#### Check for updates

#### OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY Teijo I. Saari, University of Turku, Finland

REVIEWED BY Ali Saffaei, Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences, Iran Aijun Shan, Jinan University, China

\*CORRESPONDENCE Yan Wu, ⊠ wuyan5151@hust.edu.cn Yun Lin, ⊠ franklinyun@hust.edu.cn

<sup>1</sup>These authors have contributed equally to this work

#### SPECIALTY SECTION

This article was submitted to Drugs Outcomes Research and Policies, a section of the journal Frontiers in Pharmacology

RECEIVED 26 August 2022 ACCEPTED 29 November 2022 PUBLISHED 12 December 2022

#### CITATION

Chen R, Sun S, Li Y, Dou X, Dai M, Wu Y and Lin Y (2022), Efficacy and safety evaluation of dexmedetomidine for postoperative patient controlled intravenous analgesia: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Front. Pharmacol.* 13:1028704. doi: 10.3389/fphar.2022.1028704

#### COPYRIGHT

© 2022 Chen, Sun, Li, Dou, Dai, Wu and Lin. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

# Efficacy and safety evaluation of dexmedetomidine for postoperative patient controlled intravenous analgesia: A systematic review and meta-analysis

## Rui Chen<sup>1†</sup>, Shujun Sun<sup>1†</sup>, Yufan Li<sup>2†</sup>, Xiaoke Dou<sup>1</sup>, Maosha Dai<sup>1</sup>, Yan Wu<sup>3</sup>\* and Yun Lin<sup>1</sup>\*

<sup>1</sup>Department of Anesthesiology, Union Hospital, Tongji Medical College, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan, China, <sup>2</sup>Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, The People's Hospital of Honghu, Honghu, China, <sup>3</sup>Department of Dermatology, Union Hospital, Tongji Medical College, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan, China

**Objective:** To investigate the efficacy and safety of dexmedetomidine (DEX) for postoperative patient controlled intravenous analgesia (PCIA).

**Measurements:** Two investigators independently searched Pubmed, Embase, Scopus, Cochrane Library and CBM for randomized controlled trials of DEX for PCIA.

Main results: Thirty-seven studies with a total of 5,409 patients were included in this meta-analysis. Compared with analgesics alone, DEX for PCIA reduced pain score at 24 h [mean difference (MD) = -0.70; 95% confidence interval (CI): -0.85, -0.54; p < 0.00001,  $l^2 = 90\%$ ] and 48 h postoperatively (MD = -0.43; 95% CI: -0.52, -0.34; p < 0.00001,  $l^2 = 96\%$ ). Moreover, DEX reduced analgesics consumption during the first 24 h [standardized mean difference (SMD) = -0.25; 95% CI: -0.34, -0.16; p < 0.00001,  $l^2 = 91\%$ ] and the number of resuscitation analgesics administered [odds ratio (OR) = 0.54; 95% CI: 0.44, 0.66; p < 0.00001,  $l^2 = 72\%$ ]. Furthermore, DEX improved patient satisfaction (OR = 3.55; 95% CI: 2.36, 5.35; p < 0.00001,  $l^2 = 60\%$ ), and reduced incidence of side effects, such as postoperative nausea and vomiting (PONV) (OR = 0.47; 95% CI: 0.39, 0.57; p < 0.00001,  $l^2 = 59\%$ ) and pruritus after surgery (OR = 0.45; 95% CI: 0.30, 0.68; p = 0.0001,  $l^2 = 0$ %). Besides, DEX attenuates inflammatory cytokine levels, such as IL-6 (MD = -5.73; 95% CI: -8.34, -3.12; p < 0.00001,  $l^2 = 91\%$ ) and TNF- $\alpha$  (MD = -0.63; 95% CI: -0.76, -0.50; p < 0.00001,  $l^2 = 89\%$ ). Finally, DEX increased the risk of bradycardia (OR = 1.66; 95% CI: 1.12, 2.45; p = 0.01,  $l^2 =$ 15%), but the complication of hypotension did not differ between the two groups (OR = 1.30; 95% CI: 0.84, 2.04; p = 0.25, l<sup>2</sup> = 0%).

**Conclusion:** DEX is used for postoperative PCIA analgesia, which can significantly improve the analgesic effect, effectively control postoperative inflammatory response, reduce the dosage and adverse reactions of analgesics, and improve postoperative patient satisfaction. Of course, the

impact of the immunosuppressive effect of DEX on the prognosis of patients needs further study.

**Systematic review registration:** CRD42022340933, https://www.crd.york.ac. uk/prospero/.

KEYWORDS

dexmedetomidine, patient controlled intravenous analgesia, postoperative analgesia, randomized controlled trail, meta-analysis

### Introduction

Patient controlled analgesia (PCA) is currently the most commonly used and ideal method for postoperative analgesia, with rapid onset of action, no analgesic blind spots, relatively stable blood concentrations, and timely control of burst pain by pulse (bolus) dose, meanwhile, it has the advantages of individualized medication and high patient satisfaction, and is suitable for moderate to severe pain after surgery (Pamela and Ronaldo, 2010) Patient controlled intravenous analgesia (PCIA) means that when the patient feels pain, press the start button (bolus) in the PCA pump to inject a set dose of drugs intravenously into the body through a computercontrolled micropump, which commonly used analgesics include opioids (morphine, oxycodone, hydromorphone, sufentanil, hydrocodone, fentanyl, butorfenol, desocine, etc.), tramadol or flurbiprofen axetil, ketorolac, etc. (Jeffrey, 2005). However, the single-drug application of PCIA often limits their widespread use due to poor pain control or the obvious adverse reactions associated with increasing the dose of analgesic drugs, for example, increasing the dosage of opioids in order to improve the analgesic effect often causes adverse reactions such as itching, vomiting, nausea and even respiratory depression (Motamed, 2022). Therefore, PCIA is based on analgesic drugs and is compatible with another adjuvant drug, which can improve the analgesic effect and reduce adverse drug reactions through synergistic effects, has become a popular PCA analgesic program worldwide (Song et al., 2013).

Dexmedetomidine (DEX) is a new type of highly selective  $\alpha_2$  adrenergic receptor agonist with sedative, analgesic, anxiolytic and sympathetic inhibitory effects, and no obvious respiratory depression. Multiple meta-analyses have shown that DEX application can significantly reduce the amount of sedative and analgesic drugs, reduce the occurrence of adverse reactions of general anesthesia drugs, and provide better sedative and analgesic effects (Tsaousi et al., 2018; Wang et al., 2018). However, most of the above meta-analyses focus on the application of DEX in general anesthesia, its duration of action is relatively short, and the efficacy and safety of long-term use of DEX in PCIA is still confusing, worthy of attention.

Currently, there are limited studies evaluating the advantages or disadvantages of DEX in PCIA from multicenter large randomized controlled trials. Therefore, it is necessary to conduct a meta-analysis to evaluate the safety and efficacy of DEX in PCIA to provide guidance for clinical anesthesia practice.

#### Methods

The protocol of this meta-analysis was registered in the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) with the registration number CRD42022340933. The date of registration was 16 July 2022.

#### Searching strategy

Two researchers searched PUBMED, EMBASE, Scopus, Cochrane library and CBM databases independently. The mesh and keywords used for the searches included: "dexmedetomidine," "patient controlled intravenous analgesia," and "randomized controlled trial," and we used an advanced search and limited it to Title/Abstract. The latest search was completed on 17 November 2022, and see the annex for the detailed search strategy. Furthermore, the investigators scanned references of these articles to prevent missing articles.

#### Study selection

Original studies included were based on PICOS (patient, intervention, comparison, outcome, and study design) as follows, P: postoperative patient received PCIA; I: the use of DEX for PCIA; C: DEX versus controls; O: pain score related indicators (visual analogue scale, VAS; numerical rating scale, NRS; verbal rating scale, VRS; Wong-Baker faces pain scale revision, FPS-R), sedation score, side effects, and so on; S: only randomized controlled trials (RCTs) were included. Studies with following characteristics were excluded: 1) use of DEX for PCIA in non-surgical patients; 2) incomplete and duplicate publications; 3) data cannot be retrieved or converted; 4) non English or Chinese articles.

### Data extraction

The two reviewers screened the literature independently. First, duplicate articles were deleted through Endnote (version X7.7.1) and manual methods. Then, articles that met the inclusion criteria were selected by reading the title, abstract, or even full text. Further, relevant data were extracted from the included articles according to the pre designed data extraction table, and cross checked. The pre designed data table includes the name of the first author, the year of publication, the sample size of each group of patients, the interventions of experimental and control group, and the type of surgery. And the following data from the included studies will be extracted for further statistical analysis: 1) pain score at different time points after operation; 2) analgesics consumption during the first 24 postoperative hours; 3) patient satisfaction; 4) the adverse reactions (nausea, vomiting, pruritus, hypotension and bradycardia); 5) sedation scores at different time points postoperatively; 6) changes in inflammatory signals (IL-6 and TNF- $\alpha$ ).

#### Assessment of risk of bias

Two reviewers independently read and evaluated the methodological validity of all eligible studies using the Cochrane Handbook v5.0.2. When disagreements arose, they were resolved through joint consultations. If necessary, a third researcher assisted in the decision. The following information was evaluated: random sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding, incomplete outcome data, selective reporting, and other biases. They were rated as "high risk of bias," "uncertain risk of bias," and "low risk of bias," respectively.

#### Statistical analysis

All included RCTs were quantitatively analyzed using Review Manager (version 5.3; Cochrane Collaboration, Copenhagen, Denmark) software, and Stata 12.0 (StataCorp, College Station, TX, United States) was used for Begg's test. Binary outcomes were computed as odds ratios (OR) with 95% confidence interval (95% CI), and continuous outcomes were calculated as the mean difference (MD) or the standardized mean difference (SMD) with 95% CI. In terms of heterogeneity analysis: a fixed-effects model was used to analyze non-significant heterogeneity data ( $I^2 < 50$ ). Otherwise, the random effects model is used for calculation. If the heterogeneity is significant, look for possible influencing factors of heterogeneity, and try to exclude the influence of heterogeneity through subgroup analysis, sensitivity analysis and other methods.

#### Results

# Characteristics and risk of bias of eligible trials

Our research flow chart is shown in Figure 1. A total of 37 RCTs were identified, including 5,409 patients. The risk of bias assessment was fully consistent between the two reviewers and showed moderate overall study quality. As shown in Figure 2, the risk of bias map was created using ReviewManager 5.3 software.

#### Study characteristics

The study characteristics are presented in Table 1. The included studies were first published in 2008 and the sample sizes ranged from 12 to 351 patients. In the 37 studies included in this meta-analysis, PCIA were used in abdominal surgeries (seven studies), cesarean surgeries (five studies), laparoscopic surgery (two studies), spine surgeries (two studies), shoulder arthroscopy (one study), and other procedures (20 study).

# Pain score for postoperative patients at different time points

At least seven trials reported pain score for postoperative patients at different time points (0-4 h, 4-8 h, 24 h, 48 h), while three trials reported 12 h pain score after surgery (Figure 3). Significant heterogeneity was observed among the studies in the pooled analysis at 4–8 h (p = 0.003,  $I^2 = 70\%$ ), 24 h (p < 0.00001,  $I^2 = 90\%$ ) and 48 h (p < 0.00001,  $I^2 = 96\%$ ). There was no statistical difference in the results at 0-4 h (MD = -0.02; 95% CI: -0.12, 0.09; p = 0.75), 4-8 h (MD = -0.14; 95% CI: -0.32, 0.04;p = 0.12) and 12 h (MD = -0.22; 95% CI: -0.47, 0.03; p = 0.08), however, the pain score of the patients in the DEX group was significantly lower than that in the control group postoperative 24 h (MD = -0.70; 95% CI: -0.85, -0.54; p < 0.00001) and postoperative 48 h (MD = -0.43; 95% CI: -0.52, -0.34; p < 0.00001). The above results show that, compared with a single analgesics, DEX for PCIA can significantly prolong the postoperative analgesia time and reduce postoperative pain in patients.

#### Ramsay score at postoperative 24 h

Five RCTs reported the ramsay score at 24 h postoperatively, with low heterogeneity among the results ( $I^2 = 0\%$ ), and the fixed effects model was used for meta-analysis (Figure 4). The results showed that there was no statistical difference in the ramsay score



between the two groups (MD = 0.08; 95% CI – 0.01, 0.18; *p* = 0.10, Figure 4A).

# Total consumption of analgesics within 24 h

Ten studies reported supplemental analgesics consumption during the first 24 h postoperatively. The pooled results indicated that patients receiving DEX for postoperative PCIA exhibited a significant reduction in total supplemental analgesics consumption at 24 h postoperatively, compared with patients receiving analgesics alone (SMD = -0.25; 95% CI: -0.34, -0.16; p < 0.00001,  $I^2 = 91\%$ , Figure 4B).

#### Use of rescue analgesics

Eleven studies reported the number of times rescue analgesics were used. The pooled results indicated that patients receiving DEX for postoperative PCIA exhibited a significant reduction in use of rescue analgesics, compared with patients receiving analgesics alone (OR = 0.54; 95% CI: 0.44, 0.66; p < 0.00001,  $I^2 = 72\%$ , Figure 4C).

### Patient satisfaction

Six studies reported patient satisfaction with PCIA use. Postoperative PCIA patients using DEX were significantly more satisfied than patients using analgesics alone (OR = 3.55; 95% CI: 2.36, 5.35; p < 0.00001,  $I^2 = 60\%$ , Figure 4D).

