

Fitness to Drive After Intravenous Sedation and General Anaesthesia: A Literature Review

P. F. TUCKER, MB, BS(Hons), BMedSci

C. R. CHILVERS, BMed, DA(UK), BMed, FANZCA

Department of Anaesthesia, Launceston General Hospital, Launceston, Tas.

Dr Pat Tucker is a second year accredited anaesthetics registrar currently working at the Launceston General Hospital. She graduated from the University of Tasmania in 1996 and has worked in both NSW and Tasmania. Dr Chilvers is a consultant anaesthetist. He has previously worked as a Clinical Research Fellow in Ambulatory Anaesthesia in Vancouver, Canada. Currently, he is the anaesthetist responsible for the Day Procedure Unit at the Launceston General Hospital.

Introduction

Current recommendations by the Australian and New Zealand College of Anaesthetists are that after undergoing general anaesthesia or intravenous sedation, a patient should not drive a car until the following day.¹ In the United Kingdom patients are advised not to drive for 24 hours. In this age of modern day case anaesthesia is this based on sound evidence or are we maintaining the status quo? To date there has not been a systematic review or meta-analysis of this topic, i.e. level I evidence as defined by the National Health and Medical Research Council.² In this paper the available evidence is examined. The anaesthetic agents discussed are those most commonly used in current day case anaesthesia. Fitness to drive is assessed by psychomotor function tests, multiple sleep latency tests, and simulated driving tests. Recovery after undergoing sedation or anaesthesia, is also compared with functioning at the legally safe blood alcohol levels (BALs) for driving as recommended by the World Health Organisation.³

Clinical Trials

Investigators have been studying the effects of general anaesthesia on driving ability for decades. In 1972, Ogg found that 73% of car owners drove within 24 hours after undergoing a general anaesthetic, and 9% actually drove home!⁴ Recently the percentage of patients driving after an anaesthetic has fallen, however Correa et al found that 4% of patients still drove within 24 hours, despite advice not to.⁵ Most agree that patients should never drive immediately after anaesthesia but for what period remains debatable. In the 1970s Havard wrote: "With most general anaesthetics, it is safer to advise against driving for 48 hours afterwards."⁶ This was based on the finding that tissue concentrations of anaesthetics and/or their metabolites are evident for 48 hours.

Articles used for this literature review were initially found by a search of the National Library of Medicine. Key words used were: general anaesthesia, driving, midazolam, diazepam, propofol, fentanyl, alfentanil, nitrous oxide, desflurane, sevoflurane, and isoflurane. References from studies found by the above means were then used to find further studies. Trials were excluded if: they involved anaesthetic agents not commonly

in current use or not available in Australia; aimed at studying short term recovery and recovery room behaviour only; studying recovery after operations involving overnight hospital stays (except reference 19); not written in English. The trials reviewed and listed in the tables are all randomised controlled trials or equivalent, i.e. level II evidence.⁽²⁾

Relationship between Anaesthetic Agents, Driving skills, Psychomotor Tests, and Multiple Sleep Latency Tests

Driving is a complex task. It involves attention, information processing, judgement, sensorimotor skills, and perception.⁷ All these functions are affected by the anaesthetic agents used in day case anaesthesia. Research has attempted to evaluate these anaesthetic effects in the hope of gaining sufficient evidence to confidently identify a prudent non driving period.

The clinical trials quoted in this review utilised testing of a variety of psychomotor skills, multiple sleep latency time periods, and driving skills. Brief descriptions of individual psychomotor tests are available in the Appendix. Practice (or learning) effect, whereby results improve with repeated testing, is mentioned where applicable to a study. The tables indicate if training has been used to minimise this effect.

Psychomotor studies (upon which most of this review is based) generally define "recovery time" as the time taken for the mean test results of the experimental group to return to baseline or control levels. Unfortunately this methodology could fail to identify an individual subject who is much slower to recover than the rest of the group. For safety in real life we would prefer to know the recovery time the very slowest person could take. In addition there is conflicting evidence on the sensitivity of the different psychomotor tests. Tracking tasks, the peg board test, the maddox wing test, and perceptive accuracy tests appear to be the most sensitive psychomotor tests. Choice reaction tests, critical flicker fusion threshold, and free recall appear to be the most controversial. The recovery of free recall was inconsistent with other tests in most papers and has therefore been ignored in the summaries made in this review. Marshall et al (1992) found that control subjects also had impaired free recall with subsequent testing.⁸

Multiple sleep latency tests are an alternative but valuable method of assessing if a person is fit to drive. Sleep latency is measured as the time taken to reach the first epoch of non-wakefulness.⁹ Improved driving performance has been shown to be associated with increased sleep latency times.¹⁰ Lichtor et al (2002) found these tests to be more sensitive than psychomotor tests.¹¹

Actual car driving ability is the gold standard in assessing fitness to drive after an anaesthetic. This is especially true when ability is compared with subjects at the legal BAL for driving. However, actual driving is often not a practical option. Driving simulators can be used instead. The main features recorded from the simulators are brake reaction times and performance errors (neglected instructions, driving off the road, and collisions).¹²

The ultimate test of fitness to drive, the motor vehicle accident mortality and morbidity figures from recently anaesthetised patients driving, cannot of course be studied. Interestingly, a review of motor accidents in Tasmania over the past 15 years has shown no deaths have occurred which could be attributed to either general anaesthesia or sedation. (Personal communication, Kathryn Campbell, Government Analyst.) No information was available on motor accidents not resulting in death.

