Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International

26(5): 1-9, 2019; Article no.JPRI.42178
ISSN: 2456-9119
(Past name: British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research, Past ISSN: 2231-2919, NLM ID: 101631759)

Comparison of the Effect of Intraoperative 1 mg/kg/h and 2 mg/kg/h IV Lidocaine Infusion on Postoperative Pain and Nausea-Vomiting in Laparoscopic Gastric Bypass Surgery

Mahzad Alimian[1], Reza Safaeian[1], Behrooz Zaman[1], Saeedreza Entezari[1] and Amir Ehsan Abedian[1*]

[1]Department of Anesthesia, School of Medicine, Iran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/JPRI/2019/v26i530150
Editor(s):
(1) Dr. Vasudevan Mani, Associate Professor, Brain Research Laboratory, Level 11, Block FF1, Faculty of Pharmacy, Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM), Campus Puncak Alam, Bandar Puncak Alam, Kuala Selangor, Selangor, Malaysia.
Reviewers:
(1) Joseph Eldor, Theoretical Medicine Institute, Israel.
(2) Joe Liu, USA.
Complete Peer review History: http://www.sdiarticle3.com/review-history/42178

Original Research Article

Received 15 June 2018
Accepted 08 September 2018
Published 09 April 2019

ABSTRACT

Objective: To relieve postoperative pain and nausea and vomiting, various drugs and methods, including intraoperative IV lidocaine infusion in different surgeries. However, the exact dose has not yet been determined. The purpose of this study was to evaluate and compare the effect of intraoperative 1 mg/kg/h and 2 mg/kg/h IV lidocaine infusion on postoperative pain and nausea-vomiting in laparoscopic gastric bypass surgery.
Methods: This clinical trial study was performed on patients undergoing laparoscopic gastric bypass surgery in Rasoul-e-Akram Hospital, Iran. Patients were randomly assigned into two groups (1 mg/kg/h lidocaine) and (2 mg/kg/h lidocaine). Postoperative pain and nausea and vomiting were evaluated at times 0, 30 min, 1 h, 6 h, 12 h and 24 h after surgery. Data was analysed using statistical tests and SPSS 22.
Results: There was no significant difference in the effect of intraoperative 1 mg/kg/h and 2 mg/kg/h

**Corresponding author: E-mail: amirehsan.abedian@iran.ir;*

IV lidocaine infusion on static and dynamic pain and nausea-vomiting, agitation, systolic BP, diastolic BP, pulse rate and postoperative administration of pethidine in laparoscopic gastric bypass (P>0.05).

Conclusion: Based on results of this study, administration of low dose lidocaine (1 mg/kg/h) can be considered as an appropriate dose of IV lidocaine infusion in order to control postoperative pain and nausea and vomiting in laparoscopic gastric bypass surgery.

Keywords: Lidocaine; pain; nausea-vomiting; gastric bypass.

