

1-2013

Efficacy of maropitant in preventing vomiting in dogs premedicated with hydromorphone

Bonnie L. Hay Kraus
Iowa State University, bhkraus@iastate.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/vcs_pubs

 Part of the [Small or Companion Animal Medicine Commons](#), and the [Veterinary Toxicology and Pharmacology Commons](#)

The complete bibliographic information for this item can be found at https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/vcs_pubs/29. For information on how to cite this item, please visit <http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/howtocite.html>.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Veterinary Clinical Sciences at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Veterinary Clinical Sciences Publications by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact digirep@iastate.edu.

Efficacy of maropitant in preventing vomiting in dogs premedicated with hydromorphone

Abstract

Objective The goal of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of maropitant (Cerenia®) in preventing vomiting after premedication with hydromorphone.

Study design Randomized, blinded, prospective clinical study.

Animals Eighteen dogs ASA I/II admitted for elective orthopedic surgical procedures. The dogs were a mixed population of males and females, purebreds and mixed breeds, 1.0–10.2 years of age, weighing 3–49.5 kg.

Methods Dogs were admitted to the study if they were greater than 1 year of age, healthy and scheduled to undergo elective orthopedic surgery. Dogs were randomly selected to receive one of two treatments administered by subcutaneous injection. Group M received 1.0 mg kg⁻¹ of maropitant, Group S received 0.1 mL kg⁻¹ of saline 1 hour prior to anesthesia premedication. Dogs were premedicated with 0.1 mg kg⁻¹ of hydromorphone intramuscularly. A blinded observer documented the presence of vomiting, retching and/or signs of nausea for 30 minutes after premedication.

Results All dogs in S vomited (6/9), retched (1/9) or displayed signs of nausea (2/9). None (0/9) of the dogs in M vomited, retched or displayed signs of nausea. Dogs in M had significantly fewer incidences of vomiting ($p=0.0090$), vomiting and retching ($p=0.0023$) and vomiting, retching and nausea ($p<0.0001$) when compared to S.

Conclusion and clinical relevance Maropitant prevents vomiting, retching and nausea associated with intramuscular hydromorphone administration in dogs.

Keywords

dogs, hydromorphone, maropitant, vomiting

Disciplines

Small or Companion Animal Medicine | Veterinary Toxicology and Pharmacology

Comments

This is the peer-reviewed version of the following article: Kraus, Bonnie L. Hay. "Efficacy of maropitant in preventing vomiting in dogs premedicated with hydromorphone." *Veterinary Anaesthesia and Analgesia* 40, no. 1 (2013): 28-34, which has been published in final form at DOI: [10.1111/j.1467-2995.2012.00788.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-2995.2012.00788.x). This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving. Posted with permission.

Creative Commons License



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-No Derivative Works 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

RESEARCH PAPER

Efficacy of maropitant in preventing vomiting in dogs premedicated with hydromorphone

Bonnie L. Hay Kraus

Department of Clinical Sciences, College of Veterinary Medicine, Iowa State University, Ames, IA, USA

Correspondence: Bonnie L. Hay Kraus, Iowa State University-College of Veterinary Medicine, 1600 South 16th Street, Ames, IA 50011-1250, USA. E-mail: bhkraus@iastate.edu

Abstract

Objective The goal of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of maropitant (Cerenia) in preventing vomiting after pre-medication with hydromorphone.

Study design Randomized, blinded, prospective clinical study.

Animals Eighteen dogs ASA I/II admitted for elective orthopedic surgical procedures. The dogs were a mixed population of males and females, purebreds and mixed breeds, 1.0–10.2 years of age, weighing 3–49.5 kg.

Methods Dogs were admitted to the study if they were greater than 1 year of age, healthy and scheduled to undergo elective orthopedic surgery. Dogs were randomly selected to receive one of two treatments administered by subcutaneous injection. Group M received 1.0 mg kg⁻¹ of maropitant, Group S received 0.1 mL kg⁻¹ of saline 1 hour prior to anesthesia premedication. Dogs were premedicated with 0.1 mg kg⁻¹ of hydromorphone intramuscularly. A blinded observer documented the presence of vomiting, retching and/or signs of nausea for 30 minutes after premedication.

Results All dogs in S vomited (6/9), retched (1/9) or displayed signs of nausea (2/9). None (0/9) of the dogs in M vomited, retched or displayed signs of nausea. Dogs in M had significantly fewer incidences of vomiting ($p = 0.0090$), vomiting and retching ($p = 0.0023$) and vomiting, retching and nausea ($p < 0.0001$) when compared to S.

