## Comparision of Intrathecal Hyperbaric Bupivacaine $0.5 \%$ with Fentanyl and Hyperbaric Bupivacaine 0.5\% with Buprenorphine in Trans Urethral Resection of Prostate

## KEYWORDS

Bupivacaine,Fentanyl, Buprenorphine,Analgesia, Haemodynamic parameters

## Dr. G.VISALA,

Associate Professor, Dept. of Anesthesiology, Kurnool Medical College, Kurnool.

## Dr.P.RAMAKRISHNA

Associate Professor, Dept. of Anesthesiology, Kurnool Medical College, Kurnool.


#### Abstract

To compare the charecteristics of subarachnoid block of $0.5 \%$ of 3 ml hyperbaric Bupivacaine heavy with $20 \mu \mathrm{~g}$ Fentanyl versus $0.5 \%$ of 3 ml hyperbaric Bupivacaine heavy with $60 \mu \mathrm{~g}$ Buprenorphine in subarachnoid block for Trans urethral resection of prostate in 60 patients. They were randomly divided in to two groups of 30 each. The onset of motor and sensory block was faster in fentanyl group campared to buprenorpinegroup. No significant difference was observed in haemodynamic parameters between both groups but associated with pruritis and post operative nausea and vomiting incidences were in lesser number.


## INTRODUCTION:-

The comparative study was conductedwith $0.5 \%$ of 3 ml hyperbaric Bupivacaine heavy with $20 \mu \mathrm{~g}$ Fentanyl versus $0.5 \%$ of 3 ml hyperbaric Bupivacaine heavy with $60 \mu \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{Bu}-$ prenorphine in 60 Patients. They were randomly divided into two groups of 30 each belongs to ASA grade I \&ll ,undergoing Trans Urethral Resection of Prostate ( TURP) under S.A.Block.

Group-A: 3 ml of $0.5 \%$ hyperbaric Bupivacaine $+20 \mu \mathrm{~g}$ of Fentanyl in 30 patients

Group-B: 3ml of $0.5 \%$ hyperbaric Bupivacaine $+60 \mu \mathrm{~g}$ of Buprenorphine in 30 patients

## Inclusion criteria:

1. ASA grade 1 and 2 patients.
2. Age group of 50-70 yrs.
3. Patients giving valid informed consent.
4. Patients scheduled to undergo Trans urethral resection of prostate under subarachnoid block.

| Exclusion criteria: |
| :--- |
| 1) Patients belonging to ASA |
| grade 3 and 4 |
| 2) Physically dependant on |
| narcotics. |
| 3) History of drug allergy. |
| 4) Gross spinal abnormality, |
| 5) Localized skin sepsis, |
| 6) Hemorrhagic diathesis |
| 7) Neurological involvement / |
| diseases. |

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

Patients were premedicated with tab alprazolam 0.5 mg and tab ranitidine 150 mg orally 12 hours before giving spinal anaesthesia.Preoperatively base line parameters like heart rate, blood pressure, respiratory rate recorded and intravenous line established with a large bore intravenous cannula in a large peripheral vein. All patients werepreloaded with 1 litre of ringer lactate and premedicated with 1 mg of midazolam iv 30 minutes before procedure.Monitoredwith ECG,NIBP,Pulse oximeter. We observed \& recorded the parameters like HR,BP,RR in every 2 min for the first 10 min and every 15 min there after . Onset,level, intensity of recovery of the sensory\& motor block wereanalysed and tabulated.

## OBSERVATIONS AND RESULTS

Statistical analysis done and results expressed as mean \& standard deviation with "P" value $<0.05$ was considered statistically significant.

## AGE DISTRIBUTION

| AGE | GROUP I | GROUPII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $50-55 \mathrm{yrs}$ | 9 | 5 |
| $55-60 \mathrm{yrs}$ | 5 | 7 |
| $60-65 \mathrm{yrs}$ | 6 | 5 |
| $65-70 \mathrm{yrs}$ | 10 | 13 |

STATISTICAL DATA

| Minimum | 50 | 50 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum | 70 | 70 |
| Mean | 61.7 | 63.5 |
| Standard deviation | 7.03 | 6.59 |
| Standard error | 1.28 | 1.20 |

The standard difference between means of 2 groups is 1.8 and $P$ value is 0.3105 , so it was not statistically significant value.

AGE DISTRIBUTION AMONG STUDY GROUPS
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|  | Group A | Group B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Minimum | 2 | 3 |
| Maximum | 4 | 4 |
| Mean | 2.672 | 3.497 |
| Standard deviation | 0.476 | 0.352 |
| Standard error | 0.08 | 0.064 |

The standard difference of sensory block between two means was 0.825 and $p$ value was 0.0001 which indicates the onset of action between two groups was significant.