#### IL-6 at postoperative 24 h

Two studies reported IL-6 at postoperative 24 h. Compared with patients who received PCIA alone with analgesics or placebo, patients who added DEX significantly decreased the inflammatory cytokine IL-6 at 24 h after surgery (MD = -5.73; 95% CI: -8.34, -3.12; p < 0.00001,  $I^2 = 91\%$ , Figure 5A).



The risk of bias assessment of the included studies. (A) Risk bias of summary, (B) Risk bias of graph. Note: There were no high risk of bias found in these studies.

## TNF- $\alpha$ at postoperative 24 h

Two studies reported TNF- $\alpha$  at postoperative 24 h. Compared with patients who received PCIA alone with analgesics or placebo, patients who added DEX significantly decreased the inflammatory cytokine TNF- $\alpha$  at 24 h after surgery (MD = -0.63; 95% CI: -0.76, -0.50; *p* < 0.00001, *I*<sup>2</sup> = 89%, Figure 5B).

#### Postoperative nausea and vomiting

Twenty-two studies reported the incidence of nausea and vomiting in patients undergoing PCIA. The results show that the use of DEX for PCIA can significantly reduce the incidence of postoperative nausea and vomiting, compared with PCIA alone with analgesics (OR = 0.47; 95% CI: 0.39, 0.57; p < 0.00001,  $I^2 = 59\%$ , Figure 6A).

#### Pruritus after surgery

Thirteen trials reported the incidence of pruritus after using PCIA. Heterogeneity among the studies was

insignificant in the pooled analysis ( $I^2 = 0\%$ ). Our metaanalysis found that the incidence of pruritus was significantly lower in the PCIA group with the addition of DEX compared to PCIA with analgesics alone (OR = 0.45; 95% Cl: 0.30, 0.68; p = 0.0001, Figure 6B).

#### Bradycardia after surgery

Fifteen RCTs reported the incidence of bradycardia after using PCIA, with low heterogeneity among the results ( $I^2 = 15\%$ ). The incidence of bradycardia in the DEX group was slightly higher than that in the control group (OR = 1.66; 95% CI: 1.12, 2.45; p = 0.01, Figure 6C).

#### Hypotension after surgery

Fifteen RCTs reported the incidence of hypotension after using PCIA, with low heterogeneity among the results ( $I^2 = 0\%$ ). The results showed that there was no statistical difference in the incidence of hypotension after using PCIA between the two groups (OR = 1.30; 95% CI 0.83, 2.04; p = 0.25, Figure 6D).

#### TABLE 1 Characteristics of included studies.

Author (year)	Sample s	size	Intervention s	Intervention study				
(year)	Experimental group	Control group	Experimental group	Control group				
Lin et al. (2009)	Lin et al. (2009) 50		Morphine 1 mg/ml + DEX 5 µg/ml	Morphine 1 mg/ml	Hysterectomy			
Lin et al. (2009)	50	50	Morphine 1 mg/ml + DEX 5 µg/ml	Morphine 1 mg/ml	Abdominal surgery			
Nie et al. (2014)	38	38	Sufentanil 100µg + DEX 300 µg	Sufentanil 100 µg	Cesarean Surgery			
Ren et al. (2015)	60	30	Sufentanil 0.02 mg/kg/h + DEX 0.02, 0.05 µg/kg/h	Sufentanil 0.02 mg/kg/h	Abdominal Surgery			
Ren et al. (2015)	84	41	Sufentanil 0.02 mg/kg/h + DEX 0.02, 0.04 µg/kg/h	Sufentanil 0.02 mg/kg/h	Thoracic Surgery			
Dong et al. (2016)	12	13	Sufentanil 3 µg/kg + DEX 3.0 µg/kg	Sufentanil 3 µg/kg	Spine Surgery			
Chen et al. (2017)	30	29	Sufentanil 0.02 µg/kg + DEX 0.05 µg/kg	Sufentanil 0.02 µg/kg	Abdominal Surgery			
Song et al. (2019)	53	52	Fentanyl 10 µg/kg + 120 mg Ketorolac + DEX 10 µg/kg	Fentanyl 10 µg/kg + 120 mg Ketorolac				
Wang et al. (2016a)	20	16	DEX 0.25 μg/kg/h	Fentanyl 20 mg/kg	Gynecological Surgery			
Wang et al. (2016b)	42	42	Oxycodone 50 mg + DEX 0.05 µg/kg/h	Oxycodone 50 mg	Thoracoscopic Lobectomy			
Dong et al. (2017)	30	30	Sufentanil 3.0 µg/kg + DEX 4.0 µg/kg	Sufentanil 3.0 µg/kg	Thoracotomy Surgery			
Kim et al. (2017)	57	57	Fentanyl 0.03 µg/kg + DEX 0.007 µg/kg	Fentanyl 0.03 µg/kg	Gastrectomy			
Lu et al. (2017)	76	76	Sufentanil 0.04 μg/kg/h + DEX 0.06 μg/kg/h	Sufentanil 0.04 µg/kg/h	Shoulder Arthroscopy			
Qin et al. (2017)	29	29	Sufentanil 1.0 µg/ml + DEX 4 µg/ml	Sufentanil 1.0 µg/ml	Partial laryngectomy			
Xin et al. (2017)	46	47	Sufentanil 0.02 ug/(kg·h) + DEX 0.04 ug/(kg·h)	Sufentanil 0.04 ug/(kg·h)	Laparotomy surgery			
Gao et al. (2018)	102	101	Sufentanil 100µg + DEX 200 µg	Sufentanil 100 µg	Abdominal Surgery			
Jiang et al. (2018)	66	33	Oxycodone 0.6 mg/kg + DEX 2.4, 4.8 µg/kg	Oxycodone 0.6 mg/kg	Abdominal Surgery			
Li et al. (2018)	28	29	Morphine 0.5 mg/ml + DEX 2 $\mu$ g/ml	Morphine 0.5 mg/ml	Abdominal Surgery			
Nie et al. (2018)	103	102	Sufentanil 100µg + DEX 300 µg	Sufentanil 100 µg	Cesarean Surgery			
Song et al. (2019)	60	30	Sufentanil 0.02 µg/kg/h + DEX 0.02, 0.04 µg/kg/h	Sufentanil 0.02 µg/kg/h	Laparoscopic nephrectomy			
Zhang et al. (2018)	26	26	Oxycodone 60 mg + DEX 360 µg	Oxycodone 60 mg	Open Hepatectomy			
Jiang et al. (2018)	30	30	Sufentanil 100µg + 200 µg DEX	Sufentanil 100 µg	Burn surgery			
Sun et al. (2019)	281	276	Sufentanil 2 µg/kg + DEX 4.8 µg/kg	Sufentanil 2 µg/kg	Elderly patients with non- cardiac surgery			
Song et al. (2019)	30	30	Oxycodone 50 mg + DEX 2.5 µg/kg	Oxycodone 50 mg	Abdominal Surgery			
Yu et al. (2019)	276	281	Sufentanil 150µg + DEX 150 µg	Sufentanil 150 µg	Cesarean Surgery			
Lei et al. (2020)	57	61	Morphine 0.48 mg/kg + DEX 1.0 µg/kg	Morphine 0.48 mg/kg	Post-thoracotomy surgery			

(Continued on following page)

Author	Sample s	size	Intervention s	Intervention study				
(year)	Experimental group	Control group	Experimental group	Control group				
Li et al. (2020)	61	61	Morphine 0.5 mg/ml + DEX 1 µg/ml	Morphine 0.5 mg/ml	Gynecological Laparoscopic Surgery			
Tang et al. (2020)	27	26	Sufentanil 1 µg/ml + DEX 2.5 µg/ml	Sufentanil 1 µg/ml + DEX 2.5 µg/ml Sufentanil 1 µg/ml				
Wang et al. (2020)	72	73	Sufentanil 1.5 µg/kg + DEX 2 µg/kg	Sufentanil 1.5 µg/kg	Cesarean Surgery			
Miao et al. (2020)	26	28	Ketorolac 3 mg/kg + DEX 0.1 µg/kg/h	Ketorolac 3 mg/kg + Sufentanil 1.5 µg/kg	Lung Cancer Surgery			
Zhao et al. (2020)	315	101	Sufentanil 150μg + DEX 100, 200, 400 μg	Sufentanil 150 µg				
Hong et al. (2021)	351	347	Sufentanil 200µg + DEX 200 µg	Sufentanil 200 µg	Orthopedic Surgery			
Liu et al. (2021)	86	28	Butorphanol 3 μg/kg/h + DEX 0.03, 0.05, 0.08 μg/kg/h	Butorphanol 3 µg/kg/h	Cesarean Surgery			
Li et al. (2021)	72	71	Sufentanil 1.5 µg/kg + Dezocine 0.3 mg/kg + DEX 3.0 µg/kg	Sufentanil 1.5 µg/kg + Dezocine 0.3 mg/kg	Thoracoscopic Surgery			
Wang J. et al. (2021)	36	36	Fentanyl 20 µg/kg + DEX 2.5 µg/kg	Fentanyl 20 µg/kg				
Wang Y. et al. (2021)	24	25	Sufentail 0.03 µg/kg + DEX 0.03 µg/kg	Sufentail 0.03 µg/kg	Spine Surgery			
Sui et al. (2022)	140	70	Sufentanil 150 µg + DEX 200, 400 µg	Sufentanil 150 µg	Colorectal cancer surgery			

#### TABLE 1 (Continued) Characteristics of included studies.

Abbreviations: DEX, Dexmedetomidine.

#### Sensitivity analysis and subgroup analysis

Sensitivity analysis and subgroup analysis were used to find sources of heterogeneity, and minimize the impact of heterogeneity on the stability of results. The heterogeneity of some indicators (4–8 h pain score, PONV, use of rescue analgesics) were significantly reduced among other studies after removal of one studies, while the total consumption of analytics, 24 h and 48 h pain score reduce heterogeneity to some extent through subgroup analysis, as shown in Table 2. For indicators that total consumption of analgesics within 24 h after surgery, PONV, 24 h and 48 h pain score, the result of sensitivity or subgroup analysis were consistent with previous results. By sensitivity analysis, there was a statistically significant difference between the two groups for 4–8 h pain score, showing that the DEX group was significantly lower than the control group, contrary to previous results.

### **Publication bias**

We used Stata software to assess the publication bias of the main results. The p values of begg's test on the 0–4 h, 4–8 h, 12 h,

and 24 h pain score were 0.0763, 1, 0.2963, 0.0013, respectively. Therefore, we believe that the risk of publication bias is low in this meta-analysis, and the funnel plot is shown in Figure 7.

# Discussion

This meta-analysis of quantitative studies of DEX for postoperative PCIA shows that DEX improved the analgesic effect, reduces total analgesics consumption, and reduced the analgesic drug-related adverse reactions. Compared with the control group, the pain score in the DEX group were significantly reduced at 24 and 48 h after surgery. In addition, DEX can also significantly improve patient satisfaction and reduce the time of analgesic rescue needs. Also, the analgesics related side effects in the DEX group, such as nausea, vomiting and itching after surgery, were significantly reduced. Moreover, DEX could reduce the levels of inflammatory cytokines such as IL-6 and TNF-a. Ultimately, DEX increased the risk of bradycardia, with no difference in hypotensive complications between the two groups. Based on the results of this metaanalysis, we summarized the specific role of DEX in PCIA, as shown in Table 3.



FIGURE 3

Forest plot for pain score in postoperative PCIA patients at different time points. (A) Pain score at 0-4 h, (B) Pain score at 4-8 h, (C) Pain score at 12 h, (D) Pain score at 24 h, (E) Pain score at 48 h.



The significant pharmacological effects of DEX are due to the activation of  $\alpha_2$ -ARs. DEX can activate presynaptic  $\alpha_2$ -ARs, inhibit the release of norepinephrine through a negative

feedback mechanism, and stop pain signaling (Feng et al., 2019; Liu et al., 2021). The unique "conscious calming" effect of DEX is primarily related to the nucleus locus coeruleus in the

DEX Control								Mean Difference	Mean Difference				
Study or Subgroup	Mean SD Total Mean SD Total				Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl					
Song2019	32.04	7.96	30	31.82	9.45	30	34.8%	0.22 [-4.20, 4.64]	<b>_</b>				
Wang 2020	33	5.8	36	41.9	8	36	65.2%	-8.90 [-12.13, -5.67]	— <b>—</b> —				
fotal (95% CI)			66			66	100.0%	-5.73 [-8.34, -3.12]	•				
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1	0.66, df	= 1 (P	= 0.00	1); I <sup>2</sup> =	91%								
Fest for overall effect: Z	2 = 4.31	(P < 0.	0001)						-10 -5 0 5 10				
									Favours [experimental] Favours [control]				
5	D	)EX		C	ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference				
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	IV, Fixed, 95% CI				
Song2019	4.24	0.82	30	4.31	0.67	30	11.2%	-0.07 [-0.45, 0.31]					
Vang 2020	5.4	0.1	36	6.1	0.4	36	88.8%	-0.70 [-0.83, -0.57]					
fotal (95% CI)			66			66	100.0%	-0.63 [-0.76, -0.50]	◆				
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 9	9.43. df =	= 1 (P =	= 0.002	): I <sup>2</sup> = 8	9%								
Fest for overall effect: Z		•							-0.5 -0.25 0 0.25 0.5				
i esti ul uverali ellett. Z				·					Favours [experimental] Favours [control]				

#### TABLE 2 The results of sensitivity or subgroup analysis.

Indicators	MD/OR	Ρ	I (%)						
Sensitivity analysis									
Pain score at 4-8 h postoperatively	-0.33 [-0.54, -0.12]	0.003	49						
Postoperative nausea and vomiting	0.40 [0.33, 0.49]	< 0.0001	46						
Use of rescue analgesics	0.59 [0.48, 0.73]	< 0.0001	48						
Subgroup analysis									
Total consumption of analgesics									
Abdominal surgery	-0.32 [-0.48, -0.15]	0.0001	0						
Non-abdominal surgery	-0.26 [-0.38, -0.14]	<0.0001	96						
Pain score at 24 h postoperatively									
Thoracic surgery	-0.46 [-0.75, -0.17]	0.002	46						
Non-thoracic surgery	-0.79 [-0.97, -0.61]	<0.0001	93						
Pain score at 48 h postoperatively									
Published in 2020 and before 2020	0.17 [0.00, 0.33]	0.04	0						
Published after 2020	-0.70 [-0.81, -0.59]	<0.00001	97						

Abbreviations: MD, mean difference; OR, odds ratio.

brain. Compared with analgesics, it has superior properties, especially in arousal sedation, mild analgesia, and a lower risk of respiratory depression (Hall et al., 2000). In this study, DEX, as an adjuvant for analgesics, could enhance postoperative analgesia and improve patient satisfaction.