Conclusion and clinical relevance Maropitant prevents vomiting, retching and nausea associated with intramuscular hydromorphone administration in dogs.

Keywords dogs, hydromorphone, maropitant, vomiting.

Introduction

Opioids are commonly used for chemical restraint and as preanesthetic medications in veterinary medicine. Full mu-agonists offer dose dependent sedation and analgesia and are used to treat moderate to severe pain. They may also be used as induction agents and as intra- and post-operative analgesics in veterinary patients. Adverse side effects may include respiratory depression, bradycardia, behavioral changes including sedation, dysphoria or excitement, urine retention and decreased urine production and gastrointestinal effects including salivation, nausea, vomiting and defecation (Wilson 1992; Branson & Gross 2001; Lamont & Mathews 2007).

Hydromorphone is approximately five to seven times more potent than morphine, exhibits similar efficacy, and at equianalgesic doses, produces a similar adverse effect profile as morphine (Mahler & Forrest 1975; Coda et al. 1997). However, neither hydromorphone nor oxymorphone were found to increase plasma histamine concentrations after intra-venous administration (Smith et al. 2001) as is seen with morphine (Doenicke et al. 1995). Oxymorphone also causes less vomiting than either morphine or hydromorphone in dogs (Valverde

1 et al. 2004) however, it is significantly more
2 expensive (Pettifer & Dyson 2000). The ability to
3 give hydromorphone intravenously (IV), without
4 the risk of histamine release, and the decreased cost,
5 contribute to its widespread use as an analgesic
6 drug in veterinary medicine.

7 The incidence of vomiting in dogs given opioids as
8 anesthetic pre-medications is 50–75% with mor-
9 phine (Valverde et al. 2004; Wilson et al. 2007),
10 44–100% with hydromorphone (Valverde et al.
11 2004; KuKanich et al. 2008) and 33% with
12 oxymorphone (Valverde et al. 2004). The incidence
13 of vomiting is affected by the specific drug and its
14 lipid solubility profile, the dose and route of admin-
15 istration and concomitant drug administration.
16 Decreasing incidence of vomiting is observed with
17 higher opioid doses, higher lipid solubility and prior
18 administration of acepromazine (Blancquaert et al.
19 1986; Hersom & Mackenzie 1987; Gross 2001;
20 Valverde et al. 2004; KuKanich et al. 2008).

21 Vomiting and regurgitation, especially when asso-
22 ciated with anesthesia have been documented as risk
23 factors for development of aspiration pneumonia
24 (Fransson et al. 2001; Alwood et al. 2006; Tart et al.
25 2010). Additional risk factors for aspiration include
26 underlying esophageal, laryngeal and neurological
27 disease, prolonged anesthesia, cervical disc lesions
28 and the use of hydromorphone as an intra-operative
29 analgesic; all of which can be commonly encountered
30 in clinical anesthesia practice (Fransson et al. 2001;
31 Alwood et al. 2006; Kogan et al. 2008; Tart et al.
32 2010). In addition, vomiting may be particularly
33 undesirable in certain cases such as penetrating eye
34 wounds, intra-ocular surgery and patients with head
35 trauma or a brain tumor where increasing intraoc-
36 ular or intracranial pressure caused by vomiting may
37 lead to increased patient morbidity (Cunningham &
38 Barry 1986; Yusufu 2002; Slettedal & Bragad 2005;
39 Eberhart et al. 2007).

40 Maropitant (Cerenia, Pfizer, NY, USA) is a neu-
41 rokinin-1 receptor (NK1) antagonist that has been
42 approved to prevent and treat vomiting in dogs. It
43 has been shown to be highly effective in preventing
44 vomiting secondary to a broad spectrum of emetic
45 stimuli including cisplatin, apomorphine, copper
46 sulfate, motion sickness and a wide range of clinical
47 causes of vomiting (Benchaoui et al. 2007; De La
48 Puente-Rendondo et al. 2007a,b; Vail et al. 2007;
49 Conder et al. 2008; Ramsey et al. 2008). The goal
50 of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of
51 maropitant in preventing vomiting after pre-medi-
52 cation with hydromorphone.

