Corrected and Republished: Impacts of intrathecal fentanyl on the incidence of postoperative nausea/vomiting: Systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized studies

Correction to: J Anaesthesiol Clin Pharmacol 2022;38:391-8; DOI: 10.4103/joacp.joacp_443_20 Post publication, as there were multiple corrections to be incorporated in the article under the reference list and their citations, which were missed earlier, the article is being corrected and republished."

Impacts of intrathecal fentanyl on the incidence of postoperative nausea/vomiting: Systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized studies

Andrés Fabricio Caballero-Lozada, Juan Manuel Gómez, Arley Torres-Mosquera, Álvaro González-Carvajal, Andrea Marín-Prado, Andrés Zorrilla-Vaca, Xuechun Zhao¹, Jinlei Li¹ Department of Anesthesiology, Universidad del Valle, Cali, Colombia, 'Department of Anesthesiology, Yale University, New Haven, USA

Abstract

Post-operative nausea and vomiting (PONV) is an event of multifactorial origin with an incidence of 30% in the general population. Opioids such as fentanyl are being used as adjuvant to local anesthetic for its antiemetic effect. In this context, with this study we aimed to evaluate the impact of spinal fentanyl as an adjuvant on the incidence of PONV compared with a placebo, and shivering. A systematic search of randomized controlled trials that evaluated the use of spinal fentanyl in the prevention of PONV and shivering was conducted in different databases, of which 32 studies met the inclusion criteria. A total of 2116 patients scheduled for various surgeries, including cesarean section, orthopedic surgery in the lower limb, hysterectomy, and transurethral resection of the prostate, were included in the final analysis. The meta-analysis estimated the relative risk of incidence of PONV in the first 24 hours after surgery and secondary outcomes included the shivering symptom. The use of intrathecal fentanyl was associated with lower incidence of PONV, but not statistically significant reduction in PONV incidences with lower doses between 10 and 15 µg (RR: 0.44 CI95%: 0.35–0.55 P < 0.00001, $I^2 = 0\%$) but not with higher doses 20–25 µg. Secondary outcomes showed a decrease in incidence with the use of fentanyl vs the placebo (RR: 0.49, CI95% 0.33-0.72 P = 0.0003). Current evidence shows that the use of spinal fentanyl decreases the incidence of PONV, an effect favored using low doses.

Keywords: Fentanyl, nausea, shivering, vomiting

Address for correspondence: Prof. Andrés Fabricio Caballero-Lozada, MD, Department of Anesthesiology and Resuscitation, Universidad del Valle, Street 4B # 36-00, Cali, Colombia.

E-mail: andres.caballero@correounivalle.edu.co

Access this article online						
Quick Response Code:	Website: https://journals.lww.com/joacp					
	DOI: 10.4103/0970-9185.369222					

This is an open access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work non-commercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.

For reprints contact: WKHLRPMedknow reprints@wolterskluwer.com

How to cite this article: Caballero-Lozada AF, Gómez JM, Torres-Mosquera A, González-Carvajal Á, Marín-Prado A, Zorrilla-Vaca A, *et al*. Corrected and Republished: Impacts of intrathecal fentanyl on the incidence of postoperative nausea/vomiting: Systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized studies. J Anaesthesiol Clin Pharmacol 2022;38:529-36.

 Submitted:
 17-Jul-2020
 Revised:
 21-Sep-2020

 Accepted:
 02-Dec-2020
 Published:
 31-Aug-2022

Introduction

Post-operative nausea and vomiting (PONV) are a perioperative event of multifactorial origin that can occur both in ambulatory and daycare surgeries, with an incidence that varies from 80% in high-risk patients to 30% in the general population.^[1,2] In high-risk patients it frequently triggers morbidity beyond patient discomfort and dissatisfaction, including dehydration, bleeding, compromised airway, among others, which interferes with the surgical outcome and quality of life.^[3-6] This has led to the attempt to develop multiple strategies to reduce this problem; however, given its multifactorial origin, it continues to be a challenge for the anesthesiologist.

Traditional teaching that the use of opioids favors the generation of nausea and vomiting has been challenged recently as some lipophilic opioids such as fentanyl, frequently used as an adjuvant to local anesthetic in spinal anesthesia, have been shown to have an antiemetic effect.^[7] According to Shiraishi-Zapata et al.,^[8] there are few Latin-American studies that report PONV in patients operated under general anesthesia. The incidence rate for hospitals in Colombia is 10.9%.^[9] The physio-pathological mechanisms that can cause this clinical scenario can be multiple,^[10] however intervening in some of them and managing to reduce the incidence of these adverse effects could improve the quality of life in the patient and prevent possible secondary complications of PONV. In the current literature there are no meta-analyses that review this research problem in the general population subjected to spinal anesthesia to unify an intervention, therefore it is important to perform a meta-analysis plus a meta-regression of published, controlled, clinical trials. In the case of finding potentially favourable results for the intervention of spinal fentanyl as prevention of PONV in spinal anesthesia, it would contribute to reduce this condition that leads to greater morbidity in surgical patients.