HIGHEST LEVEL OF SENSORY BLOCK

|  | GROUP A |  |  | GROUP B |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| SENSORY <br> LEVEL | NO. OF <br> PATIENTS | PERCENTAGE | NO. OF <br> PATIENTS | PERCENTAGE |  |
| T4 | 1 | 3.33 | 0 | 0 |  |
| T5 | 2 | 6.66 | 1 | 3.33 |  |
| T6 | 10 | 33.33 | 8 | 26.66 |  |
| T7 | 6 | 20 | 7 | 23.33 |  |
| T8 | 4 | 13.33 | 6 | 20 |  |
| T9 | 2 | 6.66 | 4 | 13.33 |  |
| T10 | 5 | 16.66 | 4 | 13.33 |  |

The above table shows maximum level of sensory block up to T6 level in the two groups were $33.3 \%$ and $26.6 \%$ in group $A$ and $B$ respectively.
time to attain highest level of sensory blockADE

|  | Group A | Group B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Minimum | 6 | 10 |
| Maximum | 16 | 18 |
| Mean | 10.56 | 13.5 |
| Standard deviation | 1.897 | 2.07 |
| P value | 0.0001 |  |

It was 10.56 mts and 13.5 mts in group $A$ and $B$ respectively with $P$ value of $<0.05$,
found to be clinically and statistically significant.

## ONSET OF MOTOR BLOCK

|  | Group A | Group B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Minimum | 2.5 | 3 |
| maximum | 4 | 4.5 |
| mean | 3.01 | 3.53 |
| Standard deviation | 0.359 | 0.435 |
| P value | 0.0001 |  |

This table shows statistically and clinically significant ( $\mathrm{P}<0.05$ ) Variation between two groups In onset of motor block.

## MEAN HEART RATE

| TIME | GROUP | MEAN | STANDRD <br> DEVIA- <br> IION | STAND- <br> ARD <br> ERROR | PALUE | $\mathbf{N}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Prespi- <br> nal | Group A | 80.87 | 18.44 | 3.37 | 0.345 | 30 |
|  | Group B | 85.30 | 17.59 | 3.21 |  | 30 |
| 2 min | Group A | 80.93 | 16.32 | 2.98 | 0.369 | 30 |
|  | Group B | 84.77 | 16.50 | 3.01 |  | 30 |
| 5 min | Group A | 72.73 | 12.58 | 2.30 | 0.068 | 30 |
|  | Group B | 79.87 | 14.71 | 2.69 |  | 30 |
| 30 min | Group A | 67.80 | 11.17 | 2.04 | 0.060 | 30 |
|  | Group B | 76.33 | 13.54 | 2.47 |  | 30 |
| 45 min | Group A | 68.40 | 9.24 | 4.13 | 0.388 | 5 |
|  | Group B | 73.60 | 8.76 | 3.92 |  | 5 |
| 60 min | Group A | 64.00 | 11.31 | 8.00 | 0.712 | 2 |
|  | Group B | 68.00 | 5.66 | 4.00 |  | 2 |

The variations in heart rates between 2 groups were found to be statistically insignificant, P value 0.05 .

SYSTOLIC BLOOD PRESSURE

| TIME | GROUP | N | MEAN | STAND- <br> ARD DE- <br> VIATION | STANDARD <br> ERROR | P <br> VALUE |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pre <br> Spinal | Group <br> A | 30 | 135.13 | 14.29 | 2.61 | 0.625 |
|  | GroupB | 30 | 137 | 15.12 | 2.76 |  |
| 2 min | GroupA | 30 | 123.27 | 14.84 | 2.71 | 0.829 |
|  | GroupB | 30 | 124.07 | 13.63 | 2.49 |  |
| 5 min | GroupA | 30 | 119.53 | 10.30 | 1.88 | 0.738 |
|  | GroupB | 30 | 118.60 | 11.22 | 2.05 |  |
| 30 <br> min | GroupA | 30 | 120.2 | 13.64 | 2.49 | 0.737 |
|  | GroupB | 30 | 112.23 | 9.76 | 1.78 |  |
| 45 <br> min | GroupA | 5 | 114 | 5.48 | 2.45 | 0.339 |
|  | GroupB | 3 | 118.67 | 6.11 | 3.53 |  |
| 60 <br> min | GroupA | 2 | 115 | 7.07 | 5.00 | 0.667 |
|  | GroupB | 1 | 120 |  |  |  |

The variations in Systolic BP between 2 groups were found to be statistically not significant ( $\mathrm{P}>0.05$ ).