Materials and methods

Study population

This study was approved by the Iowa State Uni-
versity Institutional Animal Care and Use Commit-
tee. Dogs presented to the Lloyd Veterinary Medical
Center at Iowa State University College of Veteri-
nary Medicine for elective orthopedic surgery were
included in the study. The owners' gave consent for
each animal to be included in the study. The study
population included 18 dogs, classified as ASA sta-
tus 1 or 2 based on complete physical examination
and normal routine blood chemistry and complete
blood count. There were 13 spayed females, 4 cas-
trated males and one intact male, aged 1–
11.2 years and weighing 3.0–49.5 kg. Ten different
breeds of dog were represented in the study
including two mixed breed dogs, four Labrador
Retrievers, four Golden Retrievers, and single rep-
resentatives of Boxer, Mastiff, Pomeranian, Brussels
Griffon, Newfoundland, Blue Heeler, German Shep-
herd, Miniature Pinscher.

Study protocol

On entry into the study, dogs were randomly
assigned to receive one of two treatments prior to
preanesthetic medication. Group M received 1.0 mg
kg⁻¹ (0.1 mL kg⁻¹) of maropitant and Group S
received saline 0.1 mL kg⁻¹ subcutaneously 1 hour
prior to anesthesia premedication. The dose of saline
was selected to parallel the volume of maropitant
needed to deliver a 1.0 mg kg⁻¹ dose. All subcuta-
neous injections were administered in the loose skin
on the midline between the scapulae to allow
monitoring of subsequent injection reaction at the
site. Dogs were premedicated with 0.1 mg kg⁻¹ of
hydromorphone intra-muscularly in the lumbar
epaxial muscles. A trained observer blinded to
treatment group documented the emetic events and
the presence of signs of nausea for each dog for
30 minutes after premedication. Vomiting was
defined by expulsion of stomach contents from the
mouth. Retching was defined as forceful contraction
of abdominal muscles without expulsion of stomach
contents from the mouth. Signs interpreted as
nausea included salivation, increased frequency of
or exaggerated swallowing motions and licking of
lips. Each discrete emetic event was recorded. All
dogs were evaluated the following day for pain and
swelling at the injection site.

Statistical analysis

The primary variable used in the analysis of efficacy was whether the dog experienced one or more vomiting episodes. A two-tailed Fisher exact test was performed between the treatment and control group. The Fisher exact test was repeated with the inclusion of retching and nausea in addition to vomiting. Statistical significance was assessed at $p \leq 0.05$. A *t*-test was used to detect incidental differences that may have occurred between the groups for age and weight. A Fisher exact test was run for the incidence of vomiting in the saline group between males and females.

Results

There was no significant difference in age or weight between dogs in Group M and S

Six of nine dogs (6/9, 66%) that received saline vomited at least once after hydromorphone (Table 1). Three dogs (3/9, 33%) vomited only once and three dogs (3/9, 33%) vomited more than once after hydromorphone. One dog (1/9, 11%) in the saline group retched but did not vomit. Two dogs (2/9, 22%) exhibited signs of nausea including profuse salivation and lip licking but did not vomit or retch. Therefore, all dogs in the saline group vomited, retched or displayed signs of nausea. There was no significant difference in the incidence of vomiting between males and females in the saline group.

None (0/9) of the dogs that received maropitant vomited, retched or displayed signs of nausea. Dogs receiving maropitant had significantly fewer incidences of vomiting ($p = 0.0090$), vomiting and retching ($p = 0.0023$) and vomiting, retching and nausea ($p < 0.0001$) when compared to saline.

Table 1 Age, weight and sex distribution of dogs receiving maropitant (Group M) and saline (Group S)

| Group | Age (years)*† | Weight (kg)*‡ | Sex | |
|-------|---------------|---------------|------|--------|
| | | | Male | Female |
| M | 5.98 ± 2.75 | 31.7 ± 14.0 | 2 | 7 |
| S | 5.35 ± 2.75 | 27.0 ± 16.5 | 3 | 6 |

*Values expressed as mean ± SD; † $p = 0.6317$; ‡ $p = 0.5249$

In Group M, one dog exhibited pain on injection of maropitant. On the day following surgery, there was no evidence of pain or swelling at the injection site in dogs receiving either saline or maropitant as evidenced by observation and palpation.

