

ADVANTAGES OF UNILATERAL SPINAL ANESTHESIA VERSUS CONVENTIONAL BILATERAL SPINAL ANESTHESIA IN LOWER LIMB ORTHOPEDIC SURGERY

Sonja Stamenić¹, Predrag Stoiljković², Milan Mitković², Ivan Golubović³, Tomislav Stamenić⁴, Marija Stošić¹, Saša Milenković²

Spinal anesthesia is a frequently applied technique for lower limb orthopedic surgery. Hypotension is the most frequent side effect of conventional bilateral spinal anesthesia. An exclusively unilateral block only affects the sensory, motor and sympathetic functions on one side of the body without the typical adverse side effects seen with a bilateral block.

The aim of this prospective, randomized study is to compare unilateral anesthesia versus conventional bilateral spinal anesthesia in lower limb orthopedic surgery according to the quality of sensory and motor blockade, analgesia, hemodynamic stability and side effects.

Forty ASA I – II patients scheduled for lower limb orthopedic surgery randomly allocated into two groups. Group BS patients received bilateral spinal anesthesia with 3 ml isobaric 0.5% levobupivacaine (conventional dose) and group US patients received unilateral low dose spinal anesthesia with hyperbaric spinal solution (0.5% levobupivacaine 7,5mg and 40mg of 10% glucose) over a period of 120 seconds and the patients were kept in the lateral position for 15 minutes.

In both groups, the quality of the sensory and motor block was adequate for the surgical procedure. The time to two segment regression of sensory blockade, recovery time of motor blockade, as well as the time of complete recovery was significantly shorter in US group as compared to the BS group. Seven patients in the bilateral, and one patient in the unilateral group developed hypotension that required treatment with ephedrine (chi square test 7.02; $p < 0, 05$).

Unilateral low dose spinal anesthesia achieves stable hemodynamics. It also results in rapid recovery compared to a bilateral conventional dose spinal anesthesia.

Acta Medica Medianae 2019;58(4):xx-xx.

Key words: Spinal anesthesia, hemodynamic, unilateral, levobupivacaine, low dose

¹Clinic for Anesthesia and Intensive Therapy, Clinical Center Niš,

²University of Niš, Faculty of Medicine, Niš, Serbia

³Clinic of Orthopedics and Traumatology, Clinical center Niš, Niš, Serbia

⁴Clinic for Urology, Clinical center Niš, Niš, Serbia

Contact: Sonja Stamenić
Bulevard dr Zoran Djindjić 48, 18000 Niš, Serbia
E-mail: tstamenic@eunet.rs

Introduction

Spinal anesthesia is a frequently applied technique with its ease of performance and high success rate for lower limb orthopedic surgery. It is

widely used for providing a fast and effective sensory and motor blockade. This blockage reduces the stress response to a surgical trauma, decreases intraoperative blood loss, reduces the incidence of postoperative thromboembolism and decreases morbidity and mortality in comparison with general anesthesia (1).

However, side effects such as hypotension, bradycardia, nausea et vomiting, postpuncture headache and urine retention are observed (2). Hypotension is the most frequent side effect of conventional bilateral spinal anesthesia, occurring in more than 30% of patients. Ward et al. reported a decrease in mean arterial blood pressure of 21.3% of the baseline following spinal anesthesia. He also reported that a level of spinal anesthesia to T5 resulted in an increase in heart rate by 3.7%. The cardio accelerator fibres originate from T1-T4, so the level of spinal anesthesia affecting these dermatomes may cause bradycardia (3,4). An exclusively unilateral block only affects the sensory, motor and sympathetic functions on one side of the body and

offers the advantages of a spinal block without the typical adverse side effects seen with a bilateral block (5, 6). The advantages of unilateral spinal anesthesia include much lower incidence of clinically relevant hypotension, lower incidence of urine retention, better patient satisfaction, better mobility during recovery time and block restriction on the operative side. Several factors are required for successful unilateral spinal anesthesia: the type of spinal needle and bevel direction, the rate of injection, volume, baricity and the concentration of local anesthetics, as well as the position of patients on the operating table (7, 8). Moreover, patient posture is thought to be fundamental in determining the level of anesthesia spread, particularly when a hyperbaric anesthetic solution is used (9, 10).