This meta-analysis sought to evaluate the impact of spinal fentanyl on the incidence of PONV compared to a placebo in patients undergoing a neuraxial anesthetic technique with bupivacaine for various surgeries, including cesarean section, orthopedic surgery in the lower limb, hysterectomy and transurethral resection of the prostate. Moreover, it sought to establish the optimal dose of spinal fentanyl related to the prevention of nausea and vomiting in the postoperative period. It is expected that fentanyl administered intrathecally has a preventive impact on the incidence of PONV.

Material and Methods

This systematic review and meta-analysis were developed using the recommendations made by the Cochrane collaboration,^[11] and following the PRISMA statement.^[12] This study was not revised by an ethics committee, but the protocol is registered in PROSPERO with ID CRD42020151869.

Inclusion criteria

The following inclusion criteria were used: 1) study design: randomized controlled clinical trials where intervention with intrathecal fentanyl was used as an adjuvant for spinal anesthesia; 2) type of participants: adults older than 18 years undergoing any surgery with spinal anesthesia; 3) type of intervention: all interventions with spinal fentanyl related to nausea and vomiting, compared with placebo; 4) type of primary outcome: Incidence of PONV; 5) type of secondary outcome: Reduction of postoperative shivering.

Exclusion criteria

We excluded quasi-randomized trials and studies conducted in patients under 18 years of age. Also, clinical trials in which spinal anesthesia was performed with local anesthetics other than bupivacaine or used other adjuvants (midazolam, clonidine, morphine) with or without fentanyl. Finally, clinical trials that used different doses of bupivacaine between the control and study groups were excluded.

Research strategy

A literature search was conducted in the main databases from 1975 to December 2018, such as MEDLINE, Google Scholar, and EMBASE. In addition, to reduce publication bias, the search was carried out on the individual citations of the articles found. No language or date restrictions were applied from the 1975 until December 2018 for articles that met the inclusion criteria. A combination of the terms *fentanyl*, *ondansetron*, *nausea and vomiting*, *postoperative*, *spinal anesthesia*, was used for the search in all the databases as follows: 1) fentanyl (Mesh) AND placebos (Mesh) AND nausea and vomiting, postoperative (Mesh) AND spinal anesthesia (Mesh); 2) fentanyl AND placebos AND nausea, postoperative; 3) "spinal fentanyl" AND "placebos" AND nausea AND vomiting.

Study selection

Two authors independently assessed the inclusion criteria in all selected studies by title and abstract. Disagreements were resolved with a third author or through dialogue. A table was designed in Excel to extract data. Two authors extracted the data from the studies chosen with full text, and in the case of disagreements, the issue was resolved with a third author. The data was entered into the Stata software to assess its accuracy.

Statistical analysis

The methodological quality of the studies was analysed using the Cochrane risk of bias assessment tool [Figure 1]. In addition, an initial exploratory analysis was performed with the data extracted from each article, the main variables



Figure 1: Risk of bias assessment. Source: Original

were tabulated and then the incidences of the primary outcome were expressed as percentages for each group, both intervention and placebo. A meta-analysis was performed for each outcome using the Review Manager program version 5.3 (Cochrane).

Results

Research results

The articles obtained in the literature search were independently reviewed by two of the authors. A total of 2187 articles were identified in different databases. After first eliminating duplicate studies and selecting articles based on inclusion criteria, 40 articles were found and full texts were reviewed. Thirteen articles were subsequently eliminated based on inclusion criteria and exclusion criteria, and five additional articles were identified and included for a total of 32 studies [Figure 2]. One of the studies, by Seewal *et al.*,^[13] was analysed as two different datasets for the meta-analysis.

Study characteristics

A total of 2116 patients scheduled for various surgeries, including cesarean section, orthopedic surgery in the lower limb, hysterectomy, and transurethral resection of the prostate, were included in the final analysis. All patients underwent spinal anesthesia with 0.5% or 0.75% hyperbaric bupivacaine (HB) with doses between 10 and 15 mg. Fentanyl was added to the intervention group at doses between 10 and 25 μ g, while the control group was treated with HB with or without the addition of normal saline solution [Table 1].

