# Available online on www.ijpcr.com

International Journal of Pharmaceutical and Clinical Research 2023; 15(11); 1479-1483

**Original Research Article** 

# Epidural Bupivacaine and Bupivacaine-Magnesium Sulphate Combination in Lower Abdominal Surgeries: A Comparative Study

Sainath<sup>1</sup>, Vinod V Hudgi<sup>2</sup>, Ajaykumar<sup>3</sup>, Kashibai<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Senior Resident, Department of Anaesthesiology and Critical Care, ESIC Medical College, Kalaburagi
<sup>2</sup>Senior Resident, Department of Anaesthesiology and Critical care, ESIC Medical College, Kalaburagi
<sup>3</sup>Senior resident, Department of Emergency Medicine, ESIC Medical College and Hospital, Kalaburagi
<sup>4</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of Anaesthesiology and Critical Care, MNR Medical College and Hospital, Fasalwadi, Sangareddy

Received: 11-11-2023 / Revised: 20-11-2023 / Accepted: 26-11-2023 Corresponding Author: Dr Kashibai Conflict of interest: Nil

#### Abstract:

The epidural technique became popular as it had some specific advantages over spinal anaesthesia. The feasibility of extended duration and differential blockade extended its application into other fields like post operative analgesia, chronic pain relief and obstetric pain relief. But some inherent negative points of epidural technique like delayed onset and patchy analgesia persist. Various attempts have been made to rectify these negative points. **Keywords:** Epidural, Dexmedetomidine, Anaesthesia

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

Epidural anesthesia was first performed by Spanish military surgeon Fidel Pages in 1921in lumbar region. In 1949 Curbelo used Tuohy equipment for continuous blockade. The epidural technique became popular as it had some specific advantages over spinal anaesthesia. The feasibility of extended duration and differential blockade extended its application into other fields like post operative analgesia, chronic pain relief and obstetric pain relief. But some inherent negative points of epidural technique like delayed onset and patchy analgesia persist. Various attempts have been made to rectify these negative points.[1]

Combined spinal-epidural technique got introduced in an attempt to rectify this and has become popular. Various additive drugs have been tried along with local anaesthetics in an attempt to hasten the blockade to improve the quality of block.[2]

Among drugs that have been tried, magnesium sulphate deserves specialmention. Even though magnesium sulphate has been used for various other purposes, its entry into anaesthetic arnamentorium is new. Magnesium sulphate has been described to possess various properties. The potentiation of local anaesthetic drugs is one among them. So my study aims to evaluate the effect of its addition to local anaesthetic in epidural blockade. [3,4]

Along with local anesthetic agent other additive drugs are Epinephrine, Clonidine, Dexmedetomidine, Neostigmine, Ketamine, and Benzodiazepines. Magnesium sulphate a potent antagonist of NMDA receptors when used epidurally is claimed to hasten the onset of sensory blockade. Magnesium also causesphysiological Calcium channel blockade and decreases the postoperative opioid requirements. [5,6]

## **Materials and Methods**

This study was conducted, Department of Anaesthesiology, ESIC Medical College, Kalaburagi, on 50 ASA grade I or II patients undergoing elective lower abdominal surgeries. Lumbar epidural anesthesia was performed to all the patients. The age of the patients ranged from 23- 70 weighing 45-80 kg and height ranging from 150 - 172 cm. all patients were thoroughly examines preoperatively. Informed consent was obtained from all of them.

In the assessment room, vital parameters like pulse, blood pressure, and base line investigations like hemoglobin, urine analysis for albumin and sugar, blood sugar, urea and creatinine and Electrocardiogram were checked. Thorough examination of all the systems and airway assessment was done.

Exclusion criteria including significant co-existing diseases, long term analgesic use, and contraindications to regional anaesthesia such as local infection and bleeding diathesis.

## Results

Of the fifty patients involved, 25 belonged to groupC and other 25 belongedto groupS

**Age distribution:** The age distribution in group S 23-73. Age distribution in control group 27-

70.the mean age and age distribution was similar statically.

| Table 1: Age |         |         |  |  |
|--------------|---------|---------|--|--|
| Age In Years | Group S | Group C |  |  |
| 20-40        | 23      | 27      |  |  |
| Maximum      | 73      | 70      |  |  |
| Mean         | 48.33   | 44.6    |  |  |

Weight distribution: Weight distribution in group S 54-80, while in control group 52-72. Meanweight of the patients were comparable.

| Table 2: weight |         |         |  |
|-----------------|---------|---------|--|
| Weight in kg    | Group S | Group C |  |
| Range           | 54-80   | 52-72   |  |
| mean            | 66.32   | 65.52   |  |

## Height distribution:



Figure 1:

Height distribution in group S 156-172 cms, while in control group 153-172. Mean height in both group patients were comparable.

