International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)

ISSN (Online): 2319-7064

Index Copernicus Value (2016): 79.57 | Impact Factor (2015): 6.391

To Compare the Effect of Intrathecal 0.5% Hyperbaric Bupivacaine 16mg Over 0.5% Hyperbaric Bupivacaine 16 Mg + 5µg Dexmedetomidine with Respect to Haemodynamic Changes

Venkatesh Kode¹, Suranjith Sorake², Partha Pratim Deka³

¹Post graduate student, Department of Anaesthesia, yenepoya university, Deralakatte Mangalore, India ²Assistant professor DA, MD AnaesthesiaDepartment of Anaesthesia, yenepoya university, Deralakatte Mangalore, India ³Post graduate student, Department of Anaesthesia, yenepoya university, Deralakatte Mangalore, India

Abstract: Introduction: Hyperbaric bupivacaine is commonly used as local anaesthetic for administering spinal anaesthesia. Spinal anaesthesia using local anaesthetic alone is associated with relatively short duration of action. Adjuvants are added to improve the quality, to accelerate the onset of action, prolong analgesia and to overcome the problems of spinal anaesthesia. Hypothesis: To compare the effect of intrathecal 0.5% Hyperbaric Bupivacaine 16mg over 0.5% Hyperbaric Bupivacaine 16 mg + 5µg Dexmedetomidine with respect to Haemodynamic changes. Sample Size: We conducted the study on 60 patients over a period of one year and six months from 1 March 2016 to 31 August 2017. Results: Our study show that supplementation of spinal bupivacaine with 5 microgram dexmedetomidine resulted stable hemodynamics. Study showed that there was no significant decrease in the mean heart rate in dexmedetomidine group when compared to Bupivacaine alone group. Conclusion: Our study showed that there was no significant decrease in the mean heart rate in dexmedetomidine group when compared to Bupivacaine alone group.

Keywords: Hyperbaric bupivacaine,. Spinal anaesthesia Dexmedetomidine, Haemodynamic changes

1. Introduction

Spinal anaesthesia is the most commonly employed technique for lower abdominal surgeries and lower limb surgeries as it is very economical and easy to administer. Spinal anaesthesia has many advantages such as easy to perform, rapid onset of action and good muscle relaxation. Hyperbaric bupivacaine is commonly used as local anaesthetic for administering spinal anaesthesia. Spinal anaesthesia using local anaesthetic alone is associated with relatively short duration of action and hence early analgesic intervention is needed in the postoperative period. A common problem encountered during lower abdominal surgery under spinal anaesthesia is visceral pain, nausea and vomiting. Adjuvants are added to improve the quality, to accelerate the onset of action, prolong analgesia and to overcome the problems of spinal anaesthesia. Depending on the purpose, various adjuvants Morphine, Fentanyl, Clonidine, Midazolam, Dexmedetomidineetc are added (1).

Alpha 2 adrenergic receptor agonists as intrathecal adjuvants have been the focus of interest for their sedative, analgesic, peri-operative sympatholytic and hemodynamic stabilizing properties. Clonidine has been studied extensively and has shown to improve the quality of spinal anaesthesia (2). Dexmedetomidine, a new highly selective α 2-agonist, is under evaluation as a neuraxial adjuvant (3). Based on earlier human studies, it is hypothesized that intrathecal 5 μ g dexmedetomidine would produce more postoperative analgesic effect with hyperbaric bupivacaine in spinal anaesthesia with minimal side effects (4), (5).

2. Review of Literature

1) Kanazi GE et al. (5) did a prospective, double-blind study on 60 patients undergoing transurethral resection of prostate or bladder tumor under spinal anaesthesia. They were randomly allocated to one of three groups. Group B received 12 mg of hyperbaric bupivacaine, group D received 12 mg of bupivacaine supplemented with 3 microgram of dexmedetomidine and group C received 12 mg of bupivacaine supplemented with 30microgram of clonidine. The onset times to reach peak sensory and motor levels, and the sensory and motor regression times, were recorded. This study showed that dexmedetomidine (3 microgram) or clonidine (30 microgram), when added to intrathecal bupivacaine, produces a similar prolongation in the duration of the motor and sensory block with preserved hemodynamic stability and lack of sedation.

2) Shukla D et al. (11) did a prospective study on 90 Society American patients classified as Anaesthesiologists status I and II scheduled for lower abdominal and lower limb procedures. Patients were randomly allocated to receive intrathecally either 15 mg bupivacaine plus 0.1 ml dexmedetomidine (group D, n=30) or 15 mg hyperbaric bupivacaine plus 0.1 ml (50 mg) magnesium sulphate (group M, n=30) or 15 mg hyperbaric bupivacaine plus 0.1 ml saline (group C, n=30) as control. The onset time to reach peak sensory and motor level, the regression time for sensory and motor block, hemodynamic changes and sideeffects were recorded. It was found that onset of anaesthesia was rapid and of prolonged duration in the dexmedetomidine group (D). However, in the magnesium

Volume 7 Issue 3, March 2018

www.ijsr.net

Licensed Under Creative Commons Attribution CC BY

Paper ID: ART2018598 DOI: 10.21275/ART2018598 775

International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)

ISSN (Online): 2319-7064

Index Copernicus Value (2016): 79.57 | Impact Factor (2015): 6.391

sulfate group (M), although onset of block was delayed, the duration was significantly prolonged as compared with the control group (C), but to a lesser degree than in the dexmedetomidine group (D).

