DOI: https://doi.org/10.53350/pjmhs221610978

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Immediate Postoperative Complications and Recovery Profile Following Spinal Anaesthesia: A Comparison Between Pethidine and Bupivacaine

SABEEN ARJUMAND[1], FAREEHA[2], HAJRA TARIQ[3], WAJIHA ZAHID[4], ZOOBIA IRUM[5], SHAHNAZ FATIMA[6]
[1]*MBBS, M. Phil Pharmacology, AP, Sharif Medical and Dental College,Lahore, Pakistan.*
[2]*MBBS, Amna Inayat Medical College, Sheikhupura, Pakistan.*
[3]*MBBS, Benazir Bhutto Shaheed Medical College, AJK,Pakistan.*
[4]*MBBS, Sahiwal Medical College,Sahiwal,Pakistan.*
[5]*MBBS,M.Phil,Assistant Professor,CMH Institute of Medical Sciences,, Bahawalpur, Pakistan.*
[6]*M.Phil Pharmacology, Associate Professor,Sahara Medical College, Narowal,Pakistan.*
Corresponding author: Sabeen Arjumand, Email: Sabeen_jabbar@hotmail.com, Cell: 03004535857

ABSTRACT

Background: Spinal anaesthesia is a less expensive option to general anaesthesia for surgical procedures below the umbilicus in resource-constrained settings with a shortage of medical gases and specialized an anesthetists. The patient's airway is not harmed by spinal anaesthesia, and both the patient and the doctor benefits from a host of additional benefits. Following the discontinuation of hyperbaric lidocaine for intrathecal injection because it can results in radiculopathy, bupivacaine is frequently used for spinal anaesthesia. For spinal, doctors employ pethidine, a lipophilic opioid with local aesthetic properties. In this study, pethidine bupivacaine were used as the only anaesthetic a gents to perform spinal anaesthesia, and the immediate postoperative problems and recovery profile were compared.

Methodology: For quick surgical procedures on the lower body, 52 American Society of Anesthesiologists physical status I and II patients between the ages of 18 and 60 were randomly assigned to receive spinalanaesthesia. The patients' recovery times for pinprick sensation at S2, plantar flexion, big toe proprioception, and full motor recovery (Bromage score 0) were compared after receiving either 2.5mL of isobaric 0.5 percent bupivacaine or 1mg/Kg of preservative-free pethidine. The immediate postoperative period complications of pain, drowsiness, nausea and vomiting, pruritus, and urine retention were compared.

Results: The time to return of pinkprick sensation at S2 was 94.6220.25 minutes and 205.9631.05 minutes, respectively, when pethidine and bupivacaine were compared. Pethidine and bupivacaine had a time to return of plantar flexion of 92.8812.01 minutes and viii 1 93.8539.56 minutes, respectively. Between pedthidine and bupivacaine, the mean recovery times f or the big toe's proprioception were 31.159.41 and 172.5042.70 minutes, respectively, for full motor recovery (Bromage score 0). All recovery time variation were significant (p 0.0001) across the broad. There was no discernible change in the incidence of pain or sedation in the immediate postoperative period. In the Bupivacaine group, four patients (15. 38%) reported having hardly bearable discomfort. Both groups did not experience any instances of nausea or vomiting. Pruritus was experience by five patients (19.22%) in the pethidine group, but none in the bupivacaine group (0.00 %). Urinary retention incidence varied, and this difference was significant (p = 0.048)

Conclusion: Compared to bupivacaine, pethidine had a quicker recovery profile and didn't lead to any major complications right after surgery.

INTRODUCTION

Surgery pain can be effectively relieved with spinal anaesthesia. The use of a single medication to relieve surgical pain in a setting with limited resources will help save money. Numerous benefits of spinal anaesthesia include little post-operative bleeding, quick gut function recovery, preserved airways, and early detection of issues in awake patients, among others. The method might also be helpful for day case procedures if the recovery profile is consistent with early home readiness. Even in locations with limited resources, pethidine and bupivacaine are utilised to deliver routine regional analgesia and postoperative pain treatment. One of the cornerstones of contemporary regional anaesthesia, spinal anaesthesia celebrated its first century in 1998.