1. INTRODUCTION

In post-operative time, it is important to control and reduce postoperative pain and nausea-vomiting [1]. Different drugs and methods are used to relieve postoperative pain and nausea and vomiting in different surgeries [2]. One of these methods, which has been studied on numerous occasions, is intraoperative intravenous (IV) lidocaine infusion undergone in a wide range of surgical procedures such as laparotomy, laparoscopy, gynecological surgery, orthopaedics, etc., and has a positive effect in most cases in reducing postoperative pain and nausea-vomiting [3]. Considering the pharmacological effects of IV lidocaine, which has both anti-inflammatory and analgesic effects (protein receptor inhibitor G and NMDA), lidocaine has been used to relieve postoperative pain [4]. According to numerous studies on various surgical procedures, intraoperative IV lidocaine infusion has been shown to reduce postoperative pain and nausea and vomiting [5-14]. Although the exact dosage is still unknown, the conducted studies have used 1-2 mg/kg/h dosages. In a double-blind clinical trial on 41 patients undergoing microdiscectomy in two groups receiving 1.5 mg/kg/h lidocaine infusion and normal saline infusion as placebo, Kim et al. concluded that fentanyl administration and postoperative pain intensity were significantly lower in the lidocaine group except 48 hours after surgery. Total fentanyl administration, hospital stay and satisfaction were significantly lower in lidocaine group than placebo group. Finally, intraoperative systemic infusion of lidocaine reduces pain level during microdiscectomy surgery [6]. According to the studies, this study tends to evaluate and compare the effect of intraoperative 1 mg/kg/h and 2 mg/kg/h IV lidocaine infusion on postoperative pain and nausea-vomiting in laparoscopic gastric bypass to determine a more suitable and effective dosage.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study was a randomised clinical trial. The studied population included elective patients who were candidate for laparoscopic gastric bypass referred to Rasoul-e-Akram Hospital since June 2014 to March 2015. The sampling method was convenient sampling. The sample size was determined using Cohen table with 80% statistical power, 0.05 alpha and 0.9 accuracy (21 subjects in each group). This study was a randomised clinical trial. Block randomisation was done in quadrilateral blocks. This study was performed on 42 elective patients who were candidate for laparoscopic gastric bypass referred to Rasoul-e-Akram Hospital since June 2014 to March 2015. After obtaining consent and qualifying patients for inclusion and exclusion, 41 patients were assigned into 2 groups of 21 patients (A and B) in 4 blocks. After entering the operating room, standardised monitoring (ECG-POM-NIBP-Etco2) and insertion of two 20G IV catheters and 3 cc/kg normal saline 0.9% Serum infusion were performed for all patients. Then, 3 mcg/kg fentanyl based on TBW and 20 mcg/kg midazolam based on TBW were administered as premedication for all patients. For induction, all patients received 5 mg/kg thiopental sodium based on TBW followed by 0.2 mg/kg atracurium based on IBW and 1.5 mcg/kg bolus lidocaine based on IBW for general anaesthesia. After intubation of the patients, all of them received 1.2 mac isoflurane followed by 0.03 mg/kg atracurium every 30 minutes and 50 mcg fentanyl every 40 minutes as maintenance. From the beginning of surgery, group A received 1 mg/kg/h IV lidocaine infusion and group B received 2 mg/kg/h IV lidocaine infusion by the pump until the end of surgery for a maximum of 4 hours. After the end of surgery and discontinuation of all drugs, patients were placed in reserve by 0.04 mg/kg neostigmine and 0.02 mg/kg atropine and extubation was done;. The time to enter recovery was set at t=0; for 24 h, patients were monitored for pain based on numerical rating score (0-10), static and dynamic

nausea-vomiting, blood pressure (BP), heart rate and agitation in predicted times in the recovery or surgery wards.

Finally, data was analysed by SPSS software version 22. In the analytical step, Kolmogorov-Sminov test was used for determining normality of quantitative values. Then, independent T-test or Mann-Whitney U-test were used for comparing the quantitative variables of two groups A and B. Chi-square test (Z) was used to compare the qualitative variables. Repeated measure ANOVA or Friedman test was used to check and compare the changes.

3. RESULTS

In this study, 42 patients who were referred to surgery ward of the Rasoul-e-Akram Hospital in 2016 and underwent laparoscopic elective gastric bypass were enrolled in the study. In group A, 21 patients (50%) received intraoperative 1 mg/kg/h IV lidocaine infusion; in group B, 21 patients (50%) received intraoperative 2 mg/kg/h IV lidocaine infusion.

The patients aged 18-49 years (36.15±6.88); 18 patients (42.9%) were male and 24 patients (57.1%) were female. BMI was 38-46 Kg/m^2 (42.23±2.22 Kg/m^2). Ten patients (23.8%) were in Class ASA 1, 25 patients (59.5%) were in Class ASA 2 and 7 patients (16.7%) were in Class ASA 3.

According to the patients, 16 people (38.1%) had a history of hypertension. None of the patients had a history of heart disease. Four patients (9.5%) had a history of diabetes, 9 patients (21.4%) had a history of fatty liver disease, and 8 (19%) had a history of other diseases.

