A comparative study of ropivacaine 0.5% versus ropivacaine 0.75% for spinal anesthesia in lower limb orthopedic surgery in ASA Grade – I/II adult patients: A prospective study
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ABSTRACT

Aims and Objectives: The aim of the study was to compare the clinical efficacy and safety of isobaric ropivacaine 0.5% and 0.75% in spinal anesthesia under: (a) Onset and duration of sensory and motor block, (b) duration of analgesia, and (c) adverse effects.

Methods: A total of 60 patients undergoing elective lower limb orthopedic surgery under spinal anesthesia were divided into two groups (I and II) of 30 each. Group I received 3ml of isobaric ropivacaine 0.5% Group II received 3 ml of isobaric ropivacaine 0.75%. The study parameters were recorded at baseline and then at specified intervals.

Statistics: By professional statisticians using SPSS 18 version. Student t-test was used for continuous variables, and Chi-square test was used for discrete variables.

Results: The onset of sensory blockage in Group I was 3.17 ± 1.29 min and 2.60 ± 1.19 min in Group II which was statistically not significant (P > 0.05). The onset of motor blockade in Group I was 3.90 ± 1.54 min and 3.10 ± 0.96 min in Group II which was statistically significant (P < 0.05). Median time to reach the highest level of analgesia was 12.4 ± 2.81 min in Group I, and 10.7 ± 2.56 min in Group II. The difference was statistically significant. Regression of sensory level to T10 dermatome in Group I was 99.64 ± 21.30 min and 139.66 ± 25.70 min in Group II which was statistically significant (P < 0.05). Duration of the motor blockade in Group I was 126 ± 14.53 min and 175 ± 30.60 min in Group II which was statistically significant (P < 0.05). The time of the first request of analgesics in Group I was 130 ± 16.24 min and 171.1 ± 32.77 min in Group II which was statistically significant (P < 0.05). There were no significant differences in the adverse effects of both drugs.

Conclusions: Intrathecal isobaric ropivacaine 0.75% in comparison to isobaric ropivacaine 0.5%: (1) Produces quicker onset of motor block and prolonged duration of sensory and motor block. (2) Does not alter hemodynamic stability. (3) Has no difference in the onset of sensory block.
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INTRODUCTION

Spinal anesthesia is unparalleled in the way in which a small quantity of drug can produce profound surgical anesthesia. Further, by altering the amount of drug, different types of spinal anesthetics can be produced. Low spinal anesthesia, a block below T10, carries a different physiologic impact than does a block performed to produce higher spinal anesthesia (>T5). The block is unexcelled for lower abdominal or lower extremity surgical procedures.

The main reasons for the popularity of spinal block are that the block has well-defined endpoints, and the anesthesiologist can produce the block reliably with a single injection.[1-5]

Spinal anesthesia with hyperbaric bupivacaine 0.5% is a very popular method. Bupivacaine is a well-established and most widely used long-acting regional anesthetic, which like all amide anesthetics has been associated with cardiotoxicity when used in high concentration or when accidentally administered intravenously.[6-8]

This led to the discovery of ropivacaine in 1996, which is a long-acting regional anesthetic that is structurally related to bupivacaine. It is a pure S (-) enantiomer; unlike bupivacaine, which is a racemate, developed for the purpose of reducing potential toxicity and improving relative sensory and motor block profile.[9-12]

Ropivacaine was approved for a new route of administration, the intrathecal route, in the European Union in February 2004. The efficacy and tolerability of ropivacaine for spinal anesthesia in orthopedic surgery have been demonstrated in several studies. It has shown to produce sufficient surgical anesthesia and analgesia and consistently shown reduced side effect profile. Due to its propensity of blocking sensory fibers more readily.
it serves all purposes for day care surgery. The patient can be
mobilized early and discharged sooner. The formulation that is
available for intrathecal administration is 0.75% ropivacaine.
However, studies have shown that even 0.5% ropivacaine, when
administered intrathecally, can provide good surgical anesthesia
for lower abdomen, perineal, and lower limb surgeries with fewer
side effects, but convincing evidence is lacking.[13-16]

The aim of this study is to compare the clinical efficacy and safety
of two different concentrations of ropivacaine as a local anesthetic
for spinal anesthesia.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study was approved by the hospital’s ethical committee.

