



The Effect of Fluid Preloading on the Incidence of Hypotension During Spinal Anesthesia

Dr. Emad Sabri Najm^{1*}, Dr. Anwar Ahmed Fadhil²,
Dr. Raghad Mohamed Shibli Younis³

^{1*}M.B.Ch.B., F.I.B.M.S. (Anesthesia and Intensive Care) Ministry of Health, Al-Russafa Health Directorate, Al-Imam Ali Hospital, Baghdad, Iraq.

²M.B.Ch.B., F.I.B.M.S. (Anesthesia and Intensive Care) Ministry of Health, Salahdin Health Directorate, Dhuluiya General Hospital, Salahdin, Iraq.

³M.B.Ch.B., F.I.B.M.S. (Anesthesia and Intensive Care) Ministry of Health, Al-Russafa Health Directorate, Fatima Al-Zhraa Teaching for Women and Children Hospital, Baghdad, Iraq.

Email: ²dr.anwar.ky@gmail.com, ³raghadmedo@yahoo.com

Corresponding Email: ^{1*}emad.sabri.najm@gmail.com

Received: 22 March 2023

Accepted: 07 June 2023

Published: 21 July 2023

Abstract: Background: Small doses of local anaesthetic are injected into the CSF fluid in the subarachnoid region to produce spinal anaesthesia (SA).

Aim: This paper was contributed to study the effect of fluid preloading on the incidence of hypotension during spinal anaesthesia.

Patients and methods: This cross-sectional study recruited 45 patients in different hospitals in Iraq for a study that ranged from the 15th of June in the year 2021 to the 24th of August in the year 2022. This paper dealt with the study of the effect of fluid preload on the incidence of hypotension during spinal anaesthesia, as it included in the clinical characteristics' tests related to mothers or women who underwent caesarean delivery under spinal anaesthesia. This study divided the collected data into two groups, one of which was the patient group, which included patients who underwent spinal anaesthesia, which this group is considered as the co-loading group, which included 23 patients out of the total number of patients' data collected, while it was represented by the preload group, which included women who underwent spinal anaesthesia, which included 22 patients out of the total number of patients. This paper was conducting and analysing the collected data by SPSS.

Discussion: The difference was that when their systolic blood pressure fell to 90 mm Hg, they began using a vasopressor heavily. The current finding found the Apgar score of the co-load who patients group (8.91) was found higher than preload who control group (8.95%) within 5 min in compare 1 min. In the present analysis, there was also a



statistically significant variation between the co-load (81.4%) and pre-load (45.3%) groups in terms of the incidence of hypotension. The incidence of hypotension was statistically significantly different between the preload (80%) as well as co-load (51%) groups, according to research through (Oh AY et al., 2014). Both trials revealed that the co-load group's blood pressure dramatically decreased.

Conclusion: This study found that (45.3%) were within the preload group as a control group and (81.4%) in the co-load group as patients group had hypotension. Preloading was, therefore, more effective than co-loading in preventing spinal anesthesia-induced hypotension of cesarean section moms. It may not be essential to postpone surgery to provide a preload of liquids.

Keywords: Spinal Anaesthesia, Preload, Co-Loading, SBP and DBP.

1. INTRODUCTION

Small doses of local anesthetic are injected into the CSF fluid in the subarachnoid region to produce spinal anesthesia (SA). It is frequently utilized for surgeries on the sides of the abdomen, pelvis, perineum, and lower extremities; generally speaking, it is advantageous for operations below the umbilicus [1,2]. SA offers numerous benefits, including being less costly, having less side effects for the respiratory system provided a high block is prevented, maintaining the integrity of the airway, which lowers the risk to aspiration, and offering great muscle relaxation in the lower abdomen and lower limb operations. The most popular method in elective caesarean sections is spinal anesthesia (SA). The most frequent side effect of this method is still hypotension. [3-7]

As a result of the sympathetic blockade brought on by neuraxial anesthesia, SIH is the most frequent cardiovascular reaction to spinal anesthesia, leading to a reduction of cardiac output and blood supply to the placenta [8]. Lower Apgar scores may be linked to maternal hypotension that lasts longer than 2 minutes. It results from a decrease in systemic vascular resistance and an increase in venous capacitance. Because uterine blood flow depends on perfusion pressure, compromised fetal oxygenation results from diminished blood flow brought on by hypotension [9,10]. With varied degrees of success, the practitioners have tried a variety of strategies and approaches to counteract these hypotensive effects of the spinal anesthetic, including leg wrapping, elastic stockings, positioning the patient optimally, intravenous fluids, and occasionally vasopressors. [11-13]