In terms of the history of previous drugs, 5 patients (11.9%) took cigarette, 4 patients (9.5%) took loratadine, 3 (7.1%) took metoral, 4 (9.5%) took metformin, 2 (4.8%) took levothyroxine, 1 (2.4%) took loratadine and levothyroxine, 4 (9.5%) took loratadine and metformin, 1 (2.4%) took atenolol and levothyroxine, 2 (4.8%) took metformin and glibenclamide, 2 (4.8%) took metformin and metoral, and 1 (2.4%) took loratadine and metformin and hydroxin. Descriptive characteristics and comparison of age and gender of patients undergoing elective laparoscopic gastric bypass in two groups A and B are summarised in Table 1.

According to Table 1, there is no significant difference in age and gender of patients undergoing elective laparoscopic gastric bypass between two groups A and B (P>0.05).

3.1 Determining and Comparing Pain in Two Groups A and B Based on Numerical Rating Score at Times 0, 30 min, 1 h, 6 h, 12 h and 24 h after Laparoscopic Gastric Bypass

In order to compare the pain level in 2 groups A and B based on numerical rating score at times 0, 30 min, 1 h, 6 h, 12 h, and 24 h after laparoscopic gastric bypass, the Mann-Whitney U-test was used. Friedman test was used for comparison at times 0, 30 min, 1 h, 6 h, 12 h and 24 h after laparoscopic gastric bypass in each of the two groups A and B (separately). Descriptive features and comparison of pain levels are summarised in Table 2.

Based on the results of Table 2, there was no significant difference between pain levels of patients in 2 groups A and B based on numerical rating score at times 0, 30 min, 1 h, 6 h, 12 h, and 24 h after laparoscopic gastric bypass (P>0.05). There was a significant difference between pain levels of patients based on numerical rating score at times 0, 30 min, 1 h, 6 h, 12 h, and 24 h after laparoscopic gastric bypass in group A (P<0.001, X^2=94.18). There was a significant difference between pain levels of patients based on numerical rating score at times 0, 30 min, 1 h, 6 h, 12 h, and 24 h after laparoscopic gastric bypass in group B (P<0.001, X^2=88.29).

Table 1. Descriptive characteristics and comparison of age and gender of patients undergoing elective laparoscopic gastric bypass in two groups A and B

Characteristic	Group		P-value
	A	B	
Age (year) Mean ± SD	34.48±5.34	37.9±7.96	0.11
Gender			1
Male	9 (42.9%)	9 (42.9%)	
Female	12 (57.1%)	12 (57.1%)	

Table 2. Descriptive features and comparison of pain level in two groups A and B based on numerical rating score at times 0, 30 min, 1 h, 6 h, 12 h and 24 h after laparoscopic gastric bypass

Time	Group		Test statistic	p-value
	A (mean ± SD)	B (mean ± SD)		
0	1.67 ± 1.01	1.71 ± 0.78	0.014	0.989
30 min	2.67 ± 0.73	2.67 ± 0.65	0.139	0.889
1 h	3.29 ± 0.84	3.19 ± 0.98	0.346	0.729
6 h	5.71 ± 0.9	5.57 ± 1.2	0.898	0.369
12 h	4.86 ± 0.96	4.71 ± 0.95	0.404	0.687
24 h	3.95 ± 1.39	3.81 ± 1.03	0.199	0.842
-	P<0.001, X^2=94.18	P<0.001, X^2=88.29	-	-

3.2 Determining and Comparing Static Nausea-Vomiting in Two Groups A and B at Times 0, 30 min, 1 h, 6 h, 12 h and 24 h after Laparoscopic Gastric Bypass

In order to compare static nausea-vomiting levels in 2 groups A and B after laparoscopic gastric bypass, Z-test was used. Friedman test was used for comparison at times 0, 30 min, 1 h, 6 h, 12 h and 24 h after laparoscopic gastric bypass in each of the two groups A and B (separately). Frequency values and nausea-vomiting comparison are summarised in Table 3.

Based on the results of Table 3, there was no significant difference between static nausea-vomiting levels of patients in 2 groups A and B at times 0, 30 min, 1 h, 6 h, 12 h, and 24 h after laparoscopic gastric bypass (P>0.05). There was a significant difference between static nausea-vomiting levels of patients at times 0, 30 min, 1 h, 6 h, 12 h, and 24 h after laparoscopic gastric bypass in group A (P=0.01, X^2=15). There was a significant difference between static nausea-vomiting levels of patients at times 0, 30 min, 1 h, 6 h, 12 h, and 24 h after laparoscopic gastric bypass in group B (P=0.008, X^2=15.73).

