ISSN: 0975-3583,0976-2833 VOL15, ISSUE 01, 2024

"A COMPARATIVE STUDY TO EVALUATE THE EFFICACY OF 90 mg DULOXETINE IN POSTOPERATIVE PAIN RELIEF IN PATIENTS IN UNDERGOING SPINE SURGERY "

Authors :

 1stauthor- Dr.Ravishankkar Goarya Associate Professor Department of AnaesthesiologyLate BRKM GMC Dimrapal Jagdalpur CG
 2nd author- Dr.Heena Shaikh Ex resident Department of Anaesthesiology, G.R.Medical College Gwalior M.P.

3rd author -(Corrsponding author) : Dr.Ashish Mathur Associate professor Department of Anaesthesiology , G.R.Medical College Gwalior M.P

ABSTRACT: AIMS AND OBJECTIVES: To evaluate the efficacy of duloxetine in different doses in postoperative pain relief in patients undergoing lumbar spine surgery. **MATERIAL AND METHOD**: : 60 patients of ASA grade I & II of either sex scheduled for lumbar spine surgery under general anaesthesia were divided into 2 groups (n=30 each) randomly.Group D (n=30) Patients who received a 90 mg duloxetine 1 hour before surgery and another tablet the following morning. Group 'P'(n=30) Patients who received a placebo tablet 1 hour before surgery and again the following morning. Pulse rate, blood pressure, respiratory rate and severity of pain on NRS scale was noted at 0 hr, 4 hr, 8 hr, 12 hr, 16 hr, 20 hr, 24 hr, 28 hr, 32 hr and 48 hr after surgery. And the presence or absence of adverse effects, such as headache, nausea, vomiting, dizziness, and drowsiness were noted. **RESULT**: Analysis revealed that time for first analgesic requirement was significantly longer with oral Duloxetine 90 mg than with placebo. Preemptive oral Duloxetine 90 mg decreases the severity of pain postoperatively but not significantly as compared to placebo in patients posted for lumbar spine surgery under general anaesthesia. Oral Duloxetine 90 mg had no significant effect on cardiovascular and respiratory parameters. Patients receiving duloxetine had higher incidence of nausea, vomiting. **CONCLUSION:** that time for first analgesic requirement was significantly longer with oral Duloxetine 90 mg than placebo.

KEYWORDS: Duloxetine , lumbar spine surgery, post operative analgesia

<u>INTRODUCTION</u>: Lumbar Spine surgeries are almost elective by nature. Some Commonly performed spinal surgeries are laminectomies, discetomies, spinal fusions, scoliosis corrections, and spinal tumour excision.

spinal surgeries often leads to extensive dissection of subcutaneous tissues, bones, and ligaments and thus result in a considerable degree of post operative pain(1). Pain is one of the most important cause of postoperative morbidity.

ISSN: 0975-3583,0976-2833 VOL15, ISSUE 01, 2024

Failure to adequate management of postoperative pain can have combined bunch of numerous undesirable sensory, emotional experiences, which are often associated with autonomic hyperactivity ,reduced mobility, endocrine metabolic, psychological and behavioural responses

Sufficient pain management is important to prevent negative outcomes(2). Breakthrough development in the knowledge of molecular mechanism have led to the evolution of multimodal analgesia and new pharmaceutical products to treat postoperative pain(2)...

Recently, antidepressants such as duloxetine, a selective serotonin and norepinephrine reuptake inhibitor(SSNRI), have accomplished pain relief in persistent and chronic pain8.

In addition it can improve post operative quality of recovery through mood improvement that can be helpful in the post operative period.

MATERIAL AND METHODS:

60 patients of ASA grade I & II of either sex scheduled for lumbar spine surgery under general anaesthesia. 60 patients who fulfilled the eligibility criteria were chosen, explained about the procedure and written consent was taken. Patients were classified randomly into 2 groups (30 patients in each group).

Group D (n=30) Patients who received a 90 mg duloxetine 1 hour before surgery and another tablet the following morning.

Group 'P'(n=30) Patients who received a placebo tablet 1 hour before surgery and again the following morning.

Pulse rate, blood pressure, respiratory rate and severity of pain on NRS scale(0-10 numaric pain rating scale) was noted at 0 hr, 4 hr, 8 hr, 12 hr, 16 hr, 20 hr, 24 hr, 28 hr, 32 hr and 48 hr after surgery. And the presence or absence of adverse effects, such as headache, nausea, vomiting, dizziness, and drowsiness were noted.

RESULT AND ANALYSIS :

Table: SHOWING DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF PATIENTS IN TWO GROUPS

S no	Daramatars	Group D		Group P		p value
5.110.	1 arameters	Mean	±SD	Mean	±SD	
1.	Age (yrs)	42.33	10.97	47.5	11.43	0.127#
2.	Weight (kgs)	65.25	7.24	65.78	5.84	0.425#
3.	Sex (M:F)	18:12		22:8		

Table 1 showing demographic profile of patients in three groups according to age, weight and sex.

