soft tissue anesthesia was longer with bupivacaine (p<0.05). Differences in post-operative analgesia, haemodynamic changes, post-operative pain and the quantity of rescue medication consumed were not statistically significant (p>0.05).

Conclusions: Articaine showed greater clinical efficacy than bupivacaine, reducing latency time, bleeding, anesthetic duration in the soft tissues and achieving higher anesthetic quality, requiring less reinforcement during surgery than bupivacaine.
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Introduction
Impacted lower third molar has a high rate of incidence, third molar extraction being the most frequent extraction performed in the oral cavity (1). It is associated with the appearance of very diverse pathologies such as pericoronitis, carries on the distal face of the second lower molar and on the third molar, myofascial pain, certain types of cyst and odontogenic tumors and dental overcrowding (2). Pain, inflammation and post-operative trismus are the main symptoms following impacted lower third molar surgery (3, 4). The pain is more intense between three and five hours after extraction, as the local anesthetic wears off (5), and is generally controlled using analgesics or non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) taken orally (6).

The application of long-acting local anesthetics has been shown to reduce immediate post-operative pain (7, 8). Bupivacaine produces a slow return of sensation that is associated with the gradual onset of post-operative discomfort (3). However, the long duration of anesthesia in the soft tissues is considered an unpleasant sensation for the patient (6, 9, 10). Its use is justified in surgery of long duration and post-operative periods with foreseeable discomfort (11, 12).

Bupivacaine was developed in 1957 by Ekenstam, Egner and Pettersson and its clinical use was first described by Widman in 1964 (3, 4). It was introduced onto the market in 1984 and since then numerous studies have been published comparing it mainly with lidocaine (3, 4, 6, 8, 13). The results of these trials suggest that bupivacaine was superior due to: similar latency time, four time greater strength, delay to the appearance and intensity of post-operative pain, a reduction to the use of analgesics and the minimal incidence of secondary effects.

There is a wide variety of literature comparing different anesthetics, but only three (11, 14, 15) have compared bupivacaine with articaine for third molar extraction. The aim of the present study was to compare the clinical efficacy of articaine at 4% (epinephrine 1:100,000) with bupivacaine at 0.5% (epinephrine 1:200,000) for the surgical extraction of impacted mandibular third molars.

Material and Methods
-Sample Selection
This randomized double blind, split-mouth, clinical trial was performed at the Oral Surgery Unit of a University Clinic. All patients gave their informed consent in writing. The study protocol was approved by the University of Valencia Faculty of Dentistry’s ethics committee. Of a total of 220 patients requiring impacted lower third molar extraction between November 2009 and May 2010, the patients selected were all adults requiring bilateral impacted lower third molar extraction with similar levels of surgical difficulty according to the Alemany-Martinez et al. scale (16) (Table 1).

Exclusion criteria were: patients presenting systemic diseases, patients in pharmacological treatment (excepting oral contraceptives) and patients allergic to the drugs used in the trial. Having completed a study protocol for each subject, 20 were discarded as they did not meet the criteria. Finally, 36 patients took part (12 men and 24 women), with an average age of 23.1 ± 6 years (range 18-37).

-Surgical Procedure
The articaine and bupivacaine carpules (1.8 ml) were marked as “1” or “2” by an individual unrelated to the study. The local anesthetic used and the side of the intervention were allotted randomly using a predefined random numbers table and enclosed in envelopes.

At the first intervention, patients received 4% articaine with 1:100,000 epinephrine (Ultracaine, Inibsa, Barcelona, Spain) or 0.5% bupivacaine with 1:200,000 epinephrine (Inibsacain Plus®, Inibsa, Barcelona, Spain). At the second intervention, the anesthetic not used at the first was used (10).

-Spatial Selection
This randomized double blind, split-mouth, clinical trial was performed at the Oral Surgery Unit of a University Clinic. All patients gave their informed consent in writing. The study protocol was approved by the University of Valencia Faculty of Dentistry’s ethics committee. Of a total of 220 patients requiring impacted lower third molar extraction between November 2009 and May 2010, the patients selected were all adults requiring bilateral impacted lower third molar extraction with similar levels of surgical difficulty according to the Alemany-Martinez et al. scale (16) (Table 1).

Exclusion criteria were: patients presenting systemic diseases, patients in pharmacological treatment (excepting oral contraceptives) and patients allergic to the drugs used in the trial. Having completed a study protocol for each subject, 20 were discarded as they did not meet the criteria. Finally, 36 patients took part (12 men and 24 women), with an average age of 23.1 ± 6 years (range 18-37).

