



## Efficacy of Intrathecal Nalbuphine Over Fentanyl as Adjuvant with Ropivacaine in Lower Abdominal and Lower Limb Surgeries

| Article History  |
|--|
| <b>Received: 04.05.2022</b><br><b>Revision: 21.05.2022</b><br><b>Accepted: 15.06.2022</b><br><b>Published: 20.06.2022</b><br><b>Plagiarism check - Plagscan</b><br><b>DOI: 10.47310/iarjmsr.2022.V03i03.04</b>   |
| Author Details   |
| Dimmiti Dinesh Raja <sup>1</sup> , Vanagondi Sivakumar <sup>2</sup> , Doli Suresh Chander, Nagasri Sowmya <sup>3</sup>   |
| Authors Affiliations   |
| <sup>1,4</sup> Senior Resident, Department of Anaesthesiology, Malla Reddy Institute of Medical Sciences, Suraram, Quthbhullapur, Hyderabad, Telangana.<br><sup>2</sup> Associate Professor, Department of Anaesthesiology, Malla Reddy Institute of Medical Sciences, Suraram, Quthbhullapur, Hyderabad, Telangana.<br><sup>3</sup> Professor & HOD, Department of Anaesthesiology, Malla Reddy Institute of Medical Sciences, Suraram, Quthbhullapur, Hyderabad, Telangana |
| Corresponding Author*  |
| Dr Doli Suresh Chander   |
| How to Cite the Article:   |
| Dimmiti DR, Vanagondi S, Doli SC, Nagasri S. Efficacy of Intrathecal Nalbuphine Over Fentanyl as Adjuvant with Ropivacaine in Lower Abdominal and Lower Limb Surgeries. <i>IAR J. Med &amp; Surg Res</i> 2022;3(3): 19-26  |
| <b>Copyright @ 2022:</b> This is an open-access article that does not charge readers or their institutions for access and distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution license ( <a href="http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0">http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0</a> ) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.                                |

**Abstract: Background:** Ropivacaine also showed the advantage of lesser motor blockade making it preferable when early mobilization is suggested. This helps to hasten the postoperative recovery [3]. Since its introduction into market in 1996, Ropivacaine has been put to extensive use in epidural, intrathecal and peripheral nerve blocks. **Objectives:** To measure, compare and analyse the below mentioned parameters at regular intervals among subjects undergoing lower abdominal and lower limb surgeries. **Material & Methods:** A prospective, randomized, comparative study. The study was conducted in the Department of Anaesthesiology, Malla Reddy Institute of Medical Sciences a tertiary care centre in Hyderabad. All the patients who were undergoing the elective lower abdominal and limb surgeries in the department of anaesthesiology during the study period. Study consisted of 60 cases. Simple random method. All the patients meeting the inclusion criteria were taken into the study. A pre- designed, pre-tested, semi structured and pre-coded proforma was used for recording all the findings. After obtaining Ethical clearance from the Institutional Ethical Committee, study was conducted. **Results:** Comparison of the Modified Ramsay Sedation Score between the two groups shows that Modified Ramsay Sedation Score at 30, 120, 150 and 180 mins is higher in GROUP-N and is statistically not significant with a p value of > 0.05. Comparison of the Modified Ramsay Sedation Score between the two groups shows that Modified Ramsay Sedation Score at 60 and 90 mins is higher in GROUP-N and is statistically significant with a p value of < 0.001. **Conclusion:** To conclude, Nalbuphine (500µg) seems to be an attractive alternative to 25µg Fentanyl as an adjuvant to spinal ropivacaine in surgical procedures as it provides good quality of intraoperative analgesia, hemodynamically stable conditions, and excellent quality of postoperative analgesia as per our study.

**Keywords:** Nalbuphine, postoperative analgesia, Modified Ramsay Sedation Score.

### INTRODUCTION

When spinal anaesthesia was discovered during a miraculous experiment in 1885 by James Leonard Corning, he hardly would have known that it would evolve into one of the most sought-after techniques in the field of anaesthesia. Spinal Anaesthesia was introduced into clinical practice by KARL AUGUST BIER in 1898. It is the most preferred regional anaesthesia technique as it is easy to perform, avoids the problem of a difficult airway, avoids polypharmacy required for general anaesthesia, economical and produces rapid onset of anaesthesia and complete muscle relaxation with less side effects.