Discussion

Vomiting involves three stages: nausea, retching and vomiting (Andrews 1992; Twedt 2000). Nausea is a sensation that precedes vomiting and may or may not lead to vomiting. Signs of nausea in animals may include depression, salivation, licking of lips and increased swallowing. Next, there are retrograde contractions of the proximal small intestine and pylorus and relaxation of the fundus (Twedt 2000; Elwood et al. 2010). Retching is the second phase and consists of forceful contractions of the expiratory intercostal muscles, diaphragm and abdominal muscles with elevation of the larynx and closure of the glottis (Andrews et al. 1990; Elwood et al. 2010). Decreased tone in the cervical esophagus, pharyngeal and lower esophageal sphincter, production of negative intra-thoracic and positive intra-abdominal pressures and contraction of the pylorus and antrum of the stomach, are associated with the movement of gastric contents into the esophagus (Andrews & Hawthorne 1988; Twedt 2000; Elwood et al. 2010). Vomiting occurs when gastric contents are expelled from the mouth. Respiration is inhibited and the nasopharynx and glottis close as the vomit passes through the pharyngeal cavity to prevent aspiration (Twedt 2000; Elwood et al. 2010).

Central neurologic control of vomiting involves a complex set of activities. There are two anatomically and functionally separate units: the vomiting or emetic center which consists of the nucleus tractus solitarius (NTS) and the dorsal motor nucleus of the vagus which are located in the medulla oblongata (Elwood et al. 2010) and the chemoreceptor trigger zone (CTZ) which has been identified as the area postrema and is located on the dorsal surface of the medulla oblongata adjacent to the fourth ventricle (Elwood et al. 2010). The CTZ lies outside the blood brain barrier (BBB) and is responsive to circulating emetogens (Elwood et al. 2010). Emetogenic signals from the CTZ stimulate neurons of the nucleus tractus solitarius and from there the central pattern generator (CPG) of the vomiting reflex which triggers the motor response (Carpenter et al. 1988; Koga & Fukuda 1992). The vomiting center,

1 which lies within the BBB, integrates efferent input
2 from a number of sources including the cerebral
3 cortex (psychogenic vomiting), vestibular input
4 arising from the semi-circular canals (vomiting
5 associated with motion sickness or vestibular disorders),
6 vagal and sympathetic afferents from the
7 gastrointestinal system and other abdominal organs
8 and the CTZ (Carpenter et al. 1983; Tattersall et al.
9 1996). Convergence of information from the CTZ
10 and higher centers in the nucleus tractus solitarius
11 leads to stimulation of the central pattern generator
12 (CPG) for vomiting, located in the reticular area,
13 eliciting the motor act of vomiting (Koga & Fukuda
14 1992; Fukuda et al. 1999).

15 Substance P, a neuropeptide in the tachykinin
16 family and a potent agonist at the NK₁ receptor, is
17 found in high concentrations in areas of the brain
18 stem involved in emesis including the nucleus
19 tractus solitarius, the area postrema and the dorsal
20 motor nucleus of the vagus (Ariumi et al. 2000;
21 Hargreaves 2002) and is considered to be the key
22 neurotransmitter involved in vomiting (Diemunsch
23 & Grelot 2000). Injection of substance P into the
24 brainstem of ferrets rapidly causes vomiting (Gardner
25 et al. 1995). Vomiting induced by emetogens
26 such as apomorphine, copper sulfate and cisplatin
27 can be prevented in dogs by inhibiting NK₁ receptors
28 for substance P (Watson et al. 1995). Confirmation
29 of the role of NK₁ receptors in the final
30 common pathway in vomiting in dogs came by
31 selective antagonism of NK₁ receptors in decerebrate
32 dogs exposed to abdominal vagal stimulation
33 (Fukuda et al. 1999). The proposed site of anti-
34 emetic action of NK₁ receptor antagonists is located
35 in the CPG or in the pathway connecting the
36 nucleus tractus solitarius to the CPG (Fukuda et al.
37 1999; Andrews et al. 2001). NK₁ receptor antagonists,
38 by acting at the center coordinating the
39 vomiting response to various central (neural) and
40 peripheral (humeral) stimuli, can provide broad-
41 spectrum inhibition of vomiting (Gardner et al.
42 1996; Fukuda et al. 1999).

43 Maropitant, a selective NK₁ receptor antagonist
44 has been shown to be effective for prevention of
45 vomiting caused by stimulation of both central and
46 peripheral pathways (De La Puente-Rendondo et al.
47 2007c, Sedlacek et al. 2008). Maropitant has been
48 shown to significantly reduce vomiting relative to a
49 saline negative control for both apomorphine (centrally
50 acting emetogen) and syrup of ipecac (peripherally
51 acting emetogen). When compared to metoclopramide,
52 chlorpromazine and ondansetron,

it was the only antiemetic effective against both centrally (apomorphine) and peripherally (syrup of ipecac) acting emetogens (Sedlacek et al. 2008).