-Surgical Procedure
The articaine and bupivacaine carpules (1.8 ml) were marked as “1” or “2” by an individual unrelated to the study. The local anesthetic used and the side of the intervention were allotted randomly using a predefined random numbers table and enclosed in envelopes.

At the first intervention, patients received 4% articaine with 1:100,000 epinephrine (Ultracaine, Inibsa, Barcelona, Spain) or 0.5% bupivacaine with 1:200,000 epinephrine (Inibsacain Plus®, Inibsa, Barcelona, Spain). At the second intervention, the anesthetic not used at the first was used (10).

-Spatial Selection

**Table 1. Table showing surgical difficulty in impacted lower third molar extraction as classified by Alemany-Martinez et al. (16).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spatial Relation</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Available Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mesioangular</td>
<td>Level A</td>
<td>Class I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal/transverse</td>
<td>Level B</td>
<td>Class II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical</td>
<td>Level C</td>
<td>Class III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distoangular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Spatial Relation**
Third molar position in relation to the second molar long axis.

**Depth**
-Level A: Highest part of third molar at the same level or above the plane of second molar occlusal surface. 
-Level B: Highest part of third molar between occlusal line and cervical line of the second molar. 
-Level C: Highest part of third molar at same level or below the plane of the second molar cervical line.

**Available Space**
-Class I: The space between the distal surface of the second molar and the ascending mandibular ramus is greater than the mesiodistal diameter of the third molar. 
-Class II: The space between the distal surface of the second molar and the ascending mandibular ramus is less than the mesiodistal diameter of the third molar. 
-Class III: The third molar is partially or totally inside the ascending mandibular ramus.

**Level of Difficulty**
3-4 minimum; 5-6, moderate; 7-10 very difficult.
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The relation between surgical time and post-operative pain was analyzed using the Pearson correlation coefficient. In the case of category variables – bleeding and anesthetic quality – the McNemar-Bowker non-parametric test was applied to determine differences between the two types of anesthetic.

ANOVA was performed on repeated measurements to analyze the effect of the type of anesthesia at each point during the surgical procedure (base-line, anesthesia, incision, flap elevation, ostectomy, extraction and suture) on haemodynamic variables, as well as time (2, 6, 12 and 24 hours) and post-operative pain.

Results

The most common reason for extraction was pericoronitis antecedents (47.2%), followed by prophylactic reasons (27.8%), orthodontic requirements (16.7%) and second molar affection (8.3%).

The average time of surgical procedures was 35.2 minutes on the right side and 38.9 minutes on the left, without statistically significant difference (t = -1.797; p = 0.081).

Average latency time for bupivacaine was 3.1 ± 1.5 minutes compared to 2 ± 1.4 minutes for articaine, with statistically significant difference (Z = -3.810; p = 0.000) (Fig. 1) (Table 2).

There were higher levels of bleeding in surgery performed under anesthesia by bupivacaine, particularly during incision and flap elevation, being abundant in 30.6% of cases using bupivacaine compared to 2.8% with articaine (Z = -3.664; p = 0.000).

Moderate and severe intra-operative discomfort, requiring additional anesthetic occurred in 16.7% of cases...
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Regarding haemodynamic parameters, the type of anesthetic solution did not influence systolic blood pressure (F=0.947; p=0.449), diastolic blood pressure (F=0.958; p=0.414) or cardiac rate (F=1.006; p=0.409) during surgery (Fig. 2 and Table 2).

The duration of anesthetic effect in soft tissues was 250.3 ± 48.3 minutes with articaine and 316.5 ± 30.1 minutes with bupivacaine, with statistically significant difference (t= -3.239; p=0.002). The duration of post-operative analgesia was 203.2 ± 20.5 minutes with articaine and 215.8 ± 15.4 minutes with bupivacaine, without significant difference (t= -0.920; p=0.363) (Table 2).

Post-operative pain peaked at the six-hour point with articaine and at twelve hours after surgery with bupivacaine, with statistically significant difference (p=0.004) (Fig. 3). The average pain levels for articaine and bupivacaine were 5.1 and 4.4 respectively, without significant difference (p=0.072) (Table 2). The number of patients needing rescue analgesics was similar between the two groups (articaine n=15, bupivacaine n=19) and no significant difference was found for this parameter (Table 2) (p = 0.836).