The electroencephalogram (EEG) was also performed in one study.⁽¹³⁾ The relationship between EEG abnormalities and driving ability has not yet been determined.

Midazolam and Diazepam Trials

Many trials have studied recovery after midazolam and diazepam used for sedation. These are listed in Table 1.

In summary, the effects of both midazolam and diazepam on psychomotor tests and car driving ability are essentially gone by 10 hours.

Propofol Trials

Propofol is a commonly used both as an anaesthetic and a sedation agent. Details of relevant research on propofol are given in Table 2.

To summarise, the effects of propofol on psychomotor function appear to be largely dissipated by 2 hours post anaesthetic. At a blood propofol concentration of 0.2 mcg/ml psychomotor impairment is equivalent to a BAL of 20 mg/100 ml.

Fentanyl and Alfentanil Trials

Few clinical trials have studied the recovery of psychomotor function and driving ability post fentanyl or alfentanil when administered alone. Details of the available trials are summarised in Table 3.

In the very limited studies performed, recovery (apart from EEG changes) after a single dose of fentanyl or alfentanil appears to occur by 6 hours. The recovery time of fentanyl is effected by the dose administered.

Inhalational Anaesthetic Trials

Details of the available trials of inhalational agents are given in Table 4.

It can be seen that testing of the volatile agents in isolation in regard to post-anaesthetic fitness to drive is limited. Studies conducted have been relatively small and time-limited. Objective recovery after N₂O appears to be consistently less than 30 minutes, but subjective recovery has been reported as being prolonged for up to 8 hours. Recovery occurs after desflurane in 3 hours. Sevoflurane recovery has not been adequately studied. However, with its pharmacokinetic profile, it could be assumed to lie somewhere between the 2-3 hour recovery period for desflurane and the 5-7 hour recovery period for enflurane and halothane.

Combined Anaesthetic Agent Trials

In practice most sedative and anaesthetic regimens utilise a combination of agents. Table 5 summarises these studies.

Trials studying a combination of midazolam, fentanyl, and propofol in sedative doses have found a recovery time of within 8 hours. Studies using propofol as the maintenance agent have revealed a recovery time of 1 hour. Trials utilising propofol and N₂O as the maintenance agents have shown a recovery time of 3 hours or less. Studies using a desflurane/N₂O anaesthetic have found a recovery time of within 3 hours. Trials studying recovery after an isoflurane/N₂O maintenance anaesthetic have usually found a recovery time of 1.5 hours or less. One exception is the Marshall et al trial in which recovery only approached baseline by 3 hours.⁽⁶⁾ In the same study, another group who had received an alfentanil infusion added to this anaesthetic did not achieve baseline levels by 5 hours. Trials studying recovery after a sevoflurane/N₂O maintenance combination anaesthetic are lacking. Only one study met this reviews criteria, hence, no comment can be made on recovery time.

Interestingly, recovery from a balanced anaesthetic using a combination of agents

Table 1
Summary of recovery after midazolam and diazepam

| Anaesthetic agent | Number subjects | Procedure | Tests used | Psychomotor recovery time period | Comments | Reference |
|---|-----------------|--------------|--|---|--|-----------|
| Midazolam 15 mg (oral) | 7 | None | 2 psychomotor tests & car driving ability. | 10 hours | Practice effect evident. Looked at recovery the next morning. No testing between 1 & 10 hours. | (14) |
| Midazolam 0.05/0.1/0.15 mg/kg | 11 | None | 8 psychomotor tests | 7 hours | Minimal practice effect | (15) |
| Midazolam 5/10/15/20 mg (oral) | 7 | None | 2 psychomotor tests | 7 hours | Minimal practice effect | (16) |
| Midazolam 0.1 mg/kg | 16 | None | 6 psychomotor tests | 3 hours (except maddox wing and subjective fatigue) | Minimal practice effect | (17) |
| Midazolam 0.05 mg/kg | 25 | Bronchoscopy | 3 psychomotor tests, Romberg's test & ability to walk in a straight line. | 2 hours undertaken. | No training | (18) |
| Midazolam 0.1 mg/kg | 24 | Bronchoscopy | " | >2 hours (significant impairment of ability to walk in a straight line) | No further testing after 2 hours. | (18) |
| Midazolam 0.075 mg/kg (mean) (+ spinal block) | 13 | TURP | 8 psychomotor tests | 2 hours — 3/9 tests remained impaired. 24 hours — free recall only - impaired | No testing between 2 & 24 hours. No training. Included because of comparison with propofol (see later section) | (19) |
| Diazepam 10/20 mg | 10 | None | 8 psychomotor tests & EEG monitoring | 6 hours (EEG changes & memory recall >8 hours) | Minimal practice effect | (13) |
| Diazepam 0.15/0.3 mg/kg | 11 | None | 8 psychomotor tests | 7 hours | Minimal practice effect | (15) |
| Diazepam 0.2 mg/kg | 27 | Bronchoscopy | 3 psychomotor tests, Romberg's test, and ability to walk in a straight line. | 2 hours | Practice effect evident | (18) |
| Diazepam 0.3 mg/kg | 11 | None | 5 psychomotor tests | 8 hours | Practice effect evident | (20) |

Note: Recovery times are based on the time taken for the mean test result to return to baseline or control levels.

