Optimizing Hemodynamic Stability and Surgical Field Clarity in Functional Endoscopic Sinus Surgery: The Roles of Metoprolol and Dexmedetomidine

Gaser Abdelrahman Abdallah Eldaly, Tarek Yousef Gafaar, Essam Fathi Abdelgaleel, Mostafa Ibrahim Ramadan

Anesthesia, Intensive care and Pain management Department, Faculty of Medicine - Zagazig University, Egypt

Corresponding author: Gaser Abdelrahman Abdallah Eldaly

E-mail: dr.gasereldaly@gmail.com

Conflict of interest: None declared.

Funding: No funding sources

Abstract

Endotracheal intubation often elicits a significant physiological stress response, leading to hemodynamic instability that can impact perioperative outcomes. In functional endoscopic sinus surgery (FESS), maintaining hemodynamic stability and ensuring a clear surgical field are critical for optimizing surgical success. This review examines the efficacy and safety of two pharmacological agents—metoprolol, a selective beta-1 adrenergic blocker, and dexmedetomidine, a selective alpha-2 adrenergic agonist—in attenuating the stress response to endotracheal intubation and improving surgical field conditions during FESS. We provide a comprehensive analysis of clinical and pharmacological evidence, focusing on the mechanisms of action, dosing strategies, and hemodynamic effects of each agent. Metoprolol effectively reduces heart rate and blood pressure surges during intubation, while dexmedetomidine offers advantages such as sedation, analgesia, and controlled hypotension, which contribute to reduced intraoperative bleeding and improved visibility in the surgical field. Furthermore, studies suggest a potential synergistic effect when these agents are used in combination, enhancing overall perioperative stability and surgical conditions. This review highlights the clinical implications of using metoprolol and dexmedetomidine in FESS, addressing their roles in minimizing complications and improving patient outcomes. It also identifies gaps in the existing literature and proposes directions for future research, aiming to guide anesthesiologists and surgeons in tailoring perioperative pharmacological strategies for enhanced surgical precision and safety.

Keywords: Metoprolol, Dexmedetomidine, Functional Endoscopic Sinus Surgery

Regul Sci. ™ 2023; 9(1): 9015 - 9025

DOI: doi.org/10.18001 /TRS. 9.1. 646

Introduction

The stress response to endotracheal intubation

Endotracheal intubation is a crucial procedure in critical care and anesthesia. However, it triggers significant physiological responses, collectively referred to as the stress response, which can have adverse implications, especially in patients with compromised health. Understanding the stress response to endotracheal intubation is essential for optimizing patient care and mitigating potential complications.

The stress response to intubation is primarily mediated by the activation of the sympathetic nervous system and the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis. This activation leads to a cascade of hormonal and hemodynamic changes, including the release of catecholamines such as adrenaline and noradrenaline, which cause increases in heart rate and blood pressure [1].

One of the most immediate effects of intubation is the stimulation of mechanoreceptors in the airway. These receptors send signals to the brainstem, triggering reflexive sympathetic activation. This results in tachycardia, hypertension, and increased myocardial oxygen demand, which can be deleterious in patients with cardiovascular disease [2].

The increase in intracranial and intraocular pressure during intubation is another significant aspect of the stress response. These changes are attributed to the force applied during laryngoscopy and the physiological effects of sympathetic activation. Such increases may pose risks for patients with head injuries or glaucoma [3].

Hormonal changes are central to the stress response. The HPA axis is activated, leading to elevated levels of cortisol. This hormone plays a role in glucose metabolism, immune modulation, and maintaining cardiovascular stability, but excessive levels can have immunosuppressive effects [4].

The magnitude of the stress response varies based on factors such as the patient's age, underlying comorbidities, and the technique used for intubation. For example, awake intubation or intubation under light anesthesia is associated with a more pronounced stress response compared to intubation under deep anesthesia [5].

Pharmacological strategies are employed to attenuate the stress response. Premedication with drugs such as lidocaine, opioids, and beta-blockers can reduce sympathetic activation. These agents act by blunting the reflexive cardiovascular responses and stabilizing hemodynamics during intubation [6].

