e-ISSN: 0975-1556, p-ISSN:2820-2643
Available online on www.ijpcr.com
International Journal of Pharmaceutical and Clinical Research 2024; 16(5); 1529-1533

Original Research Article

Comparison of Buprenorphine and Magnesium Sulfate as Adjuncts to Intrathecal Hyperbaric Bupivacaine for Lower Abdominal Surgeries

Uma Shankar Kumar[1], Nitish Kumar[2], Pramod Kumar Sinha[3]

[1]Senior Resident, Department of Anaesthesiology, ANNMCH, Gaya
[2]Senior Resident, Department of Anaesthesiology, ANNMCH, Gaya
[3]Associate Professor & Head, Department of Anaesthesiology, ANNMCH, Gaya

Received: 15-02-2024 / Revised: 20-03-2024 / Accepted: 28-04-2024
Corresponding Author: Dr. Nitish Kumar
Conflict of interest: Nil

Abstract:

Background: An adjuvant to a local anaesthetic can potentiate spinal anesthesia and provide better postoperative analgesia. Our studyhas been drafted to evaluate and compare the analgesic potency of the adjuvants, buprenorphine and magnesium, to intrathecal0.5% hyperbaric bupivacaine.

Methods: One hundred and fifty patients by inclusion criteria posted for an elective lower abdominal surgery were randomized into three groups of 50 each. They received 3ml of 0.5% hyperbaric bupivacaine with either 1ml of 0.9% Saline or 1ml of buprenorphine (60µg) or 1ml of magnesium sulphate (50mg). Time for first rescue analgesia, onset of sensory and motor blocks, time to two-segment regression and duration of motor block, haemodynamic parameters, and side effects were studied.Data was analyzed with ANOVA, Kruskal-Wallis H, Chi-square and Fischer's exact tests. Our Study was carried out from April 2020 to March 2021.

Results: The time for first analgesic request was 248.70> 186.84> 141.44 minutes, (Buprenorphine> magnesium> control), $p<0.001$. The onset of sensory and motor blocks was faster in buprenorphine group compared to magnesium and control groups. The time to two-segment regression and duration of motor block was significantlyprolonged in buprenorphine and magnesium groups compared to control group.

Conclusion: The time to first analgesic request was longer with buprenorphine compared to magnesium sulphate with adequatesedation and negligible complications. Hence, addition of adjuvant buprenorphine (60µg) has a better demonstrable role in postoperative analgesia compared to adjuvant magnesium (50mg) or 0.5% hyperbaric bupivacaine alone.

Keywords: Spinal Anaesthesia; Intrathecal buprenorphine; Intrathecal magnesium; Analgesic efficacy; Intrathecal adjuvants.

Introduction

Spinal Anesthesia is simple to perform, economical, highly efficient at less drug doses [1] rapid in onset with complete muscle relaxation, with lesser complications than General Anaesthesia but has shorter duration of action. This necessitates the need for other modes of analgesia postoperatively. By using intrathecal additives to local anesthetics we can attenuate early postoperative analgesic requirements. Semi-synthetic Thebaine derivative, buprenorphine is a mixed agonist-antagonist opioid. It is highly lipophilic with a high molecular weight of 467.64 g/mol. This might be useful in preventing rostral spread and also common side effects associated with intrathecal administration. [2] Naturally occurring mineral, magnesium, blocks NMDA channels in a voltage dependentfashion. [3] Magnesium is not associated with pruritus, respiratory depression, sedation side effects known to be associated with opioids. With this in mind, we fashioned thisstudy to evaluate and compare our primary aim, the time to first rescue analgesia of adjuvants, 60µg buprenorphine and50mg magnesium sulphate to intrathecal 0.5% hyperbaric bupivacaine. The onset of sensory and motor blocks, time totwo-segment regression, duration of motor block, hemodynamic parameters and side effects were also studied.We hypothesized that intrathecal buprenorphine and magnesium would yield superior postoperative analgesia in comparison to plain bupivacaine.