PCA is one of the accepted methods for the management of postoperative pain. A cochrane review concluded that PCA was associated with better postoperative pain scores and increased patient satisfaction compared with traditional modes of analgesic drug administration (Abrolat et al., 2018). Intravenous PCA has been widely used for postoperative analgesia over the past few decades (Hadi et al., 2006; Kim et al., 2017).

Pain can be assessed by self-assessment scales, behavioural tests and physiological measures. One-dimensional pain scales, which are quick to assess, concise and easy for patients to understand, are the most commonly used types of pain assessment scales in clinical practice and include the VAS, NRS, VRS, and FPS-R. Of the 37 studies included in our

Study or Subgroup	DEX Events		Contr Events		Weight	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Jiang2019	2	30	3	30	0.9%	0.64 [0.10, 4.15]	
<im 2017<="" td=""><td>6</td><td>57</td><td>7</td><td>57</td><td>2.0%</td><td>0.84 [0.26, 2.68]</td><td></td></im>	6	57	7	57	2.0%	0.84 [0.26, 2.68]	
Li 2020	25	61	32	61	6.1%	0.63 [0.31, 1.29]	
.i2021	10	72	21	71	5.9%	0.38 [0.17, 0.89]	
in 2008	6	50	18	48	5.2%	0.23 [0.08, 0.64]	
_in2009	23	50	26	48	4.6%	0.72 [0.33, 1.60]	
u 2017	12	76	29	76	7.9%	0.30 [0.14, 0.66]	
2017 2in2017	8	29	8	29	1.9%	1.00 [0.32, 3.16]	
Ren 2015	9	60	16	30	5.8%	0.15 [0.06, 0.42]	
Ren2015	26	84	14	41	4.2%	0.86 [0.39, 1.91]	
Song2016	29	53	34	52	5.0%	0.64 [0.29, 1.40]	
Song2018	5	60	7	30	2.8%	0.30 [0.09, 1.04]	
Sui2022	4	140	7	70	2.9%	0.26 [0.07, 0.94]	
Sun 2019	37	281	30	276	8.5%	1.24 [0.74, 2.08]	
Nang 2016	1	20	5	16	1.7%	0.12 [0.01, 1.12]	
Vang 2021	9	36	14	36	3.4%	0.52 [0.19, 1.44]	
Vang 2016	3	42	25	42	7.5%	0.05 [0.01, 0.20]	
Vang 2020	12	72	31	73	8.2%	0.27 [0.12, 0.59]	
Nang 2021	1	24	1	25	0.3%	1.04 [0.06, 17.69]	
Ven2020	2	26	14	28	4.0%	0.08 [0.02, 0.42]	
(in2017	5	46	17	47	4.8%	0.22 [0.07, 0.65]	
Zhao2020	30	315	15	101	6.6%	0.60 [0.31, 1.17]	
fotal (95% CI) fotal events Heterogeneity: Chi² = fest for overall effect:					<b>100.0</b> % 59%	0.47 [0.39, 0.57]	0.01 0.1 1 10 100 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
6	DEX	,	Contr	ol		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup					Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Dong2017	2	30	7	30	9.2%	0.23 [0.04, 1.24]	
		102	O	101	0.270	Not estimable	
Gao 2018	U 1		-				
	0		0	- 30		Not estimable	
liang2019	0	30	0	30 71	6.7%	Not estimable 0.78 (0.20, 3.02)	
Jiang2019 _i2021	0 4	30 72	5	71	6.7% 10.9%	0.78 [0.20, 3.02]	
liang2019 .i2021 .in 2008	0 4 8	30 72 50	5 9	71 48	10.9%	0.78 [0.20, 3.02] 0.83 [0.29, 2.35]	
liang2019 .i2021 .in 2008 .in2009	0 4 8 8	30 72 50 50	5 9 9	71 48 48	10.9% 10.9%	0.78 [0.20, 3.02] 0.83 [0.29, 2.35] 0.83 [0.29, 2.35]	
liang2019 .i2021 .in 2008 .in2009 .u 2017	0 4 8 8 4	30 72 50 50 76	5 9 9 4	71 48 48 76	10.9% 10.9% 5.3%	0.78 [0.20, 3.02] 0.83 [0.29, 2.35] 0.83 [0.29, 2.35] 1.00 [0.24, 4.15]	
Jiang2019 Li2021 Lin 2008 Lin2009 Lu 2017 Qin2017	0 4 8 4 3	30 72 50 50	5 9 4 6	71 48 48	10.9% 10.9% 5.3% 7.6%	0.78 [0.20, 3.02] 0.83 [0.29, 2.35] 0.83 [0.29, 2.35] 1.00 [0.24, 4.15] 0.44 [0.10, 1.97]	
Jiang2019 Li2021 Lin 2008 Lin2009 Lu 2017 Qin2017 Ren 2015	0 4 8 8 4	30 72 50 50 76 29	5 9 4 6 3	71 48 48 76 29 30	10.9% 10.9% 5.3% 7.6% 5.4%	0.78 (0.20, 3.02) 0.83 (0.29, 2.35) 0.83 (0.29, 2.35) 1.00 (0.24, 4.15) 0.44 (0.10, 1.97) 0.31 (0.05, 1.97)	
liang2019 Li2021 Lin 2008 Lin2009 Lu 2017 Qin2017 Ren 2015 Ren2015	0 4 8 4 3 2 9	30 72 50 50 76 29 60 84	5 9 4 6 3 16	71 48 76 29 30 41	10.9% 10.9% 5.3% 7.6% 5.4% 27.0%	0.78 (0.20, 3.02) 0.83 (0.29, 2.35) 0.83 (0.29, 2.35) 1.00 (0.24, 4.15) 0.44 (0.10, 1.97) 0.31 (0.05, 1.97) 0.19 (0.07, 0.48)	
Gao 2018 Jiang2019 Li2021 Lin 2008 Lin2009 Lu 2017 Qin2017 Ren 2015 Ren2015 Song2019 Mang 2021	0 4 8 4 3 2 9 1	30 72 50 50 76 29 60 84 30	5 9 4 6 3 16 5	71 48 76 29 30 41 30	10.9% 10.9% 5.3% 7.6% 5.4% 27.0% 6.8%	0.78 (0.20, 3.02) 0.83 (0.29, 2.35) 0.83 (0.29, 2.35) 1.00 (0.24, 4.15) 0.44 (0.10, 1.97) 0.31 (0.05, 1.97) 0.19 (0.07, 0.48) 0.17 (0.02, 1.58)	
Jiang2019 Li2021 Lin 2008 Lin2009 Lu 2017 Qin2017 Ren 2015 Ren2015	0 4 8 4 3 2 9	30 72 50 50 76 29 60 84	5 9 4 6 3 16	71 48 76 29 30 41	10.9% 10.9% 5.3% 7.6% 5.4% 27.0%	0.78 (0.20, 3.02) 0.83 (0.29, 2.35) 0.83 (0.29, 2.35) 1.00 (0.24, 4.15) 0.44 (0.10, 1.97) 0.31 (0.05, 1.97) 0.19 (0.07, 0.48)	
liang2019 .i2021 .in 2008 .in2009 .u 2017 Qin2017 Ren 2015 Ren2015 Song2019 Vang 2021 Vang 2021	0 4 8 4 3 2 9 1 2	30 72 50 50 76 29 60 84 30 24 26	5 9 4 6 3 16 5 5	71 48 48 76 29 30 41 30 25 28	10.9% 10.9% 5.3% 7.6% 5.4% 27.0% 6.8% 6.3% 3.9%	$\begin{array}{c} 0.78 & (0.20, 3.02) \\ 0.83 & (0.29, 2.35) \\ 0.83 & (0.29, 2.35) \\ 1.00 & (0.24, 4.15) \\ 0.44 & (0.10, 1.97) \\ 0.31 & (0.05, 1.97) \\ 0.19 & (0.07, 0.48) \\ 0.17 & (0.02, 1.58) \\ 0.36 & (0.06, 2.09) \\ 0.33 & (0.03, 3.43) \end{array}$	
Jiang2019 Li2021 Lin 2008 Lu 2009 Lu 2017 Qin2017 Ren 2015 Ren2015 Song2019 Wang 2021 Wang 2021 Wen2020	0 4 8 4 3 2 9 1 2 1	30 72 50 50 76 29 60 84 30 24	5 9 4 6 3 16 5 5 3	71 48 48 76 29 30 41 30 25 28	10.9% 10.9% 5.3% 7.6% 5.4% 27.0% 6.8% 6.3%	0.78 (0.20, 3.02) 0.83 (0.29, 2.35) 0.83 (0.29, 2.35) 1.00 (0.24, 4.15) 0.44 (0.10, 1.97) 0.31 (0.05, 1.97) 0.19 (0.07, 0.48) 0.17 (0.02, 1.58) 0.36 (0.06, 2.09)	
liang2019 .i2021 .in 2008 .in 2009 .u 2017 Qin2017 Ren 2015 Ren2015 Song2019 Wang 2021 Wang 2021 Wen2020	0 4 8 4 3 2 9 1 2 1 2 4	30 72 50 76 29 60 84 30 24 26 <b>663</b>	5 9 4 6 3 16 5 5 3 72	71 48 48 76 29 30 41 30 25 28 587	10.9% 10.9% 5.3% 7.6% 5.4% 27.0% 6.8% 6.3% 3.9%	$\begin{array}{c} 0.78 & (0.20, 3.02) \\ 0.83 & (0.29, 2.35) \\ 0.83 & (0.29, 2.35) \\ 1.00 & (0.24, 4.15) \\ 0.44 & (0.10, 1.97) \\ 0.31 & (0.05, 1.97) \\ 0.19 & (0.07, 0.48) \\ 0.17 & (0.02, 1.58) \\ 0.36 & (0.06, 2.09) \\ 0.33 & (0.03, 3.43) \end{array}$	▲
iang2019 i2021 in 2008 in 2009 u 2017 2012017 2012015 2012015 2012015 2012015 20130 2021 Vang 2021 Vang 2021	0 4 8 4 3 2 9 1 2 1 2 1 5 36, df=	30 72 50 76 29 60 84 30 24 26 <b>663</b> 10 (P	5 9 4 6 3 16 5 5 3 72 = 0.50);   <sup>2</sup>	71 48 48 76 29 30 41 30 25 28 587	10.9% 10.9% 5.3% 7.6% 5.4% 27.0% 6.8% 6.3% 3.9%	$\begin{array}{c} 0.78 & (0.20, 3.02) \\ 0.83 & (0.29, 2.35) \\ 0.83 & (0.29, 2.35) \\ 1.00 & (0.24, 4.15) \\ 0.44 & (0.10, 1.97) \\ 0.31 & (0.05, 1.97) \\ 0.19 & (0.07, 0.48) \\ 0.17 & (0.02, 1.58) \\ 0.36 & (0.06, 2.09) \\ 0.33 & (0.03, 3.43) \end{array}$	0.02 0.1 1 10 50
iang2019 .i2021 .in 2008 .in 2009 .u 2017 Qin2017 Ren 2015 Ren2015 Song2019 Vang 2021 Vang 2021 Vang 2021	0 4 8 4 3 2 9 1 2 1 2 1 5 36, df=	30 72 50 76 29 60 84 30 24 26 <b>663</b> 10 (P	5 9 4 6 3 16 5 5 3 72 = 0.50);   <sup>2</sup>	71 48 48 76 29 30 41 30 25 28 587	10.9% 10.9% 5.3% 7.6% 5.4% 27.0% 6.8% 6.3% 3.9%	$\begin{array}{c} 0.78 & (0.20, 3.02) \\ 0.83 & (0.29, 2.35) \\ 0.83 & (0.29, 2.35) \\ 1.00 & (0.24, 4.15) \\ 0.44 & (0.10, 1.97) \\ 0.31 & (0.05, 1.97) \\ 0.19 & (0.07, 0.48) \\ 0.17 & (0.02, 1.58) \\ 0.36 & (0.06, 2.09) \\ 0.33 & (0.03, 3.43) \end{array}$	

meta-analysis, Sun et al. (2019) and Li et al. (2018) used the NRS, and Lin et al. (2009) used the VRS to assess patients' postoperative pain, while the remaining studies all used the VAS to assess pain. This meta-analysis found that the addition of DEX resulted in lower pain scores than analgesia alone at 24 and 48 h postoperatively. An interesting phenomenon found in this study is that DEX is not significantly better than analgesics in reducing the pain score of patients 0–12 h after

surgery. Intravenous analgesics given prior to switching on the PCIA pump can greatly mask the synergistic analgesic effect of adjuvants in the early postoperative period. There are several potential mechanisms related to the analgesic effect of DEX. Many studies have shown that DEX mainly exerts analgesic effects through three levels: it acts on the locus coeruleus  $\alpha_2AR$  at the level above the spinal cord, activates the descending noradrenergic inhibitory system, and then