The aim of intrathecal local anaesthetics is to provide adequate sensory and motor block necessary for all lower abdominal surgeries. Three decades ago, few patients who were given bupivacaine developed life threatening arrhythmias, which were refractory to treatment. On recognizing this life- threatening cardiotoxicity of bupivacaine, the search for newer, safer local anaesthetic drugs began [1]. An important aspect of this cardiotoxicity is that it is related to the stereo specificity of bupivacaine with the 'S' isomer having very less cardio toxic potential compared to the 'R' form [2] Ropivacaine and levobupivacaine are the recent local anesthetic drugs that have significantly lower cardiotoxicity compared to bupivacaine [1].

Ropivacaine also showed the advantage of lesser motor blockade making it preferable when early mobilization is suggested. This helps to hasten the postoperative recovery [3]. Since its introduction into market in 1996, Ropivacaine has been put to extensive use in epidural, intrathecal and peripheral nerve blocks [4]. Various adjuvants have been added to Ropivacaine to shorten the onset of block and to augment the clinical efficiency and duration of analgesia.

Fentanyl is an opioid agonist and acts on  $\mu$ -opioid receptors. Nalbuphine is a synthetic opioid analgesic with agonist- antagonist activity and acts as antagonist at  $\mu$ -receptors and agonist at  $\kappa$ -receptors to provide reasonably potent analgesia. Nalbuphine, when used as an adjuvant to ropivacaine, has improved the quality of perioperative analgesia with fewer side effects. Nalbuphine has been used intrathecal by various investigators and is found to enhance the postoperative analgesia without any documentation of neurotoxicity. Morphine, fentanyl, and other  $\mu$ -opioids come under narcotics act, thus their free availability is a major concern in many hospitals in India, while nalbuphine is easily available and devoid of side effects such as nausea,

## Material & methods

**Study Design:** A prospective, randomized, comparative study.

**Study area:** The study was conducted in the Department of Anesthesiology, Malla Reddy Institute of Medical Sciences a tertiary care centre in Hyderabad.

**Study Period:** Jan. 2021 – Dec. 2021.

**Study population:** All the patients who were undergoing the elective lower abdominal and limb surgeries in the department of anesthesiology during the study period.

**Sample size:** study consisted of 60 cases.

**Sampling method:** Simple random method.

### Inclusion criteria:

1. Patients aged between 18 and 60 years of either gender.
2. American Society of Anaesthesiologist (ASA) I & II grade.
3. Patients scheduled for elective surgeries.
4. Patients who are willing to give an informed written consent.

### Exclusion criteria:

1. Patient refusal.
2. Patients having cardiovascular disorders, coagulation disorders, spinal deformities, neurological disorders.
3. Patients with history of allergy to study drugs.
4. Pregnant patients.

**Ethical consideration:** Institutional Ethical committee permission was taken prior to the commencement of the study.

### Study tools and Data collection procedure:

All the patients meeting the inclusion criteria were taken into the study. A pre- designed, pre-tested, semi structured and pre-coded proforma was used for recording all the findings. After obtaining Ethical clearance from the Institutional Ethical Committee, study was conducted.

After taking informed consent, patients were posted for lower abdominal and lower limb surgeries and fulfilling the inclusion criteria were enrolled for the study. Documents providing information on the proposed study

vomiting, pruritus, and respiratory depression with less chances of addiction. Hence the present study was undertaken to analyze the efficacy of intrathecal nalbuphine over fentanyl as adjuvant with ropivacaine in lower abdominal and lower limb surgeries.

**OBJECTIVES:** To measure, compare and analyze the below mentioned parameters at regular intervals among subjects undergoing lower abdominal and lower limb surgeries

1. Onset and duration of analgesia
2. Motor blockade
3. Hemodynamic parameters
4. Spo2 (oxygen saturation), respiratory rate
5. Postoperative period pain

and form for obtaining consent (consent form) were provided to the patient in the pre-anesthetic clinic. Pre anaesthetic assessment of each patient including detailed medical history such as diabetes mellitus, hypertension, pulmonary tuberculosis, allergy to drugs, bronchial asthma, epilepsy and bleeding disorders will be taken. Clinical examination includes general physical examination and recording of vital data as well as systemic examination of cardiovascular system, respiratory system, gastrointestinal tract, central nervous system and also airway and spine assessment will be done.