Material and Methods

Our study is a prospective, randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled study. It was carried out at a tertiary carecentre after the approval of the Institutional Ethical Committee (Number 167 (36)/ MC/ EC/ 2020) and Clinical Trials (CTRI/2020/06/025962). The study was conducted from January 2020 to April 2021. Written informed consent was obtained from all patients. Sample size was calculated to find out difference between the means of three groups from the seed article, [4] in which the duration of total analgesia was 171.63 ± 34.45,

229.43 ± 45.42 and 159.50 ± 31.52 minutes in the magnesium, buprenorphine and control groups, respectively. Using Open-epi sample size calculator for 95% confidence intervaland 80% power, sample size was calculated betweenmagnesium and buprenorphine groups to be 16, buprenorphine and control groups to be 5, and that between magnesium and control groups to be 117. Therefore, to bringout the difference between the three groups, ideally the study should be conducted with 117 cases in each group. However, this being a single investigator study and having had to recruit during the time of the pandemic, decision was made to do carry out the study with 50 individuals per group.

A total of 150 adult patients (25- 60 years) of American Society of Anesthesiologists (ASA) physical status I & II, weighing 45-70kg, of height over 145cm, scheduled forelective lower abdominal surgery at our institute under spinalanaesthesia were recruited. Patients not willing to participate in the study, with allergic history to study drugs, contraindication to spinal anaesthesia or major neurological, cardiovascular, metabolic, respiratory, renal diseases were excluded from the study. Routine Pre-anaesthetic checkup was done a day before the surgery. All the patients were fasted for at least 6 hours before the procedure. Using a computer-generated random number sheet, serially numbered opaque sealed envelopes (SNOSE) were created by a statistician for allocation concealment. These envelopes were opened on the day of the surgery to allot the patient intoone of the three groups. The envelopes were opened by an anaesthesiologist who was not involved in the investigation and all the study drugs were prepared in identical volume (4mL), in an identical syringe by them and handed over to theinvestigating anaesthesiologist who administered the spinal block. The patients and the investigating anaesthesiologist were unaware of the drug administered. The same was fed tothe system after the analysis, thereby enabling double blinding.

In the operating room, a monitor (UltraviewSL V2.03.13, Spacelabs Healthcare Ltd., Made in USA) with electrocardiograph (ECG), heart rate (HR), pulse oximetry (SpO2) and non-invasive blood pressure (NIBP) was attached and the baseline vital parameters were recorded. Intravenous (IV) line was secured with 18G cannula and patients were preloaded with Ringer's lactate 10ml/kg over 10 minutes. Ampoules of 0.5% hyperbaric bupivacaine (Celon Laboratories, Gajularamaram, India), buprenorphine300µg/cc (Neon laboratories, Thane, India) and magnesium sulphate 50% (Modern laboratories, Indore, India) were usedfor the study. Under absolute aseptic precautions, with the patient in sitting position, spinal anaesthesia was performed at the L3-L4 interspace. The total amount of 4 ml of the study drug was injected over 30 seconds through a 25G spinal needle. The intrathecal drug compositions depended on the group towhich patients were randomised to. In addition to intrathecal 15mg of 0.5% hyperbaric bupivacaine, Group A received 0.9% Saline, Group B received 60µg buprenorphine at 1:5 dilution, Group C received 50mg magnesium sulphate at 1:10 dilution. The direction of the needle aperture was cranial during the injection. The onset of sensory block was defined as the time from theintrathecal injection of the study drug to the time taken to achieve T5-T6 level of sensory block. Sensory blockade was assessed every 2 minutes by pinprick test bilaterally in the midclavicular line with a 25G needle. The highest level of the block and the time to achieve the same was noted. Regression of sensory block was defined as the time taken for the sensory block to regress up to two segments ofdermatome from the highest level achieved. The onset of motor block was defined as the time taken to achieve complete motor block and was assessed using ModifiedBromage Scale. Duration of motor block was assessed by recording the time elapsed from the maximum to the lowestBromage score (3- 0). Hypotension, defined as fall of MAP by more than 30% frombaseline or fall in SBP below 90mmHg, was treated with incremental doses of IV Mephentermine and IV fluids. Bradycardia, defined as heart rate below 55bpm, was treatedwith IV Atropine 0.3- 0.6mg.

