

Original Research Article

TO COMPARE EPIDURAL INJ. BUPIVACAINE 0.125% AND INJ. ROPIVACAINE 0.2% TO STUDY THE SIDE EFFECTS OF DRUG IN MOTHER AND BABY

**Dr. Amit Prabhu¹ (Associate Professor), Dr. Girish Verma² (Associate Professor),
Dr. Rakesh Goutam³ (Assistant Professor), Dr. Rajesh Vasure⁴ (Assistant Professor) &
Dr. Sangeeta Bansal⁵ (Prof.)**

Dept. of Anaesthesiology, Index Medical College Hospital & Research Centre, Indore,
M.P.^{1,2,3,4&5}

Corresponding Author: Dr. Amit Prabhu

Abstract

Background & Methods: the aim of the study is to compare epidural inj. Bupivacaine 0.125% and inj. Ropivacaine 0.2% to study the side effects of drug in mother and baby. Patients and relatives were explained about the procedure, advantages, disadvantages and the importance of their co-operation. Written and informed consent of the patient and their relatives was obtained. Patients were randomly divided into 2 groups of 60 each. Xylocaine sensitivity was done and all parturients were encouraged to empty their bladder.

Results: Both the groups showed no statistically significance ($P>0.05$) changes in pulse rate at any point of time from 0 minute till the time of delivery. Thus excluding the possibility of tachycardia and bradycardia. Both the groups showed no statistically significant ($P>0.05$) changes in systolic blood pressure at any point of time from 0 minute till the time of delivery.

Conclusion: Safe and effective methods for pain relief during labour are demanding and hence the present study was undertaken to find out the effect of different local anaesthetics on effectiveness of epidural analgesia in labour and on safety of mother and baby.

Keywords: Bupivacaine, Ropivacaine, side effects, mother & baby.

Study Design: Comparative Study.

1. Introduction

Pain has been a major concern of humankind since our beginnings. Prayers, exorcisms, and incantations bearing testimony to the prevalence and scourge of pain are found on Babylonian clay tablets, in papyri written in the days of pyramid builders, in Persian leather documents, in inscriptions from Mycenae and on parchment rolls from Troy[1].

The first authentic reference on the use of opium for pain relief is found in the writings of the Theophrastus who lived in the 3rd century B.C. Celsus mentions one of the first references to analgesic pills[2]. A century later, Galen suggested a natural basis of pain and wrote a book on pain and the analgesic effects of opium and Mandragora.

During the first 50 years of 20th century neuroanatomic, neurophysiologic and psychologic research on pain continued at progressively greater pace. The foundation of the International Association for the Study of Pain (IASP) in 1974 and publication of its Journal PAIN since 1975 must be considered among the most important developments in the field of pain research and therapy[3]. Chestnut et al and Vertonmea et al demonstrated that epidural analgesia with opioids did not increase the incidence of instrumental delivery & reduces the side effects of both local anaesthetics and opioids on the mother and foetus[4]. Obstetric

anaesthesia has developed in last 150 years with technical and pharmacological advancement and new development in anaesthesia.

2. Material and Methods

Study was conducted at Index Medical College Hospital & Research Centre, Indore. Patients and relatives were explained about the procedure, advantages, disadvantages and the importance of their co-operation. Written and informed consent of the patient and their relatives was obtained. Patients were randomly divided into 2 groups of 60 each. Xylocaine sensitivity was done and all parturients were encouraged to empty their bladder.

Inclusion Criteria:

1. Age: 18-35 years.
2. Booked primi / multigravida with full term pregnancy (gestational age between 37-42 weeks).

Exclusion Criteria:

1. Patients not giving consent.
2. Allergic to local anaesthetic.
3. Bleeding diathesis.

3. Result

Table1: Age wise distribution of patients

| Age Group | A | B | Total |
|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 15-19 | 06 10.0% | 02 3.3% | 08 6.7% |
| 20-24 | 30 50.0% | 36 60.0% | 66 55.0% |
| 25-29 | 20 33.3% | 22 36.7% | 42 35.0% |
| 30-34 | 04 6.7% | 00 .0% | 04 3.3% |
| Total | 60 | 60 | 120 |
| Mean ±SD | 23.03 ±1.378 | 22.43 ±3.609 | 22.73 ±2.008 |

$P > 0.05$

Age wise distribution of cases in the two groups showed that patients ranged between 18-35 years of age. Maximum numbers of patients in both the groups were between 20-25 years of age group.

Table 2: Comparison onset of analgesia (min) between the two groups

| Group | Mean | ±SD | No. of patients |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------|
| A | 17.18 | 1.214 | 60 |
| B | 23.09 | 2.039 | 60 |
| Total | 19.12 | 3.975 | 120 |

Group A showed mean onset of analgesia at 17.18 ± 2.214 min and group B had a mean onset of analgesia was 23.09 ± 3.039 min. The mean time of onset of analgesia was significantly more in group B as compared with group A. ($P < 0.0001$).

