



شبكة المعلومات الجامعية

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ





شبكة المعلومات الجامعية



شبكة المعلومات الجامعية

التوثيق الالكتروني والميكرو فيلم

جامعة عين شمس

التوثيق الالكتروني والميكرو فيلم

قسم

نقسم بالله العظيم أن المادة التي تم توثيقها وتسجيلها
علي هذه الأفلام قد اعدت دون أية تغيرات



يجب أن

تحفظ هذه الأفلام بعيداً عن الغبار

في درجة حرارة من 15 – 20 مئوية ورطوبة نسبية من 20-40 %

To be kept away from dust in dry cool place of
15 – 25c and relative humidity 20-40 %



شبكة المعلومات الجامعية



بعض الوثائق الأصلية تالفة



شبكة المعلومات الجامعية



بالرسالة صفحات
لم ترد بالأصل

The Role of Calcium Channel Blockers in the Treatment of Theophylline Toxicity

Thesis

Submitted for the partial fulfillment of MD degree in Clinical Toxicology

Presented by

Mahmoud Lotfy Ahmad

Assistant lecturer of Clinical Toxicology

Forensic Medicine and Clinical Toxicology Department – Ain Shams University

Supervised by

Prof. Dr. Shawkia Mehanni Abdel Gawad

Professor of Forensic Medicine and Clinical Toxicology

Ain Shams University

Prof. Dr. Ahmad Kamel Mashhour

Professor of Forensic Medicine and Clinical Toxicology

Ain Shams University

Prof. Dr. Nahla Hassan Tolba

Assistant professor of Clinical Toxicology

Ain Shams University

Prof. Dr. Zeinab Abdel Kader Shehab El Din

Assistant professor of Pathology

Ain Shams University

Faculty of medicine

Ain Shams University

2001

B101V

1. The first part of the document is a list of the names of the persons who were present at the meeting.

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

قَالُوا سُبْحَانَكَ لَا عِلْمَ لَنَا إِلَّا
مَا عَلَّمْتَنَا إِنَّكَ أَنْتَ الْعَلِيمُ
الْحَكِيمُ.

صَدَقَ اللَّهُ الْعَظِيمُ

البقرة - الآية ٣٢

0
01
02
03
04
05
06
07
08
09

List of Contents

	Page
• Introduction	1
• Aim of the work	3
• Review of literature	
▪ Theophylline	4
▪ Calcium channel blockers	30
1. Verapamil	35
2. Nifedipine	42
3. Diltiazem	48
▪ Drug interactions of calcium channel blockers	55
▪ Therapeutic uses of calcium channel blockers	59
▪ Toxicity of calcium channel blockers	64
• Methodology	69
• Results	86
• Discussion	155
• English summary	179
• Conclusion and recommendations	194
• References	196
• Arabic summary	

List of Tables

	Page
Table (1): Showing age, sex, delay, mode of toxicity, type of the preparation, clinical manifestations, management and prognosis of patients with acute theophylline toxicity.	87
Table (2): Showing comparison between patients group of acute theophylline toxicity (50 patients) and control group (20 patients) as regard the tested biochemical parameters.	90
Table (3): Showing ECG changes noticed in some patients with acute theophylline toxicity.	91
Table (4): Showing correlation between plasma theophylline level and the studied biochemical parameters.	93
Table (5): Showing correlation between serum theophylline concentration and some clinical manifestations and ECG changes.	93
Table (6): ANOVA one way statistical analysis showing comparison between the -ve control group, gum acacia group, saline intraperitoneal group, verapamil group (receiving 0.1 mg verapamil I.P.), nifedipine group (receiving 0.1 mg nifedipine I.P.) and diltiazem group (receiving 0.1 mg diltiazem I.P.) as regard the tested biochemical parameters. Each group consisted of 20 rats.	96
Table (7): Student (t) test showing comparison between the negative control group and theophylline group (receiving LD50 of theophylline orally) as regard the tested biochemical parameters.	97
Table (8): ANOVA one-way statistical analysis showing comparison between the -ve control group, theophylline group (receiving LD50 of theophylline orally), verapamil-1 hour group (receiving 0.1 mg verapamil I.P. 1-hour after LD50 of theophylline), verapamil-2 hours group (receiving 0.1 mg verapamil I.P. 2-hours after LD50 of theophylline) and verapamil-4 hours group (receiving 0.1 mg verapamil I.P. 4-hours after LD50 of theophylline) as regard the tested biochemical parameters.	98
Table (9): ANOVA one-way statistical analysis showing comparison between the -ve control group, theophylline group (receiving LD50 of theophylline orally), nifedipine-1 hour group (receiving 0.1 mg nifedipine I.P. 1-hour after LD50 of theophylline), nifedipine-2 hours group (receiving 0.1 mg nifedipine I.P. 2-hours after LD50 of theophylline) and nifedipine-4 hours group (receiving 0.1 mg nifedipine I.P. 4-hours after LD50 of theophylline) as regard the tested biochemical parameters.	101

