Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

# CENTRAL ANALGESIC EFFECTS OF THE NON-STEROIDAL ANTI INFLAMMATORY DRUGS

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Veterinary Science

in

Veterinary Pharmacology
at Massey University, Palmerston North
New Zealand

IGNACIO LIZARRAGA-MADRIGAL 2000

### ABSTRACT

In addition to their well-known peripheral analgesic effects, non-steroidal antiinflammatory drugs also exert antinociceptive actions at the central level.
However, it is not clear if these central effects are spinally or supraspinally
mediated nor whether cyclooxygenase inhibition or the interaction of these
drugs with neurones in a different way is responsible for these central analgesic
actions. This project investigated the possible central analgesic mechanisms of
action of these drugs. It involved the use of *in vitro* neonatal rat hemisected
spinal cord preparations and sheep implanted with indwelling cervical
intrathecal catheters.

The dorsal root of the neonatal rat hemisected spinal cord preparations was electrically stimulated in such a way to evoke excitatory postsynaptic potentials in the ipsilateral ventral root. All records from this *in vivo* technique were identified as artefacts and no further experiments were carried out.

Conscious, unrestrained, non-lame sheep chronically implanted with indwelling cervical intrathecal catheters were submitted to mechanical noxious stimulation of the left radius. They received cumulative intrathecal doses of ketoprofen, phenylbutazone, salicylic acid and tolfenamic acid as well as repetitive intrathecal administration of normal saline without significantly affecting mechanical thresholds. The same drugs and normal saline were also given intravenously and only ketoprofen and tolfenamic acid significantly raised the nociceptive thresholds.

The involvement of spinal opioidergic and  $\alpha_2$ -adrenergic mechanisms in the hypoalgesia induced by the intravenous administration of ketoprofen in sheep was investigated. The prior intrathecal administration of naloxone and atipamezole at a dose that had no effect on nociceptive thresholds and reversed the analgesia mediated by intravenous fentanyl and xylazine, respectively, almost completely reversed the antinociceptive effects mediated by intravenous ketoprofen.

iv Abstract

These studies confirm that non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs can produce hypoalgesia even when inflammation is absent and, although they did not have a direct effect on the spinal cord, their analgesic action appeared to be spinally mediated by opioidergic and adrenergic descending inhibitory systems.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

| ABSTRACT   | iii                  |
|--|----------------------|
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS   | xi                   |
| ABBREVIATIONS  | xiii                 |
| LIST OF TABLES   | xvii                 |
| LIST OF FIGURES  | xix                  |
| Chapter 1 GENERAL INTRODUCTION   | 1                    |
| Chapter 2 LITERATURE REVIEW  | 5                    |
| 2.1. PAIN  | 5                    |
| 2.1.1. The nociceptive pathways  | 7                    |
| 2.1.1.1. Peripheral afferent input   | 8                    |
| 2.1.1.2. The spinal cord   | 10                   |
| 2.1.1.3. Ascending spinal pathways   | 12                   |
| 2.1.1.4. The brain   | 1.1                  |
|  |                      |
| 2.1.1.5. Descending inhibitory systems   |                      |
| 2.1.1.5. Descending inhibitory systems   | 14                   |
| 2.1.1.5. Descending inhibitory systems   | 14                   |
| 2.1.1.5. Descending inhibitory systems  2.2. GLUTAMATE RECEPTORS  2.2.1. lonotropic glutamate receptors  | 14                   |
| 2.1.1.5. Descending inhibitory systems  2.2. GLUTAMATE RECEPTORS  2.2.1. lonotropic glutamate receptors  2.2.1.1. AMPA receptors                             | 14                   |
| 2.1.1.5. Descending inhibitory systems  2.2. GLUTAMATE RECEPTORS  2.2.1. lonotropic glutamate receptors  2.2.1.1. AMPA receptors  2.2.1.2. Kainate receptors | 14<br>17<br>18<br>18 |
| 2.1.1.5. Descending inhibitory systems  2.2. GLUTAMATE RECEPTORS  2.2.1. lonotropic glutamate receptors  2.2.1.1. AMPA receptors                             | 14<br>17<br>18<br>20 |

