Efficacy of addition of fentanyl to bupivacaine versus bupivacaine alone on postoperative analgesia in cases undergoing abdominal surgeries
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Abstract

Background: Successful selection of a drug for epidural anaesthesia needs an understanding of the anaesthetic potency and estimation of postoperative analgesia requirement. Bupivacaine is a widely used long acting analgesia. The present study was designed to assess the efficacy of bupivacaine alone and bupivacaine with fentanyl in adults cases undergoing abdominal surgeries.

Materials and methods: A total 100 cases undergoing abdominal surgeries under general anesthesia between 18-60 years belongs to ASA grade I and II were recruited. Participants were randomly divided in to two study groups i.e. group 1 administered with 0.125% Bupivacaine alone and group 2 administered with 0.125% Bupivacaine with 1mcg/kg fentanyl. Post-operative hemodynamics, respiratory rate, oxygen saturation, postoperative pain assessed by visual analogue pain scale, time for first rescue analgesia and duration of analgesia, Ramsay sedation score and GI complication like nausea/vomiting and pruritus were assessed.

Results: The postoperative difference of hemodynamics, respiratory rate and oxygen saturation was comparable between two study groups. The time for first rescue analgesia in group 1 was 103.56 ± 3.38 and in group 2 was 285.55 ± 3.14. The mean difference was statistically significant. The incidence of nausea/vomiting and pruritus was more in group 2 than group 1. VAS score and Ramsay sedation score are comparable in both the study groups.

Conclusion: Postoperative epidural analgesia was higher in group 2 than group 1. Epidural infusion of 0.125% Bupivacaine alone is more effective then 0.125% Bupivacaine with 1mcg/kg fentanyl in cases undergoing abdominal surgeries.
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Introduction

In general anesthesia practice, postoperative pain management is a challenge for anesthetist. Postoperative pain after major surgical procedures was commonly managed by local anesthetics, epidural local anaesthetic and opioid combinations [1]. Poorly managed postoperative pain leads to prolonged rehabilitation, adverse psychological and physiological complications [2]. There is a high chance for postoperative pain in abdominal surgeries, which reduces the diaphragmatic movements. This leads to respiratory tract infections due to decreased effort in coughing out the secretions.

Bupivacaine is an effective local anesthetic agent of aminoacyl group commonly used local anaesthetic agent for spinal anesthesia with 60 to 240 minutes duration of action [3, 4]. Adjuvants have been used to increase the efficacy and duration of the neuraxial blockade; opioids are the first among them. Use of opioids resulted in increased duration of analgesia but was associated with adverse events like respiratory depression, sedation and GI complication like nausea/vomiting [5, 6]. Fentanyl is a short acting lipophilic opioid, which binds to a family of G-protein-linked pre and postsynaptic opioid receptors in laminae I and II of the dorsal horn of spinal cord. It has rapid onset and short duration of action of 4 to 6 hours with minimal cephalad spread when administered in single dose (10-30 mcg) [7]. The present study was designed to assess the efficacy of bupivacaine alone and bupivacaine with fentanyl in adults cases undergoing abdominal surgeries.

Materials and Methods

The present prospective non randomized study was conducted in the department of Anaesthesiology at MNR Medical College and Hospital, Sangareddy during April 2019 to
March 2020. A total 100 cases undergoing abdominal surgeries under general anesthesia between 18-60 years belong to ASA grade I and II were recruited. Cases undergoing elective abdominal surgeries and willing to participate in the study were included. Cases allergic to opioid drugs, contraindication to epidural anesthesia, with neurological diseases, with pregnancy, with coagulation disorders and not willing to participate were excluded from the study. Informed consent was obtained from all the study participants and study protocol was approved by institutional ethics committee.