- 3) Rajnigupta et al (12) studied sixty patients classified in ASA 1 and 2 scheduled for lower abdominal surgeries. Patients were randomly allocated to receive either12.5mg hyperbaric bupivacaine plus 5µg dexmedetomidine OR 12.5mg hyperbaric bupivacaine plus 25µg fentanyl. They concluded that intrathecaldexmedetomidine is associated with prolonged motor and sensory block, hemodynamic stability and reduced demand for rescue analgesics in 24 hour as compared to fentanyl.
- 4) Al-Ghanem et al (13) did a study on seventy six patients classified as ASA 1, 2, 3 scheduled for vaginal hysterectomy. Patients were randomly allocated to receive intrathecally either 10mg isobaric bupivacaine plus 5µg dexmedetomidine OR 10mgisobaric bupivacaine plus 25µgfentanyl. The onset time to reach peak sensory and motor level, the regression time for sensory and motor block, hemodynamic changes were recorded in women undergoing vaginal reconstructive surgery under spinal analgesia. Based on their results, they concluded that 10mg plain bupivacaine supplemented with 5µg dexmedetomidine produced prolonged motor and sensory block compared with 25µg fentanyl.
- 5) Mahendru V et al (14) Conducted a prospective, double blind study which included 120American Society of Anaesthesiology (ASA) class I and II patients undergoing lower limb surgery under spinal anaesthesia. The patients were randomly allocated into four groups (30 patients each). Group BS received 12.5 mg hyperbaric bupivacaine with normal saline, group BF received 12.5 mg bupivacaine with 25 mcg fentanyl, group BC received 12.5 mg of bupivacaine supplemented with 30 mcg clonidine, and group BD received 12.5 mg bupivacaine plus 5 mcg dexmedetomidine. The onset time to reach peak sensory and motor level, the regression time of sensory and motor block, hemodynamic changes, and side effects were recorded. They concluded intrathecaldexmedetomidine is associated with prolonged motor and sensory block, hemodynamic stability, and reduced demand of rescue analgesics in 24 hours as compared to clonidine, fentanyl, or lone bupivacaine.

3. Objectives

To compare the effect of intrathecal 0.5% Hyperbaric Bupivacaine 16mg over 0.5% Hyperbaric Bupivacaine 16 mg + $5\mu g$ Dexmedetomidine with respect to Haemodynamic changes.

4. Materials and Methods

The study was conducted at yenepoya hospital Mangalore, with approval from the institutional Ethics Committee and written informed consent from all patients who participated in this study.

We conducted the study on 60 patients over a period of one year and six months from 1 March 2016 to 31 August 2017.

Inclusion Criteria

- 1. Patients posted for elective abdominal hysterectomy
- 2. Patients belonging to ASA Grade 1 and 2
- 3. Age group 40 to 60 years
- 4. Body weight 40 to 75 kg
- 5. Height 150 to 180 cm

Exclusion Criteria

- 1. History of allergy to local anaesthetics and NSAIDs
- 2. Patients with cardiac arrythmias
- 3. History of spinal surgery
- 4. Patients with spinal deformity, peripheral neuropathy and on anticoagulant therapy
- 5. Patient refusal
- 6. Duration of surgery lasting >2 hours

5. Results and Discussion

Prolongation of duration of spinal block is desirable both for long procedures and for postoperative pain relief.

Dexmedetomidine is a newer drug being used as an adjuvant for spinal anesthesia. The mechanism by which intrathecal alpha agonists prolong the motor and sensory block of local anesthetics is at the best, speculative.

Our study compared the efficacy of Plain Bupivacaine with Bupivacaine dexmedetomidine combination for spinal anaesthesia. In the present study, we assessed 60 patients aged 40 to 60 years belonging to ASA class I and II, posted for abdominal hysterectomy under spinal anesthesia. Patients fulfilling the inclusion criteria received either plain bupivacaine or bupivacaine dexmedetomidine combination. The outcomes assessed were hemodynamic changes. Both groups were comparable with respect to demographic data, duration of the surgery and ASA grading.

The results of our study show that supplementation of spinal bupivacaine with 5 microgram dexmedetomidine resulted stable hemodynamics.

In our study we found similar blood pressure trends between the groups. This finding was in concordance with the results obtained in the studies conducted Kanazi et al (5), Gupta R et al (15) Mahendru et al (16) Bajwa S et al (17), and Vinod CN et al (18), where they demonstrated no significant difference in blood pressure variation between both the groups. This present study showed that there was no significant decrease in the mean heart rate in dexmedetomidine group when compared to Bupivacaine alone group. This finding was similar to the studies done by Rajni Gupta et al and Al Ghanem et al who concluded that dexmedetomidine produces stable hemodynamics.