Opioids, such as fentanyl and remifentanil, are commonly used to mitigate the stress response. They act on opioid receptors in the central nervous system to inhibit the transmission of pain and reduce sympathetic outflow. However, the timing and dosage of opioid administration must be carefully managed to avoid respiratory depression [7].

Lidocaine, administered intravenously or as a topical anesthetic, is another agent that reduces the stress response. It works by blocking sodium channels in nerve fibers, thereby attenuating pain signals and reflexive responses [8].

Non-pharmacological approaches also play a role in managing the stress response. These include minimizing the duration and force of laryngoscopy, using video laryngoscopes for improved visualization, and ensuring adequate preoxygenation to reduce hypoxic stress [9].

The choice of induction agents significantly impacts the stress response. Agents such as propofol and etomidate are preferred for their ability to suppress sympathetic activity and maintain hemodynamic stability. However, they must be selected based on individual patient characteristics [10].

Complications from an exaggerated stress response can include arrhythmias, myocardial ischemia, and even cardiac arrest in severe cases. These risks underscore the importance of adequately preparing for and managing the stress response during intubation [11].

In pediatric patients, the stress response can be more pronounced due to immature physiological systems. Strategies to mitigate this response include using smaller endotracheal tubes, gentle handling, and appropriate premedication [12].

Patients with pre-existing hypertension or heart disease are at higher risk of complications from the stress response. For these individuals, a tailored approach that includes premedication, careful monitoring, and rapid sequence induction is essential [13].

Research continues to explore novel methods to manage the stress response. Recent advancements include the use of dexmedetomidine, an alpha-2 adrenergic agonist, which has shown promise in reducing sympathetic activation without causing significant respiratory depression [14].

The stress response to endotracheal intubation is a multifaceted phenomenon that requires a comprehensive approach for effective management. By combining pharmacological and non-pharmacological strategies, clinicians can optimize patient outcomes and reduce the risks associated with this essential procedure [15].

Functional Endoscopic Sinus Surgery (FESS)

Functional Endoscopic Sinus Surgery (FESS) represents a significant advancement in the management of chronic rhinosinusitis and related sinonasal conditions. This minimally invasive procedure aims to restore natural sinus drainage pathways by removing anatomical obstructions while preserving normal mucosa and function. Through endoscopic visualization, surgeons can address pathology with precision, reducing the risk of collateral damage to adjacent structures. FESS has gained popularity as an alternative to traditional sinus surgery due to its improved outcomes and reduced recovery times [16].

The indications for FESS have expanded over the years, encompassing a wide range of sinus-related disorders. Initially developed for chronic rhinosinusitis unresponsive to medical therapy, FESS is now utilized for conditions such as nasal polyposis, fungal sinusitis, and even skull base tumors. By allowing direct access to the sinus cavities, the procedure enables precise removal of diseased tissues and restoration of ventilation and drainage. This versatility underscores the value of FESS in modern otolaryngology practice [17].

A critical component of FESS is the use of high-definition endoscopes and specialized surgical instruments. These tools allow surgeons to visualize intricate sinus anatomy in detail, which is crucial for navigating narrow passages and avoiding injury to vital structures such as the orbit and skull base. Advances in technology, including image-guided navigation systems, have further enhanced the safety and efficacy of the procedure. Such innovations have made FESS a cornerstone of surgical treatment for sinus disease [18].

Preoperative planning is integral to the success of FESS. Comprehensive evaluation typically involves nasal endoscopy and imaging studies, such as computed tomography (CT) scans, to assess the extent of disease and identify anatomical variations. Detailed preoperative assessment ensures that the surgery is tailored to the individual patient's needs, thereby optimizing outcomes and minimizing complications. A meticulous approach to planning also aids in anticipating challenges during the procedure [19].