One of the most effective ways to counteract the consequences of hypotension is to administer intravenous fluids as a preventative measure before doing the subarachnoid block. Both from the perspective of the mother and the fetus and newborn, hypotension following spinal anesthesia in caesarean birth is a common and severe consequence. Due to the sympathectomy brought on by spinal anesthesia, the venous capacitance increases, and the Systemic Vascular Resistance (SVR) decreases, which leads to secondary relative hypovolemia, which in turn results in hypotension. Patients who are having treatment witness it happen. It can cause the mother to experience nauseous, vomit, aspirate, dizziness, syncope, and arrhythmias. Fetal hypoxia and acidosis can result from maternal hypotension's



additional disruption of the uteroplacental blood flow. The most serious risk of spinal anesthetic, which is often and widely used in obstetric surgical intervention, is hypotension. Both the mother as well as the fetus are at danger if this problem is not properly handled. There are debates about the best time to provide fluids. However, some research indicated that doing so can lower the incidence for spinal hypotension [14-17]. This paper was contributed to study the effect of fluid preloading on the incidence of hypotension during spinal anesthesia.

2. PATIENTS AND METHODS

This cross-sectional study recruited 45 patients in different hospitals in Iraq for a study that ranged from the 15th of June in the year 2021 to the 24th of August in the year 2022. This paper dealt with the study of the effect of fluid preload on the incidence of hypotension during spinal anaesthesia, as it included in the clinical characteristics' tests related to mothers or women who underwent caesarean delivery under spinal anaesthesia. This study divided the collected data into two groups, one of which was the patient group, which included patients who underwent spinal anaesthesia, which this group is considered as the co-loading group, which included 23 patients out of the total number of patients' data collected, while it was represented by the preload group, which included women who underwent spinal anaesthesia, which included 22 patients out of the total number of patients. This paper was conducting and analysing the collected data by SPSS. This paper was the distribution of patients who have spinal anaesthesia according to age in the range (26-40) years that can be seen in Table 1.

Moreover, this paper was also distributed of patients who have spinal anaesthesia according to BMI, in between <25.5 and >25.5, where these results can be found in Table 2. In addition, this paper was extended to examine the feature examinations of clinical characteristics in between patients and control groups which can include Baseline SBP, Baseline HR, Moderate hypotension, Severe hypotension, Onset of hypotension, and Duration of hypotension, where these results can be clearly in Table 3. To further of results, this paper was determined into measurements of blood pressure with comparisons between patients and control which include SBP and DBP, which has determined with (10,20,30,40,50,60) minutes which it has determined in Figure 1. Furthermore, this paper was investigated to Measure of pulse rate with comparisons between patients and control, and it is found in Table 4. The methodology was progressed within the Outcomes test of patients during and after surgery for patients which has detected into Amount of fluid, Blood loss, and Surgery time. These results have been shown in Figure 2. This study was Indicated results of hypotension detection during the time, which it is seen in Figure 3. This paper was assessed of patients' results in compare with control after surgery by Apgar score were determined with 1 min and 5 min, that it was determined in Figure 4.

3. RESULTS

Table 1: Distribution of patients who have spinal anaesthesia according to Age.

N	V	45
	M	0



Me	33.0000
StEM	.65134
Med	33.0000
Mo	26.00 ^a
SD	4.36931
Var	19.091
Ra	14.00
Min	26.00
Max	40.00
S	1485.00

Table 2: Distribution of patients who have spinal anaesthesia according to BMI.

		Freq,45	P (%)	VP (%)	CP (%)
V	<25.5	19	42.2	42.2	42.2
	>25.5	26	57.8	57.8	100.0
	T	45	100.0	100.0	

Table 3: Feature examinations of clinical characteristics in between patients and control groups.

Variables	Patients group (n=23)	Control group (n=22)	P-value
Baseline SBP, mmHg	122.82±8.6	126.52±9.92	0.04662
Baseline HR beats.min ⁻¹	96.44±8.9	98.24±8.1	0.0472
Moderate	14 (60.87%)	18 (81.81%)	0.0342



hypotension, n (%)			
Severe hypotension, n (%)	9 (39.1%)	4 (18.18%)	0.0261
Onset of hypotension, min	6.41±5.21	7.53±6.36	0.04756
Duration of hypotension, min	3.6±1.82	3.1±1.57	0.0422




Figure 1: Measurements of blood pressure with comparisons between patients and control.