| 2.2.1.3.2.1. NMDA receptors and the AA pathway                         | 26         |
|--|------------|
| 2.2.1.3.2.2. NMDA receptors and the NO pathway                         | 27         |
| 2.2.1.3.2.3. Interactions between the AA and NO pathways               | 31         |
| 2.2.1.3.3. NMDA receptors and the release of other                     |            |
| neuromediators   | 32         |
|  |            |
| 2.2.2. Metabotropic glutamate receptors                                | 36         |
| 2.2.2.1. Excitatory effects of mGluRs                                  | 37         |
| 2.2.2.2. Inhibitory effects of mGluRs                                  | 38         |
| 2.3. THE ARACHIDONIC ACID PATHWAY                                      | 39         |
| 2.3.1. Leukotrienes  | 41         |
| 2.3.2. Prostaglandins  | 42         |
| 2.3.2.1. Cyclooxygenases   | 43         |
| 2.3.2.1.1. Cycoolxygenase isoforms and functions                       | 43         |
| 2.3.2.1.2. Cycoolxygenases and the nociceptive process                 | 45         |
| 2.3.2.1.3. Cycoolxygenase inhibition by NSAIDs                         | 47         |
| 2.3.2.2. Prostaglandins and the nociceptive process                    | 48         |
| 2.3.2.3. Prostanoid receptors  | 52         |
| 2.4. CENTRAL ANALGESIC EFFECTS OF                                      | <b>5</b> 7 |
| NONSTEROIDAL ANTI-INFLAMMATORY DRUGS                                   | 37         |
| 2.4.1 Possible central antinociceptive mechanisms of action for NSAIDs | 50         |
| 2.4.1.1. NSAIDs and prostanoid synthesis inhibition                    |            |
| 2.4.1.2. NSAIDs and glutamate receptors                                |            |
| 2.4.1.3. NSAIDs and descending inhibitory mechanisms                   |            |
| 2.4.1.4. NSAIDs and other receptor systems and signal                  | 02         |
| transduction pathways  | 63         |
| 2.4.1.5. NSAIDs and interference with nuclear related events           |            |
| 2.7. 1.3. NOAIDS and interference with nuclear related events          | 04         |
| 2.5. INDUCTION AND ASSESSMENT OF PAIN                                  | 66         |
| 2.5.1. Animal models of acute pain                                     | 67         |
| 2.5.2. Animal models of chronic pain                                   | 68         |

| 2.6. AIMS OF THE PROJECT  | 70 |
|---|----|
| Chapter 3 EFFECT OF NON-STEROIDAL ANTI-<br>INFLAMMATORY DRUGS ON NMDA-RECEPTOR<br>SYNAPTIC TRANSMISSION IN THE <i>in vitro</i> RAT<br>SPINAL CORD PREPARATION | 71 |
| 3.1. INTRODUCTION   | 71 |
| 3.2. MATERIALS AND METHODS  | 72 |
| 3.2.1. Spinal cord preparation  | 72 |
| 3.2.2. Recording techniques   | 75 |
| 3.2.3. Drugs  | 76 |
| 3.2.4. Data analysis  |    |
| 3.3. RESULTS  | 77 |
| 3.4. DISCUSSION   | 80 |
| Chapter 4 THE CENTRAL ANALGESIC EFFECTS OF NON-STEROIDAL ANTI-INFLAMMATORY DRUGS IN SHEEP   | 85 |
| 4.1. INTRODUCTION   |    |
| 4.2. MATERIALS AND METHODS  | 86 |
| 4.2.1. Animals and intratecal catheterisation   | 86 |
| 4.2.2. Mechanical Nociceptive Testing   |    |
| 4.2.3. Drug admninistration protocol  |    |
| 4.2.3.1. Intrathecal administration of NSAIDs   | 93 |
| 4.2.3.2 Intravenous aministration of NSAIDs   |    |

