Spinal versus General Anesthesia in Caesarean Section Regarding to Home Readiness Discharge

Chesis

Submitted for Partial Fulfillment of the Master Degree In Obstetrics & Gynecology

By

Abeer Abd Ellateef Mohammed Khair Allah

M.B., B.Ch (2010)
Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University
Resident of Obstetrics and Gynecology
EL-Shaikh Zaid AL Nahian Hospital

Supervised by

Prof. Dr. Alaa ELdin Hamed El Feky

Professor of Obstetrics & Gynecology Faculty of Medicine-AinShams University

Prof. Dr. Fahmy Saad Latif

Professor of anesthesiology and Intensive Care Faculty of Medicine- Ain Shams University

Dr. Mohammed Mahmoud Abd Elalem

Lecturer of Obstetrics and Gynecology Faculty of Medicine- Ain Shams Universit

> Faculty of Medicine Ain Shams University Cairo- Egypt 2016



سورة البقرة الآية: ٣٢



First and foremost, I feel always indebted to **Allah**; the most kind and merciful, that this research came to its end with Allah's well and help.

Words will never be able to express my deepest gratitude to all those who helped me during preparation of this work

It is a great honor to express my deepest gratitude, my sincerest appreciation to **Prof. Dr. Alaa Eldin Hamed El Jeky**, Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Faculty of Medicine-Ain Shams University, for his kind supervision, his constructive guidance and great help in accomplishing this work.

I don't find words to express my gratitude and thanks to **Prof. Dr. Fahmy Saad Tatif**, Professor of anesthesiology and Intensive Care, Faculty of Medicine-Ain Shams University, whose consistent supervision, orientation and guidance has been of great help to me in completing this work.

I owe a particular gratitude to **Tr. Mohammed Mahmoud**Abd Elalem, Lecturer of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Faculty of
Medicine- Ain Shams University, for his endless support,
continuous guidance, advice, kind supervision and his great effort
during all stages of the work.

Finally, I would also seize the opportunity to thank my family for their continuous help, encouragement, support, and belief in me.



Contents

| Subjects | Page |
|---|------------|
| List of Abbreviations | I |
| List of Tables | III |
| List of Figures | IV |
| Protocol | |
| • Introduction | 1 |
| Aim of the Work | 6 |
| • Review of Literature | |
| • Chapter (1): Cesarean Section | 7 |
| ♦ Chapter (2): Anaesthesia. | 29 |
| • Chapter (3): Anaesthesia and maternal recov | very after |
| caesarean section | 52 |
| Patients and Methods | 67 |
| • Results | 79 |
| • Discussion | 104 |
| • Summary | 116 |
| • Conclusion | 121 |
| • Recommendation | 122 |
| • References | 123 |
| Arabic Summary | - |

List of Abbreviations

| | LIST OF ADDICALIONS |
|-------------|---------------------------------------|
| Abb. | Meaning |
| ACOG | American College of Obstetricians and |
| | Gynecologists |
| ASU | Ambulatory surgical unit |
| BC | Before Christ |
| BMI | Body mass index |
| Bp | Blood pressure |
| CDMR | Cesarean delivery on maternal request |
| CO_2 | Carbon Dioxide |
| CS | Cesarean section |
| CSF | Cerebrospinal fluid |
| CTG | Cardiotocography |
| DSPT | Deep septic pelvic thrombophlebitis |
| EFM | Electronic fetal monitoring |
| ET | End tidal |
| ETT | Endotracheal tube |
| GABA | Gamma-aminobutyric acid |
| GI | Gastrointestinal |
| GIT | Gastrointestinal tract |
| HIV | Human immunodeficiency virus |
| I.V. | Intravenous |
| IM | Intramuscular |
| IU | International Unit |
| Kg | Kilogram |
| L | Litre |
| LA | Local anaesthesia |
| M | Meter |
| MFMU | Maternal-Fetal Medicine Units |
| Mg | Milligram |
| Min | Minute |
| | |

