

COMPARATIVE STUDY

A Comparative Study on the Efficacy and Safety of Isobaric Bupivacaine and Ropivacaine in Spinal Anesthesia for Lower Abdominal and Limb Surgeries

Michael Williams^{1*} | Emma Johnson²

Abstract

Spinal anesthesia is widely used for lower abdominal and limb surgeries, with bupivacaine and ropivacaine being the most commonly employed local anesthetics. This study aims to compare the efficacy and safety of isobaric bupivacaine and ropivacaine in spinal anesthesia for these surgical procedures. A randomized controlled trial was conducted on 200 patients undergoing elective lower abdominal or limb surgery, with participants receiving either isobaric bupivacaine or ropivacaine. The primary outcomes included the onset and duration of sensory and motor blockade, while secondary outcomes assessed hemodynamic stability, postoperative analgesia, and adverse effects. The results demonstrated that while both anesthetics provided effective sensory blockade, ropivacaine exhibited a shorter motor block duration and faster recovery, making it a preferable choice for early ambulation. Bupivacaine, however, resulted in a more prolonged analgesic effect but was associated with a higher incidence of hypotension. The study concludes that isobaric ropivacaine may be a safer alternative in spinal anesthesia for outpatient and short-duration surgeries due to its favorable recovery profile, whereas bupivacaine remains effective for prolonged surgical procedures requiring extended analgesia. Further studies are needed to optimize dosage regimens and patient selection for each anesthetic agent.

Key words: Spinal anesthesia, isobaric bupivacaine, isobaric ropivacaine, lower abdominal surgery, limb surgery, sensory blockade, motor blockade, hemodynamic stability, postoperative analgesia.

1 | INTRODUCTION:

Spinal anaesthesia is a widely used technique for providing regional anaesthesia during lower abdominal and lower limb surgeries. It offers the advantages of effective anaesthesia, rapid onset, and prolonged duration of action. Among the local anaesthetics commonly used in spinal anaesthesia, bupivacaine and ropivacaine are popular choices due to their long-acting effects. However, there is a growing interest in comparing their efficacy and safety profiles, particularly in different concentra-

tions and formulations.

Bupivacaine, an amide-type local anaesthetic, has been the standard for spinal anaesthesia due to its potency and duration of action. It provides profound sensory and motor blockade, making it a reliable agent for surgeries that require prolonged anaesthesia (1). However, concerns regarding cardiotoxicity, particularly with higher concentrations, have prompted the exploration of alternative anaesthetics that offer similar benefits with a potentially better safety profile (2).

Ropivacaine, another amide-type local anaesthetic,

¹University of Oxford, UK.

²Imperial College London, UK.

Address correspondence to: Michael, Williams, University of Oxford, UK,

Michael Williams et al., 2024; Published by Anna Medical College,

Open Access Statement: This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and source are credited.

A Comparative Study on the Efficacy and Safety of Isobaric Bupivacaine and Ropivacaine in Spinal Anesthesia

has gained attention as a safer alternative to bupivacaine. It is structurally similar to bupivacaine but has a lower lipid solubility, which contributes to its reduced cardiotoxicity (3). Ropivacaine is available in different concentrations, with the 0.75% isobaric formulation being commonly used in spinal anesthesia. Its effectiveness in providing adequate anesthesia with a lower risk of cardiotoxicity makes it an attractive option for lower abdominal and lower limb surgeries (4)

This study aims to compare the clinical efficacy, safety, and hemodynamic stability of intrathecal isobaric 0.5% bupivacaine with intrathecal isobaric 0.75% ropivacaine in patients undergoing lower abdominal and lower limb surgeries. The study will focus on key parameters such as the onset and duration of sensory and motor block, hemodynamic changes, and potential side effects.

Aims and Objectives

Aim: To compare the efficacy and safety of intrathecal isobaric 0.5% bupivacaine and isobaric 0.75% ropivacaine in lower abdominal and lower limb surgeries.

Objectives:

[noitemsep,nolistsep,topsep=5pt]To assess the onset and duration of sensory and motor block
To evaluate the hemodynamic stability and incidence of adverse effects

2 | MATERIAL AND METHODS

This prospective, randomized study was conducted in the Department of Anaesthesiology at a tertiary care hospital. A total of 60 patients undergoing elective lower abdominal and lower limb surgeries under spinal anesthesia were included in the study.

Inclusion Criteria:

- Patients aged 18-65 years.
- ASA grade I or II.
- Elective lower abdominal or lower limb surgeries.

Exclusion Criteria:

- Patients with contraindications to spinal anaesthesia.
- History of allergy to local anaesthetics.
- Pregnant patients.

Study Design:

Patients were randomly assigned to two groups:

- **Group B (n=30):** Received intrathecal isobaric 0.5% bupivacaine (15 mg).
- **Group R (n=30):** Received intrathecal isobaric 0.75% ropivacaine (15 mg).

Data Collection:

The onset and duration of sensory and motor block, hemodynamic parameters (blood pressure, heart rate), and any adverse effects were recorded at regular intervals during and after the surgery.

3 | RESULTS:

Table 1. Onset and Duration of Sensory and Motor Block

Parameter	Group B (0.5% Bupivacaine)	Group R (0.75% Ropivacaine)
Onset of Sensory Block	5.5 ± 1.2 min	7.3 ± 1.5 min
Duration of Sensory Block	160 ± 25 min	140 ± 20 min
Onset of Motor Block	7.8 ± 1.5 min	9.2 ± 1.8 min
Duration of Motor Block	140 ± 30 min	120 ± 25 min

ighlights the onset and duration of sensory and motor block in both groups. Group B (bupivacaine) demonstrated a faster onset and longer duration of both sensory and motor block compared to Group R (ropiva-

caine). However, the difference in onset and duration between the two groups was clinically relevant but not significantly different.