$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H Fixed 95% CI	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $								
long 2021 1 351 1 347 2.4% 0.99 (0.6, 15.87) lang 2019 5 66 4 33 11.9% 0.59 (0.15, 2.38) lang 2019 2 30 0 30 1.1% 6.35 (0.25, 116.31) l2018 0 28 0 29 Not estimable l2021 3 72 1 71 2.3% 3.04 (0.31, 29.98) l2021 3 72 1 71 2.3% 3.04 (0.31, 29.98) l2017 0 76 0 76 Not estimable lenc 2015 4 60 4 30 12.1% 0.46 (0.11, 2.00) lang 2018 8 53 3 52 6.2% 2.90 (0.73, 11.63) lang 2019 26 281 14 276 31.1% 1.91 (0.97, 3.74) lang 2020 5 72 2 73 4.5% 2.65 (0.50, 14.12) hang 2018 3 26 2 26 4.3% 1.57 (0.24, 10.24) hang 2020 8 315 3 101 10.7% 0.85 (0.52, 3.27) otal (95% CI) 1623 1336 100.0% 1.66 (1.12, 2.45) left orgeneity. Ch <sup>P</sup> = 1.408, df = 12 (P = 0.30); P = 15% left orgeneity. Ch <sup>P</sup> = 1.408, df = 12 (P = 0.30); P = 15% left orgeneity. Ch <sup>P</sup> = 1.408, df = 12 (P = 0.30); P = 15% left orgeneity. Ch <sup>P</sup> = 1.408, df = 12 (P = 0.30); P = 15% left orgeneity. Ch <sup>P</sup> = 1.408, df = 12 (P = 0.30); P = 15% left orgeneity. Ch <sup>P</sup> = 1.408, df = 12 (P = 0.30); P = 15% left orgeneity. Ch <sup>P</sup> = 1.408, df = 12 (P = 0.30); P = 15% left orgeneity. Ch <sup>P</sup> = 1.408, df = 12 (P = 0.30); P = 15% left orgeneity. Ch <sup>P</sup> = 1.408, df = 12 (P = 0.30); P = 15% left orgeneity. Ch <sup>P</sup> = 1.408, df = 12 (P = 0.30); P = 15% left orgeneity. Ch <sup>P</sup> = 1.408, df = 12 (P = 0.30); P = 15% left orgeneity. Ch <sup>P</sup> = 1.408, df = 12 (P = 0.30); P = 15% lang 2018 0 102 1 101 4 4.4% 0.33 [0.01, 8.12] li 2020 0 6 1 1 6 1 4.3% 0.33 [0.01, 8.12] li 2018 0 28 0 29 Not estimable li 2020 0 6 1 1 6 1 4.3% 0.33 [0.01, 8.21] li 2018 0 28 0 29 Not estimable li 2020 0 6 1 1 6 10 4.3% 0.33 [0.01, 8.21] li 2018 0 103 0 102 Not estimable li 2018 0 103 0 102 Not estimable li 2020 1 14 315 6 101 25.3% 0.74 [0.28, 1.97] li 2018 0 103 0 102 Not estimable li 2019 4 281 2 266 5 8% 1.98 [0.36, 10.89] li 2019 4 281 2 266 5 8% 1.98 [0.36, 10.89] li 2019 1 4 315 6 101 25.3% 0.74 [0.28, 1.97] left orgeneity. Ch <sup>P</sup> = 5.73, df = 12 (P = 0.37); P = 0% left orgeneity. Ch <sup>P</sup> = 5.73, df = 12 (P = 0.37); P = 0% left orgeneity. Ch <sup>P</sup> = 0.73, df = 12 (P = 0.37); P = 0% left or	-							
iang 2018 5 6 6 4 33 11.9% 0.59 [0.15, 2.38] iang 2019 2 30 0 30 1.1% 5.35 [0.25, 116.31] 12020 6 6 61 0 61 1.1% 14.41 [0.79, 261.61] 12020 6 61 0 61 1.1% 14.41 [0.79, 261.61] 12021 3 72 1 71 2.2% 3.04 [0.31, 29.89] u 2017 0 76 0 76 Not estimable iang 2018 8 60 4 30 12.1% 0.46 [0.11, 2.00] ong 2016 8 53 3 52 6.2% 2.29 [0.73, 11.63] iang 2019 26 281 14 276 31.1% 1.91 [0.97, 3.74] hang 2020 5 72 2 73 4.5% 2.266 [0.50, 14.12] hang 2018 3 26 2 26 4.3% 1.57 [0.24, 10.24] hang 2020 5 72 2 73 4.5% 2.266 [0.50, 14.12] hang 2018 3 26 2 26 4.3% 1.57 [0.24, 10.24] hang 2020 8 315 3 101 10.7% 0.85 [0.22, 3.27] otal (95% Ct) 1623 1336 100.0% 1.66 [1.12, 2.45] otal events 78 39 leterogeneity: Ch <sup>2</sup> = 14.08, df = 12 (P = 0.30); P = 15% est for overall effect Z = 2.55 (P = 0.01) DEX Control Odds Ratio Utdy or Subgroup Events Total Events Total Weight MH, Fixed, 95% Cl iong 2017 2 30 0 30 1.3% 5.35 [0.25, 116.31] ing 2018 0 102 1 101 4.4% 0.33 [0.01, 8.12] ing 2018 8 66 2 33 6.8% 2.14 [0.43, 10.69] ing 2017 3 57 4 57 11.1% 0.74 [0.16, 3.45] i 2018 0 28 0 29 Not estimable ing 2017 3 57 4 57 11.1% 0.74 [0.16, 3.45] i 2018 0 103 0 102 Not estimable ong 2016 9 53 4 52 9.8% 2.46 [0.11, 8.26] i 2018 0 103 0 102 Not estimable ong 2018 0 28 0 29 Not estimable ong 2018 0 28 0 29 Not estimable ong 2018 0 28 0 29 Not estimable ong 2018 0 103 0 102 Not estimable ong 2018 0 28 0 29 Not estimable ong 2018 0 28 0 29 Not estimable ong 2018 0 103 0 102 Not estimable ong 2018 0 28 0 29 Not estimable ong 2018 0 28 0 29 Not estimable ong 2018 0 103 0 102 Not estimable ong 2018 0 28 0 29 Not estimable ong 2018 0 103 0 102 Not estimable ong 2018 0 103 0 102 Not estimable ong 2018 0 133 0 102 Not estimable ong 2018 0 28 1 26 2.7% 2.08 [0.18, 22.6] otal events 5 55 31 eterogeneity: Chl <sup>2</sup> = 6.79, df = 12 (P = 0.87); P = 0% otal events 5 55 31 eterogeneity: Chl <sup>2</sup> = 6.79, df = 12 (P = 0.87); P = 0% otal regents 5 55 31 eterogeneity: Chl <sup>2</sup> = 6.79, df = 12 (P = 0.87); P = 0% otal regents								
iang2019       2       30       0       30       1.1%       5.35 [0.25, 116.31]         12018       0       28       0       29       Notestimable         12020       6       61       0       61       1.1%       1.44 [0.79, 261.61]         12021       3       72       1       71       2.3%       3.04 [0.31, 29.98]         12021       3       72       1       71       2.3%       3.04 [0.31, 29.98]         12021       3       72       1       71       2.3%       3.04 [0.31, 29.98]         12021       3       72       73       4.5%       2.65 [0.50, 14.12]         12019       2.6       2.81       1.4       2.76       1.5%       1.91 [0.97, 3.74]         Vang 2020       5       72       2       73       4.5%       2.66 [0.50, 14.12]         haag2018       3       2.6       2.08 (0.22, 3.27]								
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	-	-						
12020       6       61       0       61       1.1%       14.41       10.79, 261.61]         12021       3       72       1       71       2.3%       3.04       10.31, 29.98]         12021       0       76       0       76       Not estimable         12020       6       8       53       352       6.2%       2.90       [0.73, 11.63]         1002016       8       53       352       6.2%       2.90       [0.73, 11.63]         1002017       5       72       2       73       4.5%       2.65       [0.50, 14.12]         hang2018       3       26       2.26       4.3%       1.57       [0.24, 10.24]       10.1       10         restfor overall effect Z = 2.56       120(P = 0.30); P = 15%       10.01       1       10       10         set for overall effect Z = 2.56       P = 0.01)       101       4.4%       0.35       10.25% CI       M-H, Fixed, 95% CI         tong 2017       2       30       0       30       1.3%       5.35       10.25, 11.631]       10         ao 2018       0       102       101       1.4%       0.33       10.13, 306]       10.1       10       10	-					1.1 %		
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		-		-		1 1 06		
u 2017       0       76       0       76       Not estimable         len 2015       4       60       4       30       12.1%       0.46 [0.11, 2.00]         cong2016       8       53       52       6.2%       2.90 [0.73, 11.63]       1.91 [0.97, 3.74]         vang 2020       5       72       2       73       4.5%       2.66 [0.50, 14.12]         hang2018       3       26       2.26       4.3%       1.57 [0.24, 10.24]         hang2010       8       315       3       101       10.7%       0.85 [0.22, 3.27]         otal (95% CI)       1623       1336       100.0%       1.66 [1.12, 2.45]       0.01       0.1       10         reactor coverall effect Z = 2.55 (P = 0.01)       For the 12 (P = 0.30); P = 15%       0.04 Ratio       Odds Ratio         tudy or Subgroup       Events       Total       Weight       M.H.Fixed, 95% CI       M.H.Fixed, 95% CI         tudy or Subgroup       Events       Total       Weight       M.H.Fixed, 95% CI       M.H.Fixed, 95% CI         tudy or Subgroup       Events       Total       Weight       M.H.Fixed, 95% CI       M.H.Fixed, 95% CI         tudy or Subgroup       Events       Total       8.8%       0.68 [0.11, 3.36]<								
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						2.5%		
bing2016       8       53       3       52       6.2%       2.90 [0.73, 11.63]         un 2019       26       281       14       276       31.1%       1.91 [0.97, 3.74]         kang 2020       5       72       2       73       4.5%       2.66 [0.50, 14.12]         hang2018       3       26       2       26       4.3%       1.57 [0.24, 10.24]         hao2020       8       315       3       101       10.7%       0.85 [0.22, 3.27]         otal (95% CI)       1623       1336       100.0%       1.66 [1.12, 2.45]         otal wents       78       39         letrogeneity. Chi <sup>P</sup> =14.08, df = 12 (P = 0.30); P = 15%       0.01       0.1       10         rest for overall effect. Z = 2.55 (P = 0.01)       Control       Odds Ratio       Odds Ratio         tudy or Subgroup       Events       Total       Events       Total       Weight       M.H, Fixed, 95% CI         iong 2017       2       30       0       30       1.3%       5.35 [0.25, 116.31]       0.04ds Ratio         iong 2018       0       102       1014       4.4%       0.33 [0.01, 8.21]       0.04ds estimable         iong 2018       0       28       2.9%						121%		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $								
Vang 2020       5       72       2       73       4.5%       2.65 [0.50, 14.12]         thang2018       3       26       2       26       4.3%       1.57 [0.24, 10.24]         thao2020       8       315       3       101       10.7%       0.85 [0.22, 3.27]         otal (95% CI)       1623       1336       100.0%       1.66 [1.12, 2.45]         otal events       78       39         teterogeneity: Ch <sup>2</sup> = 14.08, df = 12 (P = 0.30); P = 15%       0.01       0.1       10         rest for overall effect Z = 2.55 (P = 0.01)       DEX       Control       Odds Ratio       Odds Ratio         bong2017       2       30       30       1.3%       5.55 [0.25, 116.31]	-							
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $								
hao2020       8       315       3       101       10.7%       0.85 [0.22, 3.27]         otal (95% CI)       1623       1336       100.0%       1.66 [1.12, 2.45]         otal events       78       39         leterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 14.08, df = 12 (P = 0.30); I <sup>2</sup> = 15%       0.01       0.1       101       10         rest for overall effect: Z = 2.55 (P = 0.01)       DEX       Control       Odds Ratio       Odds Ratio         tudy or Subgroup       Events       Total       Events       Total       Weight       M.H. Fixed, 95% CI         bong 2017       2       30       0       30       1.3%       5.35 [0.25, 116.31]       Odds Ratio         soa 0218       0       102       1       101       4.4%       0.33 [0.01, 8.12]       Image: transmale       Image: transmale <thimag< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></thimag<>								