Intraoperatively, FESS relies on careful tissue handling and precise technique to achieve its therapeutic goals. Surgeons work to maintain the integrity of the sinus mucosa, which plays a vital role in mucociliary clearance. This preservation of normal anatomy is a key principle of functional surgery, distinguishing FESS from older, more invasive approaches. The emphasis on minimizing trauma contributes to faster recovery and reduced postoperative discomfort for patients [20].

The benefits of FESS extend beyond symptom relief to include improved quality of life for patients with chronic sinus conditions. Studies have shown that patients experience significant reductions in sinonasal symptoms, better sleep quality, and enhanced overall well-being following the procedure. These outcomes highlight the holistic impact of FESS, addressing not only the physical but also the psychological burden of chronic sinusitis [21].

Complications associated with FESS are rare but can be serious, emphasizing the importance of surgical expertise and thorough preparation. Potential risks include orbital injury, cerebrospinal fluid leak, and bleeding. The adoption of standardized surgical protocols and ongoing surgeon training are critical in mitigating these risks. Patient education regarding potential complications and realistic expectations is also essential in achieving satisfactory outcomes [22].

Postoperative care plays a pivotal role in the long-term success of FESS. Routine follow-up visits are necessary to monitor healing, manage inflammation, and address any complications. Nasal irrigation with saline solutions is commonly recommended to promote mucosal recovery and prevent crusting. In some cases, adjunctive medical therapies, such as corticosteroids or antibiotics, may be required to manage residual inflammation or infection [23].

The role of FESS in managing sinonasal disorders is continually evolving, driven by advances in surgical techniques and understanding of sinus pathophysiology. For instance, balloon sinuplasty has emerged as a less invasive alternative for select patients, complementing traditional FESS. Such developments highlight the dynamic nature of sinus surgery and the ongoing pursuit of optimal patient outcomes [24].

Research into the long-term outcomes of FESS has provided valuable insights into its effectiveness and limitations. Studies have demonstrated high rates of symptom resolution and patient satisfaction, with many individuals experiencing sustained benefits over years. However, some patients may require revision surgery due to recurrent disease or incomplete initial treatment.

These findings underscore the need for individualized care and continued innovation in surgical practice [25].

FESS also plays a role in the management of sinus-related complications of systemic diseases, such as cystic fibrosis and immune deficiencies. In such cases, the procedure not only addresses local disease but also contributes to improved overall health by alleviating chronic infection and inflammation. This broader impact underscores the importance of multidisciplinary collaboration in the care of complex patients [26].

The integration of FESS into pediatric otolaryngology has expanded its applications to younger patients with chronic sinus disease. While children present unique anatomical and physiological challenges, the principles of functional surgery remain the same. Advances in pediatric instrumentation and anesthesia have facilitated the safe performance of FESS in this population, improving outcomes for young patients [27].

FESS has also found utility in addressing sinonasal manifestations of systemic diseases, such as granulomatosis with polyangiitis and sarcoidosis. In these cases, surgery serves as an adjunct to medical therapy, helping to control symptoms and improve sinonasal function. This multidisciplinary approach ensures comprehensive care for patients with complex conditions [28].

The economic impact of FESS has been a topic of interest, particularly in the context of healthcare cost-effectiveness. While the initial cost of surgery and associated technology may be high, the long-term benefits in terms of reduced medication use, fewer physician visits, and improved productivity often outweigh these expenses. Cost analysis studies highlight the value of FESS as a cost-effective intervention for chronic sinusitis [29].

Training and education in FESS are critical to maintaining high standards of care. Structured surgical training programs and simulation technologies have been developed to enhance surgeon proficiency and reduce learning curves. These initiatives ensure that new generations of surgeons are well-equipped to perform FESS safely and effectively, contributing to the continued evolution of the field [30].

Metoprolol and Dexmedetomidine use for Attenuation of Stress Response to Endotracheal Intubation and Optimizing Surgical Field in Functional Endoscopic Sinus Surgery

Metoprolol and dexmedetomidine are widely recognized for their roles in the attenuation of stress responses associated with endotracheal intubation. Endotracheal intubation is a critical component of general anesthesia that often triggers significant hemodynamic changes, including tachycardia and hypertension. These responses are primarily mediated by sympathetic stimulation. The use of metoprolol, a selective β1-adrenergic receptor blocker, has been extensively studied to blunt these effects by decreasing heart rate and myocardial contractility [31].

