

A Randomized Clinical Comparative Assessment of Bupivacaine Heavy and 2-Chloroprocaine for Saddle Block in Perianal Day Care Surgeries

Vinit Kumar¹, C D Ram², Priyanka Hansda³, Mrityuanjay Kumar⁴, Pawan Kumar⁵

¹Senior Resident, Department of Anaesthesiology, SNMMCH, Dhanbad, Jharkhand, India

²Assistant professor and HOD, Department of Anaesthesiology, SNMMCH, Dhanbad, Jharkhand, India

³Assistant Professor, Department of Anaesthesiology, SNMMCH, Dhanbad, Jharkhand, India

⁴Assistant Professor, Department of Anaesthesiology, SNMMCH, Dhanbad, Jharkhand, India

⁵Senior Consultant, Department of Anesthesiology, Asarfi Hospital, Dhanbad, Jharkhand, India

Received: 05-01-2023 / Revised: 11-02-2023 / Accepted: 17-03-2023

Corresponding author: Dr. Vinit Kumar

Conflict of interest: Nil

Abstract

Aim: The aim of the present study was to compare the bupivacaine heavy and 2-chloroprocaine for saddle block in perianal day care surgeries.

Methods: This observational study conducted in the Department of Anesthesiology, SNMMCH, Dhanbad, Jharkhand, India for 12 months. We included 50 patients in each group.

Results: The mean time for eligibility to discharge from hospital between groups were statistically significant with p value <0.001. Group A had less mean time (234.58±20.80 min) compared to group B (340.60±15.55 min). The mean time for length of stay in PACU was less in group A (64.36±6.50 min) as compared to group B (76.24±8.45 min) with p value of <0.001. Mean time taken to ambulate was statistically significant with group A having less mean time (180.40±20.32 min) compared to group B (270.30±20.50 min), with p value of <0.001. The time taken to void was statistically significant with group A having less mean time (220.50±20.50 min) compared to group B (310.30±22.60 min), with p value of <0.001. There was no difference between the two groups in terms of demographic criteria.

Conclusion: In conclusion saddle block with 2-Chloroprocaine provides satisfactory surgical anesthesia for perianal surgeries when compared to low dose hyperbaric Bupivacaine with earlier hospital discharge and shorter PACU stay and time to ambulation and micturition.

Keywords: Bupivacaine, Saddle Block, 2-Chloroprocaine.

This is an Open Access article that uses a funding model which does not charge readers or their institutions for access and distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>) and the Budapest Open Access Initiative (<http://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/read>), which permit unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided original work is properly credited.

Introduction

An optimal anesthetic technique would provide excellent operating conditions,

rapid recovery, early discharge, no postoperative side effects, and high patient satisfaction, in addition to the high quality

and low costs of the anesthetic services. [1] Selective spinal anesthesia — spinal block with minimal effective doses for a specific type of surgery — has become a very popular technique [2] for some orthopedic and gynecological surgeries. [3-5] Saddle anesthesia is a selective spinal anesthesia that directs a small bolus of hyperbaric local anesthetic toward S4–S5 and coccygeal nerve roots⁶, and is commonly utilized for perianal surgeries. [7-10] Hyperbaric bupivacaine has safely replaced hyperbaric lidocaine for saddle block. [6,7] Although saddle blocks at different low doses of hyperbaric bupivacaine (1.5–4 mg) have been used previously for minor perianal surgeries [8-10], the optimal effective dose is yet to be determined.

Ambulatory day care surgical procedures have increased worldwide. Spinal anaesthesia is safe and reliable technique for surgery of lower abdomen and limbs. [11] However, some of its characteristics like delayed ambulation, risk of urinary retention and pain after block regression may limit its use for ambulatory surgeries. Saddle block provides a reliable but is a restricted block with good surgical conditions and hence is optimal for perianal surgeries. The ideal anesthetic should have minimal side effects with rapid onset and offset of its own effect for early patient discharge. [12,13] 2-Chloroprocaine is an amino-ester local anesthetic and has very short half-life. Bupivacaine heavy is a long acting amide local anaesthetic agent with comparatively slower onset of action and longer duration. Attempts have been made to tailor spinal anesthesia for specific surgical procedures.² Several studies targeting local anesthetic at specific nerve roots supplying the surgical field have demonstrated successful results. [3,14]

The aim of the present study was to compare the bupivacaine heavy and 2-chloroprocaine for saddle block in perianal day care surgeries.

Materials and Methods

This observational study conducted in the Department of Anesthesiology, SNMMCH, Dhanbad, Jharkhand, India for 12 months. We included 50 patients in each group.