#### Table 3: Height

| Height in cm | Group S | Group C |
|--------------|---------|---------|
| Range        | 156-172 | 153-172 |
| Mean         | 164.36  | 165.08  |



| Figure | 2: | Sensory | Onset |
|--------|----|---------|-------|
|--------|----|---------|-------|

| Table 4: Sensory blocka |
|-------------------------|
|-------------------------|

| Tuble II School y biochade |                  |           |          |  |
|----------------------------|------------------|-----------|----------|--|
| Sensory blockade min       | Group C          | Group S   | P value  |  |
| Onset                      | $13.44 \pm 1.16$ | 5.92±0.70 | < 0.0001 |  |

International Journal of Pharmaceutical and Clinical Research

| Table 5: Motor blockade             |                  |                  |          |  |  |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|----------|--|--|
| Motor blockadeGroup SGroup CP value |                  |                  |          |  |  |
| Onset                               | $12.48 \pm 2.67$ | $16.16 \pm 0.94$ | < 0.0001 |  |  |



# Figure 3: Two Segment Regression Time

| Table 6: Two Segment Regression Time |             |             |  |  |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|--|--|
| Two SegmentRegression Time Min       | Group S     | Group C     |  |  |
| Mean $\pm$ SD                        | 145.36±4.97 | 136.96±8.19 |  |  |

| Table 7: Duration of Post-Op Analgesia           |              |             |  |  |
|--|--------------|-------------|--|--|
| Duration of Post-Op Analgesia MinsGroup SGroup C |              |             |  |  |
| Mean $\pm$ SD                                    | 231.04±12.63 | 228.48±8.81 |  |  |



**Figure 4: Variation in Heart Rate** 

|                               | Group S           | Group C      |          |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|----------|
| Heart rate changes % (mean)   | 9.84              | 9.64         |          |
|                               |                   |              |          |
| Parameters                    | Group S           | Group C      | P Value  |
| Age                           | $48.3 \pm 13.00$  | 44.6±13.213  | 0.3233   |
| Height                        | 165.08±5.445      | 164.36±5.345 | 0.639    |
| Weight                        | 66.32±7.767       | 65.52±7.428  | 0.7148   |
| Onset of Sensory Block        | 5.92±0.702        | 13.44±1.158  | < 0.0001 |
| Onset of Motor Block          | $12.48 \pm 2.650$ | 16.16±0.943  | < 0.0001 |
| Two Segment RegressionTime    | 145.36±4.97       | 136.96±8.19  | < 0.0001 |
| Duration of Post Op Analgesia | 231.04±12.633     | 228.48±8.813 | 0.41     |

 Table 8: Percentage of heart rate changes(below the base line level)

## Discussion

The primary aim of this study was to evaluate the effect of adding magnesium sulphate to Bupivacaine in Epidural anaesthesia. The safety of Epidural magnesium sulphate administered in humans and animals have been established. Simpson and Kroin demonstrated in animals that epidural magnesium sulphate has a safety profile. The dose of magnesium sulphate used in this study was based on data Tammoy Ghatak and Girish Chandra where 50 mg of magnesium sulphate added to epidural Bupivacaine. In their study magnesium sulphate has quickens the onset of sensory blockade. The duration of postoperative analgesia is also increased. In the study group the time of onset of sensory blockade was 5.92±0.702 mins, whereas in control group was  $13.44\pm1.158$ (p value <0.0001) which shows that there is a significant difference in the onset time. The addition of magnesium sulphate has definitely decrease the sensory onset time.[7,8]

The time of onset of Motor blockade in study group was 12.48±2.670 whereas n the control group Motor blockade was 16.16±0.943(p value <0.0001) which shows that the difference is statistically significant.[9,10]

| Table | 9: | Parameter |
|-------|----|-----------|
|       |    |           |

| Table 9: Parameters             |                   |             |          |  |  |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|-------------|----------|--|--|
| ParametersGroup SGroup CP Value |                   |             |          |  |  |
| Onset of Sensory Block          | 5.92±0.702        | 13.44±1.158 | < 0.0001 |  |  |
| Onset of Motor Block            | $12.48 \pm 2.650$ | 16.16±0.943 | < 0.0001 |  |  |