Table 2
Summary of recovery after propofol

| Anaesthetic agent | Number subjects | Procedure undertaken | Tests used | Psychomotor recovery time period or alternative measure | Comments | Reference |
|---|-----------------|------------------------------|--|--|---|-----------|
| Propofol 0.54 mg/kg + 5/4/3 mg/kg/hr Mean anaesthetic duration 40 minutes | 13 | TURP | 8 psychomotor tests | 1 hour — except free recall (normal by 24 hours) | This study compared propofol with midazolam (see earlier comments) Propofol offers a more rapid recovery. | (19) |
| Propofol (TCI) 0.8/0.4/0.2 mcg/ml | 10 | None | 3 psychomotor tests | 0.2 mcg/ml equivalent to BAL 20 mg/ 100 ml (0.02%) although compared with baseline | Good study design in that functioning at a set propofol concentration was compared with functioning at a set BAL. Training undertaken. | (21) |
| Propofol Plasma concentration 3.9±1.0 mcg/ml (mean±SD) Anaesthetic duration 1 hour | 7 | None | Subjective sleepiness, fatigue, and sleep latency | Subjective tests normalized within 1 hour 20 minutes | | (22) |
| Propofol 4.4 mg/kg | 18 | Minor gynaeco- logical | 6 psychomotor tests | 2 hours | Training undertaken however practice effect evident. | (23) |

Note: Recovery times are based on the time taken for the mean test result to return to baseline or control levels.
TCI=target controlled infusion

appears to be no longer than that using an individual agent. In fact it is usually shorter. This is probably a result of lower individual drug doses being used.

Discussion

In setting guidelines as to when a person is fit to drive after sedation or anaesthesia many factors need to be taken into account. Most studies test fitness to drive using psychomotor tests, simulated driving tests, or multiple sleep latency tests. Although only an indirect way of assessing the risk to the patient and the public they can be performed scientifically and have been validated against the medical and legal benchmark of BALs. Lack of impairment on one particular test may not of course equate to being fit to drive a motor vehicle. A whole battery of tests need to be investigated and practice effects need to be taken into account. The practice effect noted in approximately half the studies may bias the results towards a shorter recovery. Considerable inter-individual variation in psychomotor testing after anaesthetics has also been found.

Most of the studies were been done on fit, healthy volunteers who did not undergo any operative procedure. Patients were excluded from the studies if they were taking other medications. Many studies have also excluded subjects with organ dysfunction and/or other illnesses, for example obstructive sleep apnoea. Obstructive sleep apnoea alone may

Table 3
Summary of recovery after fentanyl and alfentanil

| Anaesthetic agent | Number subjects | Procedure undertaken | Tests used | Psychomotor recovery time period | Comments | Reference |
|--|-----------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|-----------|
| Fentanyl | | | | | | |
| a) 100 mcg | 10 | None | 8 psychomotor tests & EEG monitoring | 2 hours | Minimal practice effect. | (13) |
| b) 200 mcg | " | " | " | 6 hours EEG effects seen for up to 8 hours (Increase in frontal fast activity) | Highlights the dose dependent effect of fentanyl on recovery. | (13) |
| Fentanyl 2.5 mcg/kg | 7 | None | 2 psychomotor tests | 2 hours | Minimal practice effect | (24) |
| Fentanyl 100 mcg | 9 | None | 1 psychomotor test only — tracometer | >2 hours | Testing only undertaken for 2 hours. Practice effect evident. | (25) |
| Fentanyl 167 mcg + Etomidate 20 mg + maintenance doses | 22 | Cystoscopy | 2 psychomotor tests | >1 hour | No training undertaken. | (26) |
| Alfentanil 500 mcg + Etomidate 20 mg + Maintenance doses | 25 | Cystoscopy | " | 1 hour | No training undertaken — practice effect evident. | (26) |

Note: Recovery times are based on the time taken for the mean test result to return to baseline or control levels.

affect one's ability to drive, via increased fatigue¹⁰, and if combined with an anesthetic these patients might have prolonged effects.

In addition, anxiety experienced by the patients prior to procedures and its effect on sleep deprivation and increased sedation/anaesthetic requirements has not been evaluated objectively in any study. The effect of post-operative pain on driving ability has not been evaluated either.

As driving is an individual action which may inadvertently affect others we need to take into account the time needed for the slowest patients to recover from the anaesthetic. It is not safe to give a time when the "average" patient has recovered. It must be the time when all patients are fit to drive. Most time periods mentioned in this review are unfortunately only "mean" times. Documenting of the range of times of recovery from anaesthetics may be a more appropriate method. There is some variation between studies and we need to weight decisions on "evidence" from those with the most conservative rate of recovery.

Conversely, it also needs to be accepted that to drive a car, total recovery after sedation or anaesthesia need not occur. Recovery of function only needs to be equivalent to that with a BAL of 50 mg/100 ml.