The first effective spinal anaesthesia with cocaine was performed on Hildebrandt, a friend and assistant of August Bier from Germany. Since then, spinal anaesthetic has grown in popularity around the world and has a stellar safety record. However, the history of spinal anaesthetic issues predates the technique itself.(1) Postdural puncture headaches (PDPHs) were the very first spinal anaesthetic side effects, as Bier and Hildebrandt both experienced headaches following their experiment that, at least with Bier, were posture-related. Although rare, spinal or general anaesthesia may be followed by neurologic problems. The literature contains reports of peripheral neuropathies, hemiplegia and cranial nerve palsies1 after general and spinal anaesthesia. While some neurologic issues are more common after general anaesthesia, others are more likely to occur after spinal anaesthesia.

Woltman discovered that postoperative psychosis, extrapyramidal stiffness, and convulsions nearly exclusively followed general anaesthesia. The cerebral cortex and lenticular nucleus can experience degenerative alterations as a result of the anoxic hypoxia brought on by the injection of weak anaesthetics such nitrous oxide and ethylene, as demonstrated by Courville in 2a. (2) On the other hand, the side effects of spinal anaesthetic that have been most commonly recorded include headache, septic and aseptic meningitis, arachnoiditis, neuritis, myelitis. When injected intrathecally, the lipophilic opioid analgesic pethidine has local anaesthetic effects. It is capable of serving as the only anaesthetic for the spine. However, because it is not used as frequently as bupivacaine for this reason, there is less information available about its effects and recovery parameters in current anaesthetic literature. (3)

Recovery, according to Marshall and Chung, is a continuous process that starts when intraoperative care is completed and lasts until the patient reaches his or her preoperative physiological state. For surgical procedures involving the lower trunk, perineum, and low limbs in a resource-constrained setting with a shortage of medical gases and specialised anesthesiologists, spinal anaesthesia is a less expensive option than general anaesthesia. A little amount of a local anaesthetic is injected into the cerebrospinal fluid during the procedure of spinal anaesthesia (subarachnoid block), which is a type of regional anaesthesia. Because it has a clear endpoint, it is an easy to use, straightforward strategy. Blocking the flow of nerve signals to and from the damaged area is the intended outcome.

For surgeries involving the lower trunk, perineum, and lower limbs, spinal anaesthesia is a less expensive option than general anaesthesia in areas with limited resources, such as those with a shortage of medical gases and specialised anaesthetists. (4) There are many benefits to spinal anaesthesia. As long as the block is not excessively high, it causes the respiratory system to experience only minor negative effects.There are no issues with the patient's airways. The doctor can properly monitor the patient

and any co-morbidities because verbal contact is kept with the patient. To use a diabetic who is awake as an example, hypoglycemia is simple to spot. It is known that visceral tone is preserved during spinal anaesthesia, allowing for a quick recovery of gut function following surgery. Contrary to when the same procedure is carried out under general anaesthesia, spinal anaesthesia lowers blood pressure and improves venous x drainage, which results in less blood seeping during surgery.Similar to other localised methods, problems are identified early and can be managed to prevent serious consequences. Another benefit of spinal anaesthesia is that deep vein thromboses are less frequent. (5)

Due to the withdrawal of lidocaine (heavy), a local anaesthetic drug that caused radiculopathy when injected intrathecally, bupivacaine hydrochloride is now frequently utilised for spinal anaesthesia. This amide has a protracted action.A fat-soluble opioid with local anaesthetic properties is pethidine. When used alone, it preserves consciousness and, barring patchy block, provides sufficient analgesia for surgery. (6) This study seeks to compare the immediate postoperative complications and recovery profile following spinal anaesthesia with pethidine and bupivacaine.

METHODOLOGY

Study Setting: Inclusion criteria: Male and female patients between the ages of 18 and 60 who were scheduled to have lower body surgeries were recruited for the study. The study lasted for seven months.

Exclusion criteria:

1 Patient's refusal
2 Severe spinal deformity
3 Previous back surgery
4 Spinal cord lesions
5 Infection at site of injection
6 Active neurological disease
7 Psychiatric history
8 Obesity
9 History of coagulopathy
10 History of allergy to bupivacaine or pethidine
11 Procedures that are likely to exceed 60 minutes
12 Procedures involving blood loss >250mL.
13 Obstetric cases. The volume of anaesthetic agent used in the study is higher than what is commonly used for caesarean section.

