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Dear Editor

I have read your interesting article entitled, “In vitro vasoactive effects of dexmedetomidine on isolated human umbilical arteries,” recently published in Bratisl Med J (1). The alpha-2 adrenoceptor agonist dexmedetomidine is widely used for sedation (2). The following comments should be considered to understand this article (1). First, two cumulative dexmedetomidine dose-response curves were generated in the same human umbilical artery (HUA) before and after treatment with inhibitors. Dexmedetomidine (2x10⁻⁵ M)-induced maximal contraction was used as the reference value of contraction evoked by dexmedetomidine (1). However, it is important to confirm HUA viability by assessing contractility to KCl or 5-hydroxytryptamine and the value generated can be used as a reference instead of that generated by dexmedetomidine (2x10⁻⁵ M) in the present experiment (1, 3). Additionally, as the HUA strip produces spontaneous contraction and shows wide variability in vasoreactivity to a vasoconstrictor and inconsistency of vasoreactivity over time in the same HUA, KCl-induced contraction contributes to decreased spontaneous contraction and reduced variability of vasoreactivity and may stabilize the HUA (3,4). Furthermore, two dexmedetomidine dose-response curves generated in the same HUA even without inhibitors may not be identical (1). Thus, a comparison should be performed. It is not clear how it can be verified that dexmedetomidine used in the first dexmedetomidine dose-response curve is completely washed out before the second experiment to generate a dose-response curve in the presence of the inhibitors. Second, the clinically relevant concentration of dexmedetomidine used for sedation in humans approximately corresponds to 10⁻⁸ M. Third, prazosin (3x10⁻⁸ M), an alpha-1 adrenoceptor inhibitor, inhibits dexmedetomidine-induced contraction in isolated rat aorta, whereas a very high concentration of prazosin (10⁻⁵ M) attenuated vasoconstriction induced by all concentrations of dexmedetomidine in the HUA (1, 5). This prazosin-mediated inhibition of dexmedetomidine-induced contraction may be associated with non-specific actions. Fourth, as cumulative dexmedetomidine dose-response curves were evaluated in the reported study, using a line graph appropriate for a cumulative dose-response curve instead of a bar graph in Figures 2 and 3 would be more helpful for readers to understand Figures 1 and 2 (1). In addition, for the comparison of the magnitude of cumulative dexmedetomidine-induced contraction in the presence or absence of inhibitors in the same HUA, it is more reasonable to use a linear mixed effect model or two-way repeated measure analysis of variance followed by Bonferroni’s multiple comparison test rather than Wilcoxon rank test, which was used in the reported study (1). p value used in the Wilcoxon rank test in the reported study should be adjusted to about 0.008 (p = 0.05/6) to reduce the type 1 error (1). I believe that this study contributes to understanding the mechanism associated with dexmedetomidine-induced contraction in HUA.
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