Volume 7 Issue 3, March 2018 www.ijsr.net

International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)

ISSN (Online): 2319-7064

Index Copernicus Value (2016): 79.57 | Impact Factor (2015): 6.391

6. Summary and Conclusion

A prospective observational study was undertaken to compare plain bupivacaine with bupivacaine-dexmedetomidine combination for spinal anesthesia. Sixty patients aged between 40 to 60 years belonging to ASA class I and II were studied. Our study showed that there was no significant decrease in the mean heart rate in dexmedetomidine group when compared to Bupivacaine alone group.

References

- [1] James P Rathmell, Timothy R Lair, BushraNauman. The Role of Intrathecal Drugs in the Treatment of Acute Pain. Anesthesia Analgesia 2005; 101: S30-43.
- [2] Elia N, Culebras X, Mazza C, Schiffer E, Tramèr MR. Clonidine as an adjuvant to intrathecal local anesthetics for surgery: Systematic review of randomized trials. Regional Anesthesia Pain Medicine 2008; 159–67.
- [3] Grewal A. Dexmedetomidine: New avenues. Journal of Anaesthesiology Clinical Pharmacology 2011; 27 (3): 297-302.
- [4] Al-Mustafa MM, Abu-Halaweh SA, Aloweidi AS, Murshidi MM, Ammari BA et al. Effect of dexmedetomidine added to spinal bupivacaine for urological procedure. Saudi Medical Journal.2009; 30:365–70.
- [5] Kanazi GE, Aouad MT, Jabbour-Khoury SI, Al Jazzar MD, Alameddine MM, et al. Effect of low-dose dexmedetomidine or clonidine on the characteristics of bupivacaine spinal block. Acta Anesthesiol Scand. 2006; 50:222–7.
- [6] Pitkanen M. Spinal (subarachnoid) Blockade Chapter 10. In Cousins MJ, Carr DB, Horlocker TT, Bridenbaugh PO. Editors. Cousins & Bridenbaugh's Neural Blockade in clinical anaesthesia and pain medicine. Fourth Edition.
- [7] Malhotra V, Sudheendra V, O'Hara J, Malhotra A. Anaesthesia and the Renal and Genitourinary systems. In:Millers RD Editor. Miller's Anaesthesia; eighth edition. Elsevier.Saunders; 2014.P.2231.
- [8] 8 Hocking G, Wildsmith J A W. Intrathecal drug spread. British Journal of Anaesthesia. 2004; 93 (4): 568–78.
- [9] Davidson. Churchill. In: A practice of anaesthesia, Wylie and Churchill Davidsons. Fifth edition.PG Publishing Pvt Ltd.1986.
- [10] Brown DL, Ransom DM, Hall JA, Leight CH, Shroeder DR et al. Regional anesthesia, and local anaesthetic induced systemic toxicity: seizure frequency and accompanying cardiovascular changes. Anesthesia Analgesia 1995; 81:321–328.
- [11] Shukla D, Verma A, Agarwal A, Pandey HD, Tyagi C. Comparative study of intrathecaldexmedetomidine with intrathecal magnesium sulphate used as adjuvants to bupivacaine. J AnaesthesiolClinPharmacol. 2011 Oct-Dec; 27 (4):495–499.
- [12] Gupta R, Verma R, Bogra J, A comparative study of intrathecaldexmedetomidine and fentanyl as adjuvants

- to bupivacaine.Indian journal of anaesthesia 2011; volume 55, issue 4: 347-351.
- [13] Subhi M.AL-Ghanem, Massad IM. Effect of adding dexmedetomidine versus Fentanyl to intrathecal bupivacaine on spinal block characteristics in gynaecological Procedures: A double blind controlled study. American journal of applied science2009; volume-6 (5):882-887.
- [14] Mahendru V, Tewari A, Katyal S, Grewal A, Singh MR et al. A comparison of intrathecaldexmedetomidine, clonidine, and fentanyl as adjuvants to hyperbaric bupivacaine for lower limb surgery: A double blind controlled study. Journal of AnaesthesiologyClinical Pharmacology 2013; 29:496-502.
- [15] Bajwa S, Arora V, Kaur J, Singh A, Parmar S S. Comparative evaluation of dexmedetomidine and fentanyl for epidural analgesia in lower limb orthopedic surgeries. Saudi Journal of Anaesthesia 2011; 5:365-70.
- [16] Vinod CN, Babu N, Chandra D. Effect of Dexmedetomidine Added to Spinal Bupivacaine for Total Abdominal Hysterectomy. Journal of Evolution of Medical and Dental Sciences 2014; Vol. 3, Issue 48, September 29; Page: 11520-11525

Volume 7 Issue 3, March 2018 www.ijsr.net

Licensed Under Creative Commons Attribution CC BY

Paper ID: ART2018598 DOI: 10.21275/ART2018598 777