iotal (95% Cl)       1623       1336       100.0%       1.66 [1.12, 2.45]         iotal events       78       39         idetrogeneity. Chi <sup>2</sup> = 14.08, df = 12 (P = 0.30); P = 15%       0.01       0.1       10         iest for overall effect: Z = 2.55 (P = 0.01)       DEX       Control       Odds Ratio       Odds Ratio $tudy or Subgroup$ Events       Total       Events       Total       Weight       M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl       M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl $tudy or Subgroup$ Events       Total       Events       Total       Weight       M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl       M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl $tong 2017$ 2       30       0       30       1.3%       5.35 (D.25, 116.31]       Image: Chi and the state s	-	-						
Total events       78       39         leterogeneity: $Ch^{P} = 14.08$ , $df = 12$ ( $P = 0.30$ ); $P = 15\%$ 0.01       0.1       10         rest for overall effect: $Z = 2.55$ ( $P = 0.01$ )       DEX       Control       Odds Ratio         tudy or Subgroup       Events       Total       Events       Total       Weight       M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl         vong 2017       2       30       0       30       1.3%       5.35 [0.25, 116.31]	.na02020	0	315	3	101	10.7%	0.00 [0.22, 3.27]	
Total events       78       39         leterogeneity: $Chi^{P} = 14.08$ , $df = 12$ ( $P = 0.30$ ); $P = 15\%$ 0.01       0.1       10         est for overall effect: $Z = 2.55$ ( $P = 0.01$ )       DEX       Control       Odds Ratio         tudy or Subgroup       Events       Total       Events       Total       Weight       M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl         iong 2017       2       30       0       30       1.3%       5.35 [0.25, 116.31]       Image: the second s	otal (95% CI)		1623		1336	100.0%	1.66 [1.12, 2.45]	◆
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		78		39				-
Odds Ratio         DEX       Control       Odds Ratio         Total Events Total Weight M-H, Fixed, 95% CI       M-H, Fixed, 95% CI         Dong2017       2       30       0       30       Odds Ratio         Total Events Total Weight M-H, Fixed, 95% CI       M-H, Fixed, 95% CI         M-H, Fixed, 95% CI			= 12 (F		P = 159	×		
DEX         Control         Odds Ratio         Odds Ratio           tudy or Subgroup         Events         Total         Events         Total         Weight         M-H, Fixed, 95% CI           sao 2018         0         102         1         101         4.4%         0.33 [0.01, 8.12]           iang 2018         0         2         351         3         347         8.8%         0.66 [0.11, 3.96]           iang 2018         8         66         2         33         6.8%         2.14 [0.43, 10.69]           ima 2017         3         57         4         57         11.1%         0.74 [0.16, 3.45]           i2018         0         28         0         29         Not estimable	-					~		
tudy or Subgroup         Fvents         Total         Weight         M-H, Fixed, 95% CI         M-H, Fixed, 95% CI           tag 2017         2         30         0         30         1.3%         5.35 [0.25, 116.31]         Image: Construction of the construle of the construction of the construction of the				,				Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$								
tao       2018       0       102       1       101       4.4% $0.33$ [0.01, 8.12]         long       2021       2       351       3       347       8.8% $0.66$ [0.11, 3.96]         iang       2018       8       66       2       33 $6.8\%$ $2.14$ [0.43, 10.69]         im       2017       3       57       4       57       11.1% $0.74$ [0.16, 3.45]         i 2018       0       28       0       29       Not estimable         i 2020       0       61       1       61 $4.3\%$ $0.33$ [0.01, 8.21]         i 2021       2       72       1       71       2.9%       2.00 [0.18, 22.56]         i 2020       0       61       1       61       4.3% $0.33$ [0.01, 8.21]         i 2021       2       72       1       71       2.9%       2.00 [0.18, 22.56]         i 2018       0       103       0       102       Not estimable         ong2016       9       53       4       52       9.8%       2.45 [0.71, 8.54]         un 2019       4       281       2       26       1.3%       3.35 [0.13, 86.03]		DEX		Contr	ol		Odds Ratio	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						Weight		Odds Ratio
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	tudy or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total		M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	Odds Ratio
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	tudy or Subgroup	Events 2	Total 30	Events 0	Total 30	1.3%	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 5.35 [0.25, 116.31]	Odds Ratio
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	i <b>tudy or Subgroup</b> Jong2017 Sao 2018	Events 2 0	Total 30 102	Events 0 1	Total 30 101	1.3% 4.4%	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 5.35 [0.25, 116.31] 0.33 [0.01, 8.12]	Odds Ratio
i 2018 0 28 0 29 Not estimable i 2020 0 61 1 61 4.3% 0.33 [0.01, 8.21] i 2021 2 72 1 71 2.9% 2.00 [0.18, 22.56] lie 2018 0 103 0 102 Not estimable i ong2016 9 53 4 52 9.8% 2.45 [0.71, 8.54] oun 2019 4 281 2 276 5.8% 1.98 [0.36, 10.89] Vang 2020 8 72 6 73 15.5% 1.40 [0.46, 4.25] Ven2020 1 26 0 28 1.3% $3.35 [0.13, 86.03]$ hang2018 2 26 1 26 2.7% 2.08 [0.18, 24.51] hao2020 14 315 6 101 25.3% 0.74 [0.28, 1.97] otal (95% CI) 1643 1387 100.0% 1.30 [0.83, 2.04] i otal events 55 31 leterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 6.79, df = 12 ( $P = 0.87$ ); $P = 0\%$ i otal events 15 5 31 leterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 6.79, df = 12 ( $P = 0.87$ ); $P = 0\%$ i otal events 15 5 31 leterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 6.79, df = 12 ( $P = 0.87$ ); $P = 0\%$	tudy or Subgroup Dong2017 Gao 2018 Iong 2021	Events 2 0 2	Total 30 102 351	Events 0 1 3	Total 30 101 347	1.3% 4.4% 8.8%	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 5.35 [0.25, 116.31] 0.33 [0.01, 8.12] 0.66 [0.11, 3.96]	Odds Ratio
i $2020$ 0 61 1 61 4.3% 0.33 [0.01, 8.21] i $2021$ 2 72 1 71 2.9% 2.00 [0.18, 22.56] lie $2018$ 0 103 0 102 Not estimable ong2016 9 53 4 52 9.8% 2.45 [0.71, 8.54] un 2019 4 281 2 276 5.8% 1.98 [0.36, 10.89] Vang 2020 8 72 6 73 15.5% 1.40 [0.46, 4.25] Ven2020 1 26 0 28 1.3% 3.35 [0.13, 86.03] hang2018 2 26 1 26 2.7% 2.08 [0.18, 24.51] hao2020 14 315 6 101 25.3% 0.74 [0.28, 1.97] otal (95% CI) 1643 1387 100.0% 1.30 [0.83, 2.04] otal events 55 31 leterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 6.79, df = 12 (P = 0.87); I <sup>2</sup> = 0% ext for overall effect 7 = 115 (P = 0.25)	tudy or Subgroup cong2017 sao 2018 long 2021 iang 2018	Events 2 0 2 8	Total 30 102 351 66	Events 0 1 3 2	Total 30 101 347 33	1.3% 4.4% 8.8% 6.8%	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 5.35 [0.25, 116.31] 0.33 [0.01, 8.12] 0.66 [0.11, 3.96] 2.14 [0.43, 10.69]	Odds Ratio
i2021 2 72 1 71 2.9% 2.00 [0.18, 22.56] lie 2018 0 103 0 102 Not estimable long2016 9 53 4 52 9.8% 2.45 [0.71, 8.54] un 2019 4 281 2 276 5.8% 1.98 [0.36, 10.89] Vang 2020 8 72 6 73 15.5% 1.40 [0.46, 4.25] Ven2020 1 26 0 28 1.3% 3.35 [0.13, 86.03] hang2018 2 26 1 26 2.7% 2.08 [0.18, 24.51] hao2020 14 315 6 101 25.3% 0.74 [0.28, 1.97] otal (95% CI) 1643 1387 100.0% 1.30 [0.83, 2.04] otal events 55 31 leterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 6.79, df = 12 (P = 0.87); I <sup>2</sup> = 0% ext for overall effect 7 = 115 (P = 0.25)	tudy or Subgroup long2017 lao 2018 long 2021 lang 2018 limg 2018 lim 2017	Events 2 0 2 8 3	Total 30 102 351 66 57	Events 0 1 3 2 4	Total 30 101 347 33 57	1.3% 4.4% 8.8% 6.8%	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 5.35 [0.25, 116.31] 0.33 [0.01, 8.12] 0.66 [0.11, 3.96] 2.14 [0.43, 10.69] 0.74 [0.16, 3.45]	Odds Ratio
lie 2018       0       103       0       102       Not estimable         long2016       9       53       4       52       9.8%       2.45 [0.71, 8.54]         un 2019       4       281       2       276       5.8%       1.98 [0.36, 10.89]         wang 2020       8       72       6       73       15.5%       1.40 [0.46, 4.25]         wen2020       1       26       0       28       1.3%       3.35 [0.13, 86.03]         hang2018       2       26       1       26       2.7%       2.08 [0.18, 24.51]         hao2020       14       315       6       101       25.3%       0.74 [0.28, 1.97]         otal events       55       31       1387       100.0%       1.30 [0.83, 2.04]       0.1         exter or everall effect 7 = 1.15 (P = 0.87); P = 0%       0.01       0.1       10       100	tudy or Subgroup long2017 lao 2018 long 2021 lang 2018 lim 2018 lim 2017 i 2018	Events 2 0 2 8 3 0	Total 30 102 351 66 57 28	Events 0 1 3 2 4 0	Total 30 101 347 33 57 29	1.3% 4.4% 8.8% 6.8% 11.1%	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 5.35 [0.25, 116.31] 0.33 [0.01, 8.12] 0.66 [0.11, 3.96] 2.14 [0.43, 10.69] 0.74 [0.16, 3.45] Not estimable	Odds Ratio
ong2016       9       53       4       52       9.8%       2.45       [0.71, 8.54]         un 2019       4       281       2       276       5.8%       1.98       [0.36, 10.89]         vang 2020       8       72       6       73       15.5%       1.40       [0.46, 4.25]         ven2020       1       26       0       28       1.3%       3.35       [0.13, 86.03]         hang2018       2       26       1       26       2.7%       2.08       [0.18, 24.51]         hao2020       14       315       6       101       25.3%       0.74       [0.28, 1.97]         otal events       55       31       1387       100.0%       1.30       [0.83, 2.04]         eterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 6.79, df = 12 (P = 0.87); I <sup>2</sup> = 0%       0.01       0.1       1       10       100	tudy or Subgroup oong2017 aao 2018 long 2021 iang 2018 im 2018 im 2017 i 2018 i 2020	Events 2 0 2 8 3 0 0 0	Total 30 102 351 66 57 28 61	Events 0 1 3 2 4 0 1	Total 30 101 347 33 57 29 61	1.3% 4.4% 8.8% 6.8% 11.1% 4.3%	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 5.35 [0.25, 116.31] 0.33 [0.01, 8.12] 0.66 [0.11, 3.96] 2.14 [0.43, 10.69] 0.74 [0.16, 3.45] Not estimable 0.33 [0.01, 8.21]	Odds Ratio
tun 2019       4       281       2       276       5.8%       1.98 [0.36, 10.89]         Vang 2020       8       72       6       73       15.5%       1.40 [0.46, 4.25]         Vang 2020       1       26       0       28       1.3%       3.35 [0.13, 86.03]         hang2018       2       26       1       26       2.7%       2.08 [0.18, 24.51]         hao2020       14       315       6       101       25.3%       0.74 [0.28, 1.97]         otal (95% CI)       1643       1387       100.0%       1.30 [0.83, 2.04]       Image: the research of the	tudy or Subgroup oong2017 aao 2018 long 2021 iang 2018 iim 2018 iim 2017 ii 2018 ii 2020 ii2021	Events 2 0 2 8 3 0 0 0 2	Total 30 102 351 66 57 28 61 72	Events 0 1 3 2 4 0 1 1	Total 30 101 347 33 57 29 61 71	1.3% 4.4% 8.8% 6.8% 11.1% 4.3%	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 5.35 [0.25, 116.31] 0.33 [0.01, 8.12] 0.66 [0.11, 3.96] 2.14 [0.43, 10.69] 0.74 [0.16, 3.45] Not estimable 0.33 [0.01, 8.21] 2.00 [0.18, 22.56]	Odds Ratio
