Analyzing the Effects of Morphine with a Cybernetic Model

Ansh Dholakia, Dr. Brian L. Stuart

College of Computing & Informatics, Drexel University, PA

DOI:10.37648/ijrmst.v18i01.005

[1]*Received: 29 May 2024; Accepted: 30 July 2024; Published: 06 September 2024*

ABSTRACT

Morphine is a widely recognized analgesic used to mitigate pain, especially during intense medical procedures. Its primary function is to relieve patients from unbearable pain by interacting with the body's central nervous system. Despite its effectiveness, cases where morphine does not alleviate pain, or produces an inadequate effect, present challenges in clinical settings. This study explores the application of morphine using a cybernetic automaton model, wherein pain response is viewed through the lens of classical conditioning. By simulating morphine administration in different contexts, the study aims to deepen the understanding of how preemptive and reactive morphine application alters pain perception.

Index Terms—*morphine; classical conditioning; pain response; cybernetic modeling; pain mitigation*

INTRODUCTION

The use of morphine in clinical settings has a long-established history in the management of severe pain, particularly in cases of surgery, trauma, or terminal illness. Morphine, an opioid, interacts with the body's opioid receptors to alter the perception of pain. Although its effects are generally reliable, the timing and administration of morphine can significantly impact the overall patient experience. This paper aims to explore the effects of administering morphine both preemptively—before the patient experiences pain—and reactively—after pain has been detected. Using a cybernetic automaton model, this study attempts to provide insights into the conditioned responses that may develop in patients as a result of different pain management approaches.

The focus of this study lies in understanding how a patient's pain response adapts to the administration of morphine. By modeling this interaction with a cybernetic automaton, a more structured analysis of pain and recovery can be made. The study seeks to provide a clearer understanding of how administering morphine at different stages of pain affects a patient's experience, potentially influencing clinical decisions on pain management strategies.

ACCESSING THE EXPERIMENTAL ENVIRONMENT

Using Tux for Morphine Simulation

In order to run the experiment, users must access Drexel University's tux system via a Secure Shell (SSH) connection. Tux is the university's UNIX-based server, which allows students and researchers to run computational experiments remotely. To gain access, users need to request a tux account through the university's IT services. Once the account is activated, users can access the experimental directory by navigating to '/home2/home-a/aad356/ca/'. The primary pro- gram for this study is 'morphine3.py', which can be executed to simulate the described pain and morphine administration scenarios. For further experiments, users may also explore alternate versions by using filenames such as 'morphine4.py' and 'morphine5.py'.

[1] *How to cite the article:* Dholakia A., Stuart B.L.(September 2024); Analyzing the Effects of Morphine with a Cybernetic Model; *International Journal of Research in Medical Sciences and Technology;* Vol 18, 34-36, DOI: http://doi.org/10.37648/ijrmst.v18i01.005

CASE STUDIES

Administering Morphine Preemptively

The first case study examines the scenario in which morphine is administered preemptively, prior to the patient experiencing any pain. Although this is an unconventional method of administration, the goal is to explore whether morphine can effectively prevent pain from being fully realized by the patient. The model simulates this scenario by tracking the interaction between various stimuli and responses. This case aims to determine the impact of administering morphine before pain has been detected, and whether the patient experiences a lower intensity of pain as a result.

1) **Process:** The process for this simulation consists of five primary states: normalcy (state 0), pain stimulus (state 1), recovery (state 2), morphine administration (state 3), and morphine depletion (state 4). The patient's response is measured in terms of whether pain is felt (0) or not felt (1). The intensity of pain and recovery is controlled by variables initialized at the start of each iteration, allowing the simulation to model various levels of pain and relief. The system runs for ten iterations, each of which represents a different experimental condition where morphine is administered preemptively. During each iteration, morphine is administered prior to the onset of pain (state 1), and the recovery (state 2) is observed as morphine takes effect.
2) **Results:** The results of the simulation show a notable de-crease in pain response following preemptive morphine administration. In many iterations, the patient reports no pain at all after morphine is given. The output is as follows:

```
Iteration,  Pain-free
0 0
1 7
2 9
3 10
4 8
5 10
6 10
7 10
8 10
9 10
10 10
7 states
```

The preemptive administration of morphine generally yields positive outcomes, with the majority of iterations showing no pain experienced by the patient. However, this approach is not standard in medical practice due to the unpredictability of pain stimuli, and further exploration is required to understand its real-world applicability. The model demonstrates that administering morphine prior to pain can significantly reduce the intensity of the pain response but does not eliminate the possibility of breakthrough pain.