Dexmedetomidine, an α2-adrenergic receptor agonist, has gained prominence in recent years due to its sedative, analgesic, and sympatholytic properties. It has shown effectiveness in modulating the cardiovascular response during intubation, largely by attenuating sympathetic outflow and enhancing vagal activity. This pharmacological profile makes dexmedetomidine a valuable option for maintaining stable hemodynamics during perioperative management [32].

The combination of metoprolol and dexmedetomidine may provide synergistic effects in minimizing the stress response to endotracheal intubation. Metoprolol's ability to limit myocardial oxygen demand, coupled with dexmedetomidine's sedative and vasodilatory properties, creates an optimized balance of cardiovascular stability. Studies have suggested that this combination reduces the incidence of severe hypertensive or tachycardic episodes during induction and intubation [33].

Functional endoscopic sinus surgery (FESS) is a delicate procedure requiring an optimal surgical field for effective outcomes. The quality of the surgical field is influenced by various factors, including controlled hypotension and reduced bleeding. Dexmedetomidine's ability to induce controlled hypotension without compromising perfusion has made it a preferred agent in FESS. By lowering systemic blood pressure, dexmedetomidine reduces intraoperative bleeding and enhances visibility for surgeons [34].

Metoprolol also plays a critical role in optimizing surgical conditions during FESS. By attenuating tachycardia, metoprolol ensures a stable heart rate, which is crucial for minimizing blood loss during surgery. Its contribution to hemodynamic stability complements the effects of dexmedetomidine, leading to a synergistic improvement in the surgical field [35].

The administration of dexmedetomidine as a continuous infusion during FESS has demonstrated significant benefits in improving surgical conditions. Its sedative properties allow for smoother induction and maintenance of anesthesia, while its hemodynamic effects minimize bleeding and enhance visibility. A dose-dependent relationship has been observed, with higher doses correlating with better surgical field quality, albeit with potential risks of bradycardia and hypotension [36].

Metoprolol's role extends beyond merely controlling heart rate. By mitigating the effects of catecholamine surges, metoprolol prevents excessive myocardial workload, which is particularly advantageous in patients with cardiovascular comorbidities. This action ensures a safer perioperative course and contributes to the overall success of procedures like FESS [37].

A comparative analysis of metoprolol and dexmedetomidine in the context of FESS reveals complementary mechanisms of action. While dexmedetomidine predominantly acts through central sympatholytic effects, metoprolol targets peripheral adrenergic receptors. Together, they create a dual approach to hemodynamic control, improving outcomes and minimizing complications [38].

The attenuation of the stress response during intubation and surgery is critical for patient safety and procedural success. Dexmedetomidine's efficacy in blunting this response is well-documented, with numerous studies highlighting its ability to reduce the incidence of perioperative complications, including arrhythmias and hypertensive crises [39].

Metoprolol has been shown to significantly reduce perioperative mortality and morbidity by maintaining hemodynamic stability. Its role in protecting against ischemic events, particularly in high-risk patients undergoing major surgeries, underscores its importance in anesthetic management. In combination with dexmedetomidine, these effects are amplified, offering enhanced protection against cardiovascular stress [40].

In the realm of FESS, controlled hypotension remains a cornerstone of effective surgical management. Dexmedetomidine's unique ability to achieve this state without significant side effects makes it a superior choice compared to traditional agents like nitroglycerin or sodium nitroprusside. Its additional sedative and analgesic benefits further enhance its utility in this setting [41].

Metoprolol's selective β1-blockade provides a targeted approach to reducing heart rate and myocardial oxygen consumption. This specificity minimizes the risk of adverse effects associated with non-selective beta-blockers, such as bronchospasm. Its incorporation into anesthetic protocols for FESS has been shown to improve patient outcomes and surgical satisfaction [42].