3.3 Determining and Comparing Dynamic Nausea-Vomiting in Two Groups A and B at Times 0, 30 min, 1 h, 6 h, 12 h and 24 h after Laparoscopic Gastric Bypass

In order to compare dynamic nausea-vomiting levels in 2 groups A and B after laparoscopic gastric bypass, Z-test was used. Friedman test was used for comparison at times 0, 30 min, 1 h, 6 h, 12 h and 24 h after laparoscopic gastric bypass in each of the two groups A and B (separately). Frequency values and nausea-vomiting comparison are summarised in Table 4.

Based on the results of Table 4, there was no significant difference between dynamic nausea-vomiting levels of patients in 2 groups A and B at times 0, 30 min, 1 h, 6 h, 12 h, and 24 h after laparoscopic gastric bypass (P>0.05). There was a significant difference between dynamic nausea-vomiting levels of patients at times 0, 30 min, 1 h, 6 h, 12 h, and 24 h after laparoscopic gastric bypass in group A (P=0.001, X^2=45). There was a significant difference between dynamic nausea-vomiting levels of patients at times 0, 30 min, 1 h, 6 h, 12 h, and 24 h after laparoscopic gastric bypass in group B (P=0.001, X^2=33.77).

Table 3. Descriptive features and comparison of static nausea-vomiting levels in two groups A and B after laparoscopic gastric bypass

Time	Group		Test statistic	p-value
	A (N, %)	B (N, %))		
0	2 (9.5%)	5 (23.8%)	1.26	0.896
30 min	4 (19%)	3 (14.3%)	0.4	0.655
1 h	0 (0%)	1 (4.8%)	0.22	0.587
6 h	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0	0.5
12 h	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0	0.5
24 h	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0	0.5
-	P=0.01, X^2=15	P=0.008, X^2=15.73	-	-

Table 4. Descriptive features and comparison of dynamic nausea-vomiting levels in two groups A and B after laparoscopic gastric bypass

Time	Group		Test statistic	p-value
	A (N, %)	B (N, %))		
0	8 (38.1%)	6 (28.6%)	0.65	0.742
30 min	14 (66.7%)	11 (52.4%)	0.95	0.828
1 h	5 (23.8%)	5 (23.8%)	0	0.5
6 h	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0	0.5
12 h	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0	0.5
24 h	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0	0.5
-	P=0.001, X^2=45	P=0.001, X^2=33.77	-	-

3.4 Determining and Comparing Agitation in Two Groups A and B at Times 0, 30 min and 1 h after Surgery

In order to compare agitation levels in 2 groups A and B after laparoscopic gastric bypass, Z-test was used. Friedman test was used for comparison at times 0, 30 min and 1 h after surgery in each of the two groups A and B (separately). Frequency values and agitation comparison are summarised in Table 5.

Based on the results of Table 5, there was no significant difference between agitation levels of patients in 2 groups A and B at times 0, 30 min and 1 h after laparoscopic gastric bypass (P>0.05). There was no significant difference between agitation levels of patients at times 0, 30 min and 1 h after laparoscopic gastric bypass in group A (P=0.072, X^2=5.25). There was no significant difference between agitation levels of patients at times 0, 30 min and 1 h after laparoscopic gastric bypass in group B (P=0.097, X^2=4.66).

3.5 Determining and Comparing Systolic BP in Two Groups A and B at Times 0, 30 min and 1 h after Laparoscopic Gastric Bypass

In order to compare systolic BP levels in 2 groups A and B at times 0, 30 min and 1 h after laparoscopic gastric bypass, independent t-test and Mann-Whitney U-test were used. Friedman test and repeated measure test were used for comparison of systolic BP levels at times 0, 30 min and 1 h after laparoscopic gastric bypass in each of the two groups A and B (separately). Descriptive features and comparison of systolic BP are summarised in Table 6.

