Comparative Analysis of Efficacy and Haemodynamic Response between Intrathecal Hyperbaric 0.5% Bupivacaine with Isobaric 0.75% Ropivacaine Utilizing Fentanyl as Adjuvant in Subjects Undergoing Umbilical Surgeries

Anilkumar S Patel1, Ambaram Virchanddas Patel2

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Anaesthesia, GMERS medical college and hospital, Dharpur, Patan, Gujarat, India. Email: anil2635@yahoo.co.in, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-0316-9499

²Assistant Professor, Department of Anaesthesia, GMERS medical college and hospital, Dharpur, Patan, Gujarat, India. Email: milindpatelpatan17@gmail.com, ORCID ID: 0000-0001-6177-8762

Abstract

Background: The present study aims the evaluation of hemodynamic reaction and efficiency of Intrathecal hyperbaric 0.5% Bupivacaine with isobaric 0.75% Ropivacaine utilizing Fentanyl in subjects who were planned for infra umbilical surgeries. **Subjects and Methods:** The patients planned with orthopaedic, urological, gyanecological and general surgeries that involve the lower abdominal area. All the patients were planned under spinal anesthesia. A total of 50 patients were included in the study. Patients were divided into two equal groups. All the patients were included in one of the 2 underneath declared groups as Bupivacaine group (Group B) n=25 and Ropivacaine group (Group R) n=25. Bromage scale was used to evaluate the revial of motor blockage and compactness. To check the loss of sensation the pin prick was utilized. **Results:** In group B that is Bupivacaine the sensory block was found to be elevated as compared to group R. the dissimilarity was establish to be statistical important. The motor block of 3 mins and hypotension was found to be more advanced and dense in group B as compared to group R patients. **Conclusion:** As compared to 0.5% bupivacaine; the 0.75% isobaric ropivacaine showed a comparable time of motor blockade. It shows more promising resul with dense motor block with the adjuvant utilization of Fentanyl in both the groups.

Keywords: Bupivacaine, Haemodynamic response, Fentanyl, Ropivacaine.

Corresponding Author: Dr. Ambaram Virchanddas Patel, Assistant Professor, Department of Anaesthesia, GMERS medical college and hospital, Dharpur, Patan, Gujarat, India.

Email: anil2635@yahoo.co.in

Received: 25 July 2021 Revised: 03 September 2021 Accepted: 13 September 2021 Published: 30 June 2022

Introduction

The most extensive method for lower abdominal surgeries that provide a quick result and greater efficacy of motor and sensory block is the spinal anesthesia. The baricity of the aneshthetic agent is one of the most chief significant properties.[1,2] Because of the extensive period of blockade of Motor and sensory route there is broad utilization of 0.5% hyperbaric bupivacaine hydrochloride. In the surgeries that involve the lower abdomen, urology and lower limb the chief utilized form is tge central neuraxial blockade. Ropivacaine is a optically unadulterated S-enantiomeric outline of parent chiral molecule propivacaine, go to the pipecoloxylidide group of local anesthetics.[3] By the accumulation of propyl group to the piperidine nitrogen atom contrast to the butyl group in bupivacaine, ropivacaine structurally be like the bupivacaine with alike anesthetics properties, it has abridged impending for cardiotoxicity and neurotoxicity with enhanced comparative sensory and motor

block profile.[4]

In the caesarean delivery procedure according to various researches showed the effect of intrathecal ropivacaine in adjuvants like fentanyl and sufentanil. [5.6] The side effects includes the augment nausea, itching and vomiting. It extend the revival for the parturient following the surgery. [7]

Although the bupivacaine is known for the long acting action; the side effects included arrhythmias, protracted period of sensory and motor blockade that requires compensation through introduction of lignocaine that is necessary to overcome such side effects. There is large utilization of 5% lidocaine which has transitory radicular exasperation with single dose of spinal anesthesia. Ropivacaine eases the emotional suffering of being motionless for a larger duration of time following lower abdominal surgeries. Fentanyl is frequently utilized adjuvant medicine for the regional anesthesia. [8]

The main aim of current research was evaluation of the haemodynamic rejoinder and efficiency among the 0.5% Bupivacaine with 0.5% ropivacaine with aduvant utilization

of fentanyl.