## **Two Segment Regression Time**

Figure 5: Two segment regression time

The mean duration of two segment regression time in study was 145.36±4.974, whereas in control group was 136.96±8.19 (p value <0.0001).

| Table 10: Two Segment Regression Time |             |             |          |  |  |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|----------|--|--|
| Two Segment Regression Time Min       | Group S     | Group C     | P Value  |  |  |
| Mean $\pm$ SD                         | 145.36±4.97 | 136.96±8.19 | < 0.0001 |  |  |

| Table 11: Duration of post-operative analgesia |              |             |         |  |  |
|--|--------------|-------------|---------|--|--|
| Duration Of Post Op Analgesia Mins             | Group S      | Group C     | P Value |  |  |
| Mean $\pm$ SD                                  | 231.04±12.63 | 228.48±8.81 | 0.4033  |  |  |

The duration of post-operative analgesia was  $231.40\pm12.633$  mins in study group and  $228.48\pm8.813$  in control group (pvalue <0.41) which shows 2 groups were not statistically significant. The probability value was detected by unpaired two sample student 't' test.[11,12]

This implies that additive of magnesium sulphate to epidural Bupivacaine will quickens the onset of sensory blockade with minimal prolongation of postoperative analgesia.[13,14]

This correlate the study of T. Ghatak and G. Chandra of addition of epidural magnesium sulphate to bupivacaine to reduce the time of onset of sensory blockade.[15]

**Other Parameters:** The change in Heart rate was 9.84% in study group whereas in control group 9.64% which shows there is no significant change. The usage of Ephedrine was also there is no significant changes.

## Conclusion

This study concludes that epidural magnesium sulphate when added to bupivacaine will shorten the onset of sensory blockade significantly in patients undergoing elective lower abdominal surgeries without increasing the incidence of side effects.

## References

- 1. Cynthia A. Wong Spinal and Epidural Anaesthesia Mc Graw Hill companies 2007.
- 2. Brown DL, Spinal, Epidural and Caudal anesthesia. In Ronald D Miller's Anaesthesia, 7th edition Philadelphia, Churchchill Livingstone 2009.
- Morgan clinical Anaesthesiology; 4th edition Spinal, epidural and caudal blocks; Wayne Kleinman and Maged Milhail; Lange medical books, Mcgraw Hill 309.
- 4. Reynolds FJM, Spinal and epidural block, In Churchill-Davidson HC, 5th edition, Wylie &

Churchill Davidson's: A practice of clinical Anaesthesia.

- 5. Atkinson RS Rushman GB, Davies NJH, IN Lee's synopsis of anaesthesia- Eleventh edition; Buttworth-Heinman publication: 700-03. Anaesthesia, London, Lloyd-Luke 1984.
- 6. Harold Ellis anatomy for Anaesthesiologists: eight edition; The Vertebral canal and its contents; Blackwell publishing; 125.
- Chaney MA. Side effects of Intrathecal and epidural opioids. Canadian Journal of Anaesthesia 1995; 42:891-903
- Hodgson PS, Neal JM Pollock JE, Liu SS. The neurotoxicity of drugs given intrathecally (Spinal). Anaesthesia and Analgesia 1999; 88:797-809.
- Covino BG. Pharmacology of local anaesthetic agents. British Journal of Anaesthesia 1986; 58:701-716.
- Stoelting RK. Opioid Agonist and Antagonists. In Pharmacology and Physiology in Anaesthetic Practice. Philadelphia, Lippincott-Raven 1999,93-96.
- 11. M. Ozalveli. T. O. Cetin. T.Guler The effect of adding intrathecal magnesium sulphate to bupi-vacaine and fentanyl spinal anaesthesia. Acta anaesthesiology scand 2005; 49; 1514-19.
- 12. Buvendran, Robert. Intrathecal magnesium prolongs fentanyl Analgesia. Anaesthesia and Analgesia 2002; 95:661-66.
- 13. Mermis. Turan. The use of magnesium sulphate to prevent pain on injection of propofol. Anaesthesia and Analgesia 2002; 95: 606-8.
- 14. Yousef AA, Ant Y M Dept of Anaesthesia faculty of Medicine Tanta Univ. The effect of adding Magnesium sulphate to epidural Bupivacaine and Fentanyl in elective LSCS.
- 15. Effects of Magnesium on thoracic epidural anaesthesia. Gupta SD, Mitrak Mokhyersee M, Dept of Anaesthesia & Chest medicine Inst. Of PG Medical education & research SSKM hosp. Kolkata.