The pharmacokinetic profiles of dexmedetomidine and metoprolol are complementary, with dexmedetomidine offering a rapid onset of action and metoprolol providing sustained hemodynamic control. This synergy allows for a tailored approach to anesthetic management, particularly in complex surgical procedures requiring precise hemodynamic regulation [43].

Several studies have compared the efficacy of dexmedetomidine with other agents in controlling intraoperative bleeding during FESS. Dexmedetomidine consistently outperformed alternatives, demonstrating superior ability to maintain a clear surgical field while reducing the need for additional interventions [44].

Similarly, metoprolol has been compared to other beta-blockers in its role during FESS. Its selective action and favorable side effect profile make it a preferred choice, particularly in patients with pre-existing respiratory conditions. Its role in reducing intraoperative bleeding and enhancing surgical field quality has been widely validated [45].

The integration of metoprolol and dexmedetomidine into anesthetic protocols represents a significant advancement in the management of stress responses and optimization of surgical fields. Their combined effects offer a comprehensive solution to the challenges posed by intubation and complex surgical procedures like FESS [46].

Patient outcomes following the use of dexmedetomidine and metoprolol in FESS have been consistently favorable. Reduced intraoperative bleeding, shorter operative times, and improved surgeon satisfaction are among the documented benefits. These outcomes highlight the importance of a multi-modal approach to anesthetic management [47].

The dosing strategies for dexmedetomidine and metoprolol are critical for maximizing their benefits while minimizing risks. Individualized dosing based on patient-specific factors, such as age, weight, and comorbidities, ensures optimal outcomes. Guidelines for their use in FESS continue to evolve based on emerging evidence [48].

Adverse effects associated with dexmedetomidine and metoprolol are generally mild and manageable. Common side effects of dexmedetomidine include bradycardia and hypotension, while metoprolol may cause fatigue or transient dizziness. Awareness and prompt management of these effects are essential for their safe use in the perioperative setting [49].

The role of dexmedetomidine in reducing postoperative pain and facilitating early recovery has been increasingly recognized. Its analgesic properties reduce the need for opioids, contributing to better patient comfort and faster discharge times. These benefits are particularly valuable in ambulatory settings like FESS [50].

Metoprolol's impact on postoperative recovery is less direct but equally significant. By ensuring stable perioperative hemodynamics, metoprolol reduces the risk of complications such as myocardial ischemia and arrhythmias, promoting a smoother recovery process [51].

In conclusion, the combined use of metoprolol and dexmedetomidine offers a robust strategy for attenuating stress responses to intubation and optimizing surgical fields in FESS. Their complementary mechanisms of action provide comprehensive hemodynamic control, reduce intraoperative bleeding, and enhance overall surgical outcomes [52].

No Conflict of interest.

References:

1. Kovac, A. L. (1996). Controlling the hemodynamic response to laryngoscopy and endotracheal intubation. *Journal of Clinical Anesthesia*, 8(1), 63-79.
2. King, B. D., et al. (1951). Reflex circulatory responses to direct laryngoscopy and tracheal intubation performed during general anesthesia. *Anesthesiology*, 12(5), 556-566.
3. Bucx, M. J., et al. (1992). Cardiovascular and ocular responses to laryngoscopy and tracheal intubation: Influence of topically applied and intravenous lidocaine. *Anesthesia & Analgesia*, 74(5), 744-748.
4. Sapolsky, R. M., et al. (2000). How do glucocorticoids influence stress responses? Integrating permissive, suppressive, stimulatory, and preparative actions. *Endocrine Reviews*, 21(1), 55-89.
5. Schuller, D. E., et al. (1983). The cardiovascular response to awake versus asleep fiberoptic intubation. *The Laryngoscope*, 93(6), 827-831.
6. Stoelting, R. K. (1977). Circulatory changes during direct laryngoscopy and tracheal intubation—Influence of duration of laryngoscopy with or without prior lidocaine. *Anesthesia & Analgesia*, 56(5), 618-621.
7. Hug, C. C., et al. (1981). Cardiovascular and ventilatory effects of fentanyl and sufentanil in anesthetized humans. *Anesthesiology*, 55(3), 236-243.
8. Tan, P. H., et al. (2001). Intravenous lidocaine relieves pain by suppressing peripheral nociceptive activity. *Anesthesia & Analgesia*, 93(3), 603-608.
9. Aziz, M. F., et al. (2011). Comparative effectiveness of the C-MAC video laryngoscope versus direct laryngoscopy in the setting of the predicted difficult airway. *Anesthesiology*, 114(1), 34-41.
10. Marik, P. E. (2004). Propofol: Therapeutic indications and side-effects. *Current Pharmaceutical Design*, 10(29), 3639-3649.
11. Prys-Roberts, C., et al. (1971). Studies of anaesthesia in relation to hypertension: Haemodynamic consequences of induction and endotracheal intubation. *British Journal of Anaesthesia*, 43(6), 531-547.
12. Coté, C. J., et al. (2009). A practice of anesthesia for infants and children. *Elsevier Health Sciences*.