All the patients were advised overnight fasting. The following investigations were done: Haemoglobin, Blood cell count RBCs, WBCs & Platelets, Bleeding time and clotting time, Blood urea, Serum creatinine, Serum electrolytes, Blood grouping and Rh typing, Complete urine examination. Patients will be premedicated with injection Ondansetron 4mg and inj. Pantoprazole 40mg IV 1 hr before surgery. The patients were randomly allocated into two groups. The patients were randomly assigned into two groups: (30 in each group)

• Group A (n = 30) – Patients received total of 4 ml ROPIVACAINE with 25 mcg FENTANYL

• Group B (n = 30) – Patients received total of 4 ml ROPIVACAINE with 500 mcg of intrathecal NALBUPHINE

Before commencement of anaesthesia, patients were explained about the methods of sensory and motor blockade assessments. All patients were explained regarding the visual analogue scale (VAS) scoring system. The VAS consisted of a 10- cm horizontal paper strip with two end points: 0 = no pain and 10 = worst possible pain. Heart rate, Systolic Blood Pressure, Diastolic Blood Pressure, SP02 (Oxygen Saturation) and Respiratory Rate were monitored continuously and were recorded for 1 minute 3 minutes 5 minutes 10 minutes, every 10 minutes for the next 60 minutes and every 30 minutes till the end of surgery. Sedation was assessed by a categorical scale as used by Mostafa et al<sup>[5]</sup> and graded as: 1 - awake and alert, 2 - awake but drowsy, responding

to verbal stimulus, 3 - drowsy but arousable, responding to physical stimulus, and 4 - unarousable, not responding to physical stimulus. After completion of the surgery the patients were observed in the recovery room till the level

### STATISTICAL ANALYSIS:

Data were analyzed using SPSS version 22.0 analysis between the groups was done using the unpaired sample t-test while within-group analysis was done using the paired sample t-test. Continuous variables were described using mean  $\pm$  standard deviation. Data for

of analgesia wears off to the spinal segment before shifting to the post-operative ward. The VAS score was serially assessed at every 30 min and till the patients complain of pain (VAS score  $>3$ )

categorical variables were compared using Chi-square test and Correlation was performed to examine the association between Continuous variables.  $P < 0.05$  was considered as significant.

### OBSERVATIONS & RESULTS:

**Table 1: Age & sex distribution among study participants**

|                |         | Group    |      |            |      |       |      | P Value |
|----------------|---------|----------|------|------------|------|-------|------|---------|
|                |         | FENTANYL |      | NALBUPHINE |      | Total |      |         |
|                |         | N        | %    | n          | %    | n     | %    |         |
| Age (in Years) | <=30    | 5        | 16.7 | 7          | 23.3 | 12    | 20.0 | 0.178   |
|                | 31 - 40 | 7        | 23.3 | 3          | 10.0 | 10    | 16.7 |         |
|                | 41 - 50 | 13       | 43.3 | 9          | 30.0 | 22    | 36.7 |         |
|                | >51     | 5        | 16.7 | 11         | 36.7 | 16    | 26.7 |         |
|                | Total   | 30       | 100  | 30         | 100  | 60    | 100  |         |
| Gender         | Male    | 17       | 56.7 | 18         | 60   | 35    | 58.3 | 0.550   |
|                | Female  | 13       | 43.3 | 12         | 40   | 25    | 41.7 |         |

**Table 2: ASA Grade**

|           |   | Group    |      |            |      |       |      |
|-----------|---|----------|------|------------|------|-------|------|
|           |   | FENTANYL |      | NALBUPHINE |      | Total |      |
|           |   | n        | %    | n          | %    | n     | %    |
| ASA Grade | 1 | 27       | 90.0 | 28         | 93.3 | 55    | 91.7 |
|           | 2 | 3        | 10.0 | 2          | 6.7  | 5     | 8.3  |