List of Abbreviations

| Abb. | Meaning |
|--------------|---|
| NMDA | N-methyl-D-aspartate |
| NSAID | Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs |
| OR | Operating room |
| OVT | Ovarian vein thrombophlebitis |
| PACU | Postanesthesia care unit |
| PADS | Postanesthesia Discharge Scoring System |
| PO | Per oral |
| POI | Postoperative ileus |
| PONV | Postoperative nausea and vomiting |
| RA | Regional anaesthesia |
| RCOG | Royal College of Obstetricians and |
| | Gynaecologists |
| RDS | Respiratory distress syndrome |
| TTN | Transient tachypnea of the newborn |
| VBAC | Vaginal birth after cesarean |

List of Tables

| No. | <u>Table</u> | <u>Page</u> |
|----------|---|-------------|
| 1 | Patients' characteristics in the two study | 79 |
| | groups | |
| <u>2</u> | Time to first analgesic request and Number of | 80 |
| | rescue analgesic doses | |
| <u>3</u> | Time to first pass of flatus, first pass of stool | 83 |
| | and first start of oral intake | |
| <u>4</u> | Incidence of postoperative nausea and | 86 |
| | vomiting | |
| <u>5</u> | Time to mobilization without assistance | 89 |
| <u>6</u> | Perioperative and postoperative hemoglobin | 92 |
| | level | |
| <u>7</u> | Perioperative and postoperative hematocrit | 97 |
| | value | |
| 8 | Incidence of postoperative headache | 101 |
| 9 | Incidence of overall patient satisfaction | 102 |

List of Figures

| No. | <u>Figure</u> | <u>Page</u> |
|----------------------|---|-------------|
| 1 | Lumbar spinal anesthesia; midline approach | 49 |
| <u>1</u> <u>2</u> | Lumber spinal anesthesia; paramedian approach. | 49 |
| 3 | Time to first analgesic request in the two study groups | 81 |
| 4 | Box plot showing the number of rescue analgesic doses in the two study groups | 82 |
| <u>5</u> | Time to first pass of flatus, first pass of stool and first start oral intake in the two study groups | 84 |
| <u>6</u> | Incidence of postoperative nausea in the two study groups. | 87 |
| <u>7</u> | Incidence of postoperative vomiting in the two study groups | 88 |
| <u>8</u> | Time to mobilization without assistance in the two study groups | 90 |
| 9 | Pre- and post-operative hemoglobin level in the two study groups. | 93 |
| <u>10</u> | Absolute drop in hemoglobin level in the two study groups. | 94 |
| 11 | Relative drop in hemoglobin level as percentage of preoperative level in the two study groups. | 95 |
| <u>12</u> | Pre- and post-operative haematocrit in the two study groups. | 98 |
| <u>13</u> | Absolute drop in haematocrit in the two study groups. | 99 |
| <u>14</u> | Relative drop in hematocrit as percentage of preoperative value in the two study groups. | 100 |
| <u>15</u> | Incidence of overall patient satisfaction | 103 |

Introduction

Delivery by caesarean section is by far one of the most commonly performed operations all over the world. Approximately 18.5 million caesarean sections are performed yearly worldwide (*WHO*, *2010*).

About 40% of the countries have CS rates <10%, about 10% have CS rates between 10 and 15%, and approximately 50% have CS rates >15%. Countries with CS rates<10% account for only 25% (4.5 millions) of the global CS but for 60% (77 millions) of the total number of births worldwide. On the other hand, 73% (13.5 millions) of the total number of CS are performed in the countries with CS rates >15% where 37.5% (48.4 millions) of the total number of births occur (*WHO*, 2010).

In Egypt, more than one-half of deliveries in the five-year period before the 2014 were by caesarean section. Caesarean deliveries were more common in urban areas than in rural areas (60 % and 48 %, respectively) (*El-Zanaty and Associates, 2014*).

When medically justified, caesarean section can effectively prevent maternal and perinatal mortality and morbidity. However, there is no evidence showing the benefits of caesarean delivery for women or infants who do not require the procedure. As with any surgery, caesarean sections are associated with short and long term risk which can extend many years beyond the current delivery and affect the health of the woman, her child, and future pregnancies. These risks are higher in women with limited access to comprehensive obstetric care (*Lumbiganon et al.*, 2010).