Postoperatively, pain was assessed by using visual analoguescale for pain (VAS) between 0 and 10 (0- no pain, 10- mostsevere pain). It was assessed every 30 minutes. Patients wereallowed to receive rescue analgesic (IV Diclofenac 75mg) onVAS score of 3. This time, i.e., time from intrathecal injection to first administration of rescue analgesic (total duration of analgesia) was noted. This was the end point of our study. Postoperative sedation level was measured by using four-point sedation scale. The occurrence of adverse effects such as nausea, vomiting, shivering, sedation, respiratory depression and pruritus was observed for and managed appropriately.

Statistical analysis was performed with SSPS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) software version 21 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA). The quantitative variables were checked for normality using Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. Forthe quantitative variables following normality, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test was used for comparing the groups. Intergroup comparisons were done with Tukey's post hoc test. Kruskal-Wallis H test was used to assess differences among the three groups for the variables not satisfying the assumption of normality and qualitative data as appropriate.Chi-square and Fischer's exact tests were used to check the association between two categorical data. The results were considered as statistically significant for p value <0.05.

Results

All the groups were comparable with respect to age, weight,sex, ASA status, type and duration of Surgery. (Table. 1) The onset of sensory and motor block was statistically significant among the three groups (p<0.001). It was faster in Group B compared to both Group A and Group C but thedifference between Group A and Group C is proved to be statistically insignificant (p>0.05). The time to two segment regression was longest in Group Cfollowed by Group B, and Group A denoting statistically significant difference amongstall the groups (p<0.001). The duration of motor block was significantly longer in Group B when compared to Group C,and Group A denoting statistically significant differenceamong the three groups (p<0.001). (Table. 2) The hemodynamic parameters such as hear rate (HR), mean systolic blood pressure (SBP), mean diastolic blood pressure(DBP) and mean arterial pressure (MAP) were notstatistically significant at different time intervals intraoperatively or postoperatively (p>0.05).VAS score was statistically significant in the three groups from 30 to 150 minutes. It was highest in Group A followed by GroupC and lowest in Group B (p<0.05) from 30 minutespostoperatively up to first request for rescue analgesic. The sedation score between the three groups was observed to bestatistically insignificant (p>0.05) and only two cases inGroup B had a four-point sedation score of 2 at 0 and 60minutes postoperatively. On comparing the three groups in regards to adverse effectssuch as nausea, vomiting, hypotension, bradycardia, shivering, respiratory depression and pruritus, the differencewas found to be statistically insignificant (p>0.05).

Table 1

Variables	Group A	Group B	Group C	p value
Number of cases	50	50	50	-
Age (Years)	41.62 ± 12.77	41.70 ± 10.86	44.82 ± 9.15	0.487*(N.S)
Weight (Kg)	58.36 ± 6.07	58.76 ± 6.03	56.4 ± 6.09	0.069*(N.S)
Height (Cm)	155.68 ± 6.29	155.54 ± 5.19	155.42 ± 4.78	0.972II(N.S)
Sex (No. Male/ Female)	17/ 33	16/ 34	17/ 33	.970**(N.S)
ASA Status (I/ II)	36/ 14	41/ 9	42/ 8	.335**(N.S)
Duration of Surgery (Min)	90.5 ± 0.71	90.08 ± 0.27	90.28 ± 0.70	0.958 II (N.S)
Type of Surgery				
Abdominal Hysterectomy	15 (30%)	20 (40%)	21 (42%)	.614**(N.S)
Myomectomy/Laparotomy	13 (26%)	14 (28%)	12 (24%)	
Herniorrhaphy	12 (24%)	10 (20%)	13 (26%)	
Appendectomy	10 (20%)	6 (12%)	4 (8%)	