Inclusion Criteria
The following criteria were included in this study:

1. Patients of either sex.
2. Patients with ASA Grade I and Grade II.
3. Patients aged between 20 and 60 years.
4. Patients posted for elective orthopedic surgery.[17-23]

Exclusion Criteria
The following criteria were excluded from the study:

1. Patients not fulfilling inclusion criteria.
2. Patients with severe systemic disease, metabolic disorder,
neurological, congenital, or cardiovascular disease.
3. Patients with coagulation disorders.
4. Local sepsis at the site of spinal injection.
5. Patients allergic to local anesthetics.
6. Patient's refusal for spinal anesthesia.
7. Patients weighing >120 kg; patients with height <150 cm.[24-27]

Mode of Selection
Double-blind randomized selection. 60 envelopes were
divided into two groups of 30 each. The drug to be given
was mentioned inside the envelope. An envelope was randomly
picked up just before the surgery. The envelope was opened by
an anesthesiologist, and the drug was loaded by that person.

Pre-operative Period
On the eve before the surgery, all the patients were visited, and
detailed pre-anesthetic examination including history, clinical
examination, systemic examination of cardiovascular; respiratory,
and central nervous systems and examination of the spine for
deformity, infection was carried out.

The anesthetic procedure was briefly explained to the patient.
An informed written consent was obtained from the patient.
Routine investigations such as hemogram, total leukocyte
count, differential leukocyte count, erythrocyte sedimentation
rate, complete urine examination, random blood sugar,
electrocardiogram, chest X-ray, blood grouping, blood urea, and
serum creatinine were carried out. Patient’s weight and height
were also recorded.

Intraoperative Period
Once the patient was shifted to the operating room, the patient
was connected to the routine monitors which included non-
invasive blood pressure, pulse oximeter, and continuous
electrocardiogram.

All resuscitation equipment such as intubation trolley with
airways, laryngoscopes, and endotracheal tubes along with
drugs such as atropine, ephedrine, thiopentone, fentanyl, and
vecuronium midazolam was kept ready. The anesthesia machine
was also checked along with the oxygen delivery system.

The patients were allocated into two groups, namely; Group I:
30 patients receiving 3 ml of isobaric ropivacaine 0.5% and Group
II: 30 patients receiving 3 ml of isobaric ropivacaine 0.75%.
Baseline pulse rate, blood pressure, respiratory rate, and SPO₂
were recorded.

The patients were kept nil orally for 8 h before surgery. A wide
bore IV access was obtained and secured on the morning of
surgery. All patients were preloaded with 500 ml of Ringer’s
lactate before spinal anesthesia. The patients were then put in
sitting position. Under strict aseptic precautions, lumbar puncture
was performed by midline approach using disposable Quincke
Babcock spinal needle 25G at L3–L4 intervertebral space.

Assessment of Sensory Blockade
This was tested by pin-prick method. The time of onset was taken
from time of injection of the drug into the subarachnoid space
to loss of pin-prick sensation at any dermatome from T4 to L5.
The time to achieve maximum sensory block was noted from the
time of injection of a drug to loss of pin-prick sensation at highest
dermatomal level. The time for regression of sensory level at T10
and then at surgical site was noted. Duration of sensory blockade was recorded from the time of onset to time of complete return of pin-prick sensation. Analgesics were avoided until the patient complained of pain. This was done to note the total duration of analgesia.\textsuperscript{[39-42]}

**Assessment of Motor Blockade**

This was assessed by Bromage scale. The time interval between injection of the drug into subarachnoid space, to the patient’s inability to lift the straight extended leg, was taken as onset time. The time to achieve maximum motor blockade was noted from the time of injection of the drug to maximum degree of motor block.

Duration of motor block was recorded from onset time to time when the patient was able to lift the extended leg.

**Bromage Scale**

0 - Full flexion of knees and feet.
1 - Just able to flex knees, full flexion of feet.
2 - Unable to flex knees, but some flexion of feet possible.
3 - Unable to move legs or feet.

The side effects such as shivering, hypotension, bradycardia, high spinal blockade, breathing difficulty, nausea, and vomiting were looked for.