Based on the results of Table 6, there was no significant difference between systolic BP levels of patients in 2 groups A and B at times 0, 30 min and 1 h after laparoscopic gastric bypass (P>0.05). There was a significant difference between systolic BP levels of patients at times 0, 30 min and 1 h after laparoscopic gastric bypass in group A (P<0.001, X^2=27.71). There was a significant difference between systolic BP levels of patients at times 0, 30 min and 1 h after laparoscopic gastric bypass in group B (P=0.012, X^2=5.59).

3.6 Determining and Comparing Diastolic BP in Two Groups A and B at Times 0, 30 min and 1 h after Laparoscopic Gastric Bypass

In order to compare diastolic BP levels in 2 groups A and B at times 0, 30 min and 1 h after laparoscopic gastric bypass, independent t-test was used. Repeated measure test was used for comparison of diastolic BP levels at times 0, 30 min and 1 h after laparoscopic gastric bypass in each of the two groups A and B (separately). Descriptive features and comparison of diastolic BP are summarised in Table 7.

Table 5. Descriptive features and comparison of agitation levels in two groups A and B after laparoscopic gastric bypass

Time	Group		Test statistic	p-value
	A (N, %)	B (N, %))		
0	6 (28.6%)	5 (23.8%)	0.35	0.636
30 min	5 (23.8%)	6 (28.6%)	0.35	0.636
1 h	1 (4.8%)	1 (4.8%)	0	0.5
-	P=0.072, X^2=5.25	P=0.097, X^2=4.66	-	-

Table 6. Descriptive features and comparison of systolic BP levels in two groups A and B at times 0, 30 min and 1 h after laparoscopic gastric bypass

Time	Group		Test statistic	p-value
	A (mean ± SD)	B (mean ± SD)		
0	141.76 ± 13.68	141.9 ± 14.92	0.032	0.974
30 min	139.33 ± 13.13	139.43 ± 15.27	0.025	0.98
1 h	134.05 ± 11.38	136.48 ± 10.42	0.768	0.477
-	P<0.001, X^2=27.71	P=0.012, X^2=5.59	-	-

Table 7. Descriptive features and comparison of diastolic BP levels in two groups A and B at times 0, 30 min and 1 h after laparoscopic gastric bypass

Time	Group		Test statistic	p-value
	A (mean ± SD)	B (mean ± SD)		
0	91.24 ± 8.24	93.05 ± 9.71	0.651	0.519
30 min	89.57 ± 9.3	91.19 ± 11.27	0.508	0.615
1 h	86.24 ± 9.54	89.14 ± 7.35	1.18	0.245
-	P<0.001, X^2=58.94	P=0.001, X^2=11.38	-	-

Based on the results of Table 7, there was no significant difference between diastolic BP levels of patients in 2 groups A and B at times 0, 30 min and 1 h after laparoscopic gastric bypass (P>0.05). There was a significant difference between diastolic BP levels of patients at times 0, 30 min and 1 h after laparoscopic gastric bypass in group A (P<0.001, X^2=58.94). There was a significant difference between diastolic BP levels of patients at times 0, 30 min and 1 h after laparoscopic gastric bypass in group B (P=0.001, X^2=11.38).

3.7 Determining and Comparing Heart Rate in Two Groups A and B at Times 0, 30 min and 1 h after Laparoscopic Gastric Bypass

In order to compare heart rate in 2 groups A and B at times 0, 30 min and 1 h after laparoscopic gastric bypass, independent t-test and Mann-Whitney test were used. Repeated measure test and Friedman test were used for comparison of heart rate at times 0, 30 min and 1 h after laparoscopic gastric bypass in each of the two groups A and B (separately). Descriptive features and comparison of heart rate are summarised in Table 8.

Based on the results of Table 8, there was no significant difference between heart rate of patients in 2 groups A and B at times 0, 30 min and 1 h after laparoscopic gastric bypass (P>0.05). There was a significant difference between heart rate of patients at times 0, 30 min and 1 h after laparoscopic gastric bypass in group A (P<0.001, X^2=28.5). There was a significant difference between heart rate of patients at times 0, 30 min and 1 h after laparoscopic gastric bypass in group B (P=0.001, X^2=67.43).