| 4.2.3.3. Involvement of opioidergic and $\alpha$ -adrenergic    |     |
|---|-----|
| systems in the NSAIDs-induced analgesia                         | 95  |
| 4.2.4 Statistical analysis                                      | 96  |
|   |     |
|   |     |
| 4.3. RESULTS  | 97  |
| 4.3.1. Intrathecal catheterisation of sheep                     | 97  |
| 4.3.2. Intrathecal administration of NSAIDs                     | 105 |
| 4.3.3. Intravenous administration of NSAIDs                     | 111 |
| 4.3.4. Involvement of opiodergic and α <sub>2</sub> -adrenergic |     |
| systems in NSAID-induced analgesia                              | 114 |
| 4.3.4.1. Blockade of spinal opioid receptors                    | 114 |
| 4.3.4.2. Blockade of spinal α₂-adrenoceptors                    | 115 |
| 4.3.4.3. Influence of spinal opioid and $\alpha_2$ -adrenergic  |     |
| receptor blockade on i.v. ketoprofen-induced analgesia          | 119 |
|   |     |
| 4.4. DISCUSSION   | 121 |
| 4.4.1. Intrathecal catheterisation in sheep.                    | 121 |
| 4.4.1.1. Catheter implantation technique                        | 121 |
| 4.4.1.2. Catheter maintenance                                   | 121 |
| 4.4.1.3. Catheter replacing and anchoring                       | 122 |
| 4.4.1.4. Assessment of catheter functionality                   | 124 |
| 4.4.1.5. Complications  | 126 |
| 4.4.2. Mechanical nociceptive testing                           | 127 |
| 4.4.3. Effect of NSAIDs on sheep's nociceptive                  |     |
| mechanical thresholds   | 129 |
| 4.4.3.1. Intrathecal injection of NSAIDs                        | 130 |
| 4.4.3.1.1. Spinal COX inhibition as analgesic                   |     |
| mechanism of action of NSAIDs?                                  | 130 |
| 4.4.3.1.2. Protocol and safety of NSAID injected i.t            | 139 |
| 4.4.3.2. Intravenous injection of NSAIDs                        | 140 |
| 4.4.3.2.1. Lack of analgesia with salicylic acid                |     |
| and phenylbutazone  | 141 |
| 4.4.3.2.2. Supragninal analogoic action of NSAIDs               | 142 |

|           | 4.4.3.2.1.1. Blockage of spinal opioid and            |        |
|-----------|---|--------|
|           | $\alpha_2$ -adrenergic receptor                       | 143    |
|           | 4.4.3.2.1.2. Activation of descending inhibitory mech | anisms |
|           | as analgesic mode of action of NSAIDs                 | 148    |
| Chapter 5 | GENERAL CONCLUSIONS                                   | 155    |
| REFEREN   | ICES  | 157    |

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I am deeply grateful to my supervisor, Dr Paul Chambers, who introduced me to the fascinating area of pain control. Thanks Paul for your help, guidance and encouragement during all this time.

I would also like to thank Sean Johnson for his assistance in the anaesthesia of the sheep and the preparation of drugs given to these animals during the whole experiment.

Thanks are also due to Dr Nicolás López-Villaobos who provided helpful advice on statistics.

The New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade granted me an NZODA Study Award, which made my stay possible in this beautiful country, for which I am also very thankful.



## **ABBREVIATIONS**

[Ca<sup>2+</sup>]<sub>i</sub> Intracellular calcium concentration.

5-HT Serotonin.

AA Arachidonic acid.

ACh Acetylcholine.

ACSF Artificial cerebral spinal fluid.

AMPA α-amino-3-hydroxy-5-methyl-4-isoxalone propionic acid.

ANOVA Analysis of variance.

AUC Area under the curve.

AUC30 Area under the threshold change vs. time curve values for 30

minutes.

AUC60 Area under the threshold change vs. time curve values for 60

minutes.

BDNF Brain-derived neurotrophic factor.

C5 Cervical vertebra 5.

CaM Calcium-calmodulin complex.

CaMKII Calcium/calmodulin-dependent protein kinase II.

cAMP 3',5'-cyclic guanosine monophosphate.

CDI Calcium-dependent inactivation.

cGMP 3',5'-cyclic guanosine monophosphate.

CGRP Calcitonin gene-related peptide.

CNS Central nervous system.

COX Cyclooxygenases.

COX-1-li COX-1-like immunoreactivity.

COX-2-like immunoreactivity.

cPGI<sub>2</sub> Carbaprostacyclin.

CSF Cerebral spinal fluid.

DHN Dorsal horn neurones.

DLF Dorsolateral funiculus.