Table 4
Summary of recovery after inhalational agents

| Inhalational agent | Number subjects | Procedure undertaken | Tests used | Psychomotor recovery time period or alternative measure | Comments | Reference |
|--|-----------------|---------------------------|---|---|---|-----------|
| N ₂ O/O ₂ 50/50 | 12 | Colonoscopy | 4 psychomotor tests | No post-procedural impairment. | Practice effect evident on one test despite training. Testing undertaken as soon as patient able to walk into testing area (within 30 minutes). | (27) |
| N ₂ O/O ₂ 50:50 | 80 | Flexible Sigmoid - oscopy | 1 psychomotor test only — adaptive tracking task. | No post-procedural impairment. Better than at a BAL of 80 mg/100 ml. | Compared functioning with that at a BAL of 80 mg/100 ml & with controls. | (28) |
| N ₂ O/O ₂ 30:70 Anaesthetic duration 40 minutes | 11 | None | 4 psychomotor tests | 22 minutes | Compared with the above 2 studies impairment was seen. Training undertaken. | (29) |
| N ₂ O/O ₂ Up to 50:50 | 5 | None | 5 psychomotor tests | 20 minutes Except free recall. | Subjects felt subjectively unwell for up to 8 hours. Training undertaken. | (30) |
| Desflurane ET 8.3% (mean) Mean anaesthetic duration 53 minutes | 16 | Elective day case surgery | 2 psychomotor tests | 2 hours | Training undertaken. Subjects received only local anaesthetics or oral ibuprofen for analgesia. | (31) |
| Desflurane ET 7.4% (mean) Anaesthetic duration 1 hour | 20 | None | 9 psychomotor tests | 3 hours | Training undertaken | (32) |
| Sevoflurane Fi 1-2% + N ₂ O/O ₂ 67:33 Mean anaesthetic duration 17.6 minutes | 34 | Colonoscopy | 9 psychomotor tests | 30 minutes except free recall impaired for >120 minutes | Testing only undertaken for 2 hours. Training occurred. | (33) |
| Halothane/ N ₂ O/O ₂ Induced at high conc, then reduced to Fi 0.7% for 3.5 minutes | 11 | None | 4 psychomotor tests & simulated driving test. | >5 hours (psychomotor testing); driving ability recovered by 7 hours. | Psychomotor testing only undertaken for 5 hours. Study included as a comparison with the newer agents. | (12) |
| Enflurane/ N ₂ O/O ₂ Induced at high conc, then reduced to Fi 1.5% for 3.5 minutes | 11 | None | " | >5 hours (psychomotor testing) although driving ability recovered by 4.5 hours. | " | (12) |

Note: Recovery times are based on the time taken for the mean test result to return to baseline or control levels. ET=end-tidal. Fi=fraction inspired.

Table 5
Summary of recovery after combined anaesthetics

| Anaesthetic agents | Number subjects | Procedure undertaken | Tests Used | Psychomotor recovery time period or alternative measure | Comments | Reference |
|--|-----------------|--------------------------------|--|---|---|-----------|
| a) Propofol 2.5 mg/kg | 12 | None | 5 psychomotor tests & multiple sleep latency test. | 4 hours including sleep latency period. | Sleep latency period is more sensitive than psychomotor testing. Combinations including propofol but excluding midazolam decreased sleep latency the least. | (11) |
| b) Propofol 2 mg/kg + Fentanyl 2 mcg/kg | " | " | " | " | " | (11) |
| c) Propofol 2 mg/kg + Midazolam 2 mg/70 kg | " | " | " | 4 hours 6 hours until recovery of sleep latency period. Range: up to 8 hours. | " | (11) |
| d) Midazolam 0.07 mg/kg + Fentanyl 2 mcg/kg | " | " | " | " | " | (11) |
| Fentanyl 1 mcg/kg + Midazolam 0.05 mg/kg + 0.025 mg/kg PRN + Propofol 10-20 mg PRN | 35 | Colonoscopy | 9 psychomotor tests | 2 hours except free recall | Training undertaken. Testing occurred for for only 2 hours. | (33) |
| a) Fentanyl 50 mcg/70 kg + Propofol 35 mg/70 kg | 12 | None | 4 psychomotor tests | 30 minutes until = BAL 100 mg/100 ml | To be more relevant to the Australian population a BAL of 50 mg/100 ml would be more appropriate. | (34) |
| b) Fentanyl 50 mcg/70 kg + Midazolam 2 mg/70 kg | " | " | " | 60 minutes until = BAL 100 mg/100 ml | Relatively low drug doses used. | (34) |
| c) Fentanyl 50 mcg/70 kg + Midazolam 2 mg/70 kg + Propofol 35 mg/70 kg | " | " | " | 75 minutes until = BAL 100 mg/100 ml | | (34) |
| Midazolam 0.1 mg/kg + Fentanyl 2 mcg/kg | 12 | None | 8 psychomotor tests | 3 hours Approaching baseline. | Training undertaken. | (35) |
| a) Propofol Induction 203.7 mg (mean) + 12/8 mg/kg/hr + Alfentanil 500 mcg + 250 mcg 15 minutely (operation time 15-79 minutes) | 15 | Knee Arthroscopy | 2 psychomotor tests | 1 hour | Practice effect evident with choice reaction time though not with the perceptive accuracy test. | (36) |
| b) Propofol Induction 212 mg (mean) + Fi Isoflurane 0.5-2% + Alfentanil 500 mcg + 250 mcg 15 minutely (operation time 18-73 minutes) | " | " | " | 1 hour | " | (36) |
| Propofol 10/8/6 mg/kg/hr +/- Alfentanil 10 mcg/kg Mean anaesthetic duration 13 minutes. | 46 | Oesophago-scopy & Bronchoscopy | 1 psychomotor test only - Critical flicker fusion threshold. | 1 hour | Minimal practice effect | (37) |