Hydromorphone has physicochemical properties very similar to those of morphine (Pettifer & Dyson 2000; Sarhill et al. 2001). Morphine can have both emetic and anti-emetic effects. The emetic effects are the result of stimulation of delta receptors outside the blood/brain barrier (CTZ) whereas the anti-emetic effects can be attributed to mu-and/or kappa-mediated mechanisms on the vomiting/emetic center (Blancquaert et al. 1986; Hersom & Mackenzie 1987). At low doses (0.3 mg kg⁻¹ IV), morphine caused vomiting in 6/6 dogs whereas doses of 1 and 2 mg kg⁻¹ resulted in 3/5 and 0/28 incidence of vomiting respectively (Blancquaert et al. 1986). The higher doses of morphine also prevented vomiting induced by apomorphine; 3/5 and 0/23 for doses of 1 and 2 mg kg⁻¹ respectively. It is postulated that the lower dose of morphine reaches the CTZ but not the vomiting center, therefore resulting in emesis, whereas the higher dose can reach the VC and block the effects on the CTZ (Blancquaert et al. 1986). Highly lipid soluble opioids have an anti-emetic effect due to their effect on the VC. Fentanyl, at doses of 5 and 10 µg kg⁻¹ IV did not cause vomiting in 6/6 and 12/12 dogs respectively, and 10 µg kg⁻¹ prevented the emetic effect of apomorphine and copper sulfate in 4/7 and 4/5 dogs respectively (Blancquaert et al. 1986). Methadone and sufentanil, also highly lipid soluble, did not cause vomiting in dogs (Blancquaert et al. 1986; Hersom & Mackenzie 1987).

The incidence of vomiting in the saline group was 6/9 (66%). This is slightly higher than previously reported by Valverde et al. (2004) who found an incidence of 7/16 (44%) in a group of dogs receiving hydromorphone (0.1 mg kg⁻¹) intra-muscularly 15 minutes prior to administration of acepromazine. This discrepancy may be due to the relatively low numbers of dogs in each study or differences in administration site. All dogs in the present study were injected in the lumbar epaxial muscles. Absorption of drugs given in non-postural muscles is slower than in postural muscles (Self et al. 2009). Slower absorption may have an effect similar to lower opioid doses on the CTZ, leading to a more pronounced emetic effect. The site of intra-muscular injection was not specified in the Valverde et al. (2004) study. The incidence of vomiting after intra-muscular administration is higher than when hydromorphone is administered intravenously at

1 doses of 0.1 mg kg⁻¹ (3/9, 33%) 0.5 mg kg⁻¹ (0/7,
2 0%) but lower than when administration is by
3 subcutaneous injection at doses of 0.1 mg kg⁻¹ (6/
4 8, 75%) and 0.5 mg kg⁻¹ (8/8, 100%) (KuKanich
5 et al. 2008).

6 When additional prodromal signs of vomiting
7 such as retching and nausea were included, a 100%
8 incidence was observed in the saline group. In
9 Valverde et al.'s (2004) study, inclusion of retching
10 and salivation increased the incidence of signs of
11 vomiting to 28/40 (70%) dogs. However, it was not
12 indicated whether these dogs received oxymor-
13 phone, morphine or hydromorphone. However, it
14 is clear that the incidence of prodromal signs is
15 higher than overt vomiting.

16 Acepromazine, when administered at a dose of
17 0.05 mg kg⁻¹ IM 15 minutes prior to hydromor-
18 phone, decreased the incidence of vomiting from 7/
19 16 (44%) to 5/21 (24%), which is thought to be due
20 to blockade of dopamine receptors in the chemore-
21 ceptor trigger zone (Valverde et al. 2004). Marop-
22 itant decreased the incidence of vomiting after
23 hydromorphone to 0/9, making it a more effective,
24 reliable anti-emetic.

25 In human anesthetic patients, satisfaction with
26 their anesthesia experience is closely tied to the
27 ability to avoid peri-operative nausea and vomiting.
28 This issue ranks ahead of pain, death and myocar-
29 dial infarction as a patient concern. In a recent
30 interview study of 12,276 patients, 3652 (30%)
31 reported at least one perioperative complaint, of
32 these 1705 (46%) were related to perioperative
33 nausea and vomiting (Lehmann et al. 2010).
34 Avoiding the discomfort associated with peri-oper-
35 ative nausea and vomiting may also be a consider-
36 ation for veterinary patients.