DP Prostaglandin D receptor.

DRCAP Dorsal root compound action potential.

DRG Dorsal root ganglion.

DR-VRP Dorsal root-ventral root potential.

e.p.s.p. Excitatory postsynaptic potential.

EEA Excitatory amino acid.

eNOS Eendothelial nitric oxide synthase.

EOX Epoxygenases.

EP Prostaglandin E<sub>2</sub> receptor.

GABA γ-Aminobutyric acid.

HETE Hydroxyeicosatetraenoic acids.

i.c.v. Intracerebroventricular, intracerebroventricularly.

i.p. Intraperitoneal, intraperitonaelly.

i.t. Intrathecal, intrathecally.

i.v. Intravenous, intravenously.

IL-1β Interleukin-1β.

iNOS Inducible nitric oxide synthase.

Ins(1,4,5)P3 Inositol-(1,4,5) triphosphate.

LOX Lipoxygenases.

L-PGDS Lipocalin-type prostaglandin D synthase.

LPS Lipopolysacharide.

LTs Leukotrienes.

mGluRs Metabotropic glutamate receptors.

MSR Monosynaptic compound action potential.

N Newtons.

NFκB Nuclear factor κB.

NMDA N-methyl-D-aspartate.

nNOS Neuronal nitric oxide synthase.

NO Nitric oxide.

NOS Nitric oxide synthase.

NRM Nucleus raphe magnus.

NSAIDs Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs.

p.o. Per os, oral administration.

PAG Periaqueductal grey.

PGs Prostaglandins.

PKA Protein kinase A.

PKC Protein kinase C.

PLA<sub>2</sub> Phospholipase A<sub>2</sub>.

PLC Phospholipase C.

PMNLs Polymorphonuclear leukocytes.

PTK Protein tyrosine kynase.

RVM Rostral ventromedial medulla.

SP Substance P.

TNF- $\alpha$  Tumour necrosis factor- $\alpha$ .

trkA Tyrosine kinase A.

trkB Tyrosine kinase B

Tx Thromboxane.



# LIST OF TABLES

| Table 2.1. Ligand-gated ion channels and ionotropic and                   |
|---|
| metabotropic receptors expressed by nociceptive primary                   |
| afferent neurones9  |
|   |
| Table 2.2. Distribution and functions of opioid receptors                 |
|   |
| Table 2.3. Comparison between COX-1 and COX-244                           |
|   |
| Table 2.4. Functions of COX-1 and COX-2 determined by                     |
| Ptgs 1 and Ptgs 2 gene depletion in mice, respectively46                  |
|   |
| Table 2.5. Properties and distribution of prostaglandin receptors      53 |
| Table 2.4 Floatise Street Complete the second construction                |
| Table 3.1. Electrical stimuli applied to the spinal cord preparation      |
| and data acquisition parameters76   |
| Table 4.1. Summary of the intrathecal catheterisation in the sheep98      |
| Table 1111 Callinary of the intratitodal cathotolication in the officep   |
| Table 4.2. Evaluation of the analgesic effect of intrathecally and        |
| epidurally administered non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs in          |
| different species   |

# LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure 2.1. Division of the spinal cord grey matter according                              |
|--|
| to its cytoarchitecture in laminae I-X11   |
|  |
| Figure 2.2. The role of glutamate receptors and their interaction with                     |
| other receptor systems in the modulation of nociceptive processing.                        |
| Refer to the text for details25  |
| Figure 2.3. Major pathways of the arachidonic acid cascade40                               |
| Figure 3.1. The preparation chamber. The hemicord was placed to the                        |
| right of the negative stimulating electrode with the dorsal root in contact                |
| to the positive stimulating electrode. The ventral root was in contact with                |
| the positive recording electrode   |
|  |
| Figure 3.2. The superfusion system. The ACSF was continuously gassed                       |
| with 95% O <sub>2</sub> / 5% CO <sub>2</sub> and pumped through a heated water jacket. The |
| ACSF was dripped onto the preparation chamber and then it was collected                    |
| as waste74   |
|  |
| Figure 3.3. Artefacts obtained after electrical stimulation to evoke                       |
| the DRCAP (A), the low intensity e.p.s.p. (B), the high intensity e.p.s.p.                 |
| (C) and the train e.p.s.p (D) in the neonatal rat hemisected spinal cord                   |
| preparation  |
| *  |
| Figure 3.4. Effect of lignocaine (1 mM) on nerve action potentials from                    |
| mice sciatic nerve. The threshold of this nerve was 0.5 v (not showed)                     |
| and a 6 v stimulus was used to evoke both A and C fibre compuond                           |
| action potentials (A), which amplitude was blocked and reduced,                            |
| respectively, by lignocaine (B). Recovery is shown 25 minutes                              |
| following return to lignocaine-free medium (C)79   |