Table 5
Continued

| Anaesthetic agents | Number subjects | Procedure undertaken | Tests Used | Psychomotor recovery time period or alternative measure | Comments | Reference |
|---|-----------------|----------------------------|---------------------|--|---|-----------|
| a) Propofol 2.5 mg/kg + 10 mg PRN+ N ₂ O/O ₂ 66:34 Mean anaesthetic duration 9.7 minutes | 30 | Outpatient gynaecological | 2 psychomotor tests | 1 hour | Compared their study subjects with controls hence practice effect not an issue. | (38) |
| b) Propofol 2.5 mg/kg N ₂ O/O ₂ 66:34 + Fi Isoflurane 1% Mean anaesthetic duration 12.9 minutes | " | " | " | 1 hour | " | (38) |
| a) Propofol 2 mg/kg + 10 mg/kg/hr+ N ₂ O/O ₂ 67:33 Mean anaesthetic duration 51.4 minutes | 20 | Knee Arthroscopy | 2 psychomotor tests | 1.5 hours | Did not take the practice effect which occurred into account. | (39) |
| b) Propofol 2 mg/kg+ N ₂ O/O ₂ 67:37+ Fi Isoflurane 0.9% Mean anaesthetic duration 49.9 minutes | " | " | " | 1.5 hours | " | (39) |
| a) Propofol 2.5 mg/kg + Propofol 9/6 mg/kg/hr + N ₂ O/O ₂ 67:33 Mean anaesthetic Duration 33.5 minutes | 32 | Dental surgery | 4 psychomotor tests | 3 hours (Return to baseline levels only except for free recall.) | Matched with a control group who achieved consistently better results than baseline at 3 hours (practice effect) except with free recall. | (8) |
| b) Propofol 2.5 mg/kg + Propofol 9/6 mg/kg/hr + N ₂ O/O ₂ 67:33 + Alfentanil 10 mcg/kg/hr Mean anaesthetic duration 34.5 minutes | 25 | Gynaecological laparoscopy | " | 5 hours (Just approaching baseline) | 8% of subjects unable to even take the tests. Tissue stores must have been saturated with alfentanil to account for this prolonged sedation. | (8) |
| c) Propofol 2.5 mg/kg + Fi Isoflurane 1% + N ₂ O/O ₂ 67:33 Mean anesthetic time 32.3 minutes | 32 | Dental surgery | " | 3 hours (Return to baseline levels only.) | See above comments for (a) | (8) |
| d) Propofol 2.5 mg/kg + Fi Isoflurane 1% + N ₂ O/O ₂ 67:33 + Alfentanil 10 mcg/kg/hr + 10 mcg/kg/hr Mean anaesthetic duration 40.2 minutes | 25 | Gynaecological laparoscopy | " | 5 hours (Just approaching baseline) | 2% unable to take tests. | (8) |
| a) Propofol 230 mg (mean) + 10/6 mg/kg/hr + N ₂ O/O ₂ 67:33 + Alfentanil 920 mcg (mean) Mean anaesthetic duration 33 minutes | 24 | Knee Arthroscopy | 2 psychomotor tests | >1 hour | This group received a higher dose of alfentanil compared with the group below. No testing occurred after 1 hour. Large inter-individual variation seen. | (40) |

Table 5
Continued

| Anaesthetic agents | Number subjects | Procedure undertaken | Tests Used | Psychomotor recovery time period or alternative measure | Comments | Reference |
|--|-----------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|-----------|
| b) Propofol 237 mg (mean)+ Fi Isoflurane 0.5-2% + N ₂ O/O ₂ 67:33 + Alfentanil 740 mcg (mean) Mean anaesthetic duration 24 minutes | 26 | " | " | <1 hour | | (40) |
| Propofol 2.5 mg/kg + Desflurane 1.25 MAC + N ₂ O/O ₂ 60:40 Anaesthetic duration 1 hour | 20 | None | 9 psychomotor tests | 3 hours | Training undertaken | (32) |
| Propofol 2.5 mg/kg + Fentanyl 1mcg/kg + N ₂ O/O ₂ 50:50 + Desflurane 1 MAC for 30 minutes | 4 | None | Simulated driving | 3 hours At this time simulated driving was comparable with a BAL 50 mg/100ml. | Good study design. Compared functioning with that at the legal BAL for driving. Unfortunately only used small numbers. No training undertaken. | (41) |
| a) ET desflurane 4.7% Mean anaesthetic duration 146 minutes | 16 | Elective limb orthopaedic surgery | 2 psychomotor tests | 1 hour | No training undertaken Possible practice effect. | (42) |
| b) ET Isoflurane 0.8% Mean anaesthetic duration 149 minutes | 9 | " | " | 1 hour | " | (42) |
| Both groups were combined with: Midazolam 1-2 mg + Fentanyl 50 mcg+ Thiopentone 7 mg/kg + N ₂ O/O ₂ 60:40 | | | | | | |
| Propofol 2-3 mg/kg + Fi Isoflurane 0.5-2% + Alfentanil 980 mcg (mean) Mean anaesthetic duration 39.5 minutes | 15 | Knee Arthroscopy | 4 psychomotor tests | 1 hour | Practice effect seen with 3 of the 4 tests. Not seen with the perceptive accuracy test. | (43) |
| Sevoflurane ET Sevo 0.23% + Fentanyl 1.5 mcg/kg + N ₂ O/O ₂ 66:34 Mean anaesthetic duration 57 minutes | 13 | Non - neurological elective surgery | 2 psychomotor tests & visual evoked potentials | 1 hour except visual evoked potentials > 90 minutes | No further testing after 90 minutes. Practice effect evident but not accounted for. | (44) |