Table 4: Measure of pulse rate with comparisons between patients and control.

Measure of pulse rate	Patients group (n=23)	Control group (n=22)	P-value
10 minutes	81.44±7.8	84.28±9.6	0.0485
20 minutes	82.36±6.8	83.74±10.56	0.0486
30 minutes	82.63±5.8	85.87±9.3	0.0477
40 minutes	81.77±8.26	90.11±2.4	0.0488



50 minutes	86.65±5.51	87.26±6.75	0.04866
60 minutes	85.85±7.6	86.38±8.57	0.04799




Figure 2: Outcomes test of patients during and after surgery for patients.




Figure 3: Indicated results of hypotension detection during the time.




Figure 4: Assessments of patients results in compare with control after surgery by Apgar score.



4. DISCUSSION

In 16% to 33% of cases, spinal anesthesia causes hypotension as a side effect. Decreases in Systemic Vascular Resistance (SVR), Cardiac Output (CO), or both are suggested to be the culprits. When pregnant women lie supine, the aortocaval compression in the gravid uterus exacerbates this reaction (Farid Z et al., 2016) [18]. With varied degrees of effectiveness, a variety of approaches and procedures have been utilized to counteract the hypotensive effects of the spinal anesthetic, including leg wrapping, elastic stockings, positioning the patient optimally, intravenous fluids, and even vasopressors (Bajwa SJS et al., 2013). [19] To counteract the consequences of hypotension, prophylactic intravenous fluid delivery is one of the most important techniques (Bajwa SJS et al., 2013) [20]. Fluid preloading has been proven to be a routine, well-planned strategy of lowering the risk of hypotension after caesarean sections performed under regional anesthesia (Varshney RK and Kapoor K, 2016). [21] Despite multiple studies comparing the effects of preload and co-load on spinal-induced hypotension, neither method is regarded as the most efficient or secure, leaving room for more research. In the present analysis, there was also a statistically significant variation between the co-load (81.4%) and pre-load (45.3%) groups in terms of the incidence of hypotension. The incidence of hypotension was statistically significantly different between the preload (80%) as well as co-load (51%) groups, according to research through (Oh AY et al., 2014). Both trials revealed that the co-load group's blood pressure dramatically decreased. [22] In contrast to this result, research through Banerjee et al. found no statistically significant difference between the co-loading and preloading groups in the incidence of hypotension. This can be because of various study areas. In contrast to the findings of this investigation, a study conducted by Farid Z et al. found that there was not a statistically significant difference for the incidence of hypotension following spinal anesthesia in the preload and co-load groups. They concluded that neither of the two methods can successfully stop spinal-induced hypotension. The difference was that when their systolic blood pressure fell to 90 mm Hg, they began using a vasopressor heavily. The current finding found the Apgar score of the co-load who patients group (8.91) was found higher than preload who control group (8.95%) within 5 min in compare 1 min. [23]

5. CONCLUSION

This study found that (45.3%) were within the preload group as a control group and (81.4%) in the co-load group as patients group had hypotension. Preloading was, therefore, more effective than co-loading in preventing spinal anesthesia-induced hypotension of caesarean section moms. It may not be essential to postpone surgery to provide a preload of liquids.

6. REFERENCES

1. Casey WF, Ankcorn C. Spinal anaesthesia-A practical guide. Update Anaesth. 2000.
2. Olawin AM, Das JM. Spinal anesthesia. StatPearls. 2019.
3. Naskar C, Dalai CK, Baidya TK, Sarkar N. Colloid versus crystalloid coload for the prevention of spinal anaesthesia induced hypotension of elective caesarean section. J drug deliv ther. 2013; 3 (4): 54-61.