Values presented as Mean ± SD. Statistical test used *Kruskal Wallis H IIANOVA, **Chi-square test.Group A: Control, Control B: buprenorphine, Group C: magnesium.
ASA - American Society of Anaesthesiologists; SD - Standard deviation; S - Significant (p <0.05); N.S - Non-Significant (p >0.05)

Table 2: Characteristics of Spinal Block

Variables	Group A	Group B	Group C	p value (S/ N.S)	Inter- group p value**		
					Group Av/s Group B	GroupA v/s Group C	Group B v/s Group C
Mean Duration of Analgesia (Min)	141.44± 11.64	248.70± 32.42	186.84± 31.62	<0.001* (S)	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Mean Onset Time of Sensory Block (Min)	4.52 ± 0.99	3.19 ± 1.57	4.54 ± 0.98	<0.001* (S)	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Mean Onset Time of Motor Block (Min)	5.03 ± 0.96	4.26 ± 1.46	5.56 ± 0.93	<0.001* (S)	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Time to Two Segment Regression (Min)	115.94± 14.49	134.82± 12.66	146.96± 24.89	<0.001* (S)	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Mean Duration of MotorBlock (Min)	133.06± 11.44	195.58± 22.76	153.26± 25.70	<0.001* (S)	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001

Values presented as Mean ± SD. Statistical test used *ANOVA, **Post hoc tukey test. Group A: Control, Group B: buprenorphine, Group C: magnesium. S - Significant (p<0.05); N.S - Non-Significant (p > 0.05)

Discussion

Pain being a noxious stimulation, should be effectively controlled and is essential to the care of a surgical patient. Bydoing so, the patient is comfortable, satisfied, mobilizesearly, has fewer cardiovascular, haematological and pulmonary complications thus enabling faster recovery and lesser health care