DIASTOLIC BLOOD PRESSURE

| Time | Group | $\mathbf{N}$ | Mean | Standard <br> deviation | P value |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Prespinal | GroupA | 30 | 82.3 | 6.006 | 0.8472 |
|  | GroupB | 30 | 82 | 6.000 |  |
| 2 min | GroupA | 30 | 81.6 | 6.11 | 0.3449 |
|  | GroupB | 30 | 83.1 | 6.090 |  |
| 5 min | GroupA | 30 | 76.06 | 6.18 | 0.1930 |
|  | GroupB | 30 | 74 | 5.932 |  |
| 30 min | GroupA | 30 | 75.2 | 7.281 | 0.4949 |
|  | GroupB | 30 | 74 | 6.21 |  |
| 45 min | GroupA | 5 | 78.8 | 3.487 | 0.001 |
|  | GroupB | 3 | 69.33 | 2.494 |  |
| 60 min | GroupA | 2 | 79 | 3 |  |
|  | GroupB | 1 | 82 |  |  |

The variation in Diastolic BP in between two groups were found to be statistically not significant ( $p>0.05$ )
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| TIME | GROUP | N | MEAN | STAND- <br> ARD <br> VIATION- | STANDARD <br> ERROR | PALUE <br> VALUE |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pre <br> Spinal | GroupA | 30 | 20.50 | 4.08 | 0.75 | 0.615 |
|  | GroupB | 30 | 20.00 | 3.56 | 0.65 |  |
| 2 min | GroupA | 30 | 18.40 | 3.28 | 0.60 | 0.938 |
|  | GroupB | 30 | 18.47 | 3.31 | 0.60 |  |
| 5 min | GroupA | 30 | 17.30 | 2.84 | 0.52 | 0.378 |
|  | GroupB | 30 | 18.03 | 3.52 | 0.64 |  |
| 30 min | GroupA | 30 | 16.80 | 2.87 | 0.52 | 0.325 |
|  | GroupB | 30 | 17.60 | 3.35 | 0.61 |  |
| 45 min | GroupA | 5 | 20.00 | 2.83 | 1.26 | 0.591 |
|  | GroupB | 5 | 19.00 | 2.83 | 1.26 |  |
| 60 min | GroupA | 2 | 19.00 | 1.41 | 1.00 | 0.811 |
|  | GroupB | 2 | 19.50 | 2.12 | 1.50 |  |

The mean R-R variation in both groups were disclosed here, shows statistically insignificant value as $\mathrm{P}>0.05$.

DURATION OF SURGERY

|  | Group A | Group B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Minimum | 30 | 30 |
| Maximum | 60 | 60 |
| Mean | 47.4 | 44.66 |
| Standard deviation | 12.04 | 11.54 |
| P value | 0.3719 |  |

The above table shows duration of surgery for both groups, $p$ value is 0.3719 so it is statistically significant regarding duration of surgery

## COMPARISION OF DURATION OF ANALGESIA

The duration of analgesia was taken as time from complete pain relief to the time when patient first complained of pain and demanded additional dose of analgesia.

|  | Group A | Group B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Minimum | 170 | 320 |
| Maximum | 280 | 560 |
| Mean | 224.5 | 446.8 |
| Standard deviation | 25.83 | 49.48 |
| P value | 0.0001 |  |

The above table shows mean duration of analgesia in 2 groups, $P$ value is 0.0001 . so variation between 2 groups is statistically \& clinically significant

DURATION OF ANALGESIA IN BOTH STUDY GROUPS


RECOVERY PARAMETERS
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|  | GROUP-A | GROUP-B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Minimum | 180 | 300 |
| Maximum | 250 | 370 |
| Mean | 212.9 | 331.9 |
| Standard deviation | 17.411 | 22.529 |
| P value | 0.0001 |  |

The above table shows time for sensory regression up to S1 between two groups displace the clinically and statistically significant variation with $p$ value $<0.05$.

TIME FOR RECOVERY FROM MOTOR BLOCKADE IN MINUTES

|  | Group-A | Group-B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Minimum | 182 | 296 |
| Maximum | 256 | 364 |
| Mean | 217.2 | 328.3 |
| Standard deviation | 14.66 | 17.42 |
| P value | 0.0001 |  |

The above table shows statistically significant variation between two groups with $p$ value of $<0.05$.

