

**The effect of intrathecal and epidural
supplementation of magnesium sulphate
combined with spinal anesthesia on intra-
operative and postoperative pain relief in lower
abdominal surgeries**

Thesis

Submitted for partial fulfillment
of M.D.degree in Anesthesia

By

Ahmed Abdelfattah Abdelfattah Elsayed

M.B.B.Ch., M.Sc. anesthesia
Ain Shams University

Under supervision of

Prof. Dr. Mostafa Kamel Fouad Saleh

*Professor of Anesthesia and Intensive Care
Faculty of Medicine - Ain Shams University*

Dr. Alfred Maurice Said

*Assistant Professor of Anesthesia and Intensive Care
Faculty of medicine - Ain Shams University*

Dr. Amal Hamed Rabie

*Lecturer of Anesthesia and Intensive Care
Faculty of Medicine - Ain Shams University*

**Faculty of Medicine
Ain Shams University
2010**

Acknowledgment

First of all thanks to “Allah”

*I would like to express my and cordial thanks to **Prof. Dr. Mostafa Kamel Fouad Saleh** Professor of Anesthesia and Intensive Care, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, for his encouragement, advice and unlimited support have guided me through every step of this work.*

*I would like to express my highest appreciation and gratitude to **Dr. Alfred Maurice Said** Assistant Professor of Anesthesia and Intensive Care, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, for her generous support and continuous encouragement.*

*Very special thanks should go to **Dr. Amal Hamed Rabie**, Lecturer of Anesthesia and Intensive Care, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, for his sincere help and valuable advice through the whole work.*

Ahmed Abdelfattah



Aim of the study

The aim of the this study is to evaluate the effect of intrathecal and epidural supplementation of magnesium sulphate combined with spinal anesthesia on improving the quality of intra-operative anesthesia and reduction of post-operative pain and narcotic requirements.

List of Figures

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure (1):	Lateral view of the vertebral column	4
Figure (2):	Sagittal section through lumbar vertebrae (A). Common features of vertebrae (B, C).....	5
Figure (3):	The spinal cord	9
Figure (4):	Sagittal view through lumbar vertebrae and sacrum..	10
Figure (5):	Structure of a typical spinal nerve.	10
Figure (6):	Blood supply of the spinal cord.....	11
Figure (7):	Sitting position for neuraxial blockade	19
Figure (8):	Lateral decubitus position for neuraxial blockade.....	20
Figure (9):	Paramedian approach.	23
Figure(10):	Different types of spinal needle.....	24
Figure (11):	Lumbar epidural anesthesia; midline approach...	33
Figure (12):	Different types of needles used for CSE technique.....	38
Figure (13):	Local anesthetics, esters and amides with chemical structures.....	52
Figure (14):	Glutamate receptors.....	65
Figure (15):	Visual analogue scale	73
Figure (16):	Pain intensity scale	81
Figure (17):	Time to reach highest dermatomal level among all groups.....	86

Figure (18): The percentage of maximum level of sensory block among all groups.....	88
Figure (19): Comparison between all groups as regards duration of sensory block.....	90
Figure (20): Comparison between all studied groups as regards density of motor block	93
Figure (21): Comparison between all studied groups as regards time to reach the maximum degree of the motor block.....	95
Figure (22): Comparison between all studied groups as regards duration of the motor block.....	97
Figure (23): Comparison between all studied groups as regards modified Wilson scale for intra-operative sedation assessment.....	101
Figure (24): Comparison between all groups as regards modified Wilson scale for postoperative sedation assessment.....	104
Figure (25): Comparisons among the four groups as regards VAS mean score.....	106
Figure (26): Comparison between all studied groups as regards mean pain intensity score.....	107
Figure (27): Comparison between among the groups as regards mean of total requirements of rescue analgesia.....	109

List of Contents

Title	Page No.
Introduction	1
Aim of the study	2
 Review of Literature	
- Anatomical considerations.....	3
- Physiological considerations.....	12
- Neuroaxial Blockade.....	18
- Local anesthetics pharmacology	48
- Additives to local anesthetics in regional anesthesia.....	56
 Patients and methods.....	69
 Results.....	84
 Discussion	111
 Summary.....	130
 Conclusion	135
 References	136
 Arabic Summary	