Study Design: This is an experimental study based on 26 the recovery of patients from lumbar spinal anaesthesia using either pethidine or bupivacaine as a sole agent.

Sample size collection: Sample size of 26 Was calculated On The basis of expected difference of 15 minutes and considering 5% alpha (α) and 20% beta (β) error using the following formula:52

Psychiatric history, history of coagulopathy Morbid obesity (BMI>35) xxiv

(Zα+Zβ) 2 χ 2(s) 2 δ2

Zα =1.96 (alpha error)

Zβ =0.84 (beta error)

(s2) = 361 (variance) calculated from Standard Deviation (SD) of 19 minutes being the SD obtained for the recovery time from the standard drug (Pethidine).44,53

δ = 15 minutes –expected minimum difference of recovery time between Pethidine and Bupivacaine.

(1.96 + 0.84)2 χ 2(19)2 = 5660.48 =25.157 (minimum) 152 225

Sample size of 26 will be used for each of the pethidine (A) and bupivacaine (B) groups.

Null Hypothesis: there is no difference in the immediate postoperative complication and recovery profile between patients who receive pethidine and bupivacaine spinal anaesthesia.

Alternative Hypothesis: there is a difference in the immediate postoperative complication and recovery profile between patients who receive pethidine and bupivacaine spinal anaesthesia.

Data analysis: Using Microsoft excel, pertinent tables were created and basic statistical analysis, including arithmetical means, percentages, standard deviations, and degrees of significance, was performed. The 95% level of statistical significance (p=0.05) was chosen. Testing for relationships between continuous and categorical variables was done using the T-test and the Chi-Square test, respectively.

RESULTS

The study included 52 participants with American Society of Anesthesiologists (ASA) I xxix and II physical status. They were randomly assigned to either group A (n = 26) or group B (n = 26) and given lumbar spinal anaesthesia with either preservative-free pethidine or bupivacaine. Three individuals in the pethidine group who suffered breakthrough pain underwent general anaesthesia instead of neuraxial blocking.

As a result, they were not included in the study. In the pethidine group, there were 14 inguinal hernia repairs, 2 thigh surgeries, 4 scrotal surgeries, 1 knee surgery, 3 leg surgeries, 1 foot surgery, and 1 penile surgery. Bupivacaine patients had inguinal hernia repair (17), bladder surgery (1), scrotal surgery (3), knee surgery (1), leg surgery (3), and foot surgery (1), as well as other procedures. The subjects' body mass index (BMI) and mean age did not significantly differ between the two groups.Showed by table 1 Surgery took 53.46 minutes (SD 19.01) for the pethidine group and 54.23 minutes (SD 54.23) for the bupivacaine group (SD 15.08). The length of the surgery did not differ significantly between the two groups.

Table 3 showed that the time it took for pinprick sensation to return to S2 varied significantly across the groups, with the pethidine group taking 94.62 minutes (SD 20.25) and the bupivacaine group taking 205.96 minutes (SD 31.05) (p< 0.0001). According to Table 3, the recovery times for the big toe's proprioception were substantially different between the pethidine and bupivacaine groups, being 31.15 minutes (SD 9.41) and 172.50 minutes (SD 42.70), respectively. The time of return to Bromage score 0 was significantly different. Being 47.89 minutes (SD 14.08) for the pethidine group and 221.73 minutes (SD 44.72) in the bupivacaine group (p0.0001) (Table 3).

Table 1: Patients' Characteristics

	PETHIDINE (Mean±SD)	BUPIVACAINE (Mean±SD)
Age (year)	33.69±13.59	33.27±12.11
BMI (Kg/m2)	23.90±1.38	23.75±1.63f

Table 2: Duration of Surgery

DRUG	Pethidine n=26 (mean±SD)	Bupivacaine n=26 (mean±SD)
Duration of surgery	53.46±19.01	54.23±15.08