The aim of our study is to compare unilateral anesthesia versus conventional bilateral spinal in lower limb orthopedic surgery according to the quality of sensory and motor blockade, analgesia, haemodynamic stability and side effects.

Materials and methods

This prospective study included forty adult patients scheduled for unilateral lower limb surgery, except patients with degenerative hip disease or hip fracture, in routine surgical theaters at the Clinic for orthopedic surgery and traumatology in Clinical Center Niš. Informed consent was obtained from all the patients. Inclusion criteria were American Society of Anesthesiologists (ASA) score I-II, age 18-65 years, male and female. Exclusion criteria were contraindications for spinal anaesthesia: skin infection at the site of regional anesthesia, coagulopathy, taking anticoagulant drugs, having allergy to local anesthetic drugs, hypovolemia, low fixed cardiac output, neurologic and psychiatric disorder, spine deformity, body mass index (BMI) > 35 kg/m² and chronic pain treatment.

Patients were randomly allocated into two groups of 20 patients (N = 20). Group BS patients received bilateral spinal anesthesia with 15mg isobaric 0,5% levobupivacaine (conventional doses). Group US patients received unilateral spinal anesthesia with 7,5mg hyperbaric 0,5% levobupivacaine (low doses). Hyperbaric solution was prepared by combining 7,5mg of isobaric 0.5% levobupivacaine (1,5ml) with 40mg 10% glucosae (0,4ml). All patients were given 2 mg midazolam intravenously as premedication, as well as an intravenous infusion of 7 mL/kg of lactated Ringer solution. Standard monitoring was used, including noninvasive blood pressure, electrocardiogram, peripheral pulse oximetry, and respiratory rate measurements. Baseline arterial blood pressure and heart rate was recorded at the end of volume expansion, before inducing spinal block.

All patients were placed in a lateral position on the operative side down, while the vertebral column was positioned as horizontally as possible. Under complete aseptic technique, dural puncture was performed using a midline approach at the L3-L4 interspace with a 27 gauge spinal pencil point

needle. Group BS received an intrathecal injection of 15mg plane (isobaric) levobupivacaine 0,5% over a period of 10 seconds. The direction of the needle aperture was cranial during the injection. After injection of spinal solution the patients immediately were turned in supine position (conventional bilateral spinal anesthesia). Group US received of 7,5mg plane levobupivacaine 0,5% with 40 mg glucosae (hyperbaric solution) over a period of 120 seconds (injection speed: 1ml/min) without further aspiration maneuvers. The bevel of the needle pointed down to operative site during the injection. The patients were kept in the lateral position for 15 min and then placed in the supine position for surgery (unilateral low dose spinal anesthesia).

Hemodynamic changes were recorded every 5 min after spinal anesthesia, and then until end of surgery. Hypotension (SAP < 90 or 30% decrease from the baseline) was treated with additional intravenous bolus of 250ml crystalod. However, if supplementation of fluids failed to reverse hypotension, intravenous ephedrine 5-10 mg bolus was administrated. Bradycardia (HR < 50) was treated with 0.5 mg of atropine intravenously.

The sensory anesthesia level was evaluated by pinprick method with 22 gauge hypodermic needle along the anterior mid-clavicular line of both sides. The time to onset of analgesia was defined as the time to the onset of sensory block to maximum cephalad spread. The onset and degree of motor block were evaluated using a modified Bromage scale (0 = no motor block; 1 = hip blocked; 2 = hip and knee blocked; 3 = complete motor block). Pain was assessed from the beginning of surgery using a 10-cm visual analog scale (VAS). We also recorded side-effects such as nausea, vomiting and headache. The urinary retention was not recorded due to a significant number of patients with preoperatively placed urinary catheter.

Statistical analysis was performed using standard data processing programs - MS EXCEL and software package R. Tests were performed with chi-square, Fisher's exact test and t-test for independent samples. A value of p < 0.05 was considered as significant. Continuous variables were presented as mean ± stdev or as median (range); categorical data were presented as number (%).