Primary outcome

In the intervention group there was a decrease in nausea and vomiting when compared with the control group [171 vs 253 events (RR: 0.74 95% CI 0.55-1.01 P = 0.06)]. It is important to mention that these data are marked as heterogeneous I² = 56 = 56%, so it was decided to perform a subgroup analysis based on the dose of fentanyl that was used (Subgroup 1: 10-15 µg vs Subgroup 2: 20-25 µg). Only in the subgroup of low doses, the decrease of nausea and vomiting persisted in the intervention group compared to the control group (RR: 0.44 95% CI 0.35-0.55 P < 0.00001,



Figure 2: PRISMA flow chart for the selection of studies. Source: Original

 $I^2 = 0\%$). This is suggestive of a significant antiemetic effect with spinal fentanyl at low doses [Figure 3].

Secondary outcomes

In the secondary outcome, shivering was reduced in the group that used spinal fentanyl compared to the placebo group [Figure 4]. In the intervention group with low doses of fentanyl shivering, we observed a decrease when compared the control group [14 vs 35 events (RR: 0.35 95% CI 0.16-0.77 P = 0.009)]. The same occurred in the dose group between 20 and 25 µg, where 22 vs 41 events were presented in the intervention group and in the control group respectively (RR: 0.58 95% CI 0.36–0.93 P = 0.94). When estimating for both groups, a protection trend against shivering was maintained in the fentanyl group vs. placebo (RR: 0.49, 95% CI 0.33–0.72 P = 0.0003).

Discussion

Our meta-analysis estimated the relative risk of incidence of PONV in the first 24 hours after surgery and secondary outcomes included shivering symptom, also the use of intrathecal fentanyl was associated with lower incidence of PONV, but without statistical significance, when compared to the placebo. According to our results, the use of spinal fentanyl decreases the incidence of PONV, an effect favored with the use of low doses.

One of the most common and distressing symptoms that follow general and neuraxial anesthesia and surgery is PONV.^[14] The causes of PONV are multifactorial, including

Table 1: Characteristics of the studies included in the systematic review. Source: Original									
Study	Surgery	n (total)	Dose - intervention group (HB mg+F μg)	Dose - placebo group (HB mg or HB mg+SS mL)	Nausea/ vomiting - Intervention	Nausea/ vomiting - placebo			
Ahmed et al. 2017 ^[33]	Hysterectomy	164	15 mg+25 μg	15 mg+0.5 mL	0	2			
Akanmu et al. 2013 ^[25]	Orthopedic in lower extremity	60	10 mg+25 µg	10 mg+0.5 mL	4	6			
Belzarena et al. 1992 ^[34]	Cesarean section	60	15 mg+25 μg	15 mg+0.5 mL	4	3			
Bharti <i>et al</i> . 2015 ^[35]	Transurethral resection of the prostate	40	10 mg+25 μg	10 mg	4	3			
Bhattacharje et al. 2015 ^[22]	Cesarean section	60	10 mg+25 μg	10 mg+0.5 mL	13	2			
Bhure <i>et al</i> . 2012 ^[36]	Cesarean section	60	11 mg+25 μg	11 mg+0.5 mL	2	3			
Biswas et al. 2002 ^[37]	Cesarean section	80	10 mg+12.5 μg	10 mg+0.25 mL	1	8			
Charan <i>et al</i> . 2018 ^[28]	Orthopedics in the lower extremity	50	15 mg+20 μg	15 mg	1	5			
Farzi et al. 2017 ^[20]	Cesarean section	66	12.5 mg+25 μg	12.5 mg+0.5 mL	2	5			
Hassani et al. 2014 ^[19]	Orthopedics in the lower extremity	60	15 mg+25-30 μg	15 mg+0.5-0.6 mL	7	1			
Indurkar <i>et al</i> . 2015 ^[26]	Cirugía abdomen inferior y miembro inferior	60	13 mg+12.5 μg	13 mg	1	4			
Kazemnejad et al. 2018 ^[27]	Orthopedics in the lower extremity	50	15 mg+25 μg	15 mg+0.5 mL	14	8			
Khan <i>et al</i> . 2006 ^[38]	Transurethral resection of the prostate	40	15 mg+10 μg	15 mg	3	1			
Khezri <i>et al</i> . 2014 ^[39]	Cesarean section	60	10 mg+25 μg	10 mg+0.5 mL	7	4			
Kumar <i>et al</i> . 2016 ^[40]	Cesarean section	100	10 mg+12.5 μg	10 mg+0.5 mL	19	37			
Li et al. 2014 ^[41]	Cesarean section	42	10 mg+15 μg	10 mg+2 mL	4	4			
Lim et al. 2006 ^[42]	Orthopedics in the lower extremity	36	4 mg+15 µg	4 mg	0	0			
Meshram et al. 2016 ^[43]	Cesarean section	100	10 mg+25 μg	10 mg+0.5 mL	8	29			
Motiani <i>et al</i> . 2010 ^[44]	Orthopedics in the lower extremity	70	15 mg+25 μg	15 mg+0.5 mL	4	3			
Pallavi et al. 2017 ^[45]	Lower abdomen	80	15 mg+25 μg	15 mg+0.5 mL	10	15			
Paulraj <i>et al</i> . 2018 ^[46]	Cesarean section	60	8.5 mg+25 μg	8.5 mg+0.5 mL	0	3			
Rahimzadeh et al. 2018 ^[47]	Orthopedics in the lower extremity	60	12.5 mg+25 μg	12.5 mg+0.5 mL	1	4			
Randalls <i>et al</i> . 1991 ^[48]	Cesarean section	24	12.5 mg+10 μg	12.5 mg+0.5 mL	0	3			
Rudra <i>et al</i> . 2004 ^[49]	Cesarean section	80	10 mg+12.5 μg	10 mg+0.5 mL	10	30			
Sadegh <i>et al</i> . 2012 ^[50]	Cesarean section	80	12.5 mg+25 μg	12.5 mg+0.5 mL	11	27			
Safari <i>et al.</i> 2016 ^[51]	Orthopedic in the lower extremity or lower abdomen	56	12.5 mg+25 μg	12.5 mg	11	6			
Safavi et al. 2014 ^[52]	Orthopedics in the lower extremity	60	15 mg+20 µg	15 mg+0.5 mL	2	2			
Seewal <i>et al</i> . 2007 ^[13]	Lower abdomen	24	11 mg+10 μg	11 mg+0.8 mL	1	2			
Seewal <i>et al</i> . 2007 (B) ^[13]	Lower abdomen	24	11 mg+20 μg	11 mg+0.8 mL	1	2			
Shaikh <i>et al</i> . 2015 ^[14]	Cesarean section	60	10 mg+12.5 μg	10 mg+0.5 mL	8	24			
Shashikala et al. 2014 ^[53]	Cesarean section	90	10 mg+12.5 μg	10 mg+0.5 mL a) LCR	6	8			
Shim et al. 2018 ^[54]	Anorectal	80	5 mg+15 μg	5 mg+0.3 mL	0	1			
Uike S et al. 2015 ^[23]	Cesarean section	80	10 mg+12.5 μg	10 mg	3	10			