Methodology

Total 100 patients were divided randomly into two groups, Group A and Group B by computer generated random numbers at 1:1 ratio. Group A received 2 ml of 1% 2-Chloroprocaine, group B received 2ml of 0.5% Bupivacaine heavy. Double blinding was done where neither the patient nor the investigator knew about the drug. The patients of ASA physical status grade I and II aged between 18 to 58 years undergoing elective perianal day care surgeries <60 mins duration was included in the study. The patients with bleeding/coagulation disorders, existing neurological disease, sepsis, pregnancy and obese patients (BMI> 30kg/m²) were excluded.

After pre-anaesthetic evaluation, all patients received tablet Ranitidine 150 mg orally in the night and were kept nil by mouth for 8 hours for solids and 2 hours for clear liquids. On the day of surgery, in the OT standard monitors like pulse oximetry, NIBP and ECG were connected, and baseline readings were recorded. IV line was secured with 20G iv cannula and coloaded with ringer lactate solution at the rate of 15ml / kg.

Under aseptic precautions, spinal anaesthesia was given at L3- L4 or L4-5 interspace using 25 G Quincke spinal needle with patient in sitting position. The patients were placed in supine after 6-10 minutes to achieve adequate saddle block. The sensory level of the block is assessed in a caudal to cephalad direction by using pin prick examination. The occurrence of clinically relevant hypotension (>20% from baseline values) was treated with ephedrine. Clinically relevant bradycardia was treated with atropine.

The patients were discharged from PACU after achieving modified Aldrete score of ≥ 9 and from hospital after achieving Post Anesthesia Discharge Score system of 9 [5]. Time to ambulate and void urine were also noted. Patients were contacted over phone, 24 hr and 7 days following surgery for assessing potential complications. A standardized questionnaire was used to check for the presence of headache, nausea, vomiting and backache.

Statistical analysis

Data were entered in MS-Excel and analyzed in SPSS V 21.0. Descriptive statistics were represented with percentages, Mean with SD. Chi-square test, independent t-test were applied to find significance. $P < 0.05$ was considered as statistically significant.

Results

Table 1: Clinical data

	Group A	Group B	P value
Eligibility to discharge from the hospital	234.58±20.80	340.60 ±15.55	<0.001
Length of stay in PACU (MIN)	64.36±6.50	76.24±8.45	<0.001
Time to ambulate(min)	180.40±20.32	270.30±20.50	<0.001
Time to void urine (min)	220.50±20.50	310.30±22.60	<0.001

The mean time for eligibility to discharge from hospital between groups were statistically significant with p value < 0.001 . Group A had less mean time (234.58±20.80 min) compared to group B (340.60±15.55 min). The mean time for length of stay in PACU was less in group A (64.36±6.50 min) as compared to group B (76.24±8.45 min) with p value of < 0.001 . Mean time taken to ambulate was

statistically significant with group A having less mean time (180.40±20.32 min) compared to group B (270.30±20.50 min), with p value of < 0.001 . The time taken to void was statistically significant with group A having less mean time (220.50±20.50 min) compared to group B (310.30±22.60 min), with p value of < 0.001 .

Table 2: Demographic data

Variables	Group A	Group B
Age	32.58 ± 10.30	34.66 ± 11.29
Height (cm)	170.79 ± 8.27	171.39 ± 8.32
Weight (kg)	78.79 ± 7.99	76.64 ± 7.34
BMI (kg/m ²)	26.92 ± 1.2	25.55 ± 1.2
Duration of surgery (min)	7.99 ± 4.65	6.50 ± 3.60
Sex (female/male)	9/15	22/28

There was no difference between the two groups in terms of demographic criteria.

Table 3: Complications

Parameter	Group A	Group B
No complications	34	36
Bradycardia	4	0
Hypotension	0	3
Headache	3	5
PONV	7	0
Backache	3	3

The complications in our study like bradycardia, hypotension, headache,

PONV and backache were comparable between the two groups.

Discussion

The incidence of perianal surgery varies among institutions, accounting for up to 10% of general surgical procedures. The procedure is suitable to perform on a day-case basis with spinal anaesthesia. However, prolonged sensory and motor block and urinary retention can cause a delay in discharge. [15,16] It was widely used in Anglo-Saxon countries until the 1960s, especially in obstetrics, before being replaced by more flexible epidural anaesthesia. [17] Saddle block provides anaesthesia of the perineum, tip of the coccyx, medial and bottom of the buttocks and posteromedial part of the thighs covering an area that for a rider would correspond to that in contact with a saddle. Such anaesthesia is obtained by injecting a small dose of hyperbaric local anaesthetic (LA) in a patient maintained in sitting position for a few minutes to facilitate preferential impregnation of sacral roots (S1 to S5) responsible for innervation of perineum, external genitalia and anus. The saddle block causes a parasympathetic blockade at the bladder level which may result in bladder and rectal atony which is advantageous because of sphincteric relaxation for the operator.