**Table 3: Pre OP Vitals**

|  | Group    |    |            |    | P Value |
|--|----------|----|------------|----|---------|
|  | FENTANYL |    | NALBUPHINE |    |         |
|  | Mean     | SD | Mean       | SD |         |
| Pre_OP_SBP   | 131      | 11 | 131        | 11 | 0.991   |
| Pre_OP_DBP   | 78       | 11 | 81         | 9  | 0.240   |
| Pre_OP_PR  | 78       | 10 | 79         | 9  | 0.722   |
| Pre_OP_RR  | 18       | 2  | 18         | 2  | 0.496   |
| Pre_OP_SPO2  | 100      | 0  | 100        | 0  | -       |
| Means were compared using independent sample t test. |          |    |            |    |         |

**Table 4: Time of onset Sensory and Motor**

|  | Group    |      |       |      | P value |
|--|----------|------|-------|------|---------|
|  | FENTANYL |      | B     |      |         |
|  | Mean     | SD   | Mean  | SD   |         |
| Sensory Time of Onset                                | 57.3     | 9.3  | 7.5   | 2.3  | P<0.001 |
| Sensory Duration                                     | 123.6    | 10.6 | 150.8 | 10.1 | P<0.001 |
| Motor Time of Onset                                  | 100.7    | 30.4 | 19.6  | 3.1  | P<0.001 |
| Motor Duration                                       | 148.7    | 9.0  | 188.3 | 7.2  | P<0.001 |
| Means were compared using independent sample t test. |          |      |       |      |         |

Onset of sensory block: Time of onset of Sensory block (sec) is delayed in GROUP F (mean value of Group F=57.3 and Group-N = 7.5) and is statistically significant with a p value of <0.001. Onset of motor block: Time of Onset of Motor block (sec) is delayed in GROUP F (mean value of Group F=100.7 and Group-N = 19.6) and is statistically significant with a p value of <0.001.

**Table 5: SYSTOLIC BLOOD PRESSURE**

|            | Group    |      |    |            |      |    | P Value |
|------------|----------|------|----|------------|------|----|---------|
|            | FENTANYL |      |    | NALBUPHINE |      |    |         |
|            | n        | Mean | SD | n          | Mean | SD |         |
| SBP_1Min   | 30       | 132  | 12 | 30         | 130  | 11 | 0.483   |
| SBP_3Min   | 30       | 128  | 13 | 30         | 126  | 12 | 0.707   |
| SBP_5Min   | 30       | 124  | 15 | 30         | 122  | 13 | 0.546   |
| SBP_10Min  | 30       | 119  | 13 | 30         | 115  | 12 | 0.259   |
| SBP_20Min  | 30       | 110  | 14 | 30         | 108  | 11 | 0.552   |
| SBP_30Min  | 30       | 100  | 15 | 30         | 99   | 8  | 0.766   |
| SBP_40Min  | 30       | 109  | 11 | 30         | 106  | 8  | 0.351   |
| SBP_50Min  | 30       | 110  | 10 | 30         | 108  | 9  | 0.640   |
| SBP_60Min  | 30       | 111  | 13 | 29         | 110  | 9  | 0.711   |
| SBP_90Min  | 25       | 113  | 13 | 28         | 111  | 7  | 0.415   |
| SBP_120Min | 6        | 115  | 24 | 13         | 113  | 6  | 0.816   |

Means were compared using independent sample t test.

Comparison of the SBP between the two groups shows that SBP at 0 mins (baseline), 1min, 5min, 10min, 20min, 30min, 40min, 50min, 60min, 90min, 120min, 150min, 180min is higher in GROUP-F and is statistically significant with a p value of < 0.05.