This operation requires effective anaesthesia which can be regional (epidural or spinal) or a general anesthesia. The type of anaesthesia used and the care with which it is administered is an important determine of the outcome of caesarean section (*Anderson et al.*, 1987).

Both spinal and general anaesthesia used for caesarean section have certain advantages and disadvantages and there is no method which is completely ideal. The most important factors for choice of anaesthesia are; pregnant systemic problems and wishes, the urgency of the operation, and the surgeon and the anesthetists experience (*Wu*, 2006).

General anaesthesia refers to the loss of the ability to perceive pain associated with loss of consciousness produced by intravenous or inhalational anesthetic agents. For caesarian section, this involves the use of thiopentone for induction, tracheal intubation facilitated by Suxamethonium, positive-pressure ventilation of the lung with a nitrous oxide/oxygen mixture plus a volatile agent, and a muscle relaxant (*Thorburn*, 1998).

Spinal anaesthesia refers to the use of local anesthetic solutions to produce circumscribed areas of loss of sensation. The spinal anaesthesia used for caesarean section involves the infiltration of a local anesthetic agent, usually bupivacaine, into the surroundings of the spinal cord through the lower back of the woman (the drug is injected directly into the subarachnoid space (*Thorburn*, 1998).

Over the last 30 years, the use spinal anaesthesia is rapidly increasing (*Ashok*, 2010).

Regional anaesthesia nowadays, has gained worldwide acceptance and its physiological effects provide a rationale for expecting a better outcome with this technique (*Crawford and Anmette*, 2001).

Spinal anaesthesia is relatively easy to perform, gives excellent anaesthesia with a low potential of toxicity, allows mother to be awake and interact immediately after the birth of the baby. Compared to general anaesthesia it

offers less maternal morbidity, comparable less blood loss (Danelli et al., 2009).

It also enables early recovery of gastrointestinal functions, prolonged interval to first analgesic requirement, less analgesic consumption and early ambulation (*Havas et al.*, 2013).

However, spinal anaesthesia is not free from side effects and has its own complications like maternal hypotension, hypothermia, post-operative headache accidental total spinal anaesthesia and patients at risk of heavy peripartum hemorrhage may not tolerate the haemodynamic effects of regional anaesthesia (*Jenkins and Khan*, 2003).

The lack of medical personnel trained in the technique would also exclude the use of spinal anaesthesia (*Cunningham et al.*, 2010).

General anaesthesia is a more quickly administered procedure and is often preferred in cases where speed is important (*Enkin et al.*, 2002).

It also used in certain situations like contraindication to regional anesthesia, failed regional anaesthesia and maternal request (*Afolabi et al.*, 2010).

The risks include aspiration of stomach contents, awareness to surgical procedure (due to inadequate anesthesia), failed intubations, and respiratory problems for both mother and baby (*Afolabi et al.*, 2003).

In general, general anaesthesia is preferred for emergency caesarian section since it provides rapid onset of action and more stabilization of patient's circulation and vital signs, on the other hand regional anaesthesia is preferred for elective operations because of its lower cost and relatively lower risk of drugs complications to the mother and the fetus (*Almomany*, 2012).

Spinal anaesthesia compared to general anesthesia, may allow faster maternal recovery and readiness for discharge to home which offers social and economic benefits.

Aim of the Work

To compare between general and spinal anaesthesia regarding the maternal readiness for discharge and return to home.

Caesarean Section

Incidence of Caesarean Section:

Since 1985, the international healthcare community has considered the ideal rate for caesarean sections to be between 10% and 15%. Since then, caesarean sections have become increasingly common in both developed and developing countries (*WHO and HRP*, 2015).

Approximately 18.5 million caesarean sections are performed yearly worldwide. (*WHO*, 2010).

About 40% of the countries have CS rates <10%, about 10% have CS rates between 10 and 15%, and approximately 50% have CS rates >15%. countries with CS rates<10% account for only 25% (4.5 millions) of the global CS but for 60% (77 millions) of the total number of births worldwide. On the other hand, 73% (13.5 millions) of the total number of CS are performed in the countries with CS rates >15% where 37.5% (48.4 millions) of the total number of births occur (*WHO*, 2010).

The trend of increase in caesarean section rate is more apparent in developed countries than in third world countries. One in 12 births in developing world was