Administering Morphine Reactively

The second case study involves the administration of morphine after pain has already been detected, a more conventional approach in clinical settings. In this scenario, morphine is given as soon as the patient reports experiencing pain, and the response is tracked to measure how quickly the pain subsides. This method is generally preferred in clinical settings to avoid administering medication unnecessarily and to ensure that morphine is used only when needed.

3) **Process:** The stimuli for this simulation follow the same structure as the previous case study: states 0 through 4 represent normalcy, pain stimulus, recovery, morphine administration, and morphine depletion, respectively. Unlike in the previous scenario, morphine is administered only after the patient has experienced pain. Each simulation begins with a pain stimulus (state 1), and morphine is administered in response. The model tracks the patient's recovery process and determines how long it takes for the morphine to reduce pain after it has been detected. Ten iterations of the process are run, with random variations in pain intensity and recovery rate.
4) **Results:** The results of this simulation show that ad- ministering morphine reactively, after pain has been detected, leads to a slower reduction in pain compared to the preemptive case. The output is as follows:

```
Iteration, In pain0 0
```

```
1 8
2 5
3 6
4 6
5 9
6 8
7 9
8 5
9 7
10 5
6 states
```

These results indicate that patients generally experience pain for a longer period before morphine takes effect in the reactive case. However, this approach is preferred in clinical practice because it minimizes unnecessary administration of medication and provides a more tailored response to the patient's condition. Over time, the modeldemonstrates that while reactive morphine administration does result in temporary pain, it effectively reduces pain intensity after the drug is applied. The slower onset of relief highlights the importance of timely administration in pain management strategies.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors extend their gratitude to Dr. Brian L. Stuart and the College of Computing and Informatics at Drexel University for their invaluable support throughout the research process. This study would not have been possible without the resources provided by the university's IT services and the assistance of the College in facilitating access to essential materials.

REFERENCES

[1] H. L. Fields, "Pain: An unpleasant topic," *Pain*, vol. 82, S61–S69, 1999.
[2] N. Wiener, *Cybernetics: Or Control and Communication in the Animal and the Machine*, 2nd. MIT Press, 1965.
[3] T. S. Jensen and L. Arendt-Nielsen, "Pain mechanisms: A review," *Journal of Pain Research*, vol. 4, pp. 111–125, 2011.
[4] I. P. Pavlov, *Conditioned Reflexes: An Investigation of the Physiological Activity of the Cerebral Cortex*. Oxford University Press, 1927.
[5] I. Kissin, "Preemptive analgesia: Problems with assessment of clinical significance," *Methods and Findings in Experimental and Clinical Pharmacology*, vol. 26, no. 6, pp. 437–442, 2004.
[6] H. Kehlet, M. U. Werner, and F. M. Perkins, "Balanced analgesia: What is it and what are its advantages in post-operative pain?" *Acta Anaesthesiologica Scandinavica*, vol. 43, no. 9, pp. 867–872, 1999.
[7] J. C. Ballantyne and J. Mao, "Opioid therapy for chronic pain," *New England Journal of Medicine*, vol. 349, no. 20, pp. 1943–1953, 2003.
[8] D. C. Turk, H. D. Wilson, and A. Cahana, "Treatment of chronic non-cancer pain," *The Lancet*, vol. 377, no. 9784, pp. 2226–2235, 2011.
[9] G. E. P. Box, J. S. Hunter, and W. G. Hunter, *Statistics for Experimenters: Design, Innovation, and Discovery*, 2nd. Wiley, 2005.
[10] N. R. Draper and H. Smith, *Applied Regression Analy- sis*, 3rd. Wiley, 1998.