Saddle block is advantageous in terms of usage of small dose of local anesthetic, simplicity to perform and offers rapid onset of action, reliable surgical analgesia with good muscle relaxation. In the study conducted by Liu SS [18] et al showed that long acting anesthetics such as bupivacaine can be administered for outpatient surgeries but optimum dose is needed. Bupivacaine heavy is a long acting amide local anaesthetic agent with comparatively slower onset of action and longer duration. 2-chloroprocaine is an amino-ester local anesthetic with a short half-life. Since 1952 it has been successfully used for spinal anaesthesia. [19] Many reports of neurotoxicity were reported following the use of large doses

of 2- chloroprocaine and hence was withdrawn from commercial use. [20-22]

The mean time for eligibility to discharge from hospital between groups were statistically significant with p value <0.001. Group A had less mean time (234.58±20.80 min) compared to group B (340.60±15.55 min). Yoos JR and Kopacz DJ [23] conducted double blind, randomized crossover study on 8 healthy volunteers concluded time to simulated discharge (including time to complete block regression, ambulation, and spontaneous voiding) was significantly longer with bupivacaine (191±30 min) as compared to 2-Chloroprocaine (113±14min). In the study conducted by Lacasse MA et al [24] conducted on 106 patients undergoing outpatient surgery under spinal anaesthesia, mean time to hospital discharge was 277±87 min for chloroprocaine group as compared to 353±99 for bupivacaine group.

The mean time for length of stay in PACU was less in group A (64.36±6.50 min) as compared to group B (76.24±8.45 min) with p value of <0.001. However, in the study conducted by Lacasse MA et al [24] mean duration of stay in PACU was 67±16 min in chloroprocaine group and 68±14 min which was statistically insignificant with p=0.66. The time taken to void was statistically significant with group A having less mean time (220.50±20.50 min) compared to group B (310.30±22.60 min), with p value of <0.001. Mathur V et al [25] conducted a study on 100 patients undergoing ambulatory urology surgery under spinal anaesthesia. According to their study time to first void in chloroprocaine group was lesser (177.46 33.41 min) than bupivacaine group (277.56 43.31 min) which was similar to our study. Mean time taken to ambulate was statistically significant with group A having less mean time (180.40±20.32 min) compared to group B (270.30±20.50 min), with p value of < 0.001. In a review study by Ghisi D, Bonarelli S [26] concluded that 1% 2-

chloroprocaine showed faster unassisted ambulation and discharge from hospital. In the study conducted by Lacasse MA et al [24] conducted on 106 patients undergoing outpatient surgery under spinal anesthesia, mean time to ambulate was lesser in chloroprocaine group(225 56 min) as compared to bupivacaine group(265 65 min), the results being similar to our study.

Conclusion

In conclusion saddle block with 2-Chloroprocaine provides satisfactory surgical anesthesia for perianal surgeries when compared to low dose hyperbaric Bupivacaine with earlier hospital discharge and shorter PACU stay and time to ambulation and micturition.

References

1. Zhang Y, Bao Y, Li L, Shi D. The effect of different doses of chloroprocaine on saddle anesthesia in perianal surgery. *Acta Cirúrgica Brasileira*. 2014; 29:66-70.
2. Casati A, Fanelli G, Cappelleri G, Borghi B, Cedrati V, Torri G. Low dose hyperbaric bupivacaine for unilateral spinal anaesthesia. *Canadian journal of anaesthesia*. 1998 Sep;45: 850-4.
3. Valanne JV, Korhonen AM, Jokela RM, Ravaska P, Korttila KK. Selective spinal anesthesia: a comparison of hyperbaric bupivacaine 4 mg versus 6 mg for outpatient knee arthroscopy. *Anesthesia & Analgesia*. 2001 Dec 1;93(6):1377-9.
4. Huffnagle SL, Norris MC, Huffnagle HJ, Leighton BL, Arkoosh VA. Intrathecal hyperbaric bupivacaine dose response in postpartum tubal ligation patients. *Regional Anesthesia & Pain Medicine*. 2002 May 1;27(3): 284-8.
5. Panni MK, George RB, Allen TK, Olufolabi AJ, Schultz JR, Okumura M, Columb MO, Habib AS. Minimum effective dose of spinal ropivacaine with and without fentanyl for postpartum tubal ligation. *International Journal of Obstetric Anesthesia*. 2010 Oct 1;19(4):390-4.
6. Carron M, Innocente F, Veronese S, Miotto D, Pilati P, Rossi CR, Ori C. Subarachnoid anesthesia for loco-regional antituberculous perfusion with circulatory block (stop-flow perfusion). *Minerva anesthesiologica*. 2006 Jan 1; 72(1-2):37-45.
7. Gudaityte J, Marchertiene I, Karbonskiene A, Saladzinskas Z, Tamelis A, Toker I, Pavalkis D. Low-dose spinal hyperbaric bupivacaine for adult anorectal surgery: a double-blinded, randomized, controlled study. *Journal of clinical anesthesia*. 2009 Nov 1;21(7):474-81.
8. Schmittner MD, Schreiber H, Janke A, Weiss C, Blunk J, Bussen DG, Luecke T. Randomized clinical trial of perianal surgery performed under spinal saddle block versus total intravenous anaesthesia. *Journal of British Surgery*. 2010 Jan;97(1):12-20.
9. Wassef MR, Michaels EI, Rangel JM, Tsyrlin AT. Spinal perianal block: a prospective, randomized, double-blind comparison with spinal saddle block. *Anesthesia & Analgesia*. 2007 Jun 1; 104(6):1594-6.
10. Alijo GF, Escobar GM, Catalán GR, Agulló AJ. 442. Low dose spinal saddle block. efficacy of 3 mg hyperbaric bupivacaine. *Regional Anesthesia & Pain Medicine*. 2008 Sep 1;33(Suppl 1): e48-.
11. Siddaiah J, Pujari VS, Madalu AS, Bevinaguddaiah Y, Parate LH. A comparative study on the effect of addition of intrathecal buprenorphine to 2-chloroprocaine spinal anesthesia in short duration surgeries. *Journal of Anaesthesiology, Clinical Pharmacology*. 2019 Oct;35(4):533.
12. Chung F, Ritchie E, Su J. Postoperative pain in ambulatory surgery. *Anesthesia & Analgesia*. 1997 Oct 1;85(4):808-16.

