ABSTRACT

Objectives: The objectives of our study are to study the effectiveness of fascia iliaca block for positioning during spinal anesthesia and to compare the duration of post-operative analgesia using bupivacaine alone and bupivacaine with dexamethasone as an adjuvant.

Methods: This was a prospective randomized study done at a general hospital. Fifty patients aged 18 years and above of ASA Grades II and III undergoing hip fracture surgeries (proximal femur nailing, DHS, and hemiarthroplasty) were included in the study to receive the fascia iliaca compartment block (FICB). Group A (25 patients) received 38 mL of 0.25% bupivacaine with 2 mL normal saline and Group B (25 patients) received 38 mL of 0.25% bupivacaine with 2ml dexamethasone (8 mg). Relief of pain for positioning during spinal anesthesia was assessed by recording the visual analog score, 30 min after the FICB. In both groups, the post-operative analgesia was recorded from the time of giving spinal anesthesia to the time for first rescue analgesia which was given when VAS was 4 or more.

Results: There was a significant prolongation in the post-operative analgesia in Group B patients who received FICB with bupivacaine and dexamethasone in comparison to Group A in which bupivacaine alone was used. However, the VAS score after 30 min of FICB, for positioning for spinal anesthesia and the patient satisfaction score was similar in both groups.

Conclusion: FICB is effective for providing adequate positioning for spinal anesthesia and the addition of dexamethasone (8 mg) to bupivacaine for FICB significantly prolonged the duration of the block and increased the time to first rescue analgesia as compared to using bupivacaine alone.
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The patients were given the fascia iliaca block 30 min before giving spinal anesthesia using the landmark guided technique as described by Dalens et al. A line is drawn from the anterior superior iliac spine to the pubic tubercle. The junction of lateral and medial third of the line is marked as the point of entry, for the block. Under aseptic precautions and after local infiltration of the skin, a blunt hypodermic needle is advanced perpendicularly to the line. The first give-in sensation is that of fascia lata after which the needle is advanced further and the second give-in sensation is that of fascia iliaca. The drug is administered in aliquots of 5 ml, after negative aspiration. No resistance should be felt on injection. If the needle tip is likely to be in the iliacus muscle, then withdraw it until no resistance is felt.

Assessment of pain was done using the visual analog score immediately before the block, every 5 min after giving the block, and simultaneously, vital signs were monitored. The patient was observed for any adverse effects such as pain at the site of injection, hypotension, and arrhythmias.

Thirty minutes after the block, the patient’s comfort in a sitting position during spinal anesthesia was noted using the visual analog score. At the same time, the angle made by the patient’s spine with the table during positioning for spinal anesthesia was noted.

The duration of post-operative pain relief was done by a study team member using a VAS score. Those patients having a VAS score of 4 or more were given Inj. tramadol as rescue analgesia.

**Table 1 : Distribution of patients based on ASA grading**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASA Grade</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: VAS score (30 min after FICB)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visual analog score</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3: The patient satisfaction score in both the groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction score</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-fair</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-good</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-very good</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**METHODS**

The present study is the prospective observational study done in the department of the anesthesia, medical college and hospital. A total of 50 patients who underwent the surgeries of hip fractures were included in the study. All the patients were administered with spinal anesthesia and were given FICB block. The study period was 4 months. The ethical committees of the institute were informed about the study and the ethical clearance certificate was obtained before the start of the study and written informed consent was taken from all the participants.

The inclusion and exclusion criteria included in the study were as follows:

**Inclusion criteria**

- a. Patients above the age of 18 years
- b. Patients following under the category of ASA Grades I, II, and III
- c. Patients posted for elective surgeries of hip fractures such as proximal femur nailing dynamic hip screw and hemiarthroplasty under spinal anesthesia.

**Exclusion criteria**

- a. Patients who give negative consent
- b. Infection at the local site
- c. History of allergy to local anesthetic
- d. Very obese patients
- e. Patients with a previous history of femoral bypass surgery
- f. Patients having coagulopathy, peripheral neuropathy, and neurological conditions.

The patients included in the study were divided into two groups:

- Group A-patients were administered with injection bupivacaine 0.25% 38 mL + 2 mL saline
- Group B-patients were administered with injection bupivacaine 0.25% 38 mL + Inj. dexamethasone

The detailed history of all the included patients was recorded. The examination of the airway with the general and systemic examination of all the patients was done. All patients were explained about the visual analog score. All patients were monitored with ECG, pulse oximetry and non-invasive blood pressure monitoring throughout the procedure and surgery.