Table 3: Comparison of mean pulse rate changes in the two groups

| Group | | PR 0 min | PR 5 min | PR 10 min | PR 15 min | PR 20 min | PR 25 min | PR 30 min | PR 60 min | PR 90 min | PR 120 min | PR 150 min | PR 180 min | PR 210 min | PR 240 min |
|-------|------------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | | A | Mean | 85.20 | 78.07 | 77.63 | 77.13 | 77.73 | 78.73 | 79.53 | 81.13 | 81.93 | 83.54 | 84.20 | 85.09 |
| | ±SD | 6.20 | 4.32 | 5.20 | 3.85 | 2.61 | 2.85 | 2.45 | 2.56 | 2.80 | 2.49 | 4.10 | 2.74 | 1.00 | 1.41 |
| | No. of pts | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 58 | 52 | 50 | 23 | 08 | 04 |
| B | Mean | 92.47 | 83.87 | 84.07 | 83.20 | 83.67 | 84.67 | 84.67 | 85.50 | 86.37 | 88.44 | 89.63 | 90.80 | 97.000 | |
| | ±SD | 6.68 | 7.82 | 6.53 | 5.96 | 5.99 | 5.66 | 5.42 | 5.44 | 5.36 | 6.40 | 6.84 | 7.29 | 1.41 | |
| | No. of pts | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 50 | 16 | 10 | 04 | |

Both the groups showed no statistically significance ($P > 0.05$) changes in pulse rate at any point of time from 0 minute till the time of delivery. Thus excluding the possibility of tachycardia and bradycardia.

Table 4: Comparison of mean systolic blood pressure changes in the two groups

| Group | | SBP 0 min | SBP 5 min | SBP 10 min | SBP 15 min | SBP 20 min | SBP 25 min | SBP 30 min | SBP 60 min | SBP 90 min | SBP 120 min | SBP 150 min | SBP 180 min | SBP 210 min | SBP 240 min |
|-------|------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | A | Mean | 131.6 | 128.0 | 127.6 | 127.3 | 124.07 | 120.80 | 120.9 | 123.00 | 123.45 | 124.08 | 122.48 | 123.45 |
| | SD | 5.52 | 5.28 | 6.16 | 5.70 | 7.76 | 4.77 | 4.54 | 4.60 | 5.01 | 9.01 | 4.33 | 4.74 | 6.00 | 2.83 |
| | N | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 58 | 50 | 42 | 22 | 06 | 04 |
| B | Mean | 128.4 | 123.0 | 120.7 | 120.8 | 120.733 | 121.133 | 121.2 | 122.333 | 123.733 | 124.92 | 126.667 | 126.0 | 130 | |

| n | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|------|-----|------|------|-----|------|-----|-----|--|
| S | 6.4 | 6.9 | 6.0 | 5.9 | 6.80 | 6.96 | 6.5 | 6.58 | 6.38 | 6.9 | 5.39 | 5.6 | 5.6 | |
| D | 8 | 7 | 9 | 1 | | | 0 | | | 9 | | 6 | 6 | |
| N | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 50 | 18 | 10 | 04 | |

Both the groups showed no statistically significant ($P>0.05$) changes in systolic blood pressure at any point of time from 0 minute till the time of delivery.

4. Discussion

A Study concluded in his study that spinal epidural analgesia with opioid and local anesthetic given in early labour did not increase the rate of instrumental deliveries or caesarean section. Sharma S K et al showed no such increase in instrumental deliveries[5]. Absences of any kind of instrumental delivery in both the groups in our study were comparable with the above study.

A study demonstrated in his study that there was an increase in instrumental deliveries after administration of oxytocin[6]. The mean time of onset on analgesia was less in group A with mean 16.17 min as compared with mean 22.07 min in group B with a statistically significant difference ($p<0.0001$).

There was no motor blockade in both group and patient could be ambulated ($p>0.05$). This independence of movement and awareness of contradiction without pain improve maternal satisfaction. This study correlates well with the study[7&8].

A study conducted a study and found that the Ropivacaine group was more likely to be pain free in the first stage and required fewer top ups, pain relief and satisfaction score from mid wives and patients were consistently better but did not reach statistical significance[9].

5. Conclusion

Safe and effective methods for pain relief during labour are demanding and hence the present study was undertaken to find out the effect of different local anaesthetics on effectiveness of epidural analgesia in labour and on safety of mother and baby. Neonatal outcome was good in both groups.

6. References

1. Dewandre PY. The right drug and dose for neuraxial labour analgesia. *Acta Anaesthesiol Belg.* 2006;57:395-9.
2. Chhetty YK, Naithani U, Gupta S, Bedi V, Agrawal I, Swain L. Epidural labor analgesia: a comparison of ropivacaine 0.125% versus 0.2% with fentanyl. *J Obstet Anaesth Crit Care.* 2013;3:16-22.
3. Handley G, Perkins G. The addition of pethidine to epidural bupivacaine in labour-effect of changing bupivacaine strength. *Anaesth Intens Care.* 1992;20:151-5.
4. Duggan J, Bowler GM, McClure JH, Wildsmith JA. Extradural block with bupivacaine: Influence of dose, volume, concentration and patient characteristics. *Br J Anaesth.* 1988;61:324-31.
5. Lee BB, Ngan Kee WD, Wong EL, Liu JY. Dose-response study of epidural ropivacaine for labor analgesia. *Anesthesiology.* 2001;94:767-72.
6. Gupta S. Relief of pain in labour. Ch 11 in *Obstetric Anaesthesia.* 1st Edn. Arya Publications, 2004:p.1318-21.
7. Birnbach DJ, Ingrid BM. Anaesthesia for Obstetrics. Ch 58 Ronald DM in *Miller's Anaesthesia* 6th Edn. Churchill Livingstone Publishers, 2005:p.318-21.

8. Ivani G, Borghi B, van O Oven H. Levobupivacaine. *Minerva Anesthesiol* 2001;67:20-3.
9. Berde CB, Strichartz GR. Local Anaesthetics. Ch 14, Ronald DM in Miller's *Anaesthesia* 6th Edn. Churchill Livingstone, New York, 2005:p.573-604.