37 Maropitant was completely effective in preventing
38 vomiting, retching and nausea associated with
39 administration of the opioid analgesic hydromor-
40 phone in this study. The standard dosage recom-
41 mendations for treatment or prevention of vomiting
42 are 1.0 mg kg⁻¹ by SC injection or 2.0 mg kg⁻¹ as
43 oral tablets (De La Puente-Rendondo et al. 2007b).
44 The pharmacokinetic data demonstrate that in
45 dogs, these two maropitant doses provide similar
46 peak plasma concentrations (92 ng mL⁻¹ for
47 1 mg kg⁻¹ SC, 81 ng mL⁻¹ for 2 mg kg⁻¹ PO) (De
48 La Puente-Rendondo et al. 2007b). However, the
49 time taken to achieve maximum plasma concentra-
50 tion is shorter following SC administration
51 (0.75 hours for 1 mg kg⁻¹ SC and 1.9 hours for
52 2 mg kg⁻¹ PO), thus making it the preferred route

of administration in a clinic setting (De La Puente-
Rendondo et al. 2007b). Oral dosing of 2 mg kg⁻¹ at
least 2 hours prior to administration of hydromor-
phone may provide a more appropriate route for
owners administering the product at home for the
prevention of emesis prior to a planned elective
surgery where use of hydromorphone or other
opioid drugs that are known to elicit vomiting will
be administered.

The randomized clinical study reported here
demonstrated that maropitant was effective in the
prevention of vomiting after administration of
hydromorphone 0.1 mg kg⁻¹ intra-muscularly
when given 1 hour prior to anesthetic premedica-
tion. Avoidance of peri-operative nausea and vom-
iting may decrease patient discomfort, risk of peri-
operative aspiration pneumonia and morbidity
associated with increased intra-ocular or intra-
cranial pressures.

Acknowledgements

The author wishes to thank Amanda Jirak Ayers for
technical assistance with this project. Maropitant
was provided by Pfizer Animal Health, New York,
NY.

References

- Alwood AJ, Brainard BM, LaFond E et al. (2006) Postop-
erative pulmonary complications in dogs undergoing
laparotomy: frequency, characterization and disease-
related risk factors. *J Vet Emerg Crit Care* 16, 176–183.
- Andrews PL (1992) Physiology and nausea and vomiting.
Br J Anaesth 69(7 Suppl), 2S–19S.
- Andrews PLR, Hawthorne J (1988) The neurophysiology
of vomiting. *Baillieres Clin Gastroenterol* 2, 141–168.
- Andrews PLR, Bhandari P, Garland S et al. (1990) Does
retching have a function: an experimental study in the
ferret. *Pharmacodyn Ther* 9, 135–152.
- Andrews PLR, Kovacs M, Watson JW (2001) The anti-
emetic action of the neurokinin-1 receptor antagonist
CP-99,994 does not require the presence of the area
postrema in the dog. *Neurosci Lett* 314, 102–104.
- Ariumi H, Saito R, Nago S et al. (2000) The role of
tachykinin NK₁ receptors in the area postrema of ferrets
in emesis. *Neurosci Lett* 286, 123–126.
- Benchaoui HA, Cox SR, Schneider RP et al. (2007) The
pharmacokinetics of maropitant, a novel neurokinin
type-1 receptor antagonist, in dogs. *J Vet Pharmacol
Ther* 30, 336–344.
- Blancaert JP, Lefebvre RA, Willems JL (1986) Emetic
and antiemetic effects of opioids in the dog. *Eur J
Pharmacol* 128, 143–150.