Results

There were no significant differences between two groups with respect to age, gender, weight, ASA status, duration of surgery and intraoperative crystalloids (Table 1).

In both groups, anesthesia was adequate for the surgical procedure and none of patient needs general anesthesia or intraoperative analgesics. The quality of the sensory and motor block, as well as intraoperative analgesia are shown in Table 2. T10-T12 anesthesia was achieved in both groups. The maximum level of sensory blockade was higher in the bilateral spinal group T7 (T4-T8) than in the unilateral spinal group T8 (T11-T7) thoracic dermatome, but there is no significant difference (p >0.05).

Table 1. Patient's characteristics, duration of surgery and intraoperative crystalloids

	Group BS (N = 20)	Group US (N = 20)
Age (years)	45,4±12,84	44,2±12,79
Sex (Male/Female)	12/8	14/6
Weight (kg)	76,5±13,2	75,2±12,62
ASA clasification	ASA I 4 (20 %) ASA II 16 (80 %)	ASA I 5 (25 %) ASA II 15 (75 %)
Duration of surgery (min)	64,3±18,46	61,0±17,22
Intraoperative crystalloids (ml)	1109±522,4	1038±456,86

Data are means ± sd or numbers. ASA – America Society of anesthesiologists.

There were no significant differences between groups ($p > 0,05$).

Group BS – bilateral spinal anesthesia; Group US – unilateral spinal anesthesia

Table 2. Comparison of the spinal blockades

	Group BS (N = 20)	Group US (N = 20)
Maximum cephalad spread (dermatome)	T7 (T4 – T8)	T8 (T11 – T7)
Onset time of sensory blockade (min)	6,7±0,9	8,05±1,07*
Time to two segment regresion (min)	91,55±9,55	57,75±7,32*
Intraoperative analgesia (VAS = 0 – 10)	0 (100%)	0 (100%)
Degree of motor block - operative side	Bromage III 20 (100%)	Bromage III 20 (100%)
Degree of motor block - nonoperative side	Bromage III 20 (100 %)	Bromage I/II 3 (15 %)*
Duration of motor block (min)	179±13,74	105,25±12,59*
Full recovery (min)	232±17,49	167,25±10,42*

Data are means±sd or numbers. VAS – visual analog scale.

* Statistical significance was set at the $p < 0,05$ level.

Group BS – bilateral spinal anesthesia; Group US – unilateral spinal anesthesia.

The average time to sensory onset in the unilateral group was $8,05 \pm 1,07$ min. In the bilateral group, this value was $6,7 \pm 0,9$ min (t value -4.21; $p < 0,05$). The time to two segment regression of sensory blockade was significantly shorter in unilateral spinal group $57,75 \pm 7,32$ min versus $91,55 \pm 9,55$ min in bilateral spinal group (t value -12.24; $p < 0,05$). Recovery time of motor blockade in unilateral spinal group ($105,25 \pm 12,59$ min) was

significantly shorter (t value 17.24; $p < 0,05$), as well as the time of complete recovery ($167,25 \pm 10,42$ min) in unilateral spinal group (t value -13.86: $p < 0,05$). An average Bromage score of III was achieved for the motor block in both groups. A strictly unilateral spinal anesthesia in US group was achieved in seventeen patients, while in three patients spinal block spread to the nonoperative side (Bromage I or II).

Table 3. Hemodynamic changes and side effects of spinal anesthesia

	Group BS (N = 20)	Group US (N = 20)
Hypotension (SP<90mmHg)	7 (35 %)	1 (5 %)*
Bradycardia (SF < 50 / min)	4 (20 %)	1(5 %)
Nausea, vomiting	4 (25 %)	1 (5 %)
Headache	1	0

Data are numbers.

* Statistical significance was set at the $p < 0,05$ level.

Group BS – bilateral spinal anesthesia; Group US – unilateral spinal anesthesia.