**Table 6: DIASTOLIC BLOOD PRESSURE**

|            | Group    |      |    |            |      |    | P Value |
|------------|----------|------|----|------------|------|----|---------|
|            | FENTANYL |      |    | NALBUPHINE |      |    |         |
|            | n        | Mean | SD | n          | Mean | SD |         |
| DBP_1Min   | 30       | 77   | 10 | 30         | 81   | 9  | 0.136   |
| DBP_3Min   | 30       | 77   | 10 | 30         | 81   | 9  | 0.136   |
| DBP_5Min   | 30       | 73   | 9  | 30         | 75   | 7  | 0.341   |
| DBP_10Min  | 30       | 69   | 9  | 30         | 72   | 8  | 0.120   |
| DBP_20Min  | 30       | 67   | 8  | 30         | 71   | 8  | 0.122   |
| DBP_30Min  | 30       | 64   | 8  | 30         | 67   | 7  | 0.241   |
| DBP_40Min  | 30       | 65   | 6  | 30         | 67   | 6  | 0.223   |
| DBP_50Min  | 30       | 65   | 5  | 30         | 67   | 6  | 0.273   |
| DBP_60Min  | 28       | 66   | 5  | 29         | 67   | 6  | 0.328   |
| DBP_90Min  | 23       | 67   | 6  | 28         | 68   | 6  | 0.377   |
| DBP_120Min | 4        | 72   | 8  | 13         | 70   | 6  | 0.536   |

Means were compared using independent sample t test.

Comparison of the DBP between the two groups shows that DBP at 0 (baseline), 1min, 5min, 10min, 20min, 30min, 40min, 50min, 60min and 90min mins is higher in GROUP F and is statistically not significant with a p value of > 0.05. Comparison of the DBP between the two groups shows that DBP at 120 mins is higher in GROUP N and is statistically not significant with a p value of > 0.05.

**Table 7: MEAN ARTERIAL PRESSURE**

|  | Group    |      |    |            |      |    | P Value |
|--|----------|------|----|------------|------|----|---------|
|  | FENTANYL |      |    | NALBUPHINE |      |    |         |
|  | n        | Mean | SD | n          | Mean | SD |         |
| MAP_1Min   | 30       | 96   | 9  | 30         | 97   | 8  | 0.430   |
| MAP_3Min   | 30       | 94   | 9  | 30         | 96   | 8  | 0.352   |
| MAP_5Min   | 30       | 90   | 9  | 30         | 91   | 8  | 0.769   |
| MAP_10Min  | 30       | 85   | 8  | 30         | 87   | 7  | 0.601   |
| MAP_20Min  | 30       | 82   | 8  | 30         | 83   | 7  | 0.418   |
| MAP_30Min  | 30       | 76   | 8  | 30         | 77   | 7  | 0.495   |
| MAP_40Min  | 30       | 80   | 6  | 30         | 80   | 5  | 0.742   |
| MAP_50Min  | 30       | 80   | 4  | 30         | 81   | 6  | 0.598   |
| MAP_60Min  | 30       | 78   | 11 | 29         | 82   | 5  | 0.116   |
| MAP_90Min  | 25       | 79   | 11 | 28         | 82   | 5  | 0.104   |
| MAP_120Min   | 6        | 70   | 22 | 13         | 84   | 5  | 0.037   |
| Means were compared using independent sample t test. |          |      |    |            |      |    |         |

**Table 8: Post OP Vitals**

|  | Group    |    |            |    | P Value |
|--|----------|----|------------|----|---------|
|  | FENTANYL |    | NALBUPHINE |    |         |
|  | Mean     | SD | Mean       | SD |         |
| Po_SBP_1MIN  | 100      | 15 | 99         | 8  | 0.766   |
| Po_SBP_30MIN   | 124      | 15 | 122        | 13 | 0.546   |
| Po_DBP_1MIN  | 65       | 6  | 67         | 6  | 0.223   |
| Po_DBP_30MIN   | 77       | 10 | 81         | 9  | 0.136   |
| Po_MAP_1MIN  | 77       | 7  | 78         | 6  | 0.568   |
| Po_MAP_30MIN   | 93       | 9  | 94         | 9  | 0.446   |
| Po_HR_1MIN   | 73       | 11 | 73         | 8  | 0.871   |
| Po_HR_30MIN  | 75       | 10 | 76         | 9  | 0.783   |
| Po_RR_1MIN   | 17       | 2  | 17         | 2  | 0.714   |
| Po_RR_30MIN  | 17       | 2  | 17         | 2  | 0.443   |
| Po_SPO2_1MIN   | 100      | 0  | 100        | 0  | -       |
| Po_SPO2_30MIN  | 100      | 0  | 100        | 0  | -       |
| Means were compared using independent sample t test. |          |    |            |    |         |