## POST OPERATIVE COMPLICATIONS

| ADVERSE EFFECTS | GROUP A | GROUP B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Nausea \& vomiting | 1 | 3 |
| Shivering | 2 | 1 |
| Hypotension | 3 | 3 |
| Urinary retention | 0 | 0 |
| Respiratory depression | Nil | Nil |
| Pruritis | 4 | 2 |
| Dural puncture headache | nil | Nil |

This table reveals more pruritis in group A patients and more nausea and vomiting in group B patients

COMPLICATIONS AMONG BOTH GROUPS


## DISCUSSION

Neuraxial administration of opioids along with local anaesthetics improves quality of intra operative analgesia and also provides post operative pain relief for longer duration Fentanyl, a highly lipophilic opioid, has rapid onset of action following intrathecal administration. It is associated with fewer side effects Buprenorphine a higly lipophilic opioid has slow onset of action and prolonged anaesthesia and fewer side effects compared to fentanyl

## Onset of action

Onset of sensory blockade was 2.672 min in group (A) and 3.497 min in group (B). Statistical comparison between 2 groups was found to be significant ( $\mathrm{P}>0.05$ ). so the onset of sensory block in Group A is earlier when compared to Group B as in FA Khan et al ${ }^{1}$. The onset,duration, quality of block was faster in group A than group B as in Fauzi-
abano et al ${ }^{2}$.

## Highest level of sensory block :

It was up to T4 in group A and T5 in group B, But majority of patients of both groups were reached up to T6.

## Time taken to attain highest sensory level :

It was 10.56 mts in group A and 13.5 mts in group B, correlates with the findings of FA Khan et al ${ }^{1}$, as lesser time taken to attain heighest sensory level block in fentanyl group than bruprenorphine group.

## Time taken for onset of motor blockade :

In our study it was 3.01 min in group A \& 3.53 min in group B reveals less time taken for onset of motor block as in FA Khan etal ${ }^{1}$.

Haemodynamic parameters;- Our study shows no significant difference in HR, RR,SBP.DBP between two groups,correlates with J.Koet al ${ }^{3}$, KristiinaS.Kuusniemieta et al ${ }^{4}$, AM Kornohenetal ${ }^{5}$, Catherine O Hunt et al ${ }^{6}$, JaishriBogra et al ${ }^{7}$, K.Jain et al ${ }^{8}$.

## DURATION OF ANALGESIA:

The mean duration of analgesia for Group $A$ is 224.5 min and for Group B is 446.8 min hence buprenorphine has prolonged analgesic effect compared to fentanyl as in Sapkal et al ${ }^{9}$, sumil Dixit et al ${ }^{10}$, SoumyaSamal et al ${ }^{11}$.

## COMPLICATIONS:

## NAUSEA \&VOMITING :

In our study nausea \& vomiting occurred in 3 cases in Group B \& 1 case in GroupA

## RESPIRATORY DEPRESSION:

None of the patients in our study group experienced respiratory depression.

Shivering,Hypotension and Urinary retention were occurred equally in both groups.

## PRURITIS:

Observed in 4 cases of Group A\& 2 cases of Group B

## POST DURAL PUNCTURE HEADACHE:

Not observed in both groups Thus in our study post operative nausea \& vomiting is more in buprenorphine group \&pruritis is more in fentanyl group.

## RECOVERY PARAMETERS: <br> TIME FOR SENSORY REGRESSION TO S1:

In our study mean time for sensory regression to $s 1$ is 212.9 min in group A \& 331.9 min in group B .statistical comparison between 2 groups is significant because $p$ value is $<0.05$

Thus fentanyl group has early sensory regression to s1 compared to buprenorphine.

## TIME FOR COMPLETE RECOVERY OF MOTOR BLOCKADE:

In our study the mean time for Motor recovery is 217.2 min in group A \& 328.3 min in group B .statistical comparison of both groups is significant $p<0.05$

Recovery from motor block is earlier in fentanyl group compared to buprenorphine group.

## SUMMARY

Onset of motor \& sensory block was observed to be faster with Fentanyl group compared to Buprenorphine group. No significantHaemodynamic parameters were changednin both groups.Time for sensory regression to S1,complete recovery of motor block,duration of complete analgesia, post operative analgesia were prolonged in Buprenorphine group when compared to Fentanyl.group. Pruritis common in Fentanyl group \& Post operative nausea \& vomiting common in Buprenorphine group. Other parameters and side effects were occurred in very lesser or never occurred in both groups like shivereing, hypotension, urinary retention and PDPH etc.

## CONCLUSION

Our study clearly shows that bupivacaine with fentanyl has very early onset of analgesia and shorter duration of analgesia; where as bupivacaine with buprenorphine group shows delayed onset of action and prolonged duration of analgesia
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