Hemodynamic changes and side effects of spinal anesthesia in both groups are shown in Table 3. Seven patients in the bilateral, and one patient in

the unilateral group developed hypotension that required treatment with ephedrine. There was significant differences in the incidence of hypotension

between study groups (chi square test 7.02; $p < 0,05$). Bradycardia, nausea and vomiting occurred in four patients in the bilateral group and in one patient in the unilateral group. One patient in the bilateral group and no one in the unilateral group needed treatment for headache. There were no significant differences in the incidence of bradycardia, nausea and vomiting and headache between BS versus US group ($p > 0,05$).

Discussion

The conventional bilateral spinal anesthesia is widely used in adults for lower limb orthopedic surgery. Although considered safe, it has got many complications. The most common side effects are hypotension and bradycardia due to sympathetic blockade (2, 11). Unilateral spinal anesthesia only affects the sensory, motor and sympathetic functions on one side of the body and offers the advantages of a spinal block without the typical adverse side effects seen with a bilateral block. The cardiovascular stability following unilateral spinal anaesthesia is certainly one of the most important benefits. Hypotension may develop in 30% of patients with bilateral spinal anaesthesia, even with intermediate doses (2, 12) compared to 0–6% with unilateral spinal anaesthesia (13).

The research showed that the patient's position immediately after spinal anesthesia affects the distribution of anesthetics into the spinal cord. The baricity of local anesthetics (hypo or hyperbaricity) in relation to the specific gravity of the cerebrospinal fluid enables the achievement of a unilateral block. It is also important that the distance between the left and right nerve roots and the lumbar region is about 10-15cm, which makes it possible to achieve unilateral spinal anesthesia too (14). Kuusniemi and colleagues reported that hyperbaric bupivacaine is more effective in achieving unilateral spinal anesthesia than plain bupivacaine (15). However, determining the optimal time for lateral positioning is difficult when a high dose of hyperbaric bupivacaine (12-20 mg) is used. The anesthetic drug may migrate during a 30 - 60 min. Conversely, if a low dose (5-8 mg) of anesthetic solution is used, putting the patient in the lateral position for 10-15 min may prevent migration of the anesthetic drug (9,16).

In our study, we injected 7.5 mg of hyperbaric levobupivacaine slowly through pencil-point directional needles. The patient was kept in the lateral position for 15 min, which led to unilateral spinal anesthesia in 85% of cases. In three cases, the

anesthetic drug spread to the other side, resulting in bilateral spinal anesthesia with Bromage scale I/II on the nonoperative side. In a study performed by Esmaoglu, the unilaterality of the block was achieved in 85.7% of patients after 10 minutes in a lateral decubitus with small doses of hyperbaric solution (17).

In both groups, the quality of the sensory and motor block was adequate for the surgical procedure. The time to two segment regression of sensory blockade, recovery time of motor blockade, as well as the time of complete recovery was significantly shorter in unilateral spinal group as compared to the bilateral group. Unilateral spinal anesthesia is therefore suitable for outpatient surgery. This findings is also in agreement with the studies by Fanelli et al. (18) and Borghi et al. (19).

In our study, seven patients in the bilateral group had hypotension and only one patient in unilateral group ($p < 0.05$). Chohan and Afshan administered unilateral spinal anesthesia prior to lower-limb surgery in elderly patients with ASA classification of III or IV. They used hyperbaric bupivacaine (1,1 - 1,8ml). The authors found no significant hemodynamic changes (20). The cardiovascular stability following unilateral spinal anaesthesia is certainly one of the most important benefits, especially in high risk patients.

There was no significant difference in bradycardia, nausea and vomiting, as well as postdural puncture headache (PDPH). Headache after spinal anesthesia was reported in one patient in the bilateral group. We used a small gauge (G27) pencil point (Whitacre) spinal needle. The low incidence of RDPH may be related to the type of the needle used (21).

Conclusion

We observed that both bilateral and unilateral spinal anaesthesia provide adequate intraoperative conditions. Unilateral sensory and motor block, a faster recovery profile, and a stable hemodynamic state can be achieved with low doses of hyperbaric levobupivacaine (7,5ml) injected slowly through pencil-point directional needles in patients who are maintained in the lateral decubitus position for 15 minutes. This technique of unilateral spinal anesthesia achieves stable hemodynamics, particularly in elderly. It also results in rapid recovery compared to a bilateral conventional spinal anesthesia. Unilateral low dose spinal anesthesia is suitable for high-risk patients, as well as for ambulatory surgery.