Table (10): ANOVA one-way statistical analysis showing comparison between the n-ve control group, theophylline group (receiving LD50 of theophylline orally), Diltiazem-1 hour group (receiving 0.1 mg diltiazem I.P. 1-hour after LD50 of theophylline), diltiazem-2 hours group (receiving 0.1 mg diltiazem I.P. 2-hours after LD50 of theophylline) and diltiazem-4 hours group (receiving 0.1 mg diltiazem I.P. 4-hours after LD50 of theophylline) as regard the tested biochemical parameters.	104
Table (11): ANOVA one-way statistical analysis showing comparison between the -ve control group, theophylline group (receiving LD50 of theophylline orally), verapamil 1 hour group (receiving 0.1 mg verapamil I.P. 1-hour after LD50 of theophylline), nifedipine-1 hour group (receiving 0.1 mg nifedipine I.P. 1-hour after LD50 of theophylline) and diltiazem-1 hour group (receiving 0.1 mg diltiazem I.P. 1-hour after LD50 of theophylline) as regard the tested biochemical parameters.	106
Table (12): ANOVA one way statistical analysis showing comparison between the -ve control group, gum acacia group, saline intraperitoneal group, verapamil group, nifedipine group and diltiazem group as regard pulse rate and rhythm. Each group consisted of 20 rats.	109
Table (13): ANOVA one way statistical analysis showing comparison between the -ve control group, gum acacia group, saline intraperitoneal group, verapamil group, nifedipine group and diltiazem group as regard PR interval, QRS complex duration and QT interval. Each group consisted of 20 rats.	109
Table (14): Comparison between the -ve control group, gum acacia group, saline intraperitoneal group, verapamil group, nifedipine group and diltiazem group as regard changes in P-wave, T-wave and ST-segment. Each group consisted of 20 rats.	110
Table (15): Student t-test showing comparison between the -ve control group and theophylline group (receiving LD50 of theophylline) as regard the pulse rate.	111
Table (16): Chi square test showing comparison between the negative control group and theophylline group (receiving LD50 of theophylline orally) as regard the pulse rhythm.	111
Table (17): Student t-test showing comparison between the -ve control group and theophylline group (receiving LD50 of theophylline) as regard the PR-interval, QRS complex duration and QT interval.	111

	Page
Table (18): Comparison between the negative control group and theophylline group (receiving LD50 of theophylline orally) as regard the P-wave.	112
Table (19): Chi square test showing comparison between the negative control group and theophylline group (receiving LD50 of theophylline orally) as regard the T-wave.	112
Table (20): Chi square test showing comparison between the negative control group and theophylline group (receiving LD50 of theophylline orally) as regard the ST-segment.	112
Table (21): ANOVA one-way statistical analysis showing comparison between the -ve control group, theophylline group (receiving LD50 of theophylline orally), verapamil-1 hour group (receiving 0.1 mg verapamil I.P. 1-hour after LD50 of theophylline), verapamil-2 hours group (receiving 0.1 mg verapamil I.P. 2-hours after LD50 of theophylline) and verapamil-4 hours group (receiving 0.1 mg verapamil I.P. 4-hours after LD50 of theophylline) as regard the pulse rate.	113
Table (22): Chi square test showing comparison between the negative control group, theophylline group (receiving LD50 of theophylline orally), verapamil-1 hour group (receiving 0.1 mg verapamil I.P. 1-hour after LD50 of theophylline), verapamil-2 hours group (receiving 0.1 mg verapamil I.P. 2-hours after LD50 of theophylline) and verapamil-4 hours group (receiving 0.1 mg verapamil I.P. 4-hours after LD50 of theophylline) as regard the pulse rhythm.	114
Table (23): ANOVA one-way statistical analysis showing comparison between the -ve control group, theophylline group (receiving LD50 of theophylline orally), verapamil-1 hour group (receiving 0.1 mg verapamil I.P. 1-hour after LD50 of theophylline), verapamil-2 hours group (receiving 0.1 mg verapamil I.P. 2-hours after LD50 of theophylline) and verapamil-4 hours group (receiving 0.1 mg verapamil I.P. 4-hours after LD50 of theophylline) as regard the PR-interval, QRS complex duration and QT-interval.	115
Table (24): Comparison between the negative control group, theophylline group (receiving LD50 of theophylline orally), verapamil-1 hour group (receiving 0.1 mg verapamil I.P. 1-hour after LD50 of theophylline), verapamil-2 hours group (receiving 0.1 mg verapamil I.P. 2-hours after LD50 of theophylline) and verapamil-4 hours group (receiving 0.1 mg verapamil I.P. 4-hours after LD50 of theophylline) as regard the the P-wave.	116