| Figure 4.1. Radiograph showing the correct placement of an intrathecal        |
|---|
| catheter in sheep, whit the catheter tip (arrow) at the C5 level88            |
| Figure 4.2. A knot made with the intrathecal catheter itself (A) and a        |
| silicon tubular drain (B) were used to anchor the intrathecal catheter.       |
| In both cases, the anchoring element, knot or drain tube, was kept            |
| subcutaneously (A and C)89  |
| Figure 4.3. Mechanical nociceptive device. The 2 mm diameter blunted          |
| pin attached to the plunger was pushed against the sheep's leg91              |
| Figure 4.4. Mechanical device's calibration curve. The X axis shows           |
| The pressure applied to elicits the corresponding force at 1 Newton           |
| intervals92   |
| Figure 4.5. Sheep's head medial section with the spinal cord exposed          |
| until the caudal aspect of C2. The Tuohy needle was superimposed on           |
| the atlanto-occipital joint to indicate the position where the needle had to  |
| be inserted through for the implantation of intrathecal catheters100          |
| Figure 4.6. Effect of 100 μL xylazine (388 and 1940 μM i.t.) on nociceptive   |
| thresholds of healthy sheep over two or three hours after administration      |
| (time 0). The data is the mean $\pm$ s.e.m. for $n$ = 11 cathterisations on 7 |
| sheep for the 388 $\mu M$ dose and $n$ = 6cathterisations on 6 sheep for the  |
| 1940 μM dose102   |
| Figure 4.7. Spinal cord histopatology showing neutrophil accumulation         |
| in the dura mater (arrow) of sheep no. 116. Magnification 4x104               |
| Figure 4.8. Effect of intrathecal repetitive administration of 100 μL saline  |
| solution (0.9%) on nociceptive thresholds of healthy sheep over 30            |
| minutes after administration (time 0) (A) and their respective AUC30 (B).     |
| The data is the mean $\pm$ s.e.m. for $n = 5$ sheep                           |

| Figure 4.9. Effect of intrathecal cumulative doses of 100 μL ketoprofen             |     |
|---|-----|
| $(0.8-200~\mu\mathrm{M})$ on nociceptive thresholds of healthy sheep over 30        |     |
| minutes after administration (time 0) (A) and their respective AUC30 (B).           |     |
| The data is the mean $\pm$ s.e.m. for $n$ = 4-5 sheep                               | 107 |
|   |     |
| Figure 4.10. Effect of intrathecal cumulative doses of 100 $\mu$ L                  |     |
| phenylbutazone (0.375 – 200 $\mu M$ ) on nociceptive thresholds of healthy          |     |
| sheep over 30 minutes after administration (time 0) (A) and their                   |     |
| respective AUC30 (B). The data is the mean $\pm$ s.e.m. for $n$ = 5 sheep           | 108 |
|   |     |
| Figure 4.11. Effect of intrathecal cumulative doses of 100 μL salicylic             |     |
| acid (0.375 – 200 $\mu M$ ) on nociceptive thresholds of healthy sheep over         |     |
| 30 minutes after administration (time 0) (A) and their respective AUC30             |     |
| (B). The data is the mean $\pm$ s.e.m. for $n$ = 5 sheep                            | 109 |
|   |     |
| Figure 4.12. Effect of intrathecal cumulative doses of 100µL tolfenamic             |     |
| acid (0.375 – 200 $\mu M$ ) on nociceptive thresholds of healthy sheep over         |     |
| 30 minutes after administration (time 0) (A) and their respective AUC30             |     |
| (B). The data is the mean $\pm$ s.e.m. for $n$ = 4-5 sheep                          | 110 |
|   |     |
| Figure 4.13. Effect of ketoprofen (3 mg/kg i.v.) and tolfenamic acid                |     |
| (2 mg/kg i.v.) on nociceptive thresholds of healthy sheep over six hours            |     |
| after administration (time 0) compared with saline (3 mL i.v.). The data            |     |
| is the mean $\pm$ s.e.m. for $n$ = 5-6 sheep from $-20$ to 120 minutes and          |     |
| n = 2 sheep from 150 to 360 minutes   | 112 |
|   |     |
| Figure 4.14. AUC60 for i.v. injected NSAIDs. The data is the mean $\pm$             |     |
| s.e.m. for $n = 5$ -6 sheep. * Represents a significant ( $P = 0.0001$ , $t$ -test) |     |
| difference between treatment and saline   | 113 |
| Figure 4.15. Effect of ketoprofen (3 mg/kg i.v.) and tolfenamic acid                |     |
| (2 mg/kg i.v.) on nociceptive thresholds of healthy sheep over two                  |     |
| hours after administration (time 0) compared with saline (3 mL i.v.).               |     |
| and daminoration (time of compared with same to me i.v.).                           |     |