Note: Recovery times are based on the time taken for the mean test result to return to baseline or control levels unless otherwise specified.

MAC = minimal alveolar concentration.

ET = end tidal

Fi = fraction inspired

Table 6 gives a summary of the longest recovery times for all agents. Even acknowledging the cautionary points in previous paragraphs the evidence in this review has shown remarkably rapid psychomotor recovery with the modern anaesthetic agents. The studies to date have shown that midazolam, fentanyl, and propofol anaesthetics appear to be associated with virtually total recovery within 10 hours. Some studies have shown the occasional psychomotor test, for example free recall, to remain impaired for up to 24 hours but whether this test is very discriminatory or even has a significant effect on driving skills is debatable. EEG changes have also been shown to persist for >8 hours but the significance of this for driving has not been determined. When compared with legal driving limits for alcohol, these anaesthetics compare very favourably, skills being the same as at a 50 mg/100 ml alcohol level within 3 hours. Nitrous oxide has been shown to have a very rapid objective recovery period when used as a single agent, but in one study was associated with a significant subjective feeling of being "unwell" for up to 8 hours. The implications of this for driving are difficult to ascertain. Is it like driving when we have a cold or flu? The anaesthetics conducted with volatile agents are not as clear cut. Studies involving desflurane show rapid recovery times of within 3 hours. However, evidence on sevoflurane is insufficient to make conclusions, and evidence on isoflurane is only available from combination anaesthetics. Most of the combination or balanced general anaesthetic techniques have shown a recovery within 8 hours.

It appears that if a patient needs to be as alert as possible postoperatively the best anaesthetic agents to use for sedation are propofol or N₂O, with or without fentanyl (in doses <100 mcg). For general anaesthetics the best maintenance agents are propofol with

Table 6
Summary of longest recovery times of all agents (from 2 or more level II evidence trials)

| Anaesthetic agent | Longest psychomotor recovery time period or alternative measure | Number of studies |
|---|---|----------------------------------|
| Midazolam (Maximum dose 0.15 mg/kg) | 10 hours | 6 (14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19) |
| Diazepam (Maximum dose 0.3 mg/kg) | 7 hours | 4 (13, 15, 18, 20) |
| Propofol | 2 hours | 4 (19, 21, 22, 23) |
| Fentanyl (Maximum dose 2.5 mcg/kg) | 6 hours | 4 (13, 24, 25, 26) |
| N ₂ O/O ₂ (Maximum concentration 50:50) | 0.5 hours | 4 (27, 28, 29, 30) |
| Desflurane | 3 hours | 2 (31, 32) |
| Propofol/midazolam/fentanyl/ alfentanil | 8 hours | 6 (11, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37) |
| Propofol/N ₂ O maintenance (+ alfentanil infusion >5 hours (8)) | 3 hours | 4 (8, 38, 39, 40) |
| Desflurane/N ₂ O maintenance (±midazolam/fentanyl/propofol/ thiopentone) | 3 hours | 3 (32, 41, 42) |
| Isoflurane/N ₂ O maintenance (±midazolam/fentanyl/alfentanil boluses/propofol/thiopentone) (+ alfentanil infusion >5 hours (8)) | 3 hours | 7 (8, 36, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43) |

or without N₂O, desflurane/N₂O, or isoflurane/N₂O. If analgesia is required after a procedure it would seem logical to use non-sedative drugs such as paracetamol, non-steroidal antiinflammatory agents or local anaesthetics.

Conclusion

After conducting this review one could conclude that after a minimum period of 12 hours following day case sedation or anaesthesia it is probably safe to drive a motor vehicle. The caveat being that this time may have to be extended for individuals in poorer health, taking other medications, or having larger total doses of agents than quoted here. In addition, as a patient who drives 12 hours after a procedure is almost certainly driving at night, night driving ability then becomes important. In practice it would be appropriate to advise patients that it would be safe to drive the next morning. As with all medical decisions requiring justification with scientific evidence there is room for further large controlled trials. A multi-centre study involving a real-life cross section of patients having actual day surgical procedures, and looking specifically at their functioning after 12 hours, would be ideal.

Acknowledgements

Special thanks to Dr John Paull and Dr Simon Morphett for proof reading this paper and to Dr Phil Ogden for the original idea.