cost. [5] When inadequate, it is inhuman, and may result in increased morbidity or mortality. Pain causes release of glutamate and aspartate neurotransmitters,that additionally bind to NMDA receptors and activate it. This leads to calcium and sodium influx into the cell with anefflux of potassium resulting in initiation of centralsensitization and wind-up. Our study adjuvant drugs, buprenorphine and magnesium have their own unique properties of countering pain to provide analgesia. Buprenorphine is a centrally acting lipid soluble, partial μ agonist opioid with slow dissociation from the receptors being responsible for its long duration of action. It has both spinal and supraspinal component of analgesia. [6] Magnesium is a non-competitive antagonist to NMDA receptor and produces analgesia by preventing the inductionof central sensitization, one of the mechanisms implicated inthe persistence of postoperative pain, from peripheral nociceptive stimulation [7] We have demonstrated that the duration of analgesia, i.e., time to first rescue analgesic postoperatively, was significantly prolonged in buprenorphine and magnesium group compared to control group at 248.70, 186.84 and 141.44 minutes, respectively thus confirming our hypothesis.Kaushik Theerth et al. compared both the adjuvants in the same study and concluded that intrathecal 50mg magnesiumsulphate significantly prolonged the time for first analgesic request though to a lesser extent than 150μg buprenorphine,akin to our studies. The probable reason for greater durationof analgesia of buprenorphine compared to other adjuvants, even other lipophilic opiates is due to its high opiate receptoraffinity and dose dependent action. [4,8] Rashmi Ravindran etal., Dalai et al., Khandelwal et al. also obtained similar results. [9,10,11] In our study, onset time of sensory and motor blocks in buprenorphine group were significantly shorter when compared with magnesium or control groups. On comparingmagnesium and control groups, there was not a significant difference. This finding is in contrast to Khezri et al., Khaliliet al., [12,13] but supported by Hemalatha et al. who demonstrated that post-hoc analysis of onset of sensory and motor blockade showed no statistical difference between control and 50mg magnesium group and concluded that50mg of magnesium had no effect on onset of sensory blockbut only 100mg of magnesium resulted in a significant delayin onset of sensory and motor blockade. [14] This difference among the groups can be attributed to buprenorphine's highlipid solubility and higher affinity for opiate receptors [2] andmagnesium not particularly being the strongest NMDA receptor blocker, it activates CYP450 hydroxylation of bupivacaine, changes bupivacaine pharmacokinetics due to local vasodilation at injection site. [12,15,16] The mean time to two segment regression in buprenorphine group was only slightly lesser when compared to magnesium group but bothgroups had a greater difference when compared control group. This result was in contrast to the study carried out byKaushik Theerth et al., [4] where 50mg magnesium had a lesser time to two segment regressions at 132.17 minutes compared to 150μg buprenorphine at 138.33 minutes, but their results on comparison of the adjuvants to control groupwere similar to ours. The difference in the results of the twostudies could be due to the difference in doses of the drugs and local anesthetic. The mean duration of motor block in both buprenorphine and magnesium groups were significantly longer when compared to control group. This observation in relation to the adjuvant groups and control group is supported by studies done by Hemalatha et al., Kauret al., Shukla et al., [14,17,18] These findings can be attributed to buprenorphine's nonspecific local anesthetic effect [19] andmagnesium ions' ability interfere with normal electrophysiological properties of nerve fibres [15,20] resultingin more pronounced motor blockade than plain bupivacaine. The limitation of our study was at VAS score of 3, i.e., timeto first rescue analgesic being the therapeutic end point. Twenty-Four hours total analgesic requirements including opioid consumption in the postoperative period could not bedocumented vigilantly as documented by Khezri et al., [12] who demonstrated that magnesium reduced postoperative opioid consumption. Long term follow-up was not feasible to record possible neurological or other grave deficits. Studies on comparing the effects intrathecal buprenorphine and magnesium simultaneously are limited. Hence, we wanted to compare and elicit the various above discussed effects of the adjuvant study drugs at lower range doses, fromprevious other studies, that has proved to potentiatepostoperative analgesia without significant hemodynamicchanges or complications.

Conclusion

Even though buprenorphine (60μg) and magnesium sulphate(50mg) proved to be efficient as adjuvants to intrathecal 0.5% hyperbaric bupivacaine in terms of anaesthesia and analgesia with minimal complications intraoperatively and postoperatively, the time to first analgesic request was longerwith buprenorphine compared to magnesium sulphate with negligible complications. Hence, we conclude that addition of adjuvant buprenorphine(60μg) has a better demonstrable role in postoperative analgesia compared to adjuvantmagnesium (50mg) or 0.5% hyperbaric bupivacaine alone.

References

1. Bogra J, Arora N, Srivastava P. Synergistic effect of intrathecal fentanyl and bupivacaine in spinal anesthesia for cesarean section. BMC Anesthesiology 2005;5.
2. Capogna G, Celleno D, Tagariello V, Loffreda-Mancinelli C. Intrathecal buprenorphine for postoperative analgesia in the elderly patient. Anaesthesia 2007; 43: 12 8-130.