**TABLE 9: COMPARISON OF MODIFIED RAMSAY SEDATION SCORE BETWEEN TWO GROUPS**

|                   | Group      | N  | Mean | Std. Deviation | P Value |
|-------------------|------------|----|------|----------------|---------|
| <b>RS 30 Min</b>  | Nalbuphine | 30 | 2.20 | .610           | 0.078   |
|                   | Fentanyl   | 30 | 2.00 | .000           |         |
| <b>RS 60 Min</b>  | Nalbuphine | 30 | 3.10 | .305           | <0.001  |
|                   | Fentanyl   | 30 | 2.00 | .000           |         |
| <b>RS 90 Min</b>  | Nalbuphine | 30 | 3.37 | .490           | <0.001  |
|                   | Fentanyl   | 30 | 2.20 | .407           |         |
| <b>RS 120 Min</b> | Nalbuphine | 30 | 2.20 | .610           | 0.605   |
|                   | Fentanyl   | 30 | 2.13 | .346           |         |
| <b>RS 150 Min</b> | Nalbuphine | 30 | 2.10 | .305           | 0.309   |
|                   | Fentanyl   | 30 | 2.03 | .183           |         |
| <b>RS 180 Min</b> | Nalbuphine | 30 | 2.10 | .305           | 0.309   |
|                   | Fentanyl   | 30 | 2.03 | .183           |         |

Comparison of the Modified Ramsay Sedation Score between the two groups shows that Modified Ramsay Sedation Score at 30, 120, 150 and 180 mins is higher in GROUP-N and is statistically not significant with a p value of  $> 0.05$ . Comparison of the Modified Ramsay Sedation Score between the two groups shows that Modified Ramsay Sedation Score at 60 and 90 mins is higher in GROUP-N and is statistically significant with a p value of  $< 0.001$ .

**TABLE 10: COMPARISON OF VAS AMONG THE TWO GROUPS STUDIED**

|                     | Group      | N  | Mean | P Value  |
|---------------------|------------|----|------|----------|
| <b>VAS 30 mins</b>  | Nalbuphine | 30 | .00  | 1        |
|                     | Fentanyl   | 30 | .00  |          |
| <b>VAS 60 mins</b>  | Nalbuphine | 30 | .00  | 1        |
|                     | Fentanyl   | 30 | .00  |          |
| <b>VAS 90 mins</b>  | Nalbuphine | 30 | .00  | $<0.001$ |
|                     | Fentanyl   | 30 | .92  |          |
| <b>VAS 120 mins</b> | Nalbuphine | 30 | .37  | $<0.001$ |
|                     | Fentanyl   | 30 | 1.95 |          |
| <b>VAS 180 mins</b> | Nalbuphine | 30 | 1.26 | $<0.001$ |
|                     | Fentanyl   | 30 | 2.76 |          |
| <b>VAS 240 mins</b> | Nalbuphine | 30 | 2.41 | $<0.001$ |
|                     | Fentanyl   | 30 | 3.63 |          |
| <b>VAS 300 mins</b> | Nalbuphine | 30 | 3.42 | $<0.001$ |
|                     | Fentanyl   | 30 | 4.67 |          |

Comparison of the Visual Analogue Scale between the two groups shows that Visual Analogue Scale at 30 and 60 mins is ZERO in both the groups and is statistically not significant with a p value of 1. Comparison of the Visual Analogue Scale between the two groups shows that Visual Analogue Scale at 90, 120, 180, 240 and 300 mins is higher in GROUP- F and is statistically significant with a p value of  $< 0.001$ .