- 1 Branson KR, Gross ME (2001) Opioid Agonists and
 2 Antagonists. In: *Veterinary Pharmacology and Thera-*
 3 *peutics* (8th edn) Adams HR (ed). Iowa State University
 4 Press, Ames, IA, USA. pp. 268–281.
- 5 Carpenter DO, Briggs DB, Strominger N (1983) Responses
 6 of neurons of canine area postrema to neurotransmitters
 7 and peptides. *Cell Mol Neurobiol* 3, 113–126.
- 8 Carpenter DO, Briggs DB, Knox AP et al. (1988) Excitation
 9 of area postrema neurons by transmitters, peptides and
 10 cyclic nucleotides. *J Neurophysiol* 59, 358–369.
- 11 Coda BA, Tanaka A, Jacobson RC et al. (1997) Hydro-
 12 morphone analgesia after intravenous bolus adminis-
 13 tration. *Pain* 71, 41–48.
- 14 Conder GA, Sedlacek HS, Boucher JF et al. (2008) Efficacy
 15 and safety of maropitant, a selective neurokinin1
 16 receptor antagonist, in two randomized clinical trials for
 17 prevention of vomiting due to motion sickness in dogs.
 18 *J Vet Pharmacol Ther* 31, 528–532.
- 19 Cunningham AJ, Barry P (1986) Intraocular pressure-
 20 physiology and implications for anaesthetic manage-
 21 ment. *Can Anaesth Soc J* 33, 195–208.
- 22 De La Puente-Rendondo VA, Siedek EM, Benchaoui HA
 23 et al. (2007a) The anti-emetic efficacy of maropitant
 24 (Cerenia™) in the treatment of ongoing emesis caused
 25 by a wide range of underlying clinical aetiologies
 26 in canine patients in Europe. *J Small Animal Pract* 48,
 27 93–98.
- 28 De La Puente-Rendondo VA, Tilt N, Rowan TG et al.
 29 (2007b) Efficacy of maropitant for treatment and pre-
 30 vention of emesis caused by intravenous infusion of
 31 cisplatin in dogs. *Am J Vet Res* 68, 48–56.
- 32 De La Puente-Rendondo VA, Tingley FA III, Schneider RP
 33 et al. (2007c) The neurokinin-1 antagonist activity
 34 maropitant, an anti-emetic drug for dogs, in a gerbil
 35 model. *J Vet Pharmacol Ther* 30, 281–287.
- 36 Diemunsch P, Grelot L (2000) Potential of substance
 37 P antagonists as antiemetics. *Drugs* 60, 533–546.
- 38 Doenicke A, Moss J, Lorenz W et al. (1995) Intravenous
 39 morphine and nalbuphine increase plasma histamine
 40 and catecholamine release without accompanying he-
 41 modynamic changes. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* 58, 81–89.
- 42 Eberhart LHJ, Morin AM, Kranke P et al. (2007) ????????.
 43 **I** *Best Pract Res Clin Anaesthesiol* 21, 575–593.
- 44 Elwood C, Devauchelle P, Elliott V et al. (2010) Emesis in
 45 dogs: a review. *J Small Anim Pract* 51, 4–22.
- 46 Fransson BA, Bagley RS, Gay JM et al. (2001) Pneumonia
 47 after intra-cranial surgery in dogs. *Vet Surg* 30, 433–439.
- 48 Fukuda H, Koga T, Furukawa N et al. (1999) The
 49 tachykinin NK1 receptor antagonist GR205171 abol-
 50 ishes the retching activity of neurons comprising the
 51 central pattern generator for vomiting in dogs. *Neurosci*
 52 *Res* 33, 25–32.
- Gardner CJ, Twissell DJ, Dale TJ et al. (1995) The broad-
 spectrum ante-emetic activity of the novel non-peptide
 tachykinin NK₁ receptor antagonist GR203040. *Br J*
Pharmacol 116, 3158–3163.
- Gardner CJ, Armour DR, Beattie DT et al. (1996)
 GR205171: a novel antagonist with high affinity for the
 tachykinin NK₁ receptor, and potent broad-spectrum
 anti-emetic activity. *Regul Pept* 27, 45–53.
- Gross ME (2001) Tranquilizers, Alpha-adrenergic agonists,
 and related agents. In: *Veterinary Pharmacology and*
Therapeutics (8th edn). Adams HR (ed). Iowa State
 University Press, Ames, USA, pp. 299–302, 307–310.
- Hargreaves R (2002) Imaging substance P receptors (NK-
 1) in the living human brain using positron emission
 tomography. *J Clin Psychiatry* 63(Suppl. 11), 18–24.
- Hersom AS, Mackenzie JE (1987) Opioid receptors involved
 in emesis in the dog. *Br J Pharmacol* 92, 648.
- Koga T, Fukuda H (1992) Neurons in the nucleus of the
 solitary tract mediating inputs from emetic vagal affer-
 ents and the area postrema to the pattern generator for
 the emetic act in dogs. *Neurosci Res* 14, 166–179.
- Kogan DA, Johnson LR et al. (2008) Etiology and clinical
 outcome in dogs with aspiration pneumonia: 88 cases
 (2004–2006). *J Am Vet Med Assoc* 233, 1748–1755.
- KuKanich B, Hogan BK, Krugner-Highby LA et al. (2008)
 Pharmacokinetics of hydromorphone in healthy dogs.
Vet Anaesth Analg 35, 256–264.
- Lamont LA, Mathews KA (2007) Opioids, nonsteroidal
 anti-inflammatories and analgesic adjuvants. In: *Lumb*
& Jones' veterinary anesthesia (4th edn). Tranquilli WJ,
 Thurmon JC, Grimm KA (eds). Blackwell Publishing,
 Oxford, UK. pp. 241–271.
- Lehmann M, Monte K, Barach P et al. (2010) Postopera-
 tive patient complaints: a prospective interview study of
 12,276 patients. *J Clin Anesth* 22, 13–21.
- Mahler DL, Forrest WH Jr (1975) Relative analgesic
 potencies of morphine and hydromorphone in postop-
 erative pain. *Anesthesiology* 42, 602–607.
- Pettifer G, Dyson D (2000) Hydromorphone: a cost-effec-
 tive alternative to the use of oxymorphone. *Can Vet J* 41,
 135–137.
- Ramsey DS, Kincaid K, Watkins JA et al. (2008) Safety
 and efficacy of injectable and oral maropitant, a selective
 neurokinin-1 receptor antagonist, in a randomized
 clinical trial for treatment of vomiting in dogs. *J Vet*
Pharmacol Ther 31, 538–543.
- Sarhill N, Walsh D, Nelson KA (2001) Hydromorphone:
 pharmacology and clinical applications in cancer
 patients. *Support Care Cancer* 9, 84–96.
- Sedlacek HS, Ramsey DS, Boucher JF et al. (2008) Com-
 parative efficacy of maropitant and selected drugs in
 preventing emesis induced by centrally or peripherally
 acting emetogens in dogs. *J Vet Pharmacol Ther* 31,
 533–537.
- Self IA, Hughes JML, Kenny DA et al. (2009) Effect of
 muscle injection site on preanaesthetic sedation in dogs.
Vet Record 164, 323–326.
- Slettedal JK, Bragad R (2005) Total iris expulsion through
 a sutureless cataract incision due to vomiting. *Acta*
Ophthalmol Scand 83, 111–112.