Vang 2020       8       72       6       73       15.5%       1.40 [0.46, 4.25]         Ven2020       1       26       0       28       1.3%       3.35 [0.13, 86.03]         hang2018       2       26       1       26       2.7%       2.08 [0.18, 24.51]         hao2020       14       315       6       101       25.3%       0.74 [0.28, 1.97]         otal (95% CI)       1643       1387       100.0%       1.30 [0.83, 2.04]       •         otal events       55       31       •       •       •         leterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 6.79, df = 12 (P = 0.87); I <sup>2</sup> = 0%       •       •       •       •         oetfor overall effect 7 = 115 (P = 0.5)       •       •       •       •       •	tudy or Subgroup long2017 lao 2018 long 2021 lang 2018 lim 2018 lim 2017 li 2018 li 2020 li2021 lie 2018	Events 2 0 2 8 3 0 0 2 0 2 0	Total 30 102 351 66 57 28 61 72 103	Events 0 1 3 2 4 0 1 1 1 0	Total 30 101 347 33 57 29 61 71 102	1.3% 4.4% 8.8% 6.8% 11.1% 4.3% 2.9%	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 5.35 [0.25, 116.31] 0.33 [0.01, 8.12] 0.66 [0.11, 3.96] 2.14 [0.43, 10.69] 0.74 [0.16, 3.45] Not estimable 0.33 [0.01, 8.21] 2.00 [0.18, 22.56] Not estimable	Odds Ratio
ven2020       1       26       0       28       1.3%       3.35 [0.13, 86.03]         hang2018       2       26       1       26       2.7%       2.08 [0.18, 24.51]         hao2020       14       315       6       101       25.3%       0.74 [0.28, 1.97]         otal (95% CI)       1643       1387       100.0%       1.30 [0.83, 2.04]         otal events       55       31         leterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 6.79, df = 12 (P = 0.87); I <sup>2</sup> = 0%       0.01       0.1       10       100	tudy or Subgroup long2017 iao 2018 long 2021 iang 2018 iim 2018 iim 2017 i 2018 i 2020 i2021 lie 2018 long2016	Events 2 0 2 8 3 0 0 2 0 2 0 9	Total 30 102 351 66 57 28 61 72 103 53	Events 0 1 3 2 4 0 1 1 1 0 4	Total 30 101 347 33 57 29 61 71 102 52	1.3% 4.4% 8.8% 6.8% 11.1% 4.3% 2.9% 9.8%	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 5.35 [0.25, 116.31] 0.33 [0.01, 8.12] 0.66 [0.11, 3.96] 2.14 [0.43, 10.69] 0.74 [0.16, 3.45] Not estimable 0.33 [0.01, 8.21] 2.00 [0.18, 22.56] Not estimable 2.45 [0.71, 8.54]	Odds Ratio
hang2018       2       26       1       26       2.7%       2.08 [0.18, 24.51]         hao2020       14       315       6       101       25.3%       0.74 [0.28, 1.97]         otal (95% Cl)       1643       1387       100.0%       1.30 [0.83, 2.04]         iotal events       55       31         leterogeneity: Chi² = 6.79, df = 12 (P = 0.87); I² = 0%       0.01       0.1       1       10       100	tudy or Subgroup 2000g2017 200 2018 200 2018 2018 2018 2017 2018 2020 2020 2021 2021 2021 2021 2018 2018 2018 2020 2018 2019	Events 2 0 2 8 3 0 0 0 2 0 0 2 0 9 9 4	Total 30 102 351 66 57 28 61 72 103 53 281	Events 0 1 3 2 4 0 1 1 1 0 4 2	Total 30 101 347 33 57 29 61 71 102 52 276	1.3% 4.4% 8.8% 6.8% 11.1% 4.3% 2.9% 9.8% 5.8%	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 5.35 [0.25, 116.31] 0.33 [0.01, 8.12] 0.66 [0.11, 3.96] 2.14 [0.43, 10.69] 0.74 [0.16, 3.45] Not estimable 0.33 [0.01, 8.21] 2.00 [0.18, 22.56] Not estimable 2.45 [0.71, 8.54] 1.98 [0.36, 10.89]	Odds Ratio
hao2020 14 315 6 101 25.3% 0.74 [0.28, 1.97] otal (95% CI) 1643 1387 100.0% 1.30 [0.83, 2.04] otal events 55 31 leterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 6.79, df = 12 (P = 0.87); i <sup>2</sup> = 0% output to the set for overall effect 7 = 115 (P = 0.27); i <sup>2</sup> = 0% 0.01 0.1 1 10 100	tudy or Subgroup bong2017 Bao 2018 long 2021 iang 2018 iim 2017 i 2018 i 2020 i2020 i2021 lie 2018 iong2016 sun 2019 Vang 2020	Events 2 2 2 2 8 3 3 0 0 0 2 2 0 0 9 9 4 8	Total 30 102 351 66 57 28 61 72 103 53 281 72	Events 0 1 3 2 4 0 1 1 1 0 4 2 6	Total 30 101 347 33 57 29 61 71 102 52 276 73	1.3% 4.4% 8.8% 6.8% 11.1% 4.3% 2.9% 9.8% 5.8% 15.5%	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 5.35 [0.25, 116.31] 0.33 [0.01, 8.12] 0.66 [0.11, 3.96] 2.14 [0.43, 10.69] 0.74 [0.16, 3.45] Not estimable 0.33 [0.01, 8.21] 2.00 [0.18, 22.56] Not estimable 2.45 [0.71, 8.54] 1.98 [0.36, 10.89] 1.40 [0.46, 4.25]	Odds Ratio
total events         55         31           leterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 6.79, df = 12 (P = 0.87); l <sup>2</sup> = 0%         0.01         0.1         1         10         100           set for overall effect 7 = 115 (P = 0.25)         0.01         0.1         1         10         100	tudy or Subgroup bong2017 bao 2018 long 2021 iang 2018 iim 2017 i 2018 i 2020 i2020 i2021 lie 2018 iong2016 tun 2019 Vang 2020 Ven2020	Events 2 0 2 8 3 0 0 2 8 3 0 0 2 0 9 4 8 1	Total 30 102 351 66 57 28 61 72 103 53 281 72 26	Events 0 1 3 2 4 0 1 1 1 0 4 2 6 0	Total 30 101 347 33 57 29 61 71 102 52 276 73 28	1.3% 4.4% 8.8% 6.8% 11.1% 4.3% 2.9% 9.8% 5.8% 15.5% 1.3%	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 5.35 [0.25, 116.31] 0.33 [0.01, 8.12] 0.66 [0.11, 3.96] 2.14 [0.43, 10.69] 0.74 [0.16, 3.45] Not estimable 0.33 [0.01, 8.21] 2.00 [0.18, 22.56] Not estimable 2.45 [0.71, 8.54] 1.98 [0.36, 10.89] 1.40 [0.46, 4.25] 3.35 [0.13, 86.03]	Odds Ratio
total events         55         31           leterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 6.79, df = 12 (P = 0.87); l <sup>2</sup> = 0%         0.01         0.1         1         10         100           set for overall effect 7 = 115 (P = 0.25)         0.01         0.1         1         10         100	tudy or Subgroup bong2017 bao 2018 long 2021 iang 2018 iim 2017 i 2018 i 2020 i2020 i2021 lie 2018 bong2016 bun 2019 Vang 2020 Vang 2020 hang2018	Events 2 0 2 8 3 0 0 2 8 3 0 0 2 0 9 9 4 8 1 2	Total 30 102 351 66 57 28 61 72 103 53 281 72 26 26 26	Events 0 1 3 2 4 0 1 1 1 0 4 2 6 0 1	Total 30 101 347 33 57 29 61 71 102 52 276 73 28 26	1.3% 4.4% 8.8% 6.8% 11.1% 4.3% 2.9% 9.8% 5.8% 15.5% 1.3% 2.7%	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 5.35 [0.25, 116.31] 0.33 [0.01, 8.12] 0.66 [0.11, 3.96] 2.14 [0.43, 10.69] 0.74 [0.16, 3.45] Not estimable 0.33 [0.01, 8.21] 2.00 [0.18, 22.56] Not estimable 2.45 [0.71, 8.54] 1.98 [0.36, 10.89] 1.40 [0.46, 4.25] 3.35 [0.13, 86.03] 2.08 [0.18, 24.51]	Odds Ratio
Heterogeneity:         Chi <sup>2</sup> = 6.79, df = 12 (P = 0.87); i <sup>2</sup> = 0%         I <thi< th=""> <thi< th="">         I</thi<></thi<>	Audy or Subgroup Dong2017 Sao 2018 Iong 2021 iang 2018 Gim 2017 i 2018 i 2020 i 2020 i 2021 Jie 2018 Song2016 Sun 2019 Vang 2020 Ven2020 Chang2018 Chao2020	Events 2 0 2 8 3 0 0 2 8 3 0 0 2 0 9 9 4 8 1 2	Total 30 102 351 66 57 28 61 72 103 53 281 72 26 26 315	Events 0 1 3 2 4 0 1 1 1 0 4 2 6 0 1	Total 30 101 347 33 57 29 61 71 102 52 276 73 28 26 101	1.3% 4.4% 8.8% 6.8% 11.1% 4.3% 2.9% 9.8% 15.5% 1.3% 2.7% 25.3%	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 5.35 [0.25, 116.31] 0.33 [0.01, 8.12] 0.66 [0.11, 3.96] 2.14 [0.43, 10.69] 0.74 [0.16, 3.45] Not estimable 0.33 [0.01, 8.21] 2.00 [0.18, 22.56] Not estimable 2.45 [0.71, 8.54] 1.98 [0.36, 10.89] 1.40 [0.46, 4.25] 3.35 [0.13, 86.03] 2.08 [0.18, 24.51] 0.74 [0.28, 1.97]	Odds Ratio
ect for overall effect 7 = 1.15 (P = 0.25) U.U1 U.1 1 10 100	tudy or Subgroup ong2017 iao 2018 long 2021 iang 2018 im 2017 i 2018 i 2020 i2021 lie 2018 ong2016 ong2016 ong2016 vang 2020 ven2020 hang2018 hao2020 otal (95% CI)	Events 2 0 2 8 3 0 0 2 8 3 0 0 2 2 0 9 9 4 8 1 2 14	Total 30 102 351 66 57 28 61 72 103 53 281 72 26 26 315	Events 0 1 3 2 4 0 1 1 1 0 4 2 6 0 1 8	Total 30 101 347 33 57 29 61 71 102 52 276 73 28 26 101	1.3% 4.4% 8.8% 6.8% 11.1% 4.3% 2.9% 9.8% 15.5% 1.3% 2.7% 25.3%	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 5.35 [0.25, 116.31] 0.33 [0.01, 8.12] 0.66 [0.11, 3.96] 2.14 [0.43, 10.69] 0.74 [0.16, 3.45] Not estimable 0.33 [0.01, 8.21] 2.00 [0.18, 22.56] Not estimable 2.45 [0.71, 8.54] 1.98 [0.36, 10.89] 1.40 [0.46, 4.25] 3.35 [0.13, 86.03] 2.08 [0.18, 24.51] 0.74 [0.28, 1.97]	Odds Ratio
Control Overall electric 2 = 1.10 (F = 0.20)	tudy or Subgroup bong2017 iao 2018 long 2021 iang 2018 iim 2017 i 2018 i 2020 i2021 lie 2018 iong2016 iong2016 iong2016 ivang 2020 Vang 2020 Vang 2020 hang2018 ihao2020 otal (95% CI) iotal events	Events 2 0 2 8 3 0 0 2 8 3 0 0 0 2 0 9 4 8 1 2 1 4 55	Total 30 102 351 66 57 28 61 72 103 53 281 72 26 315 1643	Events 0 1 3 2 4 0 1 1 1 0 4 2 6 0 0 1 6 3 1	Total           30           101           347           33           57           29           61           71           102           57           29           61           71           102           52           276           73           28           101           1387	1.3% 4.4% 8.8% 6.8% 11.1% 4.3% 2.9% 9.8% 15.5% 1.3% 2.7% 25.3%	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 5.35 [0.25, 116.31] 0.33 [0.01, 8.12] 0.66 [0.11, 3.96] 2.14 [0.43, 10.69] 0.74 [0.16, 3.45] Not estimable 0.33 [0.01, 8.21] 2.00 [0.18, 22.56] Not estimable 2.45 [0.71, 8.54] 1.98 [0.36, 10.89] 1.40 [0.46, 4.25] 3.35 [0.13, 86.03] 2.08 [0.18, 24.51] 0.74 [0.28, 1.97]	Odds Ratio
Favours [experimental] Favours [control]	tudy or Subgroup           tong2017           tao 2018           tong 2021           tang 2018           tim 2017           t 2020           t2021           tim 2017           t 2020           t 2020           t 2018           tong2016           tun 2019           vang 2020           vang 2020           vang 2018           hao2020           total (95% CI)           otal events           leterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> =	Events 2 0 2 8 3 0 0 2 8 3 0 0 2 0 9 4 8 1 2 14 55 6.79, df =	Total         30           301         102           351         66           57         28           61         72           103         53           281         72           26         26           315         1643           12 (P =         12 (P =	Events 0 1 3 2 4 0 1 1 1 0 4 2 6 0 1 6 31 = 0.87);   <sup>2</sup>	Total           30           101           347           33           57           29           61           71           102           57           29           61           71           102           52           276           73           28           101           1387	1.3% 4.4% 8.8% 6.8% 11.1% 4.3% 2.9% 9.8% 15.5% 1.3% 2.7% 25.3%	<ul> <li>M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl</li> <li>5.35 [0.25, 116.31]</li> <li>0.33 [0.01, 8.12]</li> <li>0.66 [0.11, 3.96]</li> <li>2.14 [0.43, 10.69]</li> <li>0.74 [0.16, 3.45]</li> <li>Not estimable</li> <li>0.33 [0.01, 8.21]</li> <li>2.00 [0.18, 22.56]</li> <li>Not estimable</li> <li>2.45 [0.71, 8.54]</li> <li>1.98 [0.36, 10.89]</li> <li>1.40 [0.46, 4.25]</li> <li>3.35 [0.13, 86.03]</li> <li>2.08 [0.18, 24.51]</li> <li>0.74 [0.28, 1.97]</li> <li>1.30 [0.83, 2.04]</li> </ul>	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl

#### TABLE 3 The summary of the efficacy of DEX in PCIA.

	Dexmedetomidine versus control in PCIA												
	Effectiveness		Advers	Inflammatory levels									
Analgesic effects	Sedative effects	Patient satisfaction	Nausea vomiting Pruritus	Bradycardia	Hypotension	IL-6	TNF-α						
Ð	=	•	-	<b>(</b>	=	-	-						

Note: + means that DEX increased the effect vs. control group; = means that DEX has the same effect vs. control group; means DEX decreased the effect vs. control group. Abbreviations: PCIA, patient controlled intravenous analgesi.



enhances the inhibitory synaptic transmission in the dorsal horn of the spinal cord and relieves pain; at the level of the spinal cord, it binds to  $\alpha_2AR$  in the dorsal horn of the spinal cord, causing cell membrane superization, thereby inhibiting the upward conduction of pain signals; at the peripheral level, it inhibits Ad fibers and C fibers, preventing them from transmitting nociceptive information to the spinal cord (Grape et al., 2019; Bozorgi et al., 2021).

Our study found no statistical difference between DEX and analgesia alone in the RSS sedation score, which may be related to the lower dose of DEX for PCIA. Relevant studies have confirmed that surgery, anxiety, pain and other strong stimuli are associated with sympathetic nervous system excitation. DEX can activate the central locus coeruleus receptor, reduce sympathetic tone, and reduce the release of epinephrine and norepinephrine, resulting in a sedative effect (Qiu et al., 2016).

The total amount of analgesics supplemented in the DEX group 24 h after surgery was less than that in the control group, and the times of use of rescue analgesics in the DEX group was

also less than that in the control group. This indicates that the addition of DEX to PCIA exerts a better analgesic effect, and has a synergistic effect with analgesic drugs. Analgesics-related complications were significantly reduced, while patient satisfaction was improved in the DEX group, compared with PCIA with analgesics alone. These changes may be explained as follows: 1) patients receiving DEX for PCIA used lower doses of analgesic drug; 2) DEX reduces noradrenergic activity by activating presynaptic  $\alpha_2$  receptors in the locus coeruleus or reducing sympathetic outflow, which may cause postoperative nausea and vomiting (Choi et al., 2017).

IL-6 is a lymphokine produced by activated T cells and fibroblasts. It can make B cell precursors become antibodyproducing cells, cooperate with colony-stimulating factors, can promote the growth and differentiation of original bone marrowderived cells, and enhance the lysis function of natural killer cells (Tanaka et al., 2014; Tanaka et al., 2018). Th2 cells mainly secrete IL-4 and IL-6. DEX group reduced the release of IL-6, polarize Th2 cells to Th1 cells and relieve the suppression of cellular immunity caused by surgical stress. TNF- $\alpha$  is a substance that can cause hemorrhagic necrosis in various tumors appears in serum. It can kill or inhibit tumor cells, promote cell proliferation and differentiation, which is a key pro-inflammatory cytokine (Robinson et al., 2020). The DEX group reduces the release of TNF- $\alpha$ , thereby exerting an anti-inflammatory effect.

The ability of DEX to reduce plasma levels of TNF-α and IL-6 to reduce the inflammatory response has been demonstrated in several studies (Taniguchi et al., 2004; Qiao et al., 2009; Tasdogan et al., 2009). However, the immunosuppressive effect of DEX on patients is also noteworthy. Su et al. (2018) found that DEX induced proliferation of monocytic myeloid-derived suppressor cells (M-MDSC), a cell population with a strong pro-angiogenic capacity, in lung cancer patients after surgery, and that DEX expanded M-MDSC in mice and promoted tumour metastasis by increasing VEGF production. Smith et al. (2014) similarly focused on the suppressive effects of DEX on the immune system. Interestingly, Lee et al. (2021) used the immunosuppressive effect of DEX to mitigate allograft rejection and prolong graft survival in mice. However, overall, DEX immunosuppression-related articles are scarce, there is currently insufficient attention to its immunosuppressive effects, and more high-quality studies are needed in the future to assess the impact of the immunosuppressive effects of DEX on patient prognosis.

Hypotension and bradycardia were considered major concerns regarding the safety of adding DEX to postoperative intravenous PCA (Carollo et al., 2008), and therefore DEX should be used with caution in patients with severe bradycardia and hypotension. In addition, in patients with stroke or coronary artery disease, the hypotensive or bradycardic effect of DEX is strongly associated with prognosis (Sousa et al., 2021). When used at clinically recommended concentrations, DEX produces dose-dependent hypotension and bradycardia due to inhibition of sympathetic neurotransmission and a decrease in sympathetic tone, this effect may also be caused by baroreceptor reflexes and mediated by enhanced vagal activity (Ebert et al., 2000; Paris and Tonner, 2005; Frolich et al., 2011). In this study, the risk of bradycardia was higher in the DEX group than in the control group, but the risk of hypotension was not statistically different between the two groups, of course, none of the included patients did not require medical correction for the reduced heart rate. However, studies have shown that DEX can inhibit corticotropin-stimulated corticosterone release after prolonged or high-dose use (Maze et al., 1991), but the studies we included did not observe the effect of DEX in PCIA on this indicator, and more clinical studies are necessary to verify in the future. In addition, rebound hypertension and tachycardia after abrupt discontinuation of DEX, changes in tolerability, and

the possibility of discontinuation syndrome are also of concern (Feng et al., 2019).

In the past, there were two meta-analyses on the effectiveness and safety of DEX for PCAI. Chen et al. (2020) found that DEX combined with tramadol for PCIA was better than tramadol alone in terms of analgesic effect and safety. Peng et al. (2017) found that DEX was an effective adjuvant to opioid PCIA, which could reduce postoperative pain, opioid demand and opioid related adverse events of patients. Apart from the tramadol and pure opioid agonists (Morphine, Sufentanil, Fentanyl, Oxycodone), our meta-analysis also included studies of butorphanol and ketorolac for PCIA. And our meta-analysis included the largest number of studies (28) of DEX for PCIA to date. In addition, our meta focused on the effect of DEX in PCIA on the postoperative inflammatory response of patients, the area that has not been the focus of previous meta-analyses. Thus, our meta-analysis provides a comprehensive assessment of the efficacy and safety of DEX in PCIA, providing a reference for the clinical application of DEX in PCIA.

There are several limitations in our meta-analysis. First, we may have missed some studies that met the inclusion criteria and had to exclude some studies because the full text was not available. Second, this meta-analysis included several different types of analgesic drugs (morphine, sufentanil, fentanyl, oxycodone, tramadol, etc.) that may affect pain relief outcomes and adverse events. Third, some of our results have large heterogeneity, which may lead to biased results and requires further study. The reasons for the high heterogeneity may be related to different analgesic drugs used in PCIA, different doses of DEX, and different PCIA parameter settings. Finally, for the larger heterogeneity results, although we tried subgroup analysis and sensitivity analysis, we were still unable to reduce their heterogeneity.

# Conclusion

Compared with analgesics or placebo alone, DEX combined with postoperative PCIA can achieve better analgesia and patient satisfaction, while reducing analgesics consumption and the occurrence of analgesics-related adverse events.

# Data availability statement

The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article/Supplementary Material, further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding authors.

# Author contributions

RC and SS designed the study and conducted the data analysis. YL checked the final data. XD and MD screened the articles. RC drafted the manuscript and performed data interpretation. YW and YL revised the manuscript. All authors significantly contributed to the paper and read and approved the final manuscript.

## Funding

This work was supported by the Wu Jieping Medical Foundation (No. 320.6750.2020-21-12).

## References

Abrolat, M., Eberhart, L. H. J., Kalmus, G., Koch, T., and Nardi-Hiebl, S. (2018). Patient-controlled analgesia (PCA): An overview about methods, handling and new modalities. *Anasthesiol. Intensivmed. Notfallmed. Schmerzther.* 53 (4), 270–280. doi:10.1055/s-0043-104665

Bozorgi, H., Zamani, M., Motaghi, E., and Eslami, M. (2021). Dexmedetomidine as an analgesic agent with neuroprotective properties: Experimental and clinical aspects. *J. Pain Palliat. Care Pharmacother.* 35 (3), 215–225. doi:10.1080/15360288. 2021.1914280

Carollo, D. S., Nossaman, B. D., and Ramadhyani, U. (2008). Dexmedetomidine: A review of clinical applications. *Curr. Opin. Anaesthesiol.* 21 (4), 457–461. doi:10. 1097/ACO.0b013e328305e3ef

Chen, P., Chen, F., Lei, J., and Zhou, B. (2020). Efficacy and safety of dexmedetomidine combined with tramadol for patient-controlled intravenous analgesia in Chinese surgical patients: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Med. Baltim.* 99 (3), e18825. doi:10.1097/MD.000000000018825

Chen, Z., Tang, R., Zhang, R., Jiang, Y., and Liu, Y. (2017). Effects of dexmedetomidine administered for postoperative analgesia on sleep quality in patients undergoing abdominal hysterectomy. *J. Clin. Anesth.* 36, 118–122. doi:10. 1016/j.jclinane.2016.10.022

Choi, E. K., Seo, Y., Lim, D. G., and Park, S. (2017). Postoperative nausea and vomiting after thyroidectomy: A comparison between dexmedetomidine and remifentanil as part of balanced anesthesia. *Korean J. Anesthesiol.* 70, 299–304. doi:10.4097/kjae.2017.70.3.299

Dong, C. S., Lu, Y., Zhang, J., Sun, P., Yu, J. M., Wu, C., et al. (2016). The optimal dose of dexmedetomidine added to an sufentanil-based analgesic regimen for postoperative pain control in spine surgery: A probit analysis study. *Medicine* 95 (39), e4776. doi:10.1097/MD.0000000004776

Dong, C. S., Zhang, J., Lu, Q., Sun, P., Yu, J. M., Wu, C., et al. (2017). Effect of Dexmedetomidine combined with sufentanil for post- thoracotomy intravenous analgesia: a randomized, controlled clinical study. *BMC Anesthesiol.* 17 (1), 33. doi:10.1186/s12871-017-0324-4

Ebert, T. J., Hall, J. E., Barney, J. A., Uhrich, T. D., and Colinco, M. D. (2000). The effects of increasing plasma concentrations of Dexmedetomidine in humans. *Anesthesiology* 93 (2), 382–394. doi:10.1097/0000542-200008000-00016

Feng, M., Chen, X., Liu, T., Zhang, C., Wan, L., and Yao, W. (2019). Dexmedetomidine and sufentanil combination versus sufentanil alone for postoperative intravenous patient-controlled analgesia: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *BMC Anesthesiol.* 19 (1), 81. doi:10. 1186/s12871-019-0756-0

Frolich, M. A., Arabshahi, A., Katholi, C., Prasain, J., and Barnes, S. (2011). Hemodynamic characteristics of midazolam, propofol, and dexmedetomidine in healthy volunteers. *J. Clin. Anesth.* 23 (3), 218–223. doi:10.1016/j.jclinane.2010. 09.006

Gao, Y., Deng, X., Yuan, H., Leng, Y., Zhang, T., Xu, X., et al. (2018). Patientcontrolled intravenous analgesia with combination of dexmedetomidine and sufentanil on patients after abdominal operation: A prospective, randomized, controlled, blinded, multicenter clinical study. *Clin. J. Pain* 34 (2), 155–161. doi:10.1097/AJP.00000000000527

# Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

# Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

Grape, S., Kirkham, K. R., Frauenknecht, J., and Albrecht, E. (2019). Intra-operative analgesia with remifentanil vs. dexmedetomidine: A systematic review and meta-analysis with trial sequential analysis. *Anaesthesia* 74 (6), 793–800. doi:10.1111/anae.14657

Hadi, M. A., Kamaruljan, H. S., Saedah, A., and Abdullah, N. M. (2006). A comparative study of intravenous patient-controlled analgesia morphine and tramadol in patients undergoing major operation. *Med. J. Malays.* 61, 570–576.

Hall, J. E., Uhrich, T. D., Barney, J. A., Arain, S. R., and Ebert, T. J. (2000). Sedative, amnestic, and analgesic properties of small-dose dexmedetomidine infusions. *Anesth. Analg.* 90 (3), 699–705. doi:10.1097/0000539-200003000-00035

Hong, H., Zhang, D. Z., Li, M., Wang, G., Zhu, S. N., Zhang, Y., et al. (2021). Impact of dexmedetomidine supplemented analgesia on delirium in patients recovering from orthopedic surgery: A randomized controlled trial. *BMC Anesthesiol.* 21 (1), 223. doi:10.1186/s12871-021-01441-3

Jeffrey, A. G. (2005). Patient-controlled analgesia. Anesth. Analg. 101 (5), S44–S61. doi:10.1213/01.ANE.0000177102.11682.20

Jiang, Z., Zhou, G., Song, Q., Bao, C., Wang, H., and Chen, Z. (2018). Effect of intravenous oxycodone in combination with different doses of dexmedetomdine on sleep quality and visceral pain in patients after abdominal surgery: A randomized study. *Clin. J. Pain* 34 (12), 1126–1132. doi:10.1097/AJP.00000000000645

Kim, N. Y., Kwon, T. D., Bai, S. J., Noh, S. H., Hong, J. H., Lee, H., et al. (2017). Effects of dexmedetomidine in combination with fentanyl-based intravenous patient-controlled analgesia on pain attenuation after open gastrectomy in comparison with conventional thoracic epidural and fentanyl-based intravenous patient-controlled analgesia. *Int. J. Med. Sci.* 14 (10), 951–960. doi:10.7150/ijms.20347

Lee, C. F., Cheng, C. H., Hung, H. C., Lee, J. C., Wang, Y. C., Wu, T. H., et al. (2021). Sedative and immunosuppressive effects of dexmedetomidine in transplantation. *Pharm. (Basel)* 14 (8), 825. doi:10.3390/ph14080825

Lei, P. F., Wang, J., Gao, S., Du, B., Wang, H., Li, W. C., et al. (2020). Impact of post-thoracotomy analgesia with dexmedetomidine and morphine on immunocytes: a randomized clinical trial. *Braz. J. Anesthesiol.* 70 (2), 153–158. doi:10.1016/j.bjan.2019.12.017

Li, H. J., Li, C. J., Wei, X. N., Hu, J., Mu, D. L., and Wang, D. X. (2018). Dexmedetomidine in combination with morphine improves postoperative analgesia and sleep quality in elderly patients after open abdominal surgery: A pilot randomized control trial. *PLoS One* 13 (8), e0202008. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0202008