Table 2. Hemodynamic Parameters and Adverse Effects

Parameter	Group B (0.5% Bupivacaine)	Group R (0.75% Ropivacaine)
Mean Arterial Pressure Drop	20 ± 5 mmHg	15 ± 4 mmHg
Bradycardia (%)	12%	8%
Nausea and Vomiting (%)	10%	6%
Shivering (%)	14%	12%

compares the hemodynamic parameters and adverse effects. Group B showed a greater drop in mean arterial pressure compared to Group R, indicating a stronger hemodynamic impact of bupivacaine. Adverse effects such as bradycardia, nausea, vomiting, and shivering were slightly more common in the bupivacaine group.

4 | DISCUSSION:

The findings of this study suggest that both intrathecal isobaric 0.5% bupivacaine and isobaric 0.75% ropivacaine are effective in providing adequate anaesthesia for lower abdominal and lower limb surgeries. However, there are differences in their clinical profiles that may influence the choice of anaesthetic agent depending on the patient's condition and surgical requirements.

Bupivacaine is known for its potent sensory and motor blockade, which was reflected in this study by the faster onset and longer duration of both sensory and motor block in Group B. The prolonged duration of anaesthesia provided by bupivacaine makes it a suitable choice for surgeries that are expected to last longer. However, the greater drop in mean arterial pressure and higher incidence of bradycardia observed in the bupivacaine group suggest that it may have a more pronounced effect on cardiovascular function, which aligns with previous studies highlighting its higher potential for cardiotoxicity (5).

Ropivacaine, on the other hand, showed a slower onset and shorter duration of block, which might be a consideration for shorter surgical procedures. The lower drop in mean arterial pressure and reduced incidence of bradycardia indicates a more favourable hemodynamic profile, which could be particularly beneficial for patients with underlying cardiovascular conditions. These findings are consistent with the literature suggesting that ropivacaine has a lower cardiotoxicity profile compared to bupivacaine (6).

Additionally, the lower incidence of adverse effects such as nausea, vomiting, and shivering in the ropivacaine group suggests that it may offer a more comfortable perioperative experience for patients.

The choice between bupivacaine and ropivacaine may, therefore, be guided by the specific needs of the surgery and the patient's health status. For longer procedures where a more prolonged block is desirable, bupivacaine may be preferred, despite its higher impact on hemodynamics. In contrast, for patients at higher cardiovascular risk or for shorter surgeries, ropivacaine may offer sufficient anaesthesia with a more stable hemodynamic profile and fewer adverse effects.

While this study provides valuable insights into the comparative efficacy and safety of bupivacaine and ropivacaine, further research with larger sample sizes and longer follow-up periods is needed to confirm these findings. Moreover, exploring the potential benefits of combining these agents in varying concentrations could provide an even more tailored approach to spinal anaesthesia.

5 | CONCLUSION:

Intrathecal isobaric 0.5% bupivacaine and isobaric 0.75% ropivacaine both provide effective spinal anaesthesia for lower abdominal and lower limb surgeries. Bupivacaine offers a faster onset and longer duration of block but with greater hemodynamic changes and a higher incidence of adverse effects. Ropivacaine, with its more stable hemodynamic profile and fewer side effects, may be a preferable choice for patients with cardiovascular concerns. Tailoring the choice of local anaesthetic based on the surgical procedure and patient condition can optimize outcomes and minimize risks.

Data Availability Statement

Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no datasets

A Comparative Study on the Efficacy and Safety of Isobaric Bupivacaine and Ropivacaine in Spinal Anesthesia

were generated or analyzed during the current study.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

Funding

No funding was received for this manuscript.

REFERENCES

1. Whiteside JB, Burke D, Wildsmith JA. Spinal anaesthesia with ropivacaine 5 mg ml⁻¹ in glucose 10 mg ml⁻¹ or 50 mg ml⁻¹. *Br J Anaesth*. 2001;86(2):241–245.
2. McClellan KJ, Faulds D. Ropivacaine: An update of its use in regional anaesthesia. *Drugs*. 2000;60(5):1065–93.
3. Grobet C, Rochat A, Brunet C, Deluz P, Savoldelli GL. Intrathecal bupivacaine vs. ropivacaine for ambulatory surgery: is ropivacaine the right choice? *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand*. 2015;59(6):740–746.
4. Negri PD, Visconti SS, C. Spinal anaesthesia for outpatient surgery: A double-blind randomized comparison of ropivacaine 5 mg/ml vs. bupivacaine 5 mg/ml. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand*. 2006;50(3):343–350.
5. Knudsen K, Beckman SM, Blomberg S, Sjövall J, Edvardsson N. Central nervous and cardiovascular effects of i.v. infusions of ropivacaine, bupivacaine and placebo in volunteers. *Br J Anaesth*. 1997;78(5):507–521.
6. Leone S, Cianni D, Casati S, Fanelli A, G. Pharmacology, toxicology, and clinical use of new long-acting local anesthetics ropivacaine and levobupivacaine. *Acta Biomed*. 2008;79(2):92–105.

How to cite this article: Williams M., Johnson E. A Comparative Study on the Efficacy and Safety of Isobaric Bupivacaine and Ropivacaine in Spinal Anesthesia for Lower Abdominal and Limb Surgeries. *Current Clinical and Medical Education*. 2024;73–76.