ISSN: 0975-3583,0976-2833 VOL15, ISSUE 01, 2024

Statistical analysis of Mean \pm SD of Age and Weight of the groups were comparable in both groups and statistically insignificant (p>0.05).

Table 2 : Duration (min) of surgery (Mean ±SD
-------------------------	------------------------

Duration of surgery	Group D	Group P
Minutes (Mean±SD)	135.50 ± 41.07	119.0±28.35

There was no statistically significant difference in duration of surgery in these two groups (p>0.05)

Table 3 : Time for Rescue Analgesia (TRA)

Parameter	Group D	Group P
TRA (mins)	116.50 ± 14.90	40.62 ± 7.94

Above table showing statistical analysis of Time for Rescue Analgesia in these two groups (p>0.05)

SN	Time	Group D	Group P	P value
	Hrs	Mean(±SD)	Mean(±SD)	
1	Pre-op	85.95±5.738	85.05±6.854	
2	PO-0	90.95±11.545	99.65±6.200	p>0.05
3	PO-4	87.13±8.486	86.48±4.873	p>0.05
4	PO-8	86.88±7.845	87.55±5.315	p>0.05
5	PO-12	87.75±9.410	86.35±5.903	p>0.05
6	PO-16	87.25±7.928	86.40±3.350	p>0.05
7	PO-20	85.78±7.468	86.75±2.12	p>0.05
8	PO-24	85.75±9.870	87.20±5.431	p>0.05
9	PO-28	84.15±7.651	83.95±3.088	p>0.05
10	PO-32	83.48±8.171	84.88±2.989	p>0.05
11	PO-048	86.33±10.511	86.40±4.733	p>0.05

Table 4 : comparison of pulse rate at various time intervals

Above table showing statistical analysis of pulse rate at different post operative time intervals in comparison to preoperative pulse rate. No statical significant difference was seen.

SN	Time	Group D	Group P	P value
	Hrs	Mean(±SD)	Mean(±SD)	
1	Pre-op	93.68±5.722	94.60±8.189	p>0.05
2	PO-0	98.67±5.44	106.07 ± 4.98	p>0.05

ISSN: 0975-3583,0976-2833

PO-4 96.03±4.02 96.70±3.11 p>0.05 PO-8 94.78 ± 6.09 95.05±3.97 p>0.05 PO-12 94.44 ± 3.60 94.78±3.79 p>0.05 PO-16 94.18±3.49 94.77±2.72 p>0.05 93.82±3.06 PO-20 94.55±2.67 p>0.05 PO-24 93.57±5.01 94.12 ± 4.01 p>0.05 **PO-28** 92.96±3.93 93.76±2.97 p>0.05

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

PO-32

PO-048

91.71±3.56

94.57±4.72

VOL15, ISSUE 01, 2024

Above table showin statistical analysis of mean blood pressure at different post operative time intervals.. No significant difference was seen.

p>0.05

p>0.05

SN	Time	Group D	Group P	P value
	Hrs	Mean(±SD)	Mean(±SD)	
1	PO-0	2.2±0.648	3.23±0.891	p> 0.05
2	PO-4	2.6±0.496	2.43±0.931	p> 0.05
3	PO-8	3.50±0.599	3.80±0.883	p> 0.05
4	PO-12	2.50 ± 0.877	$2.80{\pm}1.018$	p> 0.05
5	PO-16	2.80 ± 0.564	2.93±0.944	p> 0.05
6	PO-20	2.58±0.549	2.58±1.059	p> 0.05
7	PO-24	1.80 ± 0.687	2.00±0.716	p> 0.05
8	PO-28	2.10 ± 0.304	2.10 ± 0.841	p> 0.05
9	PO-32	2.00±0.226	2.13±0.853	p> 0.05
10	PO-048	2.10±0.632	2.20 ± 0.758	p> 0.05

Table 6 : Mean Numeric Rating Scale (NRS) score at different time interval

 93.02 ± 2.80

95.02±3.93

Above table showing statistical analysis of post operative NRS Score at different time interval in the three groups. No significant difference is seen at different point of time postoperatively in both group.

Complications	Group D		Group P	
	N	%	Ν	%
Nausea	5	12.5%	3	7.5%
Vomiting	5	12.5%	3	7.5%
drowsiness	5	12.5%	0	-
Shivring	4	10%	4	10%

 Table 7
 SHOWING COMPLICATIONS IN ALL TWO GROUPS

Incidence of post operative nausea & vomiting and drowsiness were higher in group D.