## DISCUSSION:

Spinal anaesthesia is the most frequently used regional anaesthesia technique as it is easy to perform, produces rapid onset of anaesthesia and complete muscle relaxation and is also economical. These advantages are sometimes offset by a relatively short duration of action and postoperative pain is an issue as well. The aim of Intrathecal local anaesthetic is to provide adequate sensory and motor block necessary for all lower abdominal surgeries. Local anaesthetics work by inhibiting voltage-gated sodium channels in the spinal cord by interfering with afferent and efferent sensory and motor impulses while Intrathecal Opioids activate opioid receptors in the dorsal grey matter of the spinal cord (substantia gelatinosa) to modulate the function of afferent pain fibres.

The combination of adjuvants to local anaesthetic is synergetic for producing the analgesia of prolonged duration without measurably increasing sympathetic or motor blockade, thus allows early ambulation of patients and reduction in dosages of local anaesthetics, hence the decline of their systemic side effects. Opioids selectively decrease nociceptive input from A delta and C fibres without affecting dorsal root axons or somatosensory-

evoked potentials. Various  $\mu$ - agonists of opioids such as Morphine, tramadol, and Fentanyl are used as adjuvants to ropivacaine to prolong its clinical efficacy, improve the quality and minimize the requirement of postoperative analgesics, but they are associated with side effects of pruritus, nausea, vomiting, respiratory depression, constipation, and urinary retention. Fentanyl, a lipophilic opioid agonist, when used as an adjuvant, prolongs the duration of spinal anaesthesia. Intrathecally, Fentanyl exerts its effect by combining with opioid receptors in the dorsal horn of spinal cord.

Nalbuphine, agonist-antagonist, is a synthetic highly lipid-soluble opioid analgesic and possess an agonist action at the  $\kappa$ -opioid receptor and antagonist action at the  $\mu$ -opioid receptor to provide reasonably potent analgesia of visceral nociception. It has the potential to maintain or even enhance  $\mu$ -opioid-based analgesia while simultaneously mitigating the  $\mu$ -opioid side effects. Intrathecal Fentanyl is used commonly with heavy Ropivacaine for spinal and epidural anaesthesia by many researchers. Yu et al <sup>[6]</sup> 2021 Nalbuphine as additives to local anesthetics can significantly prolong the two segments of sensory block and the average



duration of analgesia without increasing the incidence of adverse.

We conclude that Nalbuphine as additives to Ropivacaine significantly prolongs the two segments of sensory block. Contino et al <sup>[7]</sup> in 2021 Ropivacaine shows a clear advantage for spinal anesthesia during THA when considering rapid recovery. Its use should be strongly considered, especially in the ambulatory setting. We conclude that Ropivacaine shows a clear advantage for spinal anesthesia during THA when considering rapid recovery. Mavaliya et al <sup>[8]</sup> in 2020 concluded that nalbuphine significantly prolongs the duration of sensory block, duration of motor block, and duration of postoperative analgesia in comparison to fentanyl, when used as an intrathecal adjuvant to 0.75% ropivacaine in elective orthopedic lower limb surgeries, with minimal adverse effects. Our study concluded the same. Borah et al <sup>[9]</sup> in 2018 studied that Intrathecal nalbuphine can be a good adjuvant to subarachnoid block as it can prolong both sensory and motor blockade with minimal side

effects. From our study, we can infer that when compared with 1.6 mg nalbuphine, both 0.4 and 0.8 mg nalbuphine can be used safely intrathecally with isobaric 0.75% ropivacaine in elective lower limb surgery as they both provide prolonged analgesia and a reliable motor block with equal efficacy but with lesser side effects. The same result was seen in this study.

Seetharam et al <sup>[10]</sup> in 2015 studied that the addition of fentanyl to ropivacaine significantly prolongs the duration of postoperative analgesia with clinically insignificant influence on hemodynamics and motor blockade with minimal side effects. Jagtap et al <sup>[11]</sup> in 2014 Intrathecal Ropivacaine Fentanyl provides satisfactory anaesthesia with haemodynamic stability for major lower limb orthopaedic surgery. It provides similar sensory but shorter duration of motor block compared to BF which is a desirable feature for early ambulation, voiding, and physiotherapy. Our study shows Nalbuphine was alternative to fentanyl for prolonging duration of postoperative analgesia.