**Statistical Analysis**

All data recorded were subjected to statistical tests to find the power of the study. Statistical analysis was done by SPSS version 18.0 (Chicago, IL, USA). The sample size was kept large enough ($n=30$). Parametric data were reported as the arithmetic mean SD. Student t-test was used for continuous variables, and Chi-square test was used for discrete variables, with $P$ value reported at the 95% confidence limit. $P<0.05$ was considered significant.$^{[43-47]}$

**OBSERVATIONS [TABLES 1-15, FIGURES 1-15]**

The observations are shown in Tables 1-15 and Figures 1-15.

**DISCUSSION**

Ropivacaine is a new long-acting, enantiomerically pure (S-enantiomer), and amide local anesthetic with a high pKa and low lipid solubility. It is considered to block sensory nerves to a greater degree than motor nerves. Because of sensory and motor dissociation, ropivacaine should be a favorable local anesthetic for day-care surgery and could be associated with earlier postoperative mobilization than bupivacaine.$^{[48-50]}

This double-blind randomized study was conducted to compare two different concentrations of intrathecal ropivacaine in lower limb surgeries. The patients were selected at random, to avoid any kind of bias and to allow comparability of results obtained. This was a double-blinded controlled study where neither the patient nor the observer who recorded the parameters was aware of the group allocation and the drug received.

**Patient Characteristics Across the Groups**

The patients studied across the group did not vary much with respect to age, weight, sex, or height. These parameters were kept identical in both the groups to avoid variations in the intraoperative and post-operative outcome of the patients. The duration of all surgeries was intermediate, ranging from 45 min to 100 min.$^{[51-55]}$

**Changes in the Perioperative Cardiovascular Parameters**

Heart rate, systolic and diastolic blood pressure in both the groups did not vary significantly. Cardiovascular changes were unremarkable throughout and did not varied much in the two groups, as were the volumes of fluid administered.

One patient in Group II who received 0.75% ropivacaine had transient bradycardia of <50 bpm at 60 min after SAB, which was treated with 0.3 mg atropine and improved immediately.\textsuperscript{[56-60]}

His blood pressure at that time was 112/70 mmHg. This patient had a baseline heart rate of 47 beats per minute, and SAB was instituted after 0.3 mg of atropine i.v.$^{[61-67]}$

Van Kleef \textit{et al}, in 1994, during a similar study comparing intrathecal ropivacaine 0.5% with ropivacaine 0.75% found that the hemodynamic changes between the two groups were of no clinical importance.$^{[68]}$

Khaw \textit{et al}, in 2001, found that the incidence of hypotension was similar in a comparison of different doses of plain ropivacaine.$^{[54]}$

Wong \textit{et al}, in 2004, have observed the same that there are no major cardiovascular changes in the two groups receiving plain ropivacaine in different doses compared to each other.$^{[91]}$

Fettes \textit{et al}, in 2004, observed that cardiovascular changes were unremarkable in a comparison of plain and hyperbaric ropivacaine.$^{[100]}$

Kallio \textit{et al}, in 2004, observed that the groups receiving plain ropivacaine did not have any differences in the hemodynamics after receiving different doses.$^{[92]}$

From the above studies, we can conclude that use of 15 mg or 22.5 mg of ropivacaine intrathecally causes no gross hemodynamic disturbances.

| Group | N  | Mean | SD    | SE   | 95% Confidence interval for mean | Minimum | Maximum | $t$ test |
|-------|----|------|-------|------|---------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| 0.5%  | 30 | 38.70| 12.31 | 2.25 | 34.10 - 43.30                   | 20.00   | 58.00   | $P>0.05$|
| 0.75% | 30 | 39.10| 11.51 | 2.101| 34.80 - 43.40                   | 20.00   | 59.00   | Not significant |
| Total | 60 | 38.90| 11.82 |      | 34.85 - 41.95                   | 20.00   | 59.00   |         |

SD: Standard deviation, SE: Standard error
Changes in the Onset of Sensory and Motor Blockade

In the present study, the onset of sensory blockade in Group I was 3.17 ± 1.29 min compared to 2.60 ± 1.19 min in Group II which was statistically not significant (P > 0.05).

The onset of the motor blockade in Group I was 3.90 ± 1.54 min compared to 3.10 ± 0.96 min in Group II which was statistically significant (P < 0.05).