3.8 Determining and Comparing the First, Second and Third Pethidine Administrations in Two Groups A and B after Laparoscopic Gastric Bypass

In order to compare the first, second and third pethidine administrations in 2 groups A and B

Table 8. Descriptive features and comparison of heart rate in two groups A and B at times 0, 30 min and 1 h after laparoscopic gastric bypass

Time	Group		Test statistic	p-value
	A (mean ± SD)	B (mean ± SD)		
0	93.05 ± 7.32	96.86 ± 6.64	1.76	0.085
30 min	90.29 ± 6.66	92.86 ± 8.31	1.26	0.207
1 h	86.43 ± 6.47	88 ± 7.44	0.9	0.364
-	P<0.001, X^2=28.5	P=0.001, X^2=67.43	-	-

Table 9. Descriptive features and comparison of the first, second and third pethidine administrations in two groups A and B after laparoscopic gastric bypass

Time	Group		Test statistic	p-value
	A (N, %)	B (N, %)		
1st	6 (28.6%)	11 (52.3%)	1.61	0.053
2nd	12 (57.1%)	8 (38%)	1.26	0.103
3rd	3 (14.3%)	1 (4.8%)	1.06	0.144

after laparoscopic gastric bypass, Z-test was used. Frequency values and comparison of the first, second and third pethidine administrations in groups A and B after laparoscopic gastric bypass are summarised in Table 9.

Based on the results of Table 9, there was no significant difference between the first, second and third pethidine administrations in 2 groups A and B after laparoscopic gastric bypass (P>0.05).

4. DISCUSSION

According to the most important results of this study, there was no significant difference between the effect of intraoperative 1 mg/kg/h and 2 mg/kg/h IV lidocaine infusion on postoperative pain, static and dynamic nausea-vomiting, agitation, systolic BP, diastolic BP, heart rate and pethidine administration after laparoscopic gastric bypass. In both groups, intraoperative 1 mg/kg/h and 2 mg/kg/h IV lidocaine infusion significantly increased pain 6 hours postoperatively and significantly decreased pain 24 hours postoperatively. Moreover, postoperative static and dynamic nausea-vomiting, agitation, systolic BP, diastolic BP and heart rate significantly decreased 0-24 hours after the surgery. Therefore, lidocaine seems to reduce postoperative pain and complications. However, high-dose and low-dose lidocaine has the same significant effect in reducing pain and complications after laparoscopic gastric bypass.

Postoperative pain not only causes physical and mental torment, but also increases the risk of side effects and delayed recovery. Therefore, it is important to eliminate emotional pain and stress to maintain comfortable recovery, reduce the incidence of postoperative cardiovascular complications and increase sooner discharge [15]. It has been previously reported that preoperative IV lidocaine infusion can increase postoperative analgesic effects and accelerate early recovery; intraoperative continuous infusion can effectively prevent central hyperalergy through the pain pathway [16]. Lidocaine has an insignificant opioid-sparing property in patients undergoing various surgical procedures [17,18]. Several mechanisms have been suggested to explain the insignificant opioid-sparing effect of preoperative lidocaine. First, lidocaine has anti-inflammatory properties which can minimise the pain caused by surgical inflammation [19,20]. Second, lidocaine also can directly block the pathways of pain conducting sodium channels [21]. Eventually, lidocaine can reduce the need for opioid drugs or intraoperative volatile anaesthetics, which may reduce the progression of postoperative pain [22,23].