## CONCLUSION:

To conclude, Nalbuphine (500µg) seems to be an attractive alternative to 25µg Fentanyl as an adjuvant to spinal ropivacaine in surgical procedures as it provides good quality of intraoperative analgesia, hemodynamically stable conditions, and excellent quality of postoperative analgesia as per our study.

## REFERENCES:

- 1) Whiteside JB, Wildsmith JAW. Developments in local anaesthetic drugs. *Br J Anaesth*. 2001;87(1):27–35.
- 2) Vanhoutte F, Vereecke J, Verbeke N, Carmeliet E. Stereoselective effects of the enantiomers of bupivacaine on the electrophysiological properties of the guinea-pig papillary muscle. *Br J Pharmacol*. 1991 May;103(1):1275–81.
- 3) Leone S, Di Cianni S, Casati A, Fanelli G. Pharmacology, toxicology, and clinical use of new long acting local anesthetics, ropivacaine and levobupivacaine. *Acta Biomed*. 2008;79(2):92–105.
- 4) Ruetsch YA, Boni T, Borgeat A. From cocaine to ropivacaine: the history of local anesthetic drugs. *Curr Top Med Chem*. 2001;1(3):175–182.
- 5) Covino BG. Pharmacology of local anaesthetic agents. *British Journal of Anaesthesia* 1986; 58:701-716.
- 6) Contino V, Abrams JH, Arumugam S, Sinha SK, Vellanky SS, Cremens MS, et al. Spinal Anesthesia Using Ropivacaine Leads to Earlier Ambulation After Total Hip Arthroplasty. *Orthopedics*. 2021 Jun;44(3):e343–6.
- 7) Borah TJ, Dey S, Yunus M, Dev P, Karim HMR, Bhattacharyya P. Effect of different doses of intrathecal

nalbuphine as adjuvant to ropivacaine in elective lower limb surgeries: A dose finding study. *Indian J Anaesth*. 2018 Nov;62(11):865–70.

8) Mavaliya V, Babita, Tak ML, Singh B, Gurjar SS. Comparison of nalbuphine versus fentanyl as an adjuvant to 0.75% isobaric ropivacaine in subarachnoid block for orthopedic surgery of lower limbs: randomized, double-blind study. *Bali J Anaesthesiol* 2020; 4:161-5.

9) Ravipati P, Isaac GA, Reddy PN, Krishna L, Supritha T. A Comparative Study between Intrathecal Isobaric Ropivacaine 0.75% Plus Dexmedetomidine and Isobaric Ropivacaine 0.75% Plus Fentanyl for Lower Limb Surgeries. *Anesth Essays Res*. 2017 Sep;11(3):621–6.

10) Jagtap S, Chhabra A, Dawoodi S, Jain A. Comparison of intrathecal ropivacaine-fentanyl and bupivacaine-fentanyl for major lower limb orthopaedic surgery: A randomised double-blind study. *Indian journal of anaesthesia*. 2014 Jul 1; 58:442–6.

11) Gupta K, Singh S, Sharma D, Gupta PK, Krishan A, Pandey MN. Intrathecal fentanyl as an adjuvant to 0.75% isobaric ropivacaine for infraumbilical surgery under subarachnoid block: A prospective study. *Saudi J Anaesth*. 2014 Jan;8(1):64–8.

12) Shehla Shakooch , Pooja Bhosle -- Intrathecal Nalbuphine: An effective adjuvant for post-operative analgesia. *Innovative Journal of Medical Health Sciences* 2004; 4:79 -82.

- 13) A. Mukherjee, A. Pal, J. Agrawal, A. Mehrotra, N. Dawar. Intrathecal Nalbuphine as an adjuvant to subarachnoid block: What is the most effective dose- *Anaesthesia Essays Res*, (2011),5, pp. 171-175.
- 14) Kallio H, Snäll E-VT, Suvanto SJ, Tuomas CA, Iivonen MK, Pokki J-P, et al. Spinal hyperbaric ropivacaine-fentanyl for day-surgery. *Reg Anesth Pain Med*. 2005 Feb;30(1):48–54.
- 15) Minai FN, Khan FA. A comparison of morphine and nalbuphine for intraoperative and postoperative analgesia. *J Pak Med Assoc*. 2003 Sep;53(9):391–6.