	Page
Table (25): Chi square test showing comparison between the negative control group, theophylline group (receiving LD50 of theophylline orally), verapamil-1 hour group (receiving 0.1 mg verapamil I.P. 1-hour after LD50 of theophylline), verapamil-2 hours group (receiving 0.1 mg verapamil I.P. 2-hours after LD50 of theophylline) and verapamil-4 hours group (receiving 0.1 mg verapamil I.P. 4-hours after LD50 of theophylline) as regard the T-wave.	117
Table (26): Chi square test showing comparison between the negative control group, theophylline group (receiving LD50 of theophylline orally), verapamil-1 hour group (receiving 0.1 mg verapamil I.P. 1-hour after LD50 of theophylline), verapamil-2 hours group (receiving 0.1 mg verapamil I.P. 2-hours after LD50 of theophylline) and verapamil-4 hours group (receiving 0.1 mg verapamil I.P. 4-hours after LD50 of theophylline) as regard the ST-segment.	118
Table (27): ANOVA one-way statistical analysis showing comparison between the negative control group, theophylline group (receiving LD50 of theophylline orally), nifedipine-1 hour group (receiving 0.1 mg nifedipine I.P. 1-hour after LD50 of theophylline), nifedipine-2 hours group (receiving 0.1 mg nifedipine I.P. 2-hours after LD50 of theophylline) and nifedipine-4 hours group (receiving 0.1 mg nifedipine I.P. 4-hours after LD50 of theophylline) as regard the pulse rate.	120
Table (28): Chi square test showing comparison between the negative control group, theophylline group (receiving LD50 of theophylline orally), nifedipine-1 hour group (receiving 0.1 mg nifedipine I.P. 1-hour after LD50 of theophylline), nifedipine-2 hours group (receiving 0.1 mg nifedipine I.P. 2-hours after LD50 of theophylline) and nifedipine-4 hours group (receiving 0.1 mg nifedipine I.P. 4-hours after LD50 of theophylline) as regard the pulse rhythm.	121
Table (29): ANOVA one-way statistical analysis showing comparison between the negative control group, theophylline group (receiving LD50 of theophylline orally), nifedipine-1 hour group (receiving 0.1 mg nifedipine I.P. 1-hour after LD50 of theophylline), nifedipine-2 hours group (receiving 0.1 mg nifedipine I.P. 2-hours after LD50 of theophylline) and nifedipine-4 hours group (receiving 0.1 mg nifedipine I.P. 4-hours after LD50 of theophylline) as regard the PR-interval, QRS complex duration and QT-interval.	122
Table (30): Comparison between the negative control group, theophylline group (receiving LD50 of theophylline orally), nifedipine-1 hour group (receiving 0.1 mg nifedipine I.P. 1-hour after LD50 of theophylline), nifedipine-2 hours group (receiving 0.1 mg nifedipine I.P. 2-hours after LD50 of theophylline) and nifedipine-4 hours group (receiving 0.1 mg nifedipine I.P. 4-hours after LD50 of theophylline) as regard the P-wave.	123