3. Mayer M, Westbrook G, Guthrie P. Voltage-dependent block by Mg2+ of NMDA responses in spinal cord neurones. Nature 1984;309 :2 61-263.
4. Theerth K, Kurdi M. Comparison of Intrathecal Magnesium Sulphate and Intrathecal Buprenorphine Used as Adjuvants to Hyperbaric Bupivacaine: A Prospective Randomized Double Blind PlaceboControlled Study. J Anesth Res Pain Med 2016; 1:8-21.
5. Ramsay M. Acute Postoperative Pain Management. Proc (Bayl Univ Med Cent) 2000; 13:244-247.
6. Ding Z, Raffa R. Identification of an additional supraspinal component to the analgesic mechanism of action of buprenorphine. Br J Pharmacol 2009; 157:831-843.
7. Woolf C, Thompson S. The induction and maintenance of central sensitization is dependent on N -methyl-d-aspartic acid receptor activation; implications for the treatment of post-injury pain hypersensitivity states. Pain 1991; 44:293-299.
8. Wang J, Nauss L, Thomas J. Pain Relief by Intrathecally Applied Morphine in Man. Anesthesiology 1979;50:149-151.
9. Ravindran R, Sajid B, Ramadas K, Susheela I. Intrathecal hyperbaric bupivacaine with varying doses of buprenorphine for postoperative analgesia after cesarean section: A comparative study. Anesth Essays Res 2017;11: 952.
10. Dalai H, Nanda S, Chavali S. A Clinical Comparison between Intrathecal and Intravenous Infusion of Magnesium Sulphate as an Adjuvant to Hyperbaric 0.5% Bupivacaine in Spinal Anaesthesia for Elective Infraumbilical Surgeries. Annals of International medical and Dental Research 2017;3.
11. Dutta D, Khandelwal M, Bafna U, Chauhan S, Jetley P, Mitra S. Comparison of intrathecal clonidine and magnesium sulphate used as an adjuvant with hyperbaric bupivacaine in lower abdominal surgery. Indian J Anaesth 2017; 61:667.
12. Khezri MB, Yaghobi S, Hajikhani M, Asefzadeh S. Comparison of postoperative analgesic effect of intrathecal magnesium and fentanyl added to bupivacaine in patients undergoing lower limb orthopedic surgery. Acta Anaesthesiol Taiwan. 2012; 50:19-24.
13. Khalili G, Janghorbani M, Sajedi P, Ahmadi G. Effects of adjunct intrathecal magnesium sulfate to bupivacaine for spinal anesthesia: a randomized, double-blind trial in patients undergoing lower extremity surgery. J Anesth 2011;25: 892-897.
14. Hemalatha P, Banu N, Rao M, Samantaray A, Venkatraman A, Hemanth N. Comparison of two different doses of magnesium sulphate for spinal anaesthesia: a prospective, randomized double-blind study. JCSR. 2017; 6:18.
15. Hung Y-C, Chen C-Y, Lirk P, Wang C-F, Cheng J-K, Chen C-C, et al. magnesium sulfate diminishes the effects of amide local anesthetics in rat sciatic-nerve block. Reg Anesth Pain Med 2007; 32:288–95.
16. Okutomi T, Saito M, Matsumoto Y, Shimizu M, Fukuoka M, Hoka S. Altered bupivacaine pharmacokinetics by MgSO4 in rats. Can J Anaesth 2004; 51:93-94.
17. Iyer S, Kaur N, Goneppanavar U, Venkateswaran R. Comparative effects of buprenorphine and dexmedetomidine as adjuvants to bupivacaine spinal anaesthesia in elderly male patients undergoing transurethral resection of prostrate: A randomized prospective study. Anesth Essays Res. 2017; 11:886.
18. Shukla D, Verma A, Agarwal A, Pandey HD, Tyagi C. Comparative study of intrathecal dexmedetomidine with intrathecal magnesium sulfate used as adjuvants to bupivacaine. J Anaesthesiol Clin Pharmacol 2011; 27:495–9.
19. Patil S, Debata D, Doshi C, Vyas V, Sinha S. Effect of buprenorphine as an adjunct with plain local anesthetic solution in supraclavicular brachial plexus block on quality and duration of postoperative analgesia. J Anaesthesiol Clin Pharmacol 2015; 31:496–500.
20. Vadhanan P, Tripaty DK, Adinarayanan S. Physiological and pharmacologic aspects of peripheral nerve blocks. J Anaesthesiol Clin Pharmacol 2015; 31:384–93.