| The data is the mean $\pm$ s.e.m. for $n$ = 5-6 sheep  |
|--|
| Figure 4.16. Effect of fentanyl (10 μg/kg i.v.) and naloxone (100 μL, 5.49 mM i.t.) alone and the combinations i.t. naloxone + i.v. fentanyl |
|  |
| and i.t. saline (100 µL) + i.v. fentanyl on nociceptive thresholds of healthy  |
| sheep over one hour after administration (time -10 and 0 for i.t. and  |
| i.v. treatments, respectively) compared with saline (3 mL i.v.) (A) and  |
| their respective AUC60 (B). The data is the mean $\pm$ s.e.m. for $n$ = 4  |
| sheep, except saline i.v. where $n = 5$ . * Represents a significant ( $P =$   |
| 0.0001, t-test) difference between treatment and saline and **   |
| between treatment and fentanyl i.v. alone116   |
|  |
| Figure 4.17. Effect of xylazine (20 $\mu$ g/kg i.v.) and atipamezole (100 $\mu$ L,   |
| 4.03 mM i.t.) alone and the combinations i.t. atipamezole + i.v. xylazine  |
| and i.t. saline (100 µL) + i.v. xylazine on nociceptive thresholds of healthy  |
| sheep over one hour after administration (time -10 and 0 for i.t. and  |
| i.v. treatments, respectively) compared with saline (3 mL i.v.) (A) and  |
| their respective AUC60 (B). The data is the mean $\pm$ s.e.m. for $n$ = 4  |
| sheep, except saline i.v. where $n = 5$ . * Represents a significant ( $P =$   |
| 0.0001, t-test) difference between treatment and saline and **   |
| between treatment and xylazine i.v. alone117   |
|  |
| Figure 4.18. Effect of xylazine (20 $\mu$ g/kg i.v.; mean $\pm$ s.e.m. $n$ = 4) and  |
| yohimbine (100 $\mu$ L, 5.11 mM i.t.; $n$ = 1) alone and the combinations i.t.   |
| yohimbine + i.v. xylazine (mean $\pm$ s.e.m. $n$ = 2 from $-30$ to 120 minutes   |
| 4.5-4.6-4.00   |

**Figure 4.19.** Effect of ketoprofen (3 mg/kg i.v.) alone and the combinations i.t. saline (100  $\mu$ L) + i.v. ketoprofen, i.t. naloxone (100  $\mu$ L, 5.49 mM) + i.v. ketoprofen and i.t. atipamezole (100  $\mu$ L, 4.03 mM) + i.v. ketoprofen

| on nociceptive thresholds of healthy sheep over one hour after administration    |
|--|
| (time -10 and 0 for i.t. and i.v. treatments, respectively) compared with        |
| saline (3 mL i.v.) (A) and their respective AUC60 (B). The data is the mean      |
| $\pm$ s.e.m. for $n$ = 6 sheep, except saline i.v. where $n$ = 5. * Represents a |
| significant (P = 0.0001, t-test) difference between treatment and saline         |
| and ** between treatment and ketoprofen i.v. alone                               |