References

1. Australian and New Zealand College of Anaesthetists. Endoscopy of the Airways. Review PS17; 1997.
2. National Health and Medical Research Council. A Guide to the Development, Implementation and Evaluation of Clinical Practice Guidelines. Canberra; 1999.
3. Willette RE, Walsh JM. Drugs, Driving, and Traffic Safety. Geneva: World Health Organisation, 1983, Publication No. 78.
4. Ogg TW. An assessment of postoperative outpatient cases. *British Medical Journal* 1972; 4:573-766.
5. Correa R, Menezes RB, Wong J, Yogendran S, Jenkins K, Chung F. Compliance with postoperative instructions: a telephone survey of 750 day surgery patients. *Anaesthesia* 2001; 56:447-484.
6. Havard JDJ, in Medical Aspects of Fitness to Drive, (ed.) A Raffle, 3rd edn, p. 43. London, Medical Commission on Accident Prevention, 1976.
7. Mitchell MC. Alcohol-Induced Impairment of Central Nervous System Function: Behavioral Skills Involved in Driving. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* 1985; Supp 10:109-116.
8. Marshall CA, Jones RM, Bajorek PK, Cashman JN. Recovery characteristics using isoflurane or propofol for maintenance of anaesthesia: a double-blind controlled trial. *Anaesthesia* 1992; 47:461-466.
9. Rechtschaffen A, Kales A (eds): A manual of Standardized Terminology Techniques and Scoring System for Sleep Stages of Human Subjects. Washington DC, National Institutes of Health 1968, p. 204.
10. George CFP, Boudreau AC, Smiley A. Effects of nasal CPAP on simulated driving performance in patients with obstructive sleep apnoea. *Thorax* 1997; 52:648-653.
11. Lichtor JL, Alessi R, Lane BS. Sleep Tendency as a Measure of Recovery after Drugs Used for Ambulatory Surgery. *Anesthesiology* 2002; 96; 878-883.
12. Korttila K, Tammisto T, Ertama P, Pfaffli P, Blomgren E, Hakkinen S. Recovery, Psychomotor Skills, and Simulated Driving after Brief Inhalational Anaesthesia with Halothane or Enflurane Combined with Nitrous Oxide and Oxygen. *Anesthesiology* 1977; 46:20-27.
13. Ghoneim MM, Mewaldt SP, Thatcher JW. The Effect of Diazepam and Fentanyl on Mental, Psychomotor and Electroencephalographic Functions and Their Rate of Recovery. *Psychopharmacologia (Berl.)* 1975; 44:61-66.
14. Hindmarch I, Subhan Z. The Effects of Midazolam in Conjunction with Alcohol on Sleep, Psychomotor Performance and Car Driving Ability. *International Journal of Clinical Pharmacologic Res* 1983; 3(5):323-329.
15. Nuotto EJ, Korttila KT, Lichtor JL, Ostman PL, Rupani G. Sedation and Recovery of Psychomotor Function After Intravenous Administration of Various Doses of Midazolam and Diazepam. *Anesthesia and Analgesia* 1992; 74:265-271.