Subjects and Methods

The current research is the randomized blind study. A total of 50 patinets were included in the study. The ae range of the included patiners includes 25 – 65 years. All the included patients were fitting in ASA 1 & 2 and were scheduled for urological, lower abdominal surgeries, orthopaedic surgery. In all the included patients there was administration of spinal anesthesia. Included subjects were equally separated into 2 groups with each group having 25 individuals each. The first group was group B that is Bupivacaine group and other group consists of group R that is Ropivacaine group. An exclusion criterion includes subject denial, complete contrast for regional anesthesia, failure to correspond with the subject, pregnancy, patchy or failed spinal.

In the previous night and also 2 hours before operation all the subjects were administered with tab Pantoprazole 40 mg and tab Alprazolam 0.25 mg. On admission in the operation theatre the ECG, blood pressure and oxygen saturation were observed and evidenced all through the surgery. All the patients were made positioned in lateral down. The patients were sterile and draping was done. The spinal anesthesia was done in L3L4 space. Once there was free flow of cerebrospinal fluid there was Intrathecal administration of 2.6 ml of 0.75% ropivacaine in adjuvant with 25 ug fentanyl. It was administered over the period of thirty seconds as per the accidental allpocation patients was turned in the supine postion after the spinal anesthesia was administered. There was constant administered haemodynamic factors. Intravenpus crystalloids and vasopressors injection ephedrine was administered in case of low blood pressure; that is systolic pressure was less than 90 mmHg. Mephentremine 6 mg IV bolus was administered in case of importunate hypotension.

At the end of surgery, after every 15 minutes till the subject entirely recuperates; evaluation of motor blockade was completed 3 min following intrathecal injection.

Statistical analysis

The data was analyses utilizing SPSS version 15.

Results & Discussion

Table 1: Demographic details - Group B and Group R

Tubic 17 2 cm ogrupme detums of our 2 und of our 11						
Variables	Group B	Group R	P value			
Age (Mean	39.94±10.41	38.2±11.10	0.54			
±SD)						
Gender Distri	bution					
Male	15	14	0.09			
Female	11	10				
Weight	67.10±9.47	65.25±09.10	0.41			
Height	164.47±6.47	163.47±7.43	0.1			
ASA Grading						
I	18	20	0.07			
II	7	5				

Statistically significance at p \leq 0.05

Table 2: Bromage score after 3 minutes in Group B and Group

R			
Bromage Score	Grade III	Grade IV	P value
Group B	5	20	0.001*
Group R	22	3	
	1 100		

^{*}indicates statistically significance at p≤0.05

Table 3: Hemodynamic parameters – Group B and Group R

Variables	Group B	Group R	P value
1. Incidence of	hypotension		
Yes	14	5	0.01*
No	11	20	
2. Bradycardia	1		
Yes	7	7	0.51
No	18	18	
3. Nausea/Von	niting	<u>.</u>	
Yes	6	1	0.05*
No	19	24	
4. Ventricular	arrthymia	<u>.</u>	
Yes	1	1	0.47
No	23	25	

^{*}indicates statistically significance at p≤0.05

Accumulation of glucose to the isobaric ropivacaine will create the drug hyperbaric, which has established to amplify pace of onset, period of block, and pace of revival. [9,10,11] Bupivacaine is utilized usually for surgeries since of its elevated effectiveness and least neurological symptom. [12,13] Age, Gender, weight and height among 2 groups were analogous and there were no statistical differences among the 2 groups. The period of surgery was 56.51±31.12 mins in Group R and 47.45±19.24 minutes in Group B and was establish to be statistically insignificant. In the present research, highest cephalad expand is evaluated following three minutes of injection of local anaesthetic by utilizing thrashing of sensation to pinprick T10 level. In Group B mean sensory level was T4 to T6 (4.84± 0.9) was superior while contrast to Group R where the mean stage was T5 to T8 (5.61± 1.01), which was in disparity with research performed by Jean-Marc Malinovsky et al, Whiteside et al. [12,14,15] A research by Koltka K et al, [16] found that extend of sensory block was superior in Group B than R. These results were in agreement with the findings of AlMustafa et al, [17] Nevertheless, the onset times monitored in the research performed by Mahendru et al,[18] did not alter where dexmedetomidine was extra to regular hyperbaric bupivacaine. Various findings in present research could be accredited to dissimilar explanations of onset time and reality that sensory block level of limb surgery is subordinate in the spine than that in LSCS.