Table 3: Recovery Characteristics of Spinal Anaesthesia

Variables	Pethidine (n=26)	Bupivacaine (n=26)
Mean time to return of Pinprick sensation to S2 (minutes)	94.62±20.25	205.96±31.05
Mean time to plantarflexion (minutes)	92.88±12.01	193.85±39.56
Mean time to recovery of proprioception in the big toe (minutes)	31.15±9.41	172.50±42.70
Mean time to complete motor recovery (Bromage 0)	47.89±14.08	221.73±44.72

Table 4: Immediate Postoperative Complications

Variables	Group (A) Pethidine n=26	Group (B) Bupivacaine n=26
Pain	0 (0.00)	4 (15.38)
Nausea/vomiting	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)
Sedation	1 (3.90)	0 (0.00)
Pruritus	5 (19.22)	0 (0.00)
Urinary retention	0 (0.00)	3 (11.54)

DISCUSSION

The study's comparison of the recovery patterns following spinal anaesthesia with pethidine or bupivacaine as the single agent comprised the following criteria: (1) restoration of pinprick sensation to the sacral dermatome; (2) supine plantar flexion of the foot; (3) restoration of big toe proprioception and complete motor recovery of the lower limb (Bromage score 0).

Normal ambulation requires plantar flexion. Its limitation will affect how well it can do tasks like going down stairs or an incline. Sensors give signals to engage muscles to counteract the body's excessive leaning and bring it back to its upright position.This capacity depends on the toes' ability to sense their surroundings, particularly their big toes. 54-56. After spinal anaesthesia, it's crucial to make sure that the sympathetic, motor, and sensory blocks have all regressed before enabling patients to move around. Plantar flexion of the foot, proprioception in the big toe, and proper perianal (S4-5) feeling are appropriate indicators of whether this xxxvi has taken place.

By Wong et al.58, the time required to sit and move around after spinal anaesthesia in an ambulatory context was 127.9 minutes (SD 31). That period of time was deemed sufficient for ambulatory individuals without significant difficulties to be prepared for departure. In this study, 3 to 6 hours after surgery was selected as an appropriate amount of time to watch patients for problems related to pain, drowsiness, nausea and vomiting, pruritus, and urine retention in light of the aforementioned findings. The full regression of the blockage became the evaluation's endpoint when the block lasted longer than three hours. Residents on duty were then instructed to keep an eye on the patients for respiratory depression over the following 24 hours.(7)

Urinary retention is no longer a sufficient justification for delaying an ambulatory patient's release.1 the patients were examined around 24 hours after surgery. Nobody had a headache after getting a dural puncture. The change in BMI in this research was not statistically significant. It is unclear how body size, weight, body mass index (BMI), and the degree of sensory anaesthesia with a fixed dosage of spinal anaesthesia relate to one another. The distribution of spinal anaesthesia does not appear to be correlated with height or weight, according to recent research. Body height may not be as essential a factor in influencing anaesthetic distribution as vertebral column length. Urinary retention is no longer a sufficient justification for delaying an ambulatory patient's release.(8)

The patients were examined around 24 hours after surgery. Nobody had a headache after getting a dural puncture. The change in BMI in this research was not statistically significant. It is unclear how body size, weight, body mass index (BMI), and the degree of sensory anaesthesia with a fixed dosage of spinal anaesthesia relate to one another. The distribution of spinal anaesthesia does not appear to be correlated with height or weight, according to recent research.Body height may not be as essential a factor in influencing anaesthetic distribution as vertebral column length.(9)

Pethidine recovered complete motor function (Bromage score 0) more quickly than bupivacaine (221.7344.72 minutes). This discrepancy is generally consistent with the results of earlier researchers. When Grace and Fee24 evaluated the total motor recovery durations for pethidine (0.75 mg/Kg) and isobaric bupivacaine (13 mg) following transurethral prostate gland removal, they found that the times were 105 and 300 minutes, respectively. Lewis and colleagues, 61 also noted that pethidine considerably reduced the length of the block. For pethidine, the motor blockage lasted 1.1 hours (SD 0.6), and for 3.8 hours (SD 1.2) for spinal anaesthesia during transurethral prostate excision, they utilised 3.5 mL of 0.5 percent bupivacaine or 1 mg/kg of pethidine. The majority of other pethidine researchers focused on the length of the sensory block and the frequency of side effects, but they said little about how long it took for motor recovery to fully occur.(10)