Participants were randomly divided in to two study groups i.e. group 1 administered with 0.125% Bupivacaine alone and group 2 administered with 0.125% Bupivacaine with 1mcg/kg fentanyl. All the study participants were clinically examined, monitored regularly with EEG, pulse oximetry and NIBP. Parameters like heart rate, blood pressure, respiratory rate, oxygen saturation, pruritus were assessed. Post-operative pain was assessed by visual analogue pain scale, time for first rescue analgesia and duration of analgesia, Ramsay sedation score and postoperative complication like nausea and vomiting were assessed. The SPSS version 23 software was used to carry out statistical analysis relevant to the study. Descriptive statistics were used to represent mean values and percentages. Study variables was analysed by chi-square test. A p-value of < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Results

| Parameters | Group 1 | Group 2 | p value |
|------------|--------|--------|---------|
| Age        | 38.29 ± 3.40 | 36.58 ± 2.82 | 0.684   |
| Gender (Male/Female) | 19/31 | 16/34 | 0.562   |
| Weight     | 65.23 ± 2.12 | 61.20 ± 1.57 | 0.339   |
| Time for first rescue analgesia | 103.56 ± 3.38 | 285.55 ± 3.14 | 0.003   |

Graph 1: Comparison of mean heart rate in two study groups.

Graph 2: Comparison of mean arterial pressure in two study groups.
Table 2: Comparison of mean respiratory rate and oxygen saturation changes in two study groups.

|                      | Mean Respiratory rate | Mean Oxygen saturation change |
|----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
|                      | Group 1 | Group 2 | P value | Group 1 | Group 2 | P value |
| At the beginning     | 12.12 ± 0.23 | 12.56 ± 0.61 | 0.892 | 98.69 ± 0.25 | 99.82 ± 0.23 | 0.378 |
| At 5 min             | 12.41 ± 0.58 | 12.30 ± 0.45 | 0.454 | 100.01 ± 0.28 | 99.96 ± 0.35 | 0.834 |
| At 10 min            | 12.34 ± 0.18 | 12.32 ± 0.25 | 0.237 | 98.98 ± 0.12 | 98.63 ± 0.12 | 1.00  |
| At 15 min            | 12.02 ± 0.89 | 12.02 ± 0.56 | 0.189 | 99.64 ± 0.23 | 100.07±0.42 | 0.476 |
| At 30 min            | 12.00 ± 0.30 | 12.00 ± 0.23 | 0.476 | 99.98 ± 0.18 | 100.65±0.56 | 0.156 |
| At 45 min            | 12.43 ± 0.24 | 12.32 ± 0.21 | 0.588 | 99.56 ± 0.22 | 100.22±0.18 | 0.583 |
| At 60 min            | 12.00 ± 0.00 | 12.00 ± 0.00 | 0.462 | 99.98 ± 0.19 | 99.78 ± 0.21 | 0.248 |
| At 75 min            | 12.06 ± 0.22 | 12.15 ± 0.08 | 0.372 | 100.12±0.36 | 99.88 ± 0.34 | 0.652 |
| At 90 min            | 11.98 ± 0.48 | 12.45 ± 0.87 | 0.446 | 100.03±0.22 | 100.03±0.25 | 0.652 |
| At 120 min           | 12.68 ± 0.23 | 12.57 ± 0.56 | 0.898 | 99.54 ± 0.14 | 99.89 ± 0.12 | 0.368 |
| At 180 min           | 13.56 ± 0.89 | 13.23 ± 0.58 | 0.912 | 99.84 ± 0.03 | 99.96 ± 0.15 | 0.263 |
| At 240 min           | 11.78 ± 0.22 | 11.78 ± 0.45 | 0.721 | 100.05±0.00 | 100.11±0.30 | 1.00  |
| At 300 min           | 10.25 ± 0.54 | 11.44 ± 0.33 | 0.779 | 100.12±0.04 | 100.16±0.18 | 0.357 |
| At 360 min           | 11.98 ± 0.54 | 11.86 ± 0.57 | 0.019 | 98.78 ± 0.69 | 99.45 ± 0.22 | 0.002 |
| At 420 min           | 13.63 ± 0.23 | 13.62 ± 0.36 | 0.384 | 99.52 ± 0.23 | 99.86 ± 0.18 | 0.286 |
| At 480 min           | 12.72 ± 0.45 | 12.25 ± 0.56 | 0.033 | 99.28 ± 0.77 | 99.95 ± 0.59 | 0.026 |
| At 540 min           | 13.87 ± 0.42 | 12.58 ± 0.28 | 0.669 | 99.82 ± 0.21 | 99.86 ± 0.38 | 0.126 |
| At 600 min           | 12.69 ± 0.78 | 12.68 ± 0.24 | 0.242 | 99.89 ± 0.25 | 99.92 ± 0.56 | 0.242 |

The mean respiratory rate was statistically significant at 360 min and 480 minutes. The difference of oxygen saturation changes among study groups was statistically significant at 360 min ad 480 min (p<0.005) (Table 2). The visual analogue score in the study groups were statistically significant (p<0.05).