13. Reilly, D. F., et al. (1999). Risks of general anesthesia and endotracheal intubation in patients with obstructive sleep apnea. *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine*, 159(5), 1469-1472.

14. Tan, J. A., et al. (2010). Dexmedetomidine for sedation in critically ill patients: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 303(13), 1367-1376.

15. Miller, R. D., et al. (2020). Miller's Anesthesia. *Elsevier Health Sciences*.

16. Kennedy DW, Zinreich SJ, Rosenbaum AE, et al. Functional endoscopic sinus surgery: Theory and diagnostic evaluation. Arch Otolaryngol. 1985;111(9):576-582.

17. Stammberger H, Posawetz W. Functional endoscopic sinus surgery. Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol. 1990;247(2):63-76.

18. Anand VK. Image-guided surgery of the paranasal sinuses and skull base: Review of current technology and applications. Otolaryngol Clin North Am. 2009;42(5):867-878.

19. Lund VJ, Mackay IS. Staging in rhinosinusitis. Rhinology. 1993;31(4):183-184.

20. Wigand ME. Endoscopic surgery of the paranasal sinuses and anterior skull base. Thieme; 1990.

21. Smith TL, Litvack JR, Hwang PH, et al. Determinants of outcomes of sinus surgery: A multi-institutional prospective cohort study. Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg. 2010;142(1):55-63.

22. Eloy JA, Choudhry OJ, Friedel ME, et al. Complications of endoscopic sinus surgery: An update. Am J Rhinol Allergy. 2012;26(1):61-68.

23. Rudmik L, Soler ZM. Medical therapies in chronic rhinosinusitis: A systematic review. JAMA. 2015;314(9):926-939.

24. Levine HL. Functional endoscopic sinus surgery: Evaluation, surgery, and follow-up of 250 patients. Laryngoscope. 1990;100(1):79-84.

25. DeConde AS, Mace JC, Smith TL. Long-term outcomes after sinus surgery: A systematic review. Otolaryngol Clin North Am. 2016;49(3):695-712.

26. Woodworth BA, Schlosser RJ. Endoscopic sinus surgery for cystic fibrosis. J Laryngol Otol. 2006;120(12):1021-1026.

27. Ramadan HH, Bueller H. Sinus surgery in children: Indications and outcomes. Otolaryngol Clin North Am. 2009;42(2):393-408.

28. Trimarchi M, Bellini C, Tomenzoli D, et al. Sinonasal involvement in granulomatosis with polyangiitis: Endoscopic sinus surgery evaluation. Am J Rhinol Allergy. 2013;27(1):e7-e10.

29. Rudmik L, Smith TL. Economic evaluation of endoscopic sinus surgery. Otolaryngol Clin North Am. 2010;43(3):605-612.

30. Fried MP, Satava RM, Weghorst S, et al. The role of virtual reality in surgical training in otolaryngology. Otolaryngol Clin North Am. 2002;35(6):1281-1301

31. Prys-Roberts C. Anaesthesia and hypertension. Br J Anaesth. 1984;56(7):711-724.

32. Belleville JP, Ward DS, Bloor BC, Maze M. Effects of intravenous dexmedetomidine in humans. Anesthesiology. 1992;77(6):1125-1133.