- 1 Smith LJ, Yu JK, Bjorling DE et al. (2001) Effects of
2 hydromorphone or oxymorphone, with or without
3 acepromazine, on preanesthetic sedation, physiologic
4 values, and histamine release in dogs. *J Am Vet Med*
5 *Assoc* 218, 1101–1105.
- 6 Tart KM, Babski DM, Lee JA (2010) Potential risks, prog-
7 nostic indicators, and diagnostic and treatment modal-
8 ities affecting survival in dogs with presumptive
9 aspiration pneumonia: 125 cases (2005-2008). *J Vet*
10 *Emerg Crit Care* 20, 319–329.
- 11 Tattersall FD, Rycroft W, Francis B et al. (1996) Tachyk-
12 inin NK1 receptor antagonists act centrally to inhibit
13 emesis induced by the chemotherapeutic agent cisplatin
14 in ferrets. *Neuropharmacology* 35, 1121–1129.
- 15 Twedt DC (2000) Vomiting. In: *Textbook of Veterinary*
16 *Internal Medicine Vol. 1 (5th edn)*. Ettinger SJ, Feldman
17 EC (eds). WB Saunders Co., Philadelphia, PA, USA. pp.
18 117–121.
- 19 Vail DM, Rodabaugh GA, Conder JF et al. (2007) Efficacy
20 of injectable maropitant (Cerenia™) in a randomized
21 clinical trial for prevention and treatment of cisplatin-
22 induced emesis in dogs presented as veterinary patients.
23 *Vet Comp Oncol* 5, 38–46.
- 24 Valverde A, Cantwell S, Hernandez J et al. (2004) Effects of
25 acepromazine on the incidence of vomiting associated
26 with opioid administration in dogs. *Vet Anaesth Analg*
27 31, 40–45.
- 28 Watson JW, Gonsalves SF, Fossa AA et al. (1995) The
29 anti-emetic effects of CP-99,994 in the ferret and
30 the dog; role of the NK₁ receptor. *Brit J Pharmacol* 115,
31 84–94.
- 32 Wilson DV (1992) Advantages and guidelines for using
33 opioid agonists for anesthesia induction. *Vet Clin North*
34 *Amer Small Anim Pract* 22, 269–272.
- 35 Wilson DV, Evans AT, Mauer WA (2007) Pre-anesthetic
36 meperidine: associated vomiting and gastroesophageal
37 reflux during the subsequent anesthetic in dogs. *Vet*
38 *Anaesth Analg* 34, 15–22.
- 39 Yusufu LMD (2002) Post operative nausea and vomiting.
40 *Ann African Med* 1, 1–7.
- 41 Received 2 September 2011; Accepted 3 October 2011.