The VAS score at 300 min, 360 min, 420 min, 480 min and 540 min was statistically significant (p<0.05). The mean Ramsay sedation score at the beginning, 240 min, 300 min, 360 min, 420 min, 480 min and 540 min was statistically significant (p<0.05).
In group 2, 62% cases have shown nausea/vomiting postoperatively, whereas in group 1, none of the cases shown nausea/vomiting which is statistically significant. 72% cases had pruritus in group 2, whereas none in group 1.

**Discussion**

Epidural analgesia furnishes preemptive analgesia which prevents polypharmacy, central sensitization and permits early mobilization [9]. Post-operative pain is unavoidable and its relief has been consistently and systematically inadequate [9]. The present study was designed to assess the efficacy of bupivacaine alone and bupivacaine with fentanyl in adults cases undergoing abdominal surgeries. The mean difference of age, gender, weight between two study groups was statistically not significant (p>0.05). The difference of mean heart rate between two study groups (p>0.05). A study by Priestley et al. stated that the incidence of pruritus was high when 50mcg fentanyl was used as adjuvant to 0.125% bupivacaine [17]. A study by Priestley et al. stated that high dose of fentanyl was associated with increase in dose dependent complications like pruritus, sedation and respiratory depression. Study also stated that in abdominal surgeries, ropivacaine with fentanyl has higher hemodynamic stability, effective intraoperative and postoperative analgesia than bupivacaine with fentanyl [18].

**Conclusion**

The time interval between epidural drug bolus and time for first rescue analgesia was higher in group 2 than group 1. The mean heart rate, arterial blood pressure, respiratory rate, oxygen saturation were almost similar and statistically significant at certain time period. The incidence of changes among study groups was statistically significant at 360 min ad 480 min (p<0.005) (Table 2). The visual analogue score in the study groups were statistically significant (p<0.05). A study by Krishna and Sharma noticed nominal changes in respiratory rate and respiratory changes were constant during entire study. The mean oxygen saturation also remained above 98% in the study group [10]. A study by Nazareth M et al. stated that use of low dose fentanyl as an adjuvant to bupivacaine is relatively safe and rarely ends up in respiratory depression [13]. The VAS score at 300 min, 360 min, 420 min, 480 min and 540 min was statistically significant (p<0.05). The mean Ramsay sedation score at the beginning, 240 min, 300 min, 360 min, 420 min, 480 min and 540 min was statistically significant (p<0.05). A study by Kumar Lakshmi et al. noticed higher VAS score in bupivacaine with fentanyl group than ropivacaine with fentanyl [1]. Study by Patil SS et al. noticed that VAS score was decreased steadily with the progression of infusion [12]. In this study, 72% cases had pruritus in group 2, whereas none in group 1. A study by Krishna and Sharma found pruritus only in fentanyl group [10]. A study Kumar and Singh stated that Intrathecal fentanyl frequently produces pruritus which is inconsiderable difficult to control by prophylactic medication [16]. A study by Kamawat et al. stated that the incidence of pruritus was high when 50mcg fentanyl was used as adjuvant to 0.125% bupivacaine [17]. A study by Priestley et al. stated that high dose of fentanyl was associated with increase in dose dependent complications like pruritus, sedation and respiratory depression. Study also stated that in abdominal surgeries, ropivacaine with fentanyl has higher hemodynamic stability, effective intraoperative and postoperative analgesia than bupivacaine with fentanyl [18].

**Table 3:** Comparison of the post-operative nausea/vomiting and pruritus in two study groups.

| Parameters         | Group 1 | Group 2 | p value |
|--------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| Nausea/vomiting    |         |         |         |
| Present            | N       | %       | N       | %       | 0.002   |
| Absent             | 50      | 100%    | 31      | 62%     |         |
| Pruritus            |         |         |         |
| Present            | -       | 50      | 100%    | 36      | 72%     | 0.004   |
| Absent             | -       | 50      | 100%    | 36      | 72%     |         |

Graph 4: Comparison of Ramsay sedation score in two study groups.
nausea/vomiting and pruritus was more in group 2 than group 1. The result of the study concludes that postoperative epidural analgesia was higher in group 2 than group 1.

