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Abstract
The objective of the present study was to compare the analgesic efficacy and side effects of butorphanol and tramadol. Equianalgesic doses of butorphanol (1mg) and tramadol (1mg/Kg) were compared in 50 adult patients (ASA-I) undergoing any kind of surgery requiring general anesthesia. The patients were divided into two groups of 25 each (n = 25). One of the study drugs (butorphanol/tramadol) was given intravenously just prior to induction of anesthesia in a double blind fashion. Following induction with standard doses of propofol/thiopentone Na and succinyl choline and intubation, anaesthesia was maintained with N2O/O2/Halothane. Heart rate and blood pressure were recorded from preoperative to post operative period in the recovery room and the frequency of side effects was noted by the trained nursing staff on duty following direct questioning of the patients. The proportion of patients with moderate to severe pain during postoperative period was significantly higher in tramadol group as compared to butorphanol group (p< 0.05). Time to first rescue analgesic was significantly prolonged in butorphanol group compared to tramadol group. The incidence of side effects was comparable in both the groups. To conclude according to our study, butorphanol is a very effective analgesic and contributes to balanced anaesthesia.
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Introduction
Opioids are powerful centrally acting analgesic agents, used widely as a part of balanced anaesthesia. They act to smoothen the intraoperative course and decrease the requirement of other anaesthetic agents as well as to minimize post operative pain with minimum side effects (1). Butorphanol is mixed agonist-antagonist (1-5) opioid where as tramadol is an agonist at mu opioid receptors. The purpose of this study was to compare the analgesic efficacy and side effects of equipotent moderate doses of tramadol & butorphanol.

Material and Methods
After approval from departmental ethics committee and written informed consent from the patient, a randomized study was conducted on 50 adult patients (ASA I), planned for elective surgery under general anaesthesia. The patients were divided into two groups of 25 each. All patients were premedicated with standard doses of tablet diazepam and Injection glycopyrrolate. Two minutes before induction of anaesthesia equianalgesic doses of butorphanol (1 mg) or tramadol (1mg/Kg) were given to the patients intravenously in a double blind fashion. Induction of anaesthesia was done with either STP (5 mg/Kg) or propofol (2 mg/Kg) I/V followed by succinylcholine (2 mg/Kg) followed by tracheal intubation. Anaesthesia was maintained with 60% nitrous oxide in oxygen & halothane (titrated doses) and muscle relaxant neuromuscular blockade was reversed with neostigmine (0.04 mg/Kg) & atropine (0.02 mg/Kg) I/V.
Ventilation was mechanically controlled throughout the procedure. Arterial blood pressure (non-invasive), heart rate (non-invasive) & O₂ saturation via pulse oximetry were measured before during & after anaesthesia at an interval of 5-10 minutes until stable in the recovery room. The frequency of side effects e.g. nausea, vomiting, sedation, respiratory depression, recall of events during surgery were noted by the trained nursing staff in the recovery room. Nausea & vomiting were graded according to a four point scale 3 as 0-3. 0 is no N/V, 1 - nausea only, 2 - vomiting once in last hour & 3-vomiting more than once in last hour. Sedation score 2,6 was graded from 0-4. Grade 0 is no drowsiness, grade 1 is response to speech, grade 2 is response to touch, grade 3 is response to painful stimulus and grade 4 is unresponsiveness. Pain was also graded from 0-3 where grade 0 is comfortable, grade 1 is slight pain, grade 2 is moderate pain and grade 3 is equal to severe pain. Respiratory depression was noted from the pulse oximetry. Rescue analgesia was provided with standard doses of diclofenac intramuscularly to those with grade 2 or 3 pain. The data was analysed using Anova “t” test. p value < 0.05 was taken significant.

**Results**

The two groups were comparable with respect to age, weight and sex of the patients (Table-I). There was no pressor response seen after intubation in patients who received butorphanol where as pressor response was not attenuated in tramadol group (Table-II). The time to first rescue analgesic was significantly higher in butorphanol group than tramadol group. There were more number of patients who complained of moderate to severe pain in tramadol group than butorphanol group (Table-III). Post operative side effects were elicited by direct questioning of the patients (Table-IV). Incidence of nausea and vomiting was higher in butorphanol group than in tramadol group but it was statistically insignificant. Sedation (Group 3 & 4) was seen more in butorphanol group than tramadol group (about 10 patients of butorphanol group and 4 patients of tramadol group). There is a histogram summarizing various observations.

**Discussion**

The basic difference between the two drugs is their characteristics to bind different opioid receptors of activate the same opioid receptor in a different way. Butorphanol is a mixed agonist antagonist (1,6). Butorphanol is a kappa receptor agonist as well as weak mu-receptor antagonist (1). Because of its antagonist action on mu receptors which are involved in supraspinal analgesia; it results in a low incidence of respiratory depression. Butorphanol has a ceiling effect on respiratory depression, again mediated by mu receptors. It is also a Kappa receptor agonist where as tramadol has a weak affinity on mu receptors as an agonist. It also enhances spinal pain inhibiting pathways by inhibiting neuronal uptake of serotonin. In this study, we used equipotent moderate doses of each drug used routinely by most of anesthesiologists. Patients in butorphanol group demonstrated better protection against autonomic stimulation to tracheal intubation as
these patients were haemodynamically more stable through out the operation. This is consistent with previous reports by Pandit et al (6) & Philip et al (7). Butorphanol leads to more sedation due to its action on kappa receptors (1), where as incidence of sedation is less in tramadol group. This property of sedation & efficient analgesia provided by butorphanol has been used in some minor out patient surgical procedure like oral surgery (8,9).

The rescue analgesia required in butorphanol group was far less than tramadol group because of longer duration of action. The enhancing action of tramadol on serotonin often contribute to occurrence of emesis (10). The incidence of nausea and vomiting was not as high with butorphanol as reported by Pandit et al (6). Butorphanol does not increase the incidence of postoperative nausea and vomiting (9). Respiratory depression was not seen in any of the patients in both the groups. Neither patient in butorphanol group had any recall of procedure (11). Our study suggests that butorphanol is a better choice than tramadol for use in balanced anaesthesia technique because of it ability to produce prolonged analgesia and amnesia, stable haemodynamic parameters and no post operative respiratory depression. Also butorphanol is effective for relieving postanesthesia shivering without producing any significant respiratory depression, nausea, vomiting or recurrence of shivering (12-14). Moreover, butorphanol as the advantage of being non-narcotic and having a low propensity for addiction (5,15,16). Becuse o its potent analgesic effects, alternative routes of butorphanol have come up like caudal epidural (17), nasal (18) and also in labour analgesia (19).

**Conclusion**

Butorphanol is very effective and contributes to balanced anaesthesia.

**References**

6. Pandit SK, Kothary SP. Comparison of fentanyl and butorphanol for outpatient.*Anaesthesia* 1987; 34:130 -34
13. Alfonsi P. Postanesthetic shivering : epidemiology, pathophysiology and approaches to prevention and management. *Drugs* 2001; 61(15) ; 2193-205