The dissimilarity in motor blockade among groups were statistically noteworthy and analogous with research by Mantouvalou, Erturk E and CG Miller et al. [19,20,21] Mc Namee DA et al, [22] recorded the onset and period of sensory block at dermatome level T10, utmost upper and lower extend of sensory block and the onset, strength and period of motor block. However the median period of entire motor block was appreciably diminutive in the Ropivacaine group contrast with the Bupivacaine group in the present research. In the present research we utilized 25 μ g as a subsidiary and had comparable findings analogous to Erturk et al. [20] The improved occurrence of nausea and vomiting in group B can be elucidated owing to superior frequency of hypotension and highest cephalad stretch. [23,24]

Conclusion

0.75% isobaric Ropivacaine generates comparable period of motor blockade with steady hemodynamic contrast to hyperbaric Bupivacaine (0.5%) creating denser motor blockade through hypotension when Fentanyl is utilized as supplementary in all groups.

References

- Casey WF. Spinal anaesthesia A practical guide. Update Anaesth. 2000;12:1–7.
- Horlocker TT, Wedel DJ. Density, specific gravity, and baricity of spinal anesthetic solutions at body temperature. Anesth Analg. 1993;76(5):1015-8. doi: 10.1213/00000539-199305000-00018.
- McClure JH. Ropivacaine. Br J Anaesth. 1996;76(2):300-7. doi: 10.1093/bja/76.2.300.
- Nakamura G, Ganem EM, Rugolo LM, Castiglia YM. Effects on mother and fetus of epidural and combined spinal-epidural techniques for labor analgesia. Rev Assoc Med Bras (1992). 2009;55(4):405-9. doi: 10.1590/s0104-42302009000400014.
- Chung CJ, Yun SH, Hwang GB, Park JS, Chin YJ. Intrathecal fentanyl added to hyperbaric ropivacaine for cesarean delivery. Reg Anesth Pain Med. 2002 27(6):600-3. doi: 10.1053/rapm.2002.36455.
- Chen X, Qian X, Fu F, Lu H, Bein B. Intrathecal sufentanil decreases the median effective dose (ED50) of intrathecal hyperbaric ropivacaine for caesarean delivery. Acta Anaesthesiol Scand. 2010;54(3):284-90. doi: 10.1111/j.1399-6576.2009.02051.x.
- Weigl W, Bieryło A, Wielgus M, Krzemień-Wiczyńska Ś, Kołacz M, Dąbrowski MJ. Perioperative analgesia after intrathecal fentanyl and morphine or morphine alone for cesarean section: A randomized controlled study. Medicine (Baltimore). 2017;96(48):e8892. doi:10.1097/MD.00000000000008892
- Gupta K, Singh S, Sharma D, Gupta PK, Krishan A, Pandey MN. Intrathecal fentanyl as an adjuvant to 0.75% isobaric ropivacaine for infraumbilical surgery under subarachnoid block: A prospective study. Saudi J Anaesth. 2014;8(1):64-8. doi: 10.4103/1658-354X.125939.
- Makhni R, Attri JP, Jain P, Chatrath V. Comparison of Dexmedetomidine and Magnesium Sulfate as Adjuvants with Ropivacaine for Spinal Anesthesia in Infraumbilical Surgeries and Postoperative Analgesia. Anesth Essays Res. 2017;11(1):206-210. doi: 10.4103/0259-1162.200237.
- Chatterjee S, Bisui B, Mandal A, Sheet J, Sengupta S, Majumdar S, Swaika S. Effects of intrathecal hyperbaric ropivacaine versus hyperbaric bupivacaine for lower limb orthopedic surgery. Anesth Essays Res. 2014;8(3):349-53. doi: 10.4103/0259-1162.143138.
- 11. Feldman HS, Covino BG. Comparative motor-blocking effects of bupivacaine and ropivacaine, a new amino amide local anesthetic, in the rat and dog. Anesth Analg. 1988;67(11):1047-52.
- Koltka K, Uludag E, Senturk M, Yavru A, Karadeniz M, Sengul T, et al. Comparison of equipotent doses of ropivacaine-fentanyl and bupivacaine-fentanyl in spinal anaesthesia for lower abdominal surgery. Anaesth Intensive Care. 2009;37(6):923-8. doi: 10.1177/0310057X0903700606.
- Salazar F, Bogdanovich A, Adalia R, Chabás E, Gomar C. Transient neurologic symptoms after spinal anaesthesia using isobaric 2% mepivacaine and isobaric 2% lidocaine. Acta Anaesthesiol Scand. 2001;45(2):240-5. doi: 10.1034/j.1399-6576.2001.450216.x.