16. Gudgeon AC, Hindmarch I. Midazolam: Effects on Psychomotor Performance and Subjective Aspects of Sleep and Sedation in Normal Volunteers. *British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology* 1983; 16 Supp 1:121S-126S.
17. Lichtor JL, Zacny J, Korttila K et al. Alcohol After Midazolam Sedation: Does It Really Matter? *Anesthesia and Analgesia* 1991; 72:661-666.
18. Korttila K, Tarkkanen J. Comparison of Diazepam and Midazolam for Sedation during Local Anaesthesia for Bronchoscopy. *British Journal of Anaesthesia* 1985; 57:581-586.
19. Kestin IG, Harvey PB, Nixon C. Psychomotor Recovery after Three Methods of Sedation during Spinal Anaesthesia. *British Journal of Anaesthesia* 1990; 64:675-681.
20. Korttila K, Linnola M. Skills Related to Driving After Intravenous Diazepam, Flunitrazepam or Droperidol. *British Journal of Anaesthesia* 1974; 46:961-969.
21. Grant SA, Murdoch J, Millar K, Kenny GNC. Blood propofol concentration and psychomotor effects on driving skills. *British Journal of Anaesthesia* 2000; 85(3):396-400.
22. Ozone M, Itoh H, Yamadera W, et al. Changes in subjective sleepiness, subjective fatigue and nocturnal sleep after anaesthesia with propofol. *Psychiatry and Clinical Neurosciences* 2000; 54:317-318.
23. Sanders LD, Clyburn PA, Rosen M, Robinson JO. Propofol in short gynaecological procedures. *Anaesthesia* 1991; 46:451-455.
24. Manner T, Kanto J, Salonen M. Simple devices in differentiating the effects of buprenorphine and fentanyl in healthy volunteers. *European Journal of Clinical Pharmacology* 1987; 31(6):673-676.
25. Stevenson GW, Pathria MN, Lamping DL, Buck L, Rosenbloom D. Driving Ability After Intravenous Fentanyl or Diazepam. A Controlled Double-Blind Study. *Investigative Radiology* 1986; 21(9):717-719.
26. Kay B, Venkataraman P. Recovery After Fentanyl and Alfentanil in Anaesthesia for Minor Surgery. *British Journal of Anaesthesia* 1983; 55:169S-171S.
27. Trojan J, Saunders BP, Woloshynowych M, Debinsky HS, Williams CB. Immediate Recovery of Psychomotor Function After Patient-Administered Nitrous Oxide/Oxygen Inhalation for Colonoscopy. *Endoscopy* 1997; 29:17-22.
28. Martin JP, Sexton BF, Saunders BP, Atkin WS. Inhaled patient-administered nitrous oxide/oxygen mixture does not impair driving ability when used as analgesia during screening flexible sigmoidoscopy. *Gastrointestinal Endoscopy* 2000; 51(6):701-703.
29. Korttila K, Ghoneim MM, Jacobs L, Mewaldt SP, Petersen RC. Time Course of Mental and Psychomotor Effects of 30 Per Cent Nitrous Oxide during Inhalation and Recovery. *Anesthesiology* 1981; 54:220-226.
30. Cheam EWS, Dob DP, Skelly AM, Lockwood GG. The effect of nitrous oxide on the performance of psychomotor tests. *Anaesthesia* 1995; 50:764-768.
31. Fletcher JE, Sebel PS, Murphy MR, Smith CA, Mick SA, Flister MP. Psychomotor Performance After Desflurane Anaesthesia: A Comparison With Isoflurane. *Anesthesia and Analgesia* 1991; 73:260-265.
32. Apfelbaum JL, Lichtor JL, Lane BS, Coalson DW, Korttila KT. Awakening, Clinical Recovery, and Psychomotor Effects After Desflurane and Propofol Anaesthesia. *Anesthesia and Analgesia* 1996; 83:721-725.
33. Theodorou T, Hales P, Gillespie P, Robertson B. Total Intravenous Versus Inhalational Anaesthesia for Colonoscopy: A Prospective Study of Clinical Recovery and Psychomotor Function. *Anaesthesia and Intensive Care* 2001; 29:124-136.
34. Thapar P, Zacny JP, Choi M, Apfelbaum JL. Objective and Subjective Impairment from Often-Used Sedative/ Analgesic Combinations in Ambulatory Surgery, Using Alcohol as a Benchmark. *Anesthesia and Analgesia* 1995; 80:1092-1098.
35. Lichtor JL, Zacny J, Apfelbaum JL et al. Alcohol after Sedation with I.V. Midazolam-Fentanyl: Effects on Psychomotor Functioning. *British Journal of Anaesthesia* 1991; 67:579-584.
36. Larson LE, Gupta A, Ledin T, Doolan M, Linder P, Lennmarken C. Psychomotor recovery following propofol or isoflurane anaesthesia for day-care surgery. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand* 1992; 36(3):276-282.
37. Kestin IG, Chapman JM, Coates MB. Alfentanil used to supplement propofol infusions for oesophagoscopy and bronchoscopy. *Anaesthesia* 1989; 44:994-996.
38. Milligan KR, O'Toole DP, Howe JP, Cooper JC, Dundee JW. Recovery from Outpatient Anaesthesia: A Comparison of Incremental Propofol and Propofol-Isoflurane. *British Journal of Anaesthesia* 1987; 59:1111-1114.
39. Zuurmond WWA, Van Leeuwen L, Helmers JH. Recovery from propofol infusion as the main agent for outpatient arthroscopy. *Anaesthesia* 1987; 42:356-359.
40. Gupta A, Kullander M, Ekberg K, Lennmarken C. Assessment of recovery following day-case arthroscopy. A comparison between propofol and isoflurane-based anaesthesia. *Anaesthesia* 1995; 50:937-942.

41. Sinclair D, Chung F, Smiley A. Recovery and Simulated Driving after Outpatient Anaesthesia. *Canadian Journal of Anaesthesia Part II* 1999; 46:A28.
42. Tsai SK, Lee C, Kwan WF, Chen BJ. Recovery of Cognitive Functions after Anaesthesia with Desflurane of Isoflurane and Nitrous Oxide. *British Journal of Anaesthesia* 1992; 69:255-258.
43. Gupta A, Larson LE, Sjoberg F, Lindh ML, Lennmarken C. Thiopentone or propofol for induction of isoflurane-based anaesthesia for ambulatory surgery? *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand* 1992; 36:670-674.
44. Iohom G, Collins I, Murphy D, et al. Postoperative changes in visual evoked potentials and cognitive function tests following sevoflurane anaesthesia. *British Journal of Anaesthesia* 2001; 87(6):855-859.

Appendix

Description of Psychomotor Tests

| Psychomotor Test | Description |
|--------------------------|---|
| Choice reaction time | Time required to react to one specific stimulus, with a distinct response, when presented with multiple stimuli. |
| Critical flicker fusion | Requires the subject to discriminate flickering in a set of "four light emitting threshold diodes in foveal fixation at one metre." |
| Free recall | Ability to recall 9 objects off a picture card 15 minutes later. |
| Maddox wing test | Measures the divergence of the eyes (extraocular muscle balance) and is representative of general muscle tone. |
| Peg board test | Subject puts tight-fitting pegs through holes as quickly as possible. |
| Perceptive accuracy test | Involves reacting to a 2 digit number flashed transiently up on a screen by pressing the same numbers on a keyboard. |
| Tracking task | Subject maintains a marker icon in contact with a target circle moving across the screen. |
| Tracometer | A steering task. |
| Visual Evoked Potentials | Measurement of the integrity of the visual neural pathway. |