Findings from earlier researchers on bupivacaine are consistent with the data made in this investigation. Complete motor recovery took 210 minutes for Ratsch and colleagues to achieve when using hyperbaric bupivacaine spinal anaesthesia for day case surgery, compared to 180 minutes for Luck, Fettes, and Wildsmith63 when comparing the use of hyperbaric solutions of racemic bupivacaine, levobupivacaine, and ropivacaine for spinal anaesthesia. Numbness and rigidity in the legs are frequent surgical side effects that cause patient discontent. Because of this, using bupivacaine for quick treatments is impractical. Prolonged motor and sensory blockage may cause the patient discomfort during brief operations on the lower abdomen or lower limbs. Due to this, doctors now frequently combine a low dosage local anaesthetic with spinal opioids for quick surgeries. (11)

Pethidine restored pinprick sensation to S2 more quickly than bupivacaine; the times were 94.6220.25 minutes and 205.9631.05 minutes, respectively. This result also agrees well with those of earlier researchers. With intrathecal pethidine and bupivacaine, Grace and Fee24 documented time to regression of sensory block to L5 of 150 minutes and 360 minutes, respectively. In their research, Hansen and Hansen measured the sensory block regression time with 1.2 mg/kg pethidine at 79–28 minutes. Using a spinal anaesthesia dose of 0.5 mg/kg of pethidine, Chaudhari and colleagues 25 recorded 97.32 minutes of sensory block regression.(12)

The variances in peak block height achieved, patient placement, disparities in the features of the populations investigated, and observer mistakes may all contribute to the discrepancies in sensory block regression times among the various studies. It should be emphasised that T10 was the desired block height in this investigation. Positioning was utilised to accomplish this. The extended apparent duration of sensory block regression seen by Grace and Fee24 may be related to their obtaining a peak block height of T5 (T3, T6). They also employed smaller sample sizes for their research; for pethidine and bupivacaine, the numbers were 20 and 19, respectively, as opposed to this study's sample sizes of 26 for each group. With pethidine, it took 92.88 minutes to reach plantar flexion and 31.15 minutes to restore big toe proprioception, but with bupivacaine, it took 193.85 minutes to reach plantar flexion and 172.50 minutes to restore big toe proprioception, respectively. The pethidine group's patients had shorter durations in this study, which is a reflection of the tendency toward faster recovery in the previously covered parameters. This concurs with previous researchers' findings. 2 It is interesting that in the pethidine group, straight leg lifting was accomplished before plantar flexion was feasible. This result makes it clear that achieving Bromage 0 with pethidine spinal anaesthesia does not ensure that the patient would be able to walk right away. According to Hogan64, resistance to anaesthetic effects is known to be caused by the great size of low lumbar and high sacral roots. The thoracic roots' more compact size, however, could make neural blockage easier. It is argued that the lack of predictability in anaesthetic response may be caused by the interindividual heterogeneity in root diameters.(13)

It is well known that the amount of local anaesthetic used directly affects the block's intensity. Each dosage of pethidine used in this investigation was further diluted to produce a volume of 2.5 mL. This will undoubtedly have a motor-sparing impact. The differential impact of diluted pethidine as a local anaesthetic on nerve fibres responsible for the contraction of muscles in the anterior and posterior compartments of the lower limb has to be further investigated. When the anaesthetic approach used for the treatment is linked to a low frequency of postoperative side effects, patient satisfaction with their perioperative experience and quality of recovery is increased.

This research examined the effects of the two drugs, pethidine and bupivacaine, on pain, nausea, vomiting, sedation, pruritus, and urine retention in the early postoperative period. In the immediate postoperative phase, only two patients in the bupivacaine group felt discomfort. However, none of the pain

ratings on the Numeric Rating Scale (NRS) topped 2/10, making them acceptable. Therefore, there was no discernible difference between participants who got pethidine and those who received bupivacaine in the occurrence of pain as an immediate postoperative consequence (p = 0.110). This result is consistent with Grace and Fee's24 discovery that both pethidine (0.00) and bupivacaine (0.00) caused no pain in the early postoperative period (0.00). However, 42 percent of patients (n=50) who had spinal anaesthesia with pethidine experienced discomfort, albeit bearable, according to Chaudhari and colleagues25. The amount of pethidine utilised for the block was presumably what caused the discomfort that was seen. In contrast to this study, they utilised 1mg/Kg of pethidine as opposed to using 0.5mg/Kg.(14)