- Malinovsky JM, Charles F, Kick O, Lepage JY, Malinge M, Cozian A, Bouchot O, Pinaud M. Intrathecal anesthesia: ropivacaine versus bupivacaine. Anesth Analg. 2000;91(6):1457-60. doi: 10.1097/00000539-200012000-00030.
- 15. Whiteside JB, Burke D, Wildsmith JA. Comparison of ropivacaine 0.5% (in glucose 5%) with bupivacaine 0.5% (in glucose 8%) for spinal anaesthesia for elective surgery. Br J Anaesth. 2003;90(3):304-8. doi: 10.1093/bja/aeg077.
- Koltka K, Uludag E, Senturk M, Yavru A, Karadeniz M, Sengul T, et al. Comparison of equipotent doses of ropivacaine-fentanyl and bupivacaine-fentanyl in spinal anaesthesia for lower abdominal surgery. Anaesth Intensive Care. 2009;37(6):923-8. doi: 10.1177/0310057X0903700606.
- Al-Mustafa MM, Abu-Halaweh SA, Aloweidi AS, Murshidi MM, Ammari BA, Awwad ZM, et al. Effect of dexmedetomidine added to spinal bupivacaine for urological procedures. Saudi Med J. 2009;30(3):365-70.
- Mahendru V, Tewari A, Katyal S, Grewal A, Singh MR, Katyal R. A comparison of intrathecal dexmedetomidine, clonidine, and fentanyl as adjuvants to hyperbaric bupivacaine for lower limb surgery: A double blind controlled study. J Anaesthesiol Clin Pharmacol. 2013;29(4):496-502. doi:10.4103/0970-9185.119151
- 19. Mantouvalou M, Ralli S, Arnaoutoglou H, Tziris G, Papadopoulos G. Spinal anesthesia: comparison of plain ropivacaine, bupivacaine and levobupivacaine for lower abdominal surgery. Acta Anaesthesiol Belg. 2008;59(2):65-71.
- Erturk E, Tutuncu C, Eroglu A, Gokben M. Clinical comparison of 12 mg ropivacaine and 8 mg bupivacaine, both with 20 microg fentanyl, in spinal anaesthesia for major orthopaedic surgery in geriatric patients. Med Princ Pract. 2010;19(2):142-7. doi: 10.1159/000249581.
- Soni AK, Miller CG, Pratt SD, Hess PE, Oriol NE, Sarna MC. Low dose intrathecal ropivacaine with or without sufentanil provides effective analgesia and does not impair motor strength during labour: a pilot study. Can J Anaesth. 2001;48(7):677-80. doi: 10.1007/BF03016202.
- 22. McNamee DA, McClelland AM, Scott S, Milligan KR, Westman L, Gustafsson U. Spinal anaesthesia: comparison of plain ropivacaine 5 mg ml(-1) with bupivacaine 5 mg ml(-1) for major orthopaedic surgery. Br J Anaesth. 2002;89(5):702-6.
- López-Soriano F, Lajarín B, Rivas F, Verdú JM, López-Robles J. Hyperbaric subarachnoid ropivacaine in ambulatory surgery: comparative study with hyperbaric bupivacaine. Rev Esp Anestesiol Reanim. 2002 Feb;49(2):71-5.
- 24. Whiteside JB, Burke D, Wildsmith JA. Comparison of ropivacaine 0.5% (in glucose 5%) with bupivacaine 0.5% (in glucose 8%) for spinal anaesthesia for elective surgery. Br J Anaesth. 2003;90(3):304-8. doi: 10.1093/bja/aeg077.

Copyright: © the author(s), 2022. It is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0), which permits authors to retain ownership of the copyright for their content, and allow anyone to download, reuse, reprint, m odify, distribute and/or copy the content as long as the original authors and source are cited.

How to cite this article: Patel AS, Patel AV. Comparative Analysis of Efficacy and Haemodynamic Response Between Intrathecal Hyperbaric 0.5% Bupivacaine with Isobaric 0.75% Ropivacaine Utilizing Fentanyl as Adjuvant in Subjects Undergoing Umbilical Surgeries. Acad. Anesthesiol. Int. 2022;7(1):8-10.

DOI: dx.doi.org/10.21276/aanat.2022.7.1.2

Source of Support: Nil, Conflict of Interest: None declared.