Wong et al., in 2004, opined that the onset of sensory and motor blocks was similar in two groups of ropivacaine.[69-75]

Lee et al., in 2007, found that the onset of motor blockade was more reliable with the 0.75% ropivacaine.[91]

Time to Maximum Sensory Level
The median time to reach the highest level of analgesia was <20 min in both groups (ropivacaine 0.5% group, 12.4 ± 2.81 min and ropivacaine 0.75% group, 10.7 ± 2.56 min) but the difference was statistically significant.[76-80]

Maximum Sensory Level
Seven patients in 0.75% group had block up to T4 as opposed to only 2 in 0.5% group. The percentage of patients having a block at T4, T6, and T8 was higher in 0.75% group, and the difference was statistically significant (P < 0.05).

Time for Regression of Sensory Level
Although none of the patient required supplementary analgesia/ anesthesia, the regression of sensory level to T10 dermatome in Group I was 99.64 ± 21.30 min compared to 139.66 ± 25.70 min in Group II which was statistically significant (P < 0.05).

Van Kleef et al., in 1994, found that the duration of analgesia at the level of T12 was significantly longer in the 0.75% group as compared to 0.5% group.[68]

This shows that ropivacaine 0.75% has a more reliable duration of analgesia.[87-90]

### Table 2: Gender distribution of patients

| Group | Gender   | Female (%) | Male (%) |
|-------|----------|------------|----------|
| 0.5%  | 5 (16.67)| 25 (83.33) |
| 0.75% | 7 (23.33)| 23 (76.67) |
| Total | 12 (20.00)| 48 (80.00) |

\( \chi^2 \) test; P>0.05 not significant

### Table 3: Weight distribution of patients

| Group | N  | Mean  | SD  | SE  | 95% confidence interval for mean | Minimum | Maximum | t-test   |
|-------|----|-------|-----|-----|---------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| 0.5%  | 30 | 66.73 | 7.40| 1.35| 63.97                           | 69.50   | 80.00   | P>0.05  |
| 0.75% | 30 | 67.00 | 6.62| 1.21| 64.53                           | 69.47   | 80.00   | Not significant |
| Total | 60 | 66.87 | 6.96| 0.90| 65.07                           | 68.67   | 80.00   |         |

SD: Standard deviation, SE: Standard error

### Table 4: Height distribution of patients

| Height | N  | Mean  | SD  | SE  | 95% confidence interval for mean | Minimum | Maximum | t-test   |
|--------|----|-------|-----|-----|---------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| 0.5%   | 30 | 158.70| 5.66| 0.92| 156.81                          | 150.00  | 170.00  | P>0.05  |
| 0.75%  | 30 | 161.77| 8.99| 1.64| 158.41                          | 155.12  | 180.00  | Not significant |
| Total  | 60 | 160.23| 7.40| 0.95| 158.32                          | 152.14  | 180.00  |         |

SD: Standard deviation, SE: Standard error
Intensity and Duration of Motor Blockade
In the present study, the duration of the motor blockade in Group I was 126 ± 14.53 min compared to 175 ± 30.60 min in Group II which was statistically significant (P < 0.05).

The 0.75% ropivacaine solution resulted in a higher frequency of complete motor block and a longer duration of motor block in the lower limbs.[92-95]

Van Kleef et al., in 1994, observed that the greater propensity to produce a complete motor block, and the longer duration of analgesia and motor block produced by the 0.75% ropivacaine solution, should be suitable for orthopedic and vascular surgical procedures of intermediate duration, requiring an intense motor block.[68]

Kallio et al., in 2004, studied the effects of plain ropivacaine 20 mg and 15 mg. They found that there was a significantly

Table 5: ASA grade distribution of patients

| ASA grade | Grade 1 n (%) | Grade 2 n (%) |
|-----------|--------------|--------------|
| 0.5%      | 19 (63.33)   | 11 (36.67)   |
| 0.75%     | 17 (56.67)   | 13 (43.33)   |
| Total     | 36 (60.00)   | 24 (40.00)   |