In this investigation, there was no statistically significant difference between participants who got pethidine 1 (3.9%) and those who received bupivacaine (0.0%) in the incidence of sedation as an immediate postoperative consequence. The lone patient who was anaesthetized most likely had pethidine spread to the brain from the cephalad. However, given that its high lipophilicity limits rostral diffusion, it is believed to be uncommon. 25, 26 In their research, Grace and Fee24 also noted sedation in the pethidine (8/20) and bupivacaine (1/19) groups, but solely as an intraoperative occurrence.

CONCLUSION

In the current trial, pethidine showed a faster rate of recovery than bupivacaine and didn't lead to any major issues in the first few days after surgery. As an alternative to traditional local anaesthetic drugs, it is thus suitable for use in procedures of the lower trunk and extremities that last less than 60 minutes.

REFERENCES

1. Marshall SI, Chung F. Discharge criteria and complications after ambulatory surgery. Anesth Analg. 1999;88(3):508-17.
2. Rekhi BK, Kaur T, Arora D, Dugg P. Comparison of Intravenous Dexmedetomidine with Midazolam in Prolonging Spinal Anaesthesia with Ropivacaine. J Clin Diagn Res. 2017;11(2):Uc01-uc4.
3. Afolayan JM, Olajumoke TO, Esangbedo SE, Edomwonyi NP. Spinal anaesthesia for caesarean section in pregnant women with fetal distress: time for reappraisal. Int J Biomed Sci. 2014;10(2):103-10.
4. Udonquak M, Kalu Q, Eshiet A. Pethidine and bupivacaine spinal anaesthesia: a comparative evaluation of postoperative complications and recovery profile. International Journal of Research in Medical Sciences. 2017;5:2490.
5. Wagner LE, 2nd, Eaton M, Sabnis SS, Gingrich KJ. Meperidine and lidocaine block of recombinant voltage-dependent Na+ channels: evidence that meperidine is a local anesthetic. Anesthesiology. 1999;91(5):1481-90.
6. Shephard DA. Harvey Cushing and anaesthesia. Can Anaesth Soc J. 1965;12(5):431-42.
7. Hwang JJ, Ho ST, Wang JJ, Liu HS. Post dural puncture headache in cesarean section: comparison of 25-gauge Whitacre with 25- and 26-gauge Quincke needles. Acta Anaesthesiol Sin. 1997;35(1):33-7.
8. Pflug AE, Aasheim GM, Foster C. Sequence of return of neurological function and criteria for safe ambulation following subarachnoid block (spinal anaesthetic). Can Anaesth Soc J. 1978;25(2):133-9.
9. Wong J, Marshall S, Chung F, Sinclair D, Song D, Tong D. Spinal anesthesia improves the early recovery profile of patients undergoing ambulatory knee arthroscopy. Can J Anaesth. 2001;48(4):369-74.
10. Hartwell BL, Aglio LS, Hauch MA, Datta S. Vertebral column length and spread of hyperbaric subarachnoid bupivacaine in the term parturient. Reg Anesth. 1991;16(1):17-9.
11. Lewis RP, Spiers SP, McLaren IM, Hunt PC, Smith HS. Pethidine as a spinal anaesthetic agent--a comparison with plain bupivacaine in patients undergoing transurethral resection of the prostate. Eur J Anaesthesiol. 1992;9(2):105-9.
12. Chegini A, Behnaz F. Intravenous pethidine as the sole agent for regional anesthestesia; a randomized controlled trial. 2014.
13. Luck JF, Fettes PD, Wildsmith JA. Spinal anaesthesia for elective surgery: a comparison of hyperbaric solutions of racemic bupivacaine, levobupivacaine, and ropivacaine. Br J Anaesth. 2008;101(5):705-10.
14. Li S, Coloma M, White PF, Watcha MF, Chiu JW, Li H, et al. Comparison of the costs and recovery profiles of three anesthetic techniques for ambulatory anorectal surgery. Anesthesiology. 2000;93(5):1225-30.