ISSN: 0975-3583,0976-2833 VOL15, ISSUE 01, 2024

Discussion

Our study assessed the effect of short-term administration of duloxetine in different doses on acute postoperative pain in patients undergoing lumbar spine surgery under general anesthesia.

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA:

In our study there is even distribution of age ,weight and sex in both groups.(Table-1) and we find that it was statistically insignificant .

DURATION OF SURGERY As shown in table 2 the mean \pm SD of duration of surgeries (min) in group D,and P were 135.50 \pm 41.07 and 119.0 \pm 28.35minutes respectively. These values were statistically insignificant

DURATION OF RESCUE ANALGESIA As shown in table 3 the mean \pm SD of duration of surgeries (min) in group D,and P were 116.50 \pm 14.90, and 40.62 \pm 7.94 minutes respectively. These values were statistically significant.

Our study in accordance with Attia JZ et al (3). , Kassim DY et ,(4) ,Nasr DA et al(5) Govil N et al(6) , Lierz P et al(7) and Srivastava S et al(8)

HAEMODYNAMICS

Perioperative pulse rate and mean blood pressure in group Duloxetine 90mg, and Placebo is shown in table no.4 & 5. On comparing the statistics of postoperative pulse rate at different time intervals in comparison to preoperative pulse rate, statistically significant difference was found at 1 sthrpostoperativly that may be due to emergence from general anaesthesia. No significant difference was seen at 4th ,8th ,12th ,16th ,20th ,24th ,28th ,32nd and 48th postoperative hours. Our study in accordance with Kassim DY et al(4)

ADVERSE EFFECTS: As regard of postoperative adverse effect in the study, all cases of two groups were haemodynamically stable and study showed incidence of post operative nausea & vomiting and drowsiness were higher in duloxetine 90 mg when compared to group Placebo. Our study in accordance with Saoud A et al(9), Kassim DY et al(4) and Nasr DA et a(10)

CONCLUSION

Analysis revealed that time for first analgesic requirement was significantly longer with oral Duloxetine 90 mg than with placebo. Pre-emptive oral Duloxetine 90 mg decreases the severity of pain postoperatively but not significantly as compared to placebo in patients posted for lumbar spine surgery under general anaesthesia. Oral Duloxetine 90 mg had no significant effect on cardiovascular and respiratory parameters. Patients receiving duloxetine had higher incidence of nausea, vomiting..

ISSN: 0975-3583,0976-2833 VOL15, ISSUE 01, 2024

REFERENCES

•

(1). Bajwa. S J, Haldar R. Pain management following spinal surgeries, J Craniovertebr Junction spine.2015 Jul-sep; 6(3):105-110.

(2). Vadivelu N, Mitra S, Narayan D. Recent advances in postoperative pain management. Yale J Biol Med 2010;83:11-25.

(3). Attia JZ, Mansour HS. Perioperative Duloxetine and Etoricoxibto improve postoperative pain after lumbar Laminectomy: a randomized, 76 double-blind, controlled study. BMC Anesthesiol. 2017;17(1):162. DOI 10.1186/s12871-017-0450-z

(4) Kassim DY, Esmat IM, Elgendy MA. Impact of duloxetine and dexamethasone for improving postoperative pain after laparoscopic gynecological surgeries: A randomized clinical trial. Saudi J Anaesth 2018;12:95-102.

(5). Nasr DA. Efficacy of perioperative duloxetine on acute and chronicpostmastectomy pain. Ain-Shams J Anaesthesiol. 2014;7:129-33.

(6). Govil N., Parag K, Arora P, Khandelwal H, Singh A; Ruchi. Perioperative duloxetine as part of a multimodal analgesia regime reduces postoperative pain in lumbar canal stenosis surgery: a randomized triple blind, and placebo controlled trial. Korean J pain. 2020;33(1): 40-47

(7). Lierz P., Losch H, Felleiter P. Evaluation of a a single preoperative dose of etoricoxib for postoperative pain relief in therapeutic knee arthroplasty, Acta Orthopaedica 2012, 83:6, 642-647.
(8). Srivastava S, Gupta D, Naz A, Rizvi MM, Singh PK. Effects of preoperative single dose etoricoxib on postoperative pain and sleep after lumbar discectomy: Prospective randomized double blind controlled study. Middle East J Anaesthesiol.2012 Jun;21(5):725-30.

(9). Saoud A, Elkabarity R. Effect of perioperative Duloxetine on postoperative pain relief following anterior Cervical Microdisectomy and fusion - A Pilot Study. WScJ. 2013:4:57-66

(10). B. Sowbhagyalaxmi, Prasad k.p., SreeM.S., Rao. N. Comparative study to evaluate the Efficacy of etoricoxib vs Placebo as preemptive Analgesia for Acute Postoperative Pain relief in orthopaedic surgeries: Journal of evolution of medical and dental sciences 2014;3(30):8333-8339.