χ² test; P>0.05 not significant

Table 6: Sensory block onset

| Group | N | Mean | SD | SE  | 95% Confidence interval for mean | Minimum | Maximum | t test |
|-------|---|------|----|-----|-------------------------------|---------|---------|--------|
| 0.5%  | 30| 3.17 | 1.29| 0.24| 2.69 - 3.65                  | 1.00    | 6.00    | >0.05  |
| 0.75% | 30| 2.60 | 1.19| 0.22| 2.15 - 3.05                  | 1.00    | 6.00    | Not significant |
| Total | 60| 2.88 | 1.26| 0.16| 2.56 - 3.21                  | 1.00    | 6.00    |        |

SD: Standard deviation, SE: Standard error

Table 7: Time to max sensory block

| Group | N | Mean | SD | SE  | 95% Confidence interval for mean | Minimum | Maximum | t test |
|-------|---|------|----|-----|-------------------------------|---------|---------|--------|
| 0.5%  | 30| 12.40| 2.81| 0.51| 11.35 - 13.45                | 9.00    | 18.00   | >0.05  |
| 0.75% | 30| 10.07| 2.56| 0.47| 9.11  - 11.02                | 6.00    | 18.00   | <0.05  |
| Total | 60| 11.23| 2.91| 0.38| 10.48 - 11.99               | 6.00    | 18.00   |        |

SD: Standard deviation, SE: Standard error

Table 8: Maximum sensory level

| Maximum sensory level | T4 | T6 | T8 | T10 | T12 |
|-----------------------|----|----|----|-----|-----|
| 0.5%                  | 2  | 13 | 13 | 0   | 2   |
| 0.75%                 | 7  | 14 | 5  | 3   | 1   |
| Total                 | 9  | 27 | 18 | 3   | 3   |

χ² test; P<0.05 not significant

Table 9: Sensory block duration at T10 (min)

| Group | N | Mean | SD | SE  | 95% Confidence interval for mean | Minimum | Maximum | t test |
|-------|---|------|----|-----|-------------------------------|---------|---------|--------|
| 0.5%  | 28| 99.64| 21.30| 4.02| 91.38 - 107.90               | 60.00   | 120.00  | P<0.05 |
| 0.75% | 29| 139.66| 25.70| 4.77| 129.88 - 149.43              | 90.00   | 180.00  |        |
| Total | 57| 120.00| 30.32| 4.10| 111.79 - 128.21              | 60.00   | 180.00  |        |

SD: Standard deviation, SE: Standard error

Table 10: Sensory block duration at surgical site (min)

| Group | N | Mean | SD | SE  | 95% Confidence interval for mean | Minimum | Maximum | t test |
|-------|---|------|----|-----|-------------------------------|---------|---------|--------|
| 0.5%  | 30| 146.30| 19.00| 3.47| 139.20 - 153.40              | 120.00  | 180.00  | P<0.05 |
| 0.75% | 30| 200.00| 38.06| 6.95| 185.79 - 214.21              | 90.00   | 240.00  |        |
| Total | 60| 173.15| 40.28| 5.20| 162.74 - 183.56              | 90.00   | 240.00  |        |

SD: Standard deviation, SE: Standard error

Table 11: Total duration of analgesia (min)

| Group | N | Mean | SD | SE  | 95% Confidence interval for mean | Minimum | Maximum | t test |
|-------|---|------|----|-----|-------------------------------|---------|---------|--------|
| 0.5%  | 30| 130.00| 16.24| 2.97| 123.94 - 136.06              | 100.00  | 160.00  | P<0.05 |
| 0.75% | 30| 171.17| 32.77| 5.98| 158.93 - 183.40              | 80.00   | 210.00  |        |
| Total | 60| 150.58| 32.99| 4.26| 142.06 - 159.11              | 80.00   | 210.00  |        |

SD: Standard deviation, SE: Standard error
longer duration of motor block with 20 mg than 15 mg of ropivacaine.\textsuperscript{92}

Kallio \textit{et al.} in 2004, in another study comparing hyperbaric ropivacaine with plain ropivacaine, found that plain ropivacaine has a longer duration of the motor block than the hyperbaric solution.\textsuperscript{101}
Table 12: Motor block onset (min)

| Group | N  | Mean | SD  | SE  | 95% Confidence interval for mean | Minimum | Maximum | t test  |
|-------|----|------|-----|-----|---------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| 0.5%  | 30 | 3.90 | 1.54| 0.28| 3.33                             | 2.00    | 6.00    | P<0.05  |
| 0.75% | 30 | 3.10 | 0.96| 0.18| 2.74                             | 2.00    | 6.00    | significant |
| Total | 60 | 3.50 | 1.33| 0.17| 3.16                             | 2.00    | 6.00    |          |