List of Tables

Tab. No.	Title	Page No.
Table (1):	Nerve fiber classification	14
Table (2):	Contraindications of neuroaxial blockade	18
Table (3):	Densities and baricities of commonly used local anesthetics for spinal anesthesia	25
Table (4):	Modified Wilson Sedation Scale	80
Table (5):	Comparison in demographic data among the four groups.....	84
Table (6):	Comparison among the four different groups as regards time to reach highest dermatomal level.....	85
Table (7):	Comparison between each two groups as regards time to reach highest dermatomal level. The multiple comparisons Post-hoc test or least significant difference (LSD).....	86
Table (8):	Comparison among the four different groups as regards maximum level of sensory block.	87
Table (9):	Comparison between each two groups as regards maximum level of sensory block. The multiple comparisons Post-hoc test or least significant difference (LSD).....	88
Table (10):	Comparison among the four groups as regards duration of sensory block.....	89

Table (11): Comparison between each two groups as regards duration of sensory block. The multiple comparisons Post-hoc test or least significant difference (LSD).....	90
Table (12): Comparison among the four different groups as regards density of motor block.	91
Table (13): Comparison between each two groups as regards density of motor block. The multiple comparisons Post-hoc test or least significant difference (LSD).....	92
Table (14): Comparison among the four different groups as regards time to reach the maximum degree of the motor block.....	94
Table (15): Comparison between each two groups as regards time to reach maximum degree of the motor block. The multiple comparisons Post-hoc test or least significant difference (LSD).....	94
Table (16): Comparison among the four different groups as regards duration of motor block.....	96
Table (17): Comparison between each two groups as regards duration of the motor block. The multiple comparisons Post-hoc test or least significant difference (LSD).....	96
Table (18): .Comparison among the four different groups as regards mean arterial blood pressure intra-operatively.....	98
Table (19): Comparison among the four different groups as regards hemodynamic parameters postoperatively.....	99

Table (20): Comparison among the four groups as regards sedation assessment intraoperative	100
Table (21): Comparison between each two groups as regards sedation assessment intraoperative. The multiple comparisons Post-hoc test or least significant difference (LSD).....	101
Table (22): Comparison among the four groups as regards sedation assessment postoperative.....	102
Table (23): Comparison between each two groups as regards sedation assessment postoperative. The multiple comparisons Post-hoc test or least significant difference (LSD).....	103
Table (24): Comparison among the four groups as regards Visual Analogue Scale mean score.....	105
Table (25): Comparison between each two groups as regards Visual Analogue Scale mean score. The multiple comparisons Post-hoc test or least significant difference (LSD).....	105
Table (26): Comparison among the four different groups regards Pain intensity score.....	106
Table (27): Comparison between each two groups as regards Pain Intensity Score. The multiple comparisons (Post-hoc test or least significant difference, LSD).....	108

Table (28): Comparison among the four different groups as regards mean of total requirements of rescue analgesia1	109
--	------------

List of Abbreviations

Abbrev.	Meaning
ASA	American society of anesthesiologist
CNS	Central nervous system
COPD	Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease
COX	Cyclooxygenase
CSEA	Combined Spinal Epidural Anesthesia
CSF	Cerebrospinal fluid
CT	Computerized tomography
DST	Double Segment Technique
EA	Epidural Abscess
FRC	Functional Residual Capacity
GABA	Gama amino butyric acid
HR	Heart Rate
I.N.R	International Normalization Ratio
IVRA	Intravenous Regional Anesthesia
MAP	Mean Arterial Pressure
MgSO₄	Magnesium sulfate
NIBP	Non-invasive Blood Pressure
NMDA	N-methyl-d-aspartate
NMDARs	N-methyl-d-aspartate Receptor
NSAIDs	Non-Steroidal Anti-inflammatory Drugs
P.T	Prothrombin Time
P.T.T	Partial Throbmoplastin Time
PABA	Para Aminobezoic Acid
PDPH	Post Dural Puncture Headache
PNS	Peripheral nervous system
PSPS	Post spinal pain syndrome
SpO₂	Peripheral Oxygen Saturation
SST	Single Segment Technique
TNS	Transient Neurologic Symptoms
TRI	Transient Radicular Irritation
VAS	Visual analogue scales
μ	Mu Receptor
δ	Delta receptor
κ	Kappa receptor