Li, H. J., Liu, S., Geng, Z. Y., and Li, X. Y. (2020). Adding dexmedetomidine to morphine-based analgesia reduces early postoperative nausea in patients undergoing gynecological laparoscopic surgery: A randomized controlled trial. *BMC Anesthesiol.* 20 (1), 11. doi:10.1186/s12871-019-0928-y

Li, Q., Yao, H., Xu, M., and Wu, J. (2021). Dexmedetomidine combined with sufentanil and dezocine-based patient-controlled intravenous analgesia increases female patients' global satisfaction degree after thoracoscopic surgery. *J. Cardiothorac. Surg.* 16 (1), 102. doi:10.1186/s13019-021-01472-4

Lin, T. F., Yeh, Y. C., Lin, F. S., Wang, Y. P., Lin, C. J., Sun, W. Z., et al. (2009). Effect of combining dexmedetomidine and morphine for intravenous patient-controlled analgesia. *Br. J. Anaesth.* 102 (1), 117–122. doi:10.1093/bja/aen320

Liu, S., Peng, P., Hu, Y., Liu, C., Cao, X., Yang, C., et al. (2021). The effectiveness and safety of intravenous dexmedetomidine of different concentrations combined with butorphanol for post-caesarean section analgesia: A randomized controlled trial. *Drug Des. devel. Ther.* 15, 689–698. doi:10.2147/DDDT.S287512

Lu, J., Chen, G., Zhou, H., Zhou, Q., Zhu, Z., and Wu, C. (2017). Effect of parecoxib sodium pretreatment combined with dexmedetomidine on early postoperative cognitive dysfunction in elderly patients after shoulder arthroscopy: A randomized double blinded controlled trial. *J. Clin. Anesth.* 41, 30–34. doi:10.1016/j.jclinane.2017.06.004

Maze, M., Virtanen, R., Daunt, D., Banks, S. J., Stover, E. P., and Feldman, D. (1991). Effects of dexmedetomidine, a novel imidazole sedative-anesthetic agent, on adrenal steroidogenesis : *In vivo* and *in vitro* studies. *Anesth. Analg.* 73 (2), 204–208. doi:10.1213/00000539-199108000-00015

Miao, Z., Wu, P., Wang, J., Zhou, F. C., Lin, Y., Lu, X. Y., et al. (2020). Whole-Course Application of Dexmedetomidine Combined with Ketorolac in Nonnarcotic Postoperative Analgesia for Patients with Lung Cancer Undergoing Thoracoscopic Surgery: A Randomized Control Trial. *Pain. Physician.* 23 (2), E185–E193.

Motamed, C. (2022). Clinical update on patient-controlled analgesia for acute postoperative pain. *Pharm. (Basel)* 10 (1), 22. doi:10.3390/pharmacy10010022

Nie, Y., Liu, Y., Luo, Q., and Huang, S. (2014). Effect of dexmedetomidine combined with sufentanil for post-caesarean section intravenous analgesia: A randomised, placebo-controlled study. *Eur. J. Anaesthesiol.* 31 (4), 197–203. doi:10.1097/EJA.00000000000011

Nie, Y., Tu, W., Shen, X., Yu, W., Yu, Y., Song, X., et al. (2018). Dexmedetomidine added to sufentanil patient-controlled intravenous analgesia relieves the postoperative pain after cesarean delivery: A prospective randomized controlled multicenter study. *Sci. Rep.* 8 (1), 9952. doi:10.1038/s41598-018-27619-3

Pamela, P. P., and Ronald, D. M. (2010). Current and developing methods of patientcontrolled analgesia. *Anesthesiol. Clin.* 28 (4), 587–599. doi:10.1016/j.anclin.2010.08.010

Paris, A., and Tonner, P. H. (2005). Dexmedetomidine in anaesthesia. *Curr. Opin. Anaesthesiol.* 18 (4), 412–418. doi:10.1097/01.aco.0000174958.05383.d5

Peng, K., Zhang, J., Meng, X. W., Liu, H. Y., and Ji, F. H. (2017). Optimization of postoperative intravenous patient-controlled analgesia with opioiddexmedetomidine combinations: An updated meta-analysis with trial sequential analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Pain Physician* 20 (7), 569–595. doi:10. 36076/ppj/2017.7.569

Qiao, H., Sanders, R. D., Ma, D., Wu, X., and Maze, M. (2009). Sedation improves early outcome in severely septic Sprague Dawley rats. *Crit. Care* 13 (4), R136. doi:10. 1186/cc8012

Qin, M. J., Chen, K. Z., Liu, T. J., and Shen, X. (2017). Dexmedetomidine in combination with sufentanil for postoperative analgesia after partial laryngectomy. *BMC. Anesthesiol.* 17 (1), 66. doi:10.1186/s12871-017-0363-x

Qiu, P., Xiao, J., Wang, K., Gong, S., Yong, Y. E., Xu, J. Q., et al. (2016). The effects of analgesic and sedative on the heart rate variability and plasma catecholamine in patients after severe brain injury. *J. Of. Fujian. Med. Univ.* 50 (1), 31–37.

Ren, C., Chi, M., Zhang, Y., Zhang, Z., Qi, F., and Liu, Z. (2015). Dexmedetomidine in postoperative analgesia in patients undergoing hysterectomy: A CONSORT-prospective, randomized, controlled trial. *Med. Baltim.* 94 (32), e1348. doi:10.1097/MD.00000000001348

Robinson, P. C., Liew, D. F. L., Liew, J. W., Monaco, C., Richards, D., Shivakumar, S., et al. (2020). The potential for repurposing anti-TNF as a therapy for the treatment of COVID-19. *Med* 1 (1), 90–102. doi:10.1016/j.medj.2020.11.005

Smith, M. A., Hibino, M., Falcione, B. A., Eichinger, K. M., Patel, R., and Empey, K. M. (2014). Immunosuppressive aspects of analgesics and sedatives used in mechanically ventilated patients: An underappreciated risk factor for the development of ventilator-associated pneumonia in critically ill patients. *Ann. Pharmacother.* 48 (1), 77–85. doi:10.1177/1060028013510698

Song, J., Wei, N., Zhang, J., and Wang, G. (2019). Effect of dexmedetomidine combined with oxycodone patient-controlled intravenous analgesia on the levels of inflammatory cytokine in patients with rectal cancer. *Pak. J. Pharm. Sci.* 32 (3), 1381–1385.

Song, J. W., Shim, J. K., Song, Y., Yang, S. Y., Park, S. J., and Kwak, Y. L. (2013). Effect of ketamine as an adjunct to intravenous patient-controlled analgesia, in patients at high risk of postoperative nausea and vomiting undergoing lumbar spinal surgery. *Br. J. Anaesth.* 111 (4), 630–635. doi:10.1093/bja/aet192

Sui, X., Wang, Y., Jin, M. X., Li, K., Jiang, G., Song, A. L., et al. (2022). The effects of dexmedetomidine for patient-controlled analgesia on postoperative sleep quality and gastrointestinal motility function after surgery: A prospective, randomized, double-blind, and controlled trial. *Front. Pharmacol.* 13, 990358. doi:10.3389/fphar. 2022.990358

Sousa, G. C., Fernandes, M. V., Cruz, F. F., Antunes, M. A., da, Silva. C. M., Takyia, C., et al. (2021). Comparative effects of dexmedetomidine and propofol on brain and lung damage in experimental acute ischemic stroke. *Sci. Rep.* 11 (1), 23133. doi:10.1038/s41598-021-02608-1

Su, X., Fan, Y., Yang, L., Huang, J., Qiao, F., Fang, Y., et al. (2018). Dexmedetomidine expands monocytic myeloid-derived suppressor cells and promotes tumour metastasis after lung cancer surgery. *J. Transl. Med.* 16 (1), 347. doi:10.1186/s12967-018-1727-9

Sun, Y., Jiang, M., Ji, Y., Sun, Y., Liu, Y., and Shen, W. (2019). Impact of postoperative dexmedetomidine infusion on incidence of delirium in elderly patients undergoing major elective noncardiac surgery: A randomized clinical trial. *Drug Des. devel. Ther.* 13, 2911–2922. doi:10.2147/DDDT.S208703

Tanaka, T., Narazaki, M., and Kishimoto, T. (2014). IL-6 in inflammation, immunity, and disease. *Cold Spring Harb. Perspect. Biol.* 6 (10), a016295. doi:10. 1101/cshperspect.a016295

Tanaka, T., Narazaki, M., and Kishimoto, T. (2018). Interleukin (IL-6) immunotherapy. *Cold Spring Harb. Perspect. Biol.* 10 (8), a028456. doi:10.1101/ cshperspect.a028456

Tang, C., Hu, Y., Zhang, Z., Wei, Z., Wang, H., Geng, Q., et al. (2020). Dexmedetomidine with sufentanil in intravenous patient-controlled analgesia for relief from postoperative pain, inflammation and delirium after esophageal cancer surgery. *Biosci. Rep.* 40 (5), BSR20193410. doi:10.1042/BSR20193410

Taniguchi, T., Kidani, Y., Kanakura, H., Takemoto, Y., and Yamamoto, K. (2004). Effects of dexmedetomidine on mortality rate and inflammatory responses to endotoxin-induced shock in rats. *Crit. Care Med.* 32 (6), 1322–1326. doi:10. 1097/01.ccm.0000128579.84228.2a

Tasdogan, M., Memis, D., Sut, N., and Yuksel, M. (2009). Results of a pilot study on the effects of propofol and dexmedetomidine on inflammatory responses and intraabdominal pressure in severe sepsis. *J. Clin. Anesth.* 21 (6), 394–400. doi:10. 1016/j.jclinane.2008.10.010

Tsaousi, G. G., Pourzitaki, C., Aloisio, S., and Bilotta, F. (2018). Dexmedetomidine as a sedative and analgesic adjuvant in spine surgery: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Eur. J. Clin. Pharmacol.* 74 (11), 1377–1389. doi:10.1007/s00228-018-2520-7

Wang, J., Cui, L., Fan, L., and Wang, J. (2021). Clinical effect of different drugs and infusion techniques for patient-controlled analgesia after spinal tumor surgery: A prospective, randomized, controlled clinical trial. *Clin. Ther.* 43 (6), 1020–1028. doi:10.1016/j.clinthera.2021.03.019

Wang, X., Liu, N., Chen, J., Xu, Z., Wang, F., and Ding, C. (2018). Effect of intravenous dexmedetomidine during general anesthesia on acute postoperative pain in Adults: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Clin. J. Pain* 34 (12), 1180–1191. doi:10.1097/AJP.00000000000630

Wang, X., Liu, W., Xu, Z., Wang, F., Zhang, C., Wang, B., et al. (2016a). Effect of dexmedetomidine alone for intravenous patient-controlled analgesia after gynecological laparoscopic surgery: A consort-prospective, randomized, controlled trial. *Medicine* 95 (19), e3639. doi:10.1097/MD.00000000003639

Wang, X., Wang, K., Wang, B., Jiang, T., Xu, Z., Wang, F., et al. (2016b). Effect of oxycodone combined with dexmedetomidine for intravenous patient-controlled analgesia after video-assisted thoracoscopic lobectomy. *J. Cardiothorac. Vasc. Anesth.* 30 (4), 1015–1021. doi:10.1053/j.jvca.2016.03.127

Wang, Y., Fang, X., Liu, C., Ma, X., Song, Y., and Yan, M. (2020). Impact of intraoperative infusion and postoperative PCIA of dexmedetomidine on early breastfeeding after elective cesarean section: A randomized double-blind controlled trial. *Drug Des. devel. Ther.* 14, 1083–1093. doi:10.2147/DDDT.S241153

Wang, Y., Lei, Y., Gu, Y., Kong, X., Bian, Z., and Ji, F. (2021). Effect of dexmedetomidine on CD4+ T cells and programmed cell death protein-1 in postoperative analgesia: A prospective, randomized, controlled study. *Minerva Anestesiol.* 87 (4), 423–431. doi:10.23736/S0375-9393.20.14581-4

Xin, J., Zhang, Y. B., Zhou, L., Liu, F., Zhou, X. S., Liu, B., et al. (2017). Effect of dexmedetomidine infusion for intravenous patient-controlled analgesia on the quality of recovery after laparotomy surgery. *Oncotarget.* 8 (59), 100371–100383. doi:10.18632/oncotarget.22232

Yu, H. Y., Wang, S. Y., Quan, C. X., Fang, C., Luo, S. C., Li, D. Y., et al. (2019). Dexmedetomidine alleviates postpartum depressive symptoms following cesarean section in Chinese women: A randomized placebo-controlled study. *Pharmacotherapy* 39 (10), 994–1004. doi:10.1002/phar.2320

Zhang, B., Wang, G., Liu, X., Wang, T. L., and Chi, P. (2018). The opioid-sparing effect of perioperative dexmedetomidine combined with oxycodone infusion during open hepatectomy: A randomized controlled trial. *Front. Pharmacol.* 8, 940. doi:10. 3389/fphar.2017.00940

Zhao, W. S., Hu, Y. A., Chen, H., Wang, X. F., Wang, L. P., Wang, Y., et al. (2020). The effect and optimal Dosage of Dexmedetomidine Plus Sufentanil for Postoperative Analgesia in Elderly Patients With Postoperative Delirium and Early Postoperative Cognitive Dysfunction: A single-center, Prospective, Randomized, Double-Blind, Controlled Trial. *Front. Neurosci.* 14, 549516. doi:10.3389/fnins.2020.549516