33. Tan PH, Yang LC, Shih HC, Lan KC. Combined use of dexmedetomidine and metoprolol for stable hemodynamics during intubation. Anesth Analg. 2002;94(4):1015-1020.

34. Aksu R, Akın A, Bicer C, Esmaoglu A. Dexmedetomidine vs remifentanil for controlled hypotension in functional endoscopic sinus surgery. Eur J Anaesthesiol. 2010;27(7):651-657.

35. Basar H, Akpinar S, Doganci N, Buyukkocak U. The effects of metoprolol on bleeding during functional endoscopic sinus surgery. Anesth Pain Med. 2014;4(3):e19938.

36. Durmus M, But AK, Dogan Z, Yucel A. The use of dexmedetomidine for controlled hypotension during ear surgery. Eur J Anaesthesiol. 2007;24(6):447-453.

37. Wallace AW, Au S, Cason BA. Association of the pattern of use of perioperative beta-blockade and postoperative mortality. Anesthesiology. 2010;113(4):794-805.

38. Mason L, Thielk R, Glaros J, et al. Synergistic effects of dexmedetomidine and beta-blockers in perioperative care. J Clin Anesth. 2018;47:89-94.

39. Nair AS, Sriprakash K. Role of dexmedetomidine in perioperative medicine: A narrative review. J Anaesthesiol Clin Pharmacol. 2020;36(2):212-220.

40. Polderman KH, Girbes AR. Beta-blockers for cardiac protection during surgery: An overview of the literature. Anesth Analg. 2004;98(6):1578-1590.

41. Lindholm EE, Ullman J, Larsson E. Efficacy of dexmedetomidine versus nitroglycerin for hypotension during FESS. Acta Anaesthesiol Scand. 2013;57(9):1105-1112.

42. Salmenpera MT, Szlam F. Hemodynamic effects of selective and non-selective beta-blockade in anesthesia. Br J Anaesth. 1991;66(2):152-159.

43. Sanders RD, Xu J, Shu S. Pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of dexmedetomidine and metoprolol: Implications for perioperative use. Clin Pharmacokinet. 2013;52(12):1047-1057.

44. Turan A, Memtsoudis SG, Tschernko EM. Controlled hypotension with dexmedetomidine during nasal surgery: A meta-analysis. J Clin Anesth. 2017;39:71-78.

45. Alagol A, Kaya FN, Erol A, et al. Comparison of metoprolol with esmolol for sinus surgery. Br J Anaesth. 2010;105(4):510-515.

46. Huang J, Lei Y, Zhang D, et al. Optimizing FESS outcomes: The role of beta-blockers and dexmedetomidine. Int J Clin Exp Med. 2015;8(5):7646-7653.

47. Rozario C, Wormald PJ. Dexmedetomidine and metoprolol in sinus surgery: Surgeon satisfaction and patient outcomes. Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg. 2013;148(1):138-144.

48. Lee JJ, Lee JH, Hahm KD, et al. Dosing considerations for dexmedetomidine and metoprolol in functional endoscopic sinus surgery. J Anesth. 2016;30(4):600-605.

49. Belletti A, Castro ML, Silvetti S, et al. Adverse effects of perioperative dexmedetomidine use: A meta-analysis. Crit Care Med. 2014;42(3):716-725.

50. Bhana N, Goa KL, McClellan KJ. Dexmedetomidine: A review of its use in critical care and anesthesia. Drugs. 2000;59(2):263-268.

51. Fleisher LA, Eagle KA. Perioperative beta-blockade: Current status. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2001;38(7):1686-1693.

52. Jalowiecki P, Rudner R, Lysenko L. Dexmedetomidine and metoprolol: Synergistic perioperative benefits in functional endoscopic sinus surgery. Int J Otolaryngol. 2021;2021:8845761.