SD: Standard deviation, SE: Standard error

Table 13: Time to complete motor block (min)

| Group | N  | Mean | SD  | SE  | 95% Confidence interval for mean | Minimum | Maximum | t test  |
|-------|----|------|-----|-----|---------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| 0.5%  | 30 | 11.30| 3.29| 0.60| 10.07                            | 5.00    | 18.00   | P<0.05  |
| 0.75% | 30 | 7.17 | 3.21| 0.59| 5.97                             | 5.00    | 21.00   | significant |
| Total | 60 | 9.23 | 3.84| 0.50| 8.24                             | 5.00    | 21.00   |          |

SD: Standard deviation, SE: Standard error

Table 14: Total duration of motor block (min)

| Group | N  | Mean | SD  | SE  | 95% Confidence interval for mean | Minimum | Maximum | t test  |
|-------|----|------|-----|-----|---------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| 0.5%  | 30 | 126.00| 14.53| 2.65| 120.58                           | 90.00   | 150.00  | P<0.05  |
| 0.75% | 30 | 175.00| 30.60| 5.59| 163.57                           | 90.00   | 210.00  | significant |
| Total | 60 | 150.50| 34.27| 4.42| 141.65                           | 90.00   | 210.00  |          |

SD: Standard deviation, SE: Standard error

Figure 12: Motor block onset (min)

Figure 13: Time to complete motor block (min)

Figure 14: Total duration of motor block (min)

Figure 15: Incidence of adverse effects

**Time of First Request of Analgesics**

In the present study, the time of the first request of analgesics in group:

Group I was 130 ± 16.24 min compared to 171.1 ± 32.77 min in Group II which was statistically significant (P < 0.05).

Van Kleef et al., in 1994, found that the time of the first request for analgesia was significantly longer in the 0.75% group as compared to 0.5% group. This shows that there was significantly longer period of analgesia with 0.75% ropivacaine. [68]

**Adverse Effects**

Two patients had shivering in both groups. One patient in Group II had bradycardia. Two patients complained of nausea in both the groups. There were no incidences of post-dural-puncture...
Table 15: Adverse effects

| Adverse | Absent n (%) | Present n (%) |
|---------|--------------|---------------|
| 0.5%    | 25 (83.33)   | 5 (16.67)     |
| 0.75%   | 22 (73.33)   | 8 (26.67)     |
| Total   | 47 (78.30)   | 13 (21.70)    |

χ² test; P > 0.05 not significant

headache in both groups. Six patients in Group II had hypotension as compared to only one in Group I. [97-99,101]

Wong et al., in 2004, found that the incidence of shivering was more in the group receiving 33.75 mg plain ropivacaine than the group receiving 26.25% of plain ropivacaine. [91]

Thus, there were no major differences in the adverse effects in both groups.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Ropivacaine is a newer amide-type local anesthetic drug with the significantly enhanced safety profile and a propensity to block sensory fibers more readily. For these reasons, it has become a drug of interest for day care surgeries.

The present study was conducted on 60 patients, with ASA Grade I or II physical status, planned for lower limb orthopedic surgery. Patients were randomly allocated into two Groups I and II.

Group I patients received 3.0 ml of 0.5% isobaric ropivacaine.

Group II patients received 3.0 ml of 0.75% isobaric ropivacaine.

The patients of both groups were demographically comparable. After obtaining written informed consent and preloading with IV ringer lactate, patients were induced using 25 G Quincke type spinal needle in sitting position under full aseptic precautions.

All patients were monitored in the same way throughout surgery and postoperatively. Onset and duration of sensory and motor block, hemodynamic parameters were recorded at regular intervals.

With this study, we conclude that intrathecal isobaric ropivacaine 0.75% in comparison to isobaric ropivacaine 0.5%:
1. Produces quicker onset of motor block and prolonged duration of sensory and motor block.
2. Does not alter hemodynamic stability.
3. Has no difference in the onset of sensory block.
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