References

1. Rodgers A, Walker N, Schug S, et al. Reduction of postoperative mortality and morbidity with epidural or spinal anaesthesia: Results from overview of randomised trials. *BMJ* 2000; 321:1493-99
2. Carpenter RL, Caplan RA, Brown DL, Stephenson C, Wu R. Incidence and risk factors for side effects of spinal anaesthesia. *Anesthesiology* 1992;76:906-16.
3. Singla D, Kathuria S, Singh A, Kaul TK, Gupta S. Risk Factors for Development of Early Hypotension during Spinal Anesthesia. *J Anaesth Clin Pharmacol* 2006 22:387-93.
4. Ward RJ, Bonica JJ, Freund PG, Akamatsu T, Danziger F, Englesson S. Epidural and Subarachnoid Anesthesia. Cardiovascular and Respiratory Effects. *JAMA*. 1965;191(4):275-78.
5. Casati A, Fanelli G, Beccaria P, Aldegheri G, Berti M, Senatore R, et al. Block Distribution and Cardiovascular Effects of Unilateral Spinal Anesthesia by 0.5% Hyperbaric Bupivacaine. A Clinical Comparison with Bilateral Spinal Block. *Minerva Anesthesiol*. 1998;64:307-12.
6. Casati A, Fanelli G, Aldegheri G, et al. Frequency of hypotension during conventional or asymmetric hyperbaric spinal block. *Reg Anesth Pain Med* 1999;24:214-9.
7. Casati A, Fanelli G. Unilateral spinal anesthesia: state of the art. *Minerva Anesthesiol*. 2001;67:855-62.
8. Critchley LA, Morley AP, Derrick J. The influence of baricity on the haemodynamic effects of intrathecal bupivacaine 0.5%. *Anaesthesia*. 1999;54:469-74.
9. Al Malyan M, Becchi C, Falsini S, et al. Role of patient posture during puncture on successful unilateral spinal anaesthesia in outpatient lower abdominal surgery. *Eur J Anaesthesiol*. 2006;23:491-5.
10. Casati A, Fanelli G. Restricting spinal block to the operative side: why not? *Reg Anesth Pain Med* 2004;29:4-6.
11. Picard J, Meek T. Complications of regional anaesthesia. *Anaesthesia*. 2010;65 Suppl 1: 105-15.
12. Cappelleri G, Aldegheri G, Danelli G, et al. Spinal anesthesia with hyperbaric levobupivacaine and ropivacaine for outpatient knee arthroscopy: a prospective, randomized, double-blind study. *Anesth Analg* 2005;101:77-82.
13. Korhonen A-M, Valanne JV, Jokela RM, et al. Intrathecal hyperbaric bupivacaine 3mg +fentanyl 10 mg for outpatient knee arthroscopy with tourniquet. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand* 2003;47:342-346.
14. Imbelloni LE, Beato L, Cordeiro JA. Unilateral Spinal Anesthesia with Low 0.5% Hyperbaric Bupivacaine Dose. *Anesthesiology*. 2004;5:4-11.
15. Kuusniemi KS, Pihlajamaki KK, Pitkanen MT. A low dose of plain or hyperbaric bupivacaine for unilateral spinal anesthesia. *Reg Anesth Pain Med* 2000;25:605-610.
16. Atef HM et al. Optimal dose of hyperbaric bupivacaine 0.5% for unilateral spinal anesthesia during diagnostic knee arthroscopy. *Local and Regional Anesthesia* 2010;3:85-91.
17. Esmoğlu A, Karaoğlu M, Mızrak A, et al. Bilateral vs unilateral spinal anesthesia for outpatient knee arthroscopies. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc*. 2004;12:155-17.
18. Fanelli G, Borghi B, Casati A, Bertini L, Montebugnoli M, Torri G. Unilateral bupivacaine spinal anesthesia for outpatient knee arthroscopy. Italian Study Group on Unilateral Spinal Anesthesia. *Can J Anaesth*. 2000;47:746-51.
19. Borghi B, Stagni F, Bugamelli S, et al. Unilateral spinal block for outpatient knee arthroscopy: A dose-finding study. *J Clin Anesth*. 2003;15:351-6.
20. Chohan U, Afshan G, Hoda MQ. Hemodynamic Effects of Unilateral Spinal Anesthesia in High Risk Patients. *J Pak Med Assoc*. 2002;52:66-9.
21. Santanen U, Rautoma P, Luurila H, et al. Comparison of 27-gauge (0.41-mm) Whitacre and Quincke spinal needles with respect to postdural puncture headache and nondural puncture headache. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand* 2004;48:474-9.