Introduction

Magnesium (Mg^{2+}) is a non-competitive NMDA receptor antagonist that blocks ion channels in a voltage-dependent fashion. Numerous clinical studies investigating the effects of intravenously injected magnesium sulphate (MgSO_4) on intra-operative and post-operative pain perception have shown that MgSO_4 reduces the intra-operative consumption of hypnotic agents and analgesics (*Kara et al., 2002*).

NMDA receptor antagonists prevent central sensitization induced by peripheral nociceptive stimulation. They abolish hypersensitization once it is established by blocking dorsal horn NMDA receptor activation induced by excitatory amino acid transmitters, such as glutamate and aspartate (*Woolf and Thompson, 1991*).

Adding magnesium to spinal anesthesia should improve the quality, and prolong the duration of spinal anesthesia and reduce the incidence of side effects observed when local anesthetics are used in high doses or combined with opioids, such as respiratory depression, hemodynamic instability, pruritus, urinary retention, and severe nausea and vomiting (*Özalevli et al., 2005*).

Intrathecal administration of magnesium sulphate has been shown to be more effective than intravenous administration due to the limitation of magnesium transfer across the blood brain barrier (*De Kock and Lavand'homme, 2007*).

Patients and Methods

This study was conducted in the obstetric department, general surgery department and urology department of Ain Shams University hospitals on one hundred and twenty patients undergoing elective lower abdominal surgeries after approval of Ain Shams University medical ethics committee in 2010. A written consent was taken from all patients who were either class I or II according to the classification of the American Society of Anesthesiologists (ASA I or II). The age of the patients ranged between 21-50 years old and they were of both sexes. The expected duration of surgery was not more than 2 hours.

This study was a prospective double blind randomized controlled study where the patients were allocated into four equal groups, thirty patients each, according to magnesium sulphate supplementation as an adjunct to spinal anesthesia:

A. Group (I): [S]

30 patients received intrathecal injection of 0.5% hyperbaric bupivacaine 15 mg (3 ml bupivacaine 5 mg/ml in hyperbaric solution) combined with 25 µg fentanyl (0.5 ml) and 1 ml saline 0.9%. Total volume of intrathecal injection was 4.5 ml.

B. Group (II): [IM]

30 patients received intrathecal injection of 0.5% hyperbaric bupivacaine 15 mg (3 ml bupivacaine 5 mg/ ml in hyperbaric solution) combined with 25 µg fentanyl (0.5 ml) and 100 mg of 10% magnesium sulphate (1 ml). Total volume of intrathecal injection was 4.5 ml.

C. Group (III): [EM]

30 patients received intrathecal injection of 0.5% hyperbaric bupivacaine 15 mg (3 ml bupivacaine 5 mg/ ml in hyperbaric solution) combined with 25 µg fentanyl (0.5 ml) and 1 ml saline 0.9%. In addition, to an epidural dose of magnesium sulphate 100 mg of 2% solution (5 ml) was given to be repeated hourly including the first 24 hours of the postoperative period. Total volume of intrathecal injection was 4.5 ml in addition to an epidural dose of magnesium.

D. Group (IV): [IEM]

30 patients received intrathecal injection of 0.5% hyperbaric bupivacaine 15 mg (3 ml bupivacaine 5 mg/ ml in hyperbaric solution) combined with 25 µg fentanyl (0.5 ml) solution) and 100 mg of 10% magnesium sulphate (1 ml). In addition, to an epidural dose of magnesium sulphate 100 mg of 2% solution (5 ml) was given to be repeated hourly including the first postoperative period of the 24 hours. Total volume of