The patients were given the fascia iliaca block 30 min before giving spinal anesthesia using the landmark guided technique as described by Dalens et al. A line is drawn from the anterior superior iliac spine to the pubic tubercle. The junction of lateral and medial third of the line is marked as the point of entry, for the block. Under aseptic precautions and after local infiltration of the skin, a blunt hypodermic needle is advanced perpendicularly to the line. The first give-in sensation is that of fascia lata after which the needle is advanced further and the second give-in sensation is that of fascia iliaca. The drug is administered in aliquots of 5 ml, after negative aspiration. No resistance should be felt on injection. If the needle tip is likely to be in the iliacus muscle, then withdraw it until no resistance is felt.

Assessment of pain was done using the visual analog score immediately before the block, every 5 min after giving the block, and simultaneously, vital signs were monitored. The patient was observed for any adverse effects such as pain at the site of injection, hypotension, and arrhythmias.

Thirty minutes after the block, the patient’s comfort in a sitting position during spinal anesthesia was noted using the visual analog score. At the same time, the angle made by the patient’s spine with the table during positioning for spinal anesthesia was noted.

The duration of post-operative pain relief was done by a study team member using a VAS score. Those patients having a VAS score of 4 or more were given Inj. tramadol as rescue analgesia.

**Statistical analysis**

For a normally distributed data, the student “t” test was used to compare the mean difference of variables between the two groups. Significant differences for categorical data such as gender distribution and ASA grading were done by Chi-square method. p<0.05 was accepted as the level of significance and p<0.001 was taken as highly significant.

**RESULTS**

A total of 50 patients were included in the study. There was no statistically significant difference in the distribution of demographic characteristics such as age, gender distribution, and ASA grading in both the groups (p>0.05) (Table 1).

The visual analog score for analysis of pain done 30 minutes after FICB was comparable between the two groups and did not show any statistically significant difference. It was observed to be at the same time the angle made by the patient’s spine with the table was observed to be 90° in all patients (Table 2).

The duration of post-operative analgesia, as inferred by the time to first rescue analgesia in Group A was 6.6+1.25 h and in Group B was 12.4+3.13 h. As the value of p is 0.001, the duration of post-operative analgesia is significantly greater in Group B than in Group A. The patient satisfaction score in both the groups was comparable and did not show any significant statistical difference between the two groups (Table 3).

**DISCUSSION**

The fascia iliaca compartment block provides safe and effective analgesia that mitigates the pain in sitting position in patients with hip fractures. The block is easy to perform using the landmark-guided technique. As the drug is administered in a compartment, the site of nerve which reduces the chances of hematoma formation, systemic adverse events such as hypotension, arrhythmias, and local adverse effects such as neuropraxia associated with peripheral blocks [17,18].

The aim of our study was to test the efficacy of the block in providing a comfortable sitting position for spinal anesthesia and compare the visual analog score 30 minutes after the block in both groups. It was observed that the mean VAS score was reduced from 7.27 to 1.28+0.82, 30 min after the block was given in Group A and from 7.35 to 1.20+0.69 in Group B. In 2009, Garlich et al. found that FICB decreased mean VAS
score from 7.4 to 2 [19]. Similarly, a study by Kumar et al., in 2019, showed a decrease in mean VAS from 7.16 to 1.67 after FICB. Both of the studies are comparable to our results which show a statistically significant reduction in VAS (p<0.001) in both groups. However, the VAS scores done 30 min after FICB were comparable in both groups and did not show any statistically significant difference [5].

We also compared the FICB using Inj bupivacaine alone and injection bupivacaine with injection dexamethasone 8 mg as adjuvant and observed that there was prolongation of post-operative analgesia in the latter group. In 2016, Rosenfeld et al. [20] studied perineural versus intravenous dexamethasone as an adjuvant to local anesthetic in brachial plexus block for shoulder surgery. In 2014, Kawanishi et al. observed that perineural, not intravenous dexamethasone prolongs the duration of interscalene block with ropivacaine [21].

In our study, the mean time to first rescue analgesia in Group A was 6.6+1.35 h and Group B was 12.4+3.13 h. The difference in the duration of post-operative analgesia is statistically significant (p<0.001). The result is comparable to the study done by Weinstein et al., in 2014, [6] which demonstrated that adding dexamethasone to bupivacaine plain would significantly prolong post-operative analgesia in FICB done before spinal anesthesia.

Finally, no adverse effects such as local hematoma, neurotoxicity, and arrhythmias were observed in either group.

CONCLUSION

The observation from our study is that the fascia iliaca block given before spinal anesthesia allows for comfortable positioning during the subarachnoid block. Addition of dexamethasone to plain bupivacaine significantly prolongs the duration of post-operative analgesia.
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