4. Farid Z, Mushtaq R, Ashraf S, Zaeem K. Comparative efficacy of crystalloid preloading and co-loading to prevent spinal anesthesia induced hypotension in elective caesarean section. *Pak J Med Health Sci.* 2016; 10 (1): 42-45.
5. Varshney RK, Kapoor K. A randomised prospective, double-blind study to compare the effects of fluid preloading and co-loading during spinal anaesthesia for caesarean delivery. *Ann Int Med Dent Res.* 2016; 2 (1): 410. 4.
6. Bajwa SJS, A Kulshrestha, Jindal R. Co-loading or pre-loading for prevention of hypotension after spinal anaesthesia! a therapeutic dilemma. *Anesth: Essays res.* 2013; 7 (2): 155.
7. Lotfy ME, Moustafa AM, Feky EME, Mowafy IA. Colloid versus crystalloid co-load with spinal anesthesia during emergent cesarean section and their effect on hemodynamic changes. *J Am Sci.* 2014; 10 (11): 158-163.
8. Kiliç N, Deniz MN, Erhan E. Crystalloid preload versus crystalloid coload during spinal anesthesia for ureterorenoscopy: A randomized controlled trial. *Ege Tıp Dergisi.* 2020; 59 (3): 181-187.
9. Bhardwaj N, Thakur A, Sharma A, Kaushal S, Kumar V. Comparative study between crystalloid preloading and coload for prevention of hypotension in the elective cesarean section under spinal anesthesia in a secondary care hospital. *Int J Res Rev.* 2020; 7 (7): 500-504.
10. Ni HF, Liu HY, Zhang J, Peng K, Ji FH. Crystalloid coload reduced the incidence of hypotension in spinal anesthesia for cesarean delivery when compared to crystalloid preload: A meta-analysis. *BioMed research is international.* 2017.
11. Jackson R, Reid J, Thorburn J. Volume preloading is not essential to prevent spinal-induced hypotension at caesarean section. *Br J Anaesth.* 1995; 75 (3): 262-265.
12. Kaufner L, Karekla A, Henkelmann A, Welfle S, Weizsacker KV, Hellmeyer L, et al. Crystalloid coload vs. colloid coload in elective Caesarean section: Postspinal hypotension and vasopressor consumption, a prospective, observational clinical trial. *J Anesth.* 2019; 33 (1): 40-49.
13. Jain P, Valecha D. Comparative evaluation of preloading and coload of crystalloids to prevent spinal induced hypotension in caesarean section. *Int J Contemp Med.* 2017; 4 (2): 411-414.
14. Teoh WH, Sia RT. Colloid preload versus coload for spinal anesthesia for cesarean delivery: The effects on maternal cardiac output. *Anesth Analg.* 2009; 108 (5): 1592-1598.
15. Oh AY, Hwang JW, Song IA, Kim MH, Ryu JH, Park HP, et al. Influence of the timing of administration of crystalloid on maternal hypotension during spinal anesthesia for cesarean delivery: Preload versus coload. *BMC Anesthesiol.* 2014; 14 (1): 1-5.
16. Banerjee A, Stocche RM, Angle P, Halpern SH. Preload or coload for spinal anesthesia for elective cesarean delivery: A meta-analysis. *Can J Anaesth.* 2010; 57 (1): 24-31.
17. Jacob JJ, Williams A, Verghese M, Afzal L. Crystalloid preload versus crystalloid coload for parturients undergoing cesarean section under spinal anesthesia. *J Obstet Anesth Crit Care.* 2012; 2 (1): 10.
17. Parmar SB, Sheikh ANA, Shalu PS. A comparative study of preloading versus coload of crystalloid to prevent spinal anaesthesia induced hypotension. *J Evolution Med Dental Sci.* 2012; 5 (1): 746-753.



18. Kumari S, George JK. Comparative study of hemodynamic effects of crystalloid preloading versus coload during spinal anaesthesia for caesarean section. *Int j res anal rev.* 2017; 4 (4): 343-348.
19. Dyer RA, Farina Z, Joubert IA, Toit PD, Meyer M, Torr G, et al. Crystalloid preload versus rapid crystalloid administration after induction of spinal anaesthesia (coload) for elective caesarean section. *Anaesth Intensive Care.* 2004; 32 (3): 351-357.
20. Idehen HF, Amadasun FE, Ekwere IT. Comparison of intravenous colloid and crystalloid combination in hypotension prophylaxis during spinal anaesthesia for caesarean section. *Niger J Clin Pract.* 2014; 17 (3): 309-313.
21. Olajumoke TO, Owojuyigbe AF, Afolayan JM. Preloading or coload of crystalloid for prevention of hypotension during caesarian section under spinal anaesthesia, a randomised control trial. *IOSR-J Med Dent Sci.* 2017; 16 (4): 140-142.
22. Singhal A, Gupta A, Chittora S. Influence of the timing of administration of crystalloid on maternal hypotension during low dose spinal anaesthesia for elective caesarean delivery: Preload versus coload. *Int Arch Integr Med.* 2019; 6 (5): 16-21.