PREDNOSTI UNILATERALNE SPINALNE ANESTEZIJE U ODNOSU NA KONVENCIONALNU BILATERALNU SPINALNU ANESTEZIJU U ORTOPEDSKOJ HIRURGIJI DONJEG EKSTREMITETA

Sonja Stamenić¹, Predrag Stoiljković², Milan Mitković², Ivan Golubović³, Tomislav Stamenić⁴, Marija Stošić¹, Saša Milenković²

¹Klinika za anesteziju i intenzivnu terapiju, Klinički centar Niš, Srbija

²Univerzitet u Nišu, Medicinski fakultet, Niš, Srbija

³Klinika za ortopediju i traumatologiju, Klinički centar Niš, Niš, Srbija

⁴Klinika za urologiju, Klinički centar Niš, Niš, Srbija

Kontakt: Sonja Stamenić
Bulevar dr Zorana Đinđića 48, 18000 Niš, Srbija
E-mail: tstamenic@eunet.rs

Spinalna anestezija je često primenjivana tehnika u ortopedskoj hirurgiji donjeg ekstremiteta. Hipotenzija je najčešći sporedni efekat konvencionalne bilateralne spinalne anestezije. Poseban unilateralni blok utiče na senzornu, motornu i simpatičku funkciju samo jedne strane tela bez tipičnih neželjenih sporednih efekata viđenih sa bilateralnim blokom.

Cilj ove prospektivne, randomizovane studije je da uporedi unilateralnu anesteziju sa konvencionalnom bilateralnom spinalnom anestezijom u ortopedskoj hirurgiji donjeg ekstremiteta u odnosu na kvalitet senzorne i motorne blokade, analgezije, hemodinamske stabilnosti i sporednih efekata.

Četrdeset ASA I – II bolesnika planiranih za ortopedsku hirurgiju donjeg ekstremiteta, randomizacijom su podeljeni u dve grupe. Bolesnici BS grupe dobili su bilateralnu spinalnu anesteziju sa 3ml izobarnog 0,5% levobupivakaina (konvencionalna doza), a pacijenti US grupe dobili su unilateralnu spinalnu anesteziju malom dozom sa hiperbarnim spinalnim rastvorom (7,5mg 0,5% levobupivakaina i 40 mg 10% glukoze) tokom 120 sekundi i bolesnici su držani u lateralnom položaju 15 minuta.

U obe grupe, kvalitet senzornog i motornog bloka je bio adekvatan za hiruršku proceduru. Vreme regresije senzornog bloka za dva segmenta, vreme oporavka od motorne blokade, kao i vreme do potpunog oporavka bilo je značajno kraće u US grupi u poređenju sa BS grupom. Sedam bolesnika u bilateralnoj i jedan bolesnik u unilateralnoj grupi su razvili hipotenziju koja je zahtevala lečenje efedrinom (chi square test 7.02; $p < 0,05$).

Unilateralna spinalna anestezija malom dozom postiže stabilnu hemodinamiku. Takođe, rezultira brzim oporavkom u poređenju sa bilateralnom spinalnom anestezijom konvencionalnom dozom.

Acta Medica Medianae 2019;58(4):xx-xx.

Ključne reči: Spinalna anestezija, hemodinamika, unilateralna, levobupivakain, mala doza