13. Förster JG, Rosenberg PH. Revival of old local anesthetics for spinal anesthesia in ambulatory surgery. *Current Opinion in Anesthesiology*. 2011 Dec 1;24(6):633-7.
14. Kuusniemi KS, Pihlajamäki KK, Pitkänen MT. A low dose of plain or hyperbaric bupivacaine for unilateral spinal anesthesia. *Regional Anesthesia & Pain Medicine*. 2000 Nov 1;25 (6):605-10.
15. Ergül Z, Akinci M, Ugurlu C, Kaya O, Kulacoglu H, Baran I. How did a training hospital change in ten years? *Journal of Clinical and Analytical Medicine*. 2012; 3:320-4.
16. Watson B, Howell V. Spinal anaesthesia: the saviour of day surgery? *Current Anaesthesia & Critical Care*. 2007 Jan 1;18(4):193-9.
17. Schaupp Jr KL, RB D. Saddle block and caudal block analgesia for the control of pain in labor. *California Medicine*. 1949 Mar 1;70(3):211-5.
18. Liu SS, Ware PD, Allen HW, Neal JM, Pollock JE, Zarmsky R. Dose-Response Characteristics of Spinal Bupivacaine in Volunteers: Clinical Implications for Ambulatory Anesthesia. *Surv Anesthesiol*. 1997; 41(6):317.
19. Foldes FF, Mcnall PG. 2-Chloroprocaine: A new local anesthetic agent. *Anesthesiology*. 1952; 13:287-96.
20. Ravindran RS, Bond VK, Tasch MD, Gupta CD, Luerssen TG. Prolonged neural blockade following regional anesthesia with 2-chloroprocaine. *Anesth Analg*. 1980; 59:447-51.
21. Reisner LS, Hochman BN, Plumer MH. Persistent neurologic deficit and adhesive arachnoiditis following intrathecal 2-chloroprocaine injection. *Anesth Analg*. 1980;59(6):452-4.
22. Moore DC, Spierdijk J, Vankleef JD, Coleman RL, Love GF. Chloroprocaine toxicity: Four additional cases. *Anesth*. 1982; 61:158-9.
23. Yoos JR, Kopacz DJ. Spinal 2-chloroprocaine: a comparison with small-dose bupivacaine in volunteers. *Anesth Analg*. 2005;100(2):566-72
24. Lacasse MA, Roy JD, Forget J, Vandenbroucke F, Seal RF, Beaulieu D, McCormack M, Massicotte L. Comparison of bupivacaine and 2-chloroprocaine for spinal anesthesia for outpatient surgery: a double-blind randomized trial. *Canadian Journal of Anesthesia*. 2011 Apr 1;58(4):384.
25. Mansuri T, Mathur V, Goyal VK, Jethava D. Spinal anaesthesia for ambulatory urology surgery: A comparison of chloroprocaine with fentanyl and bupivacaine with fentanyl. *Indian J Clin Anaesth*. 2020;7 (2):313-8.
26. Ghisi D, Bonarelli S. Ambulatory surgery with chloroprocaine spinal anesthesia: a review. *Ambulatory Anesthesia*. 2015 Nov 2; 2:111-20.