Table 2. Objective and subjective parameters recorded in patients following surgical extraction of lower third molars under local anesthetic by articaine or bupivacaine. Mean averages ± standard deviation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Articaine</th>
<th>Bupivacaine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latency Time (minutes)*</td>
<td>2 ± 1.4</td>
<td>3.1 ± 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haemodynamics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systolic Blood Pressure (mmHg)</td>
<td>124.7</td>
<td>124.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diastolic Blood Pressure (mmHg)</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiac Rate (ppm)</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Operative Pain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>4.2 ± 0.4</td>
<td>3.5 ± 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 hours</td>
<td>5.7 ± 0.3</td>
<td>4.7 ± 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 hours</td>
<td>5.3 ± 0.3</td>
<td>5.1 ± 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 hours</td>
<td>5.2 ± 0.3</td>
<td>4.3 ± 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of anesthetic Effects on Soft Tissues (minutes)*</td>
<td>250.3 ± 48.3</td>
<td>316.5 ± 30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of Post-Operative Analgesia (minutes)</td>
<td>203.2 ± 20.5</td>
<td>215.8 ± 15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescue Medication Consumption</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Statistically significant results (p<0.05).
Discussion

The present study calculated a mean latency time of two minutes for articaine, results similar to those obtained by Malamed et al. (17), and Sierra Rebolledo et al. (18). For bupivacaine, latency time was 3.1 minutes, coinciding with results published by Gregorio et al. (11) and Trullenque-Eriksson et al. (14). In other studies (15, 19-21), latency time for bupivacaine varies between 1.9 and 2.6 minutes, lower values than found in the present study. The difference in latency time between articaine and bupivacaine could be explained by the faster activation of drugs with low pKa, articaine having lower pKa (7.8) than bupivacaine (8.1).

More bleeding was observed in interventions performed under anesthesia with bupivacaine, a finding that agrees with Buckley et al. (22) and Moore et al. (23), although it should be noted that these authors evaluated hemorrhaging associated with periodontal surgery. However, the results disagree with those obtained by Gregorio et al. (11) and Trullenque-Eriksson y cols. (14) who obtained minimal bleeding during surgery using articaine and bupivacaine, both with epinephrine at 1:200,000. The results of the present study could be interpreted as the effects of a higher concentration of epinephrine in the articaine and the greater vasodilatory capacity of bupivacaine.

In spite of the initial administration of equal volumes of both local anesthetics (3.6ml), in 22% of the surgical procedures with bupivacaine the patient complained of discomfort and an additional volume was needed (1.6ml). Only 8% of cases in which articaine was used required an additional infiltration of the anesthetic solution (0.7ml). These results coincide with findings obtained by Gregorio et al. (11), whereby 14% of cases using bupivacaine needed additional anesthetic, compared to 2% of cases using articaine. However, Trullenque-Eriksson et al. (14) and Sancho-Puchades et al. (15) did not find statistically significant differences in the need for additional anesthetic.

The anesthetic used did not significantly influence blood pressure or heart rate during the different stages of surgery. Bupivacaine was associated with higher diastolic blood pressure than articaine and lower systolic blood pressure and heart rate, but without statistically significant differences. These findings coincide with the majority of published studies (10,24), whereby the presence or absence of vasoconstrictor in the anesthetic did not directly influence blood pressure due to the small quantities involved. Fluctuations in cardiovascular function observed during the surgical procedure could be associated with stress (25).

Duration of anesthesia in the soft tissues was longer with bupivacaine compared to articaine, with statistically significant difference; this is similar to the results of other research (11, 14, 15). However, these other studies used articaine at 4% with 1:200,000 epinephrine. The longer duration of soft tissue anesthesia when bupivacaine was used can be explained by its greater fixation to proteins and vasodilatory capacity (26).

As other authors have found (13, 27-30), bupivacaine reduced post-operative pain more effectively compared to articaine, although this difference did not reach statistical difference. Pain peaked later (after 12 hours) and with less intensity following the interventions performed.
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In the present study, the difference in rescue anesthetic consumption was not significant, a finding born out by other studies (11, 14, 15).

Overall, articaine was found to provide greater clinical efficacy than bupivacaine, with shorter latency time, less bleeding, shorter duration of soft tissue anesthesia and better anesthetic quality and required less additional anesthetic compared to bupivacaine.
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