References

1. Kumar Lakshmi, Meera Prabhaja Kumari, Rajan Sunil. A comparison of the analgesic efficacy and safety of epidural bupivacaine with fentanyl and ropivacaine with fentanyl in abdominal surgery. Ain-Shams Journal of Anesthesiology 2015;08:623-627.

2. Kehlet H, Holte K. Effect of postoperative analgesia on surgical outcome. Br J Anaesth 2001;87(1):62-72.

3. Vasantha K, Madhusudhana R. Intrathecal bupivacaine with neostigmine and bupivacaine with normal saline for postoperative analgesia: A cost-effective additive. Anesth Essays Res 2018;12:328-32.

4. Concepcion MA. Spinal anesthetic agents. Int Anesthesiol Clin. 1989;27(1):21-5.

5. Parameswari A, Dhev AM, Vakamudi M. Efficacy of clonidine as an adjuvant to bupivacaine for caudal analgesia in children undergoing sub-umbilical surgery. Ind J Anesthesia 2010;54(5):458-63.

6. Sarkar A, Bafila NS, Singh RB, Rasheed MA, Choubey S, Arora V, et al. Comparison of epidural bupivacaine and dexmedetomidine with bupivacaine and fentanyl for postoperative pain relief in lower limb orthopedic surgery. Anesth Essays Res 2018;12:572-80.

7. Sivevski AG, Karadjova D, Ivanov E, Kartalov A. Neuraxial Anesthesia in the Geriatric Patient. Frontiers in medicine 2018;5:254.

8. Vassilikopoulos T, Mastora Z, Katsaounou P, Doukas G, Klimopoulos S, Roussos C, et al. Contribution of pain to inspiratory muscle dysfunction after upper abdominal surgery: A randomized controlled trial. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2000;161(4 Pt 1):1372-5.

9. Nilsson S, Finnström B, Kokinsky E. The FLACC behavioral scale for procedural pain assessment in children aged 5-16 years. Paediatr Anesth 2008;18(8):767-774.

10. Krishna PGV, Sharma VJ. A comparative study of hemodynamic changes and adverse effects of intrathecal bupivacaine with fentanyl and intrathecal bupivacaine with clonidine in infra-umbilical abdominal and lower limb surgery. Int Surg J 2019;6:4048-55.

11. Kulkarni A, Gupta A, Shah SB, Bhargava AK. A comparative study of ropivacaine and bupivacaine with fentanyl for postoperative patient-controlled epidural analgesia after major abdominal oncosurgery. J Curr Oncol 2018;1:66-72.

12. Patil SS, Kudalkar AG, Tendolkar BA. Comparison of continuous epidural infusion of 0.125% ropivacaine with 1µg/ml fentanyl versus 0.125% bupivacaine with 1µg/ml fentanyl for postoperative analgesia in major abdominal surgery. J Anaesthesiol Clin Pharmacol 2018;34:29-34.

13. Nazareth M, Ghoshal P, Namshikar V, Gaude Y. Addition of intrathecal fentanyl to bupivacaine clonidine mixture effect on quality of subarachnoid block and postoperative analgesia. Anesth Essays Res 2013;7(1):76-82.

14. Benyamin R, Tresco AM, Datta S, Buenaventura R, Adlaka R, Sehgal N, et al. Opioid complications and side effects. Pain Physician 2008;11(2):S105-20.

15. Asghar AM, Samina I, Muhammad S, Asiyah A. A double-blind randomized control trial to compare the effect of varying doses of intrathecal fentanyl on clinical efficacy and side effects in parturients undergoing cesarean section. J Anaesthesiol Clin Pharmacol 2018;34(2):221-6.

16. Kumar K, Singh SI. Neuraxial opioid-induced pruritus: An update. J Anaesthesiol, Clinical Pharmacol 2013;29(3):303-7.

17. Karnawat R, Chhabra S, Mohammed S, Paliwal B. Comparison of Effect of Epidural Bupivacaine, Epidural Bupivacaine Plus Fentanyl and Epidural Bupivacaine Plus Clonidine on Postoperative Analgesia after Hip Surgery. J Anaesth Clin Res 2013;4:373.

18. Priestley MC, Cope L, Halliwell R, Gibson P, Chard RB, Skinner M, et al. Thoracic epidural anesthesia for cardiac surgery: the effects on tracheal intubation time and length of hospital stay. Anesth Analg 2002;94:275-282.