Based on literature review, this study was the first study to compare the effects of two different doses of lidocaine (1 mg/kg/h vs. 2 mg/kg/h IV infusion) on postoperative pain and nausea-vomiting after laparoscopic gastric bypass. However, many studies have shown that different doses of lidocaine infusion reduced postoperative pain level and side effects, compared with placebo and other drugs. For example, Tikuišis et al. studied 64 patients undergoing laparoscopic colon surgery and found that pain level significantly decreased 24 h after the surgery in both rest and movement in 2 mg/kg/h lidocaine group compared to placebo group. Moreover, there was no significant difference between postoperative complications between the two groups [5]. Through a meta-analysis, Ventham et al. reviewed 40 clinical trials on comparing the effect of lidocaine infusion with placebo or routine postoperative laparoscopic treatments and found that lidocaine intervention reduced the pain score at rest in 2, 12 and 24 hours after surgery and reduced nausea and vomiting [9]. Selcuk et al. studied 226 patients undergoing laparoscopic gynecological surgery and revealed that 1% lidocaine infusion was more effective on postoperative pain than placebo [12]. Terkawi et al. found no significant difference in pain scores between the two groups by follow-up of 216 patients after 2 days of abdominal surgery in two groups of 1 mg/kg/h IV Lidocaine infusion and epidural analgesia. In lidocaine group, episodes of hypotension and postoperative nausea and

vomiting were less frequent than placebo group [14].

According to previous studies some of which has been noted in the previous paragraph, on a certain dosage, pain and nausea-vomiting were not compared between two groups of 1 mg/kg/h and 2 mg/kg/h lidocaine; positive effect of lidocaine in reducing pain and nausea-vomiting in most of these studies may be due to the fact that lidocaine has been compared with opiate and placebo. Moreover, inconsistency of this study with some studies may be due to differences in samples, design of studies, lidocaine doses and surgical site and procedures.

In the present study in which patients were carefully monitored for up to 24 hours after surgery, although administration of high-dose lidocaine did not cause side effects after surgery, administration of low doses, as high doses, reduced pain, nausea-vomiting and agitation. Therefore, low doses of lidocaine (1 mg/kg/h), rather than high doses (2 mg/kg/h), can be used as an appropriate dose of IV lidocaine infusion to control postoperative pain and nausea-vomiting in laparoscopic gastric bypass.

5. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of this study, low doses of lidocaine (1 mg/kg/h), rather than high doses (2 mg/kg/h), can be used as an appropriate dose of IV lidocaine infusion to control postoperative pain and nausea-vomiting in laparoscopic gastric bypass.

CONSENT

After obtaining consent and qualifying patients for inclusion and exclusion, 41 patients were assigned into 2 groups of 21 patients (A and B) in 4 blocks.

ETHICAL APPROVAL

It is not applicable.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Christopher L. Wu. Acute Postoperative Pain. In: Miller RD, ed. Miller`s Anesthesia, 6th ed. Philadelphia; Churchill Livingstone. 2005;2729-2750.
2. McCracken G, Houston P, Lefebvre G.Guideline for the Management of Postoperative Nausea and Vomiting. JULY JOGC JUILLET. 2008;209.
3. McCarthy GC, Megalla SA, Habib AS. Impact of intravenous lidocaine infusion on postoperative analgesia and recovery from surgery: A systematic review of randomized controlled trials. Drugs. 2010; 70(9):1149-63.
4. Van der Wal SE, van den Heuvel SA, Radema SA, van Berkum BF, Vaneker M, Steegers MA, et al. The *in vitro* mechanisms and in vivo efficacy of intravenous lidocaine on the neuroinflammatory response in acute and chronic pain. Eur J Pain; 2015.
5. Tikuišis R, Miliauskas P, Samalavičius NE, Žurauskas A, Samalavičius R, Zabulis V. Intravenous lidocaine for post-operative pain relief after hand-assisted laparoscopic colon surgery: A randomized, placebo-controlled clinical trial. Tech Coloproctol. 2014;18(4):373-80.
6. Kim KT, Cho DC, Sung JK, Kim YB, Kang H, Song KS, Choi GJ. Intraoperative systemic infusion of lidocaine reduces postoperative pain after lumbar surgery: A double-blinded, randomized, placebo-controlled clinical trial. Spine J. 2014; 14:1559 –1566.
7. Patrick Tauzin-Fin, Olivier Bernard, Musa Sesay, Matthieu Biais, Philippe Richebe, Alice Quinart, et al. Benefits of intravenous lidocaine on post-operative pain and acute rehabilitation after laparoscopic nephrectomy. J Anaesthesiol Clin Pharmacol. 2014;30(3):366–372.
8. Kranke P, Jokinen J, Pace NL, Schnabel A, Hollmann MW, Hahnenkamp K, et al. Continuous intravenous perioperative lidocaine infusion for postoperative pain and recovery. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2015;7:CD009642.
9. Ventham NT, Kennedy ED, Brady RR, Paterson HM, Speake D, Foo I, Fearon KC. Efficacy of intravenous lidocaine for postoperative analgesia following laparoscopic surgery: A meta-analysis. World J Surg. 2015;39(9):2220-34.
10. Ahn E, Kang H, Choi GJ, Park YH, Yang SY, Kim BG, et al. Intravenous lidocaine for effective pain relief after a laparoscopic colectomy: A prospective, randomized, double-blind, placebocontrolled study. Int Surg. 2015;100(3):394-401.

11. Hesham F. Solimana, Ahmed R. Gharbiya. Efficacy of systemic lidocaine infusion compared with systemic ketorolac infusion in improvement of recovery after laparoscopic bariatric surgery. Ain-Shams Journal of Anesthesiology. 2015;8:334-40.
12. Selcuk S, Api M, Polat M, Arinkan A, Aksoy B, Akca T, et al. Effectiveness of local anesthetic on postoperative pain in different levels of laparoscopic gynecological surgery. Arch Gynecol Obstet; 2015. [Epub ahead of print]
13. Yang W, Hu WL. Effects of intravenously infused lidocaine on analgesia and gastrointestinal function of patients receiving laparoscopic common bile duct exploration. Pak J Med Sci. 2015;31(5): 1073-7.
14. Terkawi AS, Tsang S, Kazemi A, Morton S, Luo R, Sanders DT, et al. A clinical comparison of intravenous and epidural local anesthetic for major abdominal surgery. Reg Anesth Pain Med. 2016; 41(1):28-36.
15. 15.Hui V, Hyman N, Viscomi C, Osler T. Implementing a fasttrack protocol for patients undergoing bowel resection: Not so fast. Am J Surg. 2013;206(2):152-158.
16. Gil V, Parsons S, Gallego D, Huizinga J, Jimenez M. Effects of hydrogen sulphide on motility patterns in the rat colon. Br J Pharmacol. 2013;169(1):34-50.
17. De Oliveira GS Jr, Duncan K, Fitzgerald P, Nader A, Gould RW, McCarthy RJ. Systemic lidocaine to improve quality of recovery after laparoscopic bariatric surgery: A randomized double-blinded placebocontrolled trial. Obes Surg. 2014; 24:21 2–218.
18. Vigneault L, Turgeon AF, Cöté D, Lauzier F, Zarychanski R, Moore L, et al. Perioperative intravenous lidocaine infusion for postoperative pain control: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Can J Anaesth. 2011;58:22–37.
19. Jeong HJ, Lin D, Li L, Zuo Z. Delayed treatment with lidocaine reduces mouse microglial cell injury and cytokine production after stimulation with lipopolysaccharide and interferon γ. Anesth Analg. 2012;114:856–861.
20. Suto T, Obata H, Tobe M, Oku H, Yokoo H, Nakazato Y. Longterm effect of epidural injection with sustained-release lidocaine particles in a rat model of postoperative pain. Br J Anaesth 2012;109:957–967.
21. Obreja O, Hirth M, Turnquist B, Rukwied R, Ringkamp M, Schmelz M. The differential effects of two sodium channel modulators on the conductive properties of C-fi bers in pig skin *in vivo*. Anesth Analg. 2012;115:56 0–571.
22. Hamp T, Krammel M, Weber U, Schmid R, Graf A, Plöchl W. The effect of a bolus dose of intravenous lidocaine on the minimum alveolar concentration of sevofl urane: A prospective, randomized, double-blinded, placebo-controlled trial. Anesth Analg. 2013;117:32 3–328.
23. Petrenko AB, Ishii H, Kohno T, Baba H. When similar is not alike: Decreased sensory thresholds after intravenous infusion of remifentanil may not be remifentanil-induced hyperalgesia. Anesth Analg. 2012;115:977.

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
http://www.sdiarticle3.com/review-history/42178