F: Fentanyl, HB: hyperbaric bupivacaine, HB+SS: hyperbaric bupivacaine with saline solution

hypotension due to sympathetic block/dehydration, hypoxemia in the center of vomiting, traction of the local peritoneum and the patient's own risk factors.^[15] When assessing the risk of PONV for a particular patient, it is important to know which factors are independent predictors and which are not relevant, in order to predict a possible PONV.^[16] If anesthesia is not administered properly, one-third of patients who undergo surgery will have postoperative nausea and

	IT Fent	anyl	Placebo Risk Ratio		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio		
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	M-H, Random, 95% CI	
1.1.2 10-15 mcg								
Biswas et al	10	40	30	40	5.9%	0.33 [0.19, 0.59]		
Indurkar et al	1	30	4	30	1.6%	0.25 [0.03, 2.11]		
Khan et al	3	20	1	20	1.6%	3.00 [0.34, 26.45]		
Kumar et al	19	50	37	50	6.6%	0.51 [0.35, 0.76]		
Li et al	4	21	4	21	3.3%	1.00 [0.29, 3.48]		
Lim et al	0	18	0	18		Not estimable		
Meshram et al	8	50	16	50	5.1%	0.50 [0.24, 1.06]		
Randalls et al	0	12	3	12	1.0%	0.14 [0.01, 2.50]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Rudra et al	10	40	30	40	5.9%	0.33 [0.19, 0.59]		
Safavi et al	2	30	2	30	1.9%	1.00 [0.15, 6.64]		
Seewal et al	1	12	2	12	1.5%	0.50 [0.05, 4.81]		
Shaikh et al	8	30	24	30	5.6%	0.33 [0.18, 0.62]		
Shashikala et al	6	45	8	45	4.2%	0.75 [0.28, 1.99]		
Sung-Min et al	0	40	1	40	0.8%	0.33 [0.01, 7.95]		
Uike et al	3	40	10	40	3.4%	0.30 [0.09, 1.01]		
Subtotal (95% CI)		478		478	48.3%	0.44 [0.35, 0.55]	•	
Total events	75		172					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.00; Ch	$i^2 = 11$.15, df =	13 (P	= 0.60);	$ ^2 = 0\%$		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 7.33	(P < 0	.00001)					
1.1.3 20-25 mcg								
Ahmed et al	0	82	2	82	0.9%	0.20 [0.01, 4.10]	+	
Akanmu et al	4	30	6	30	3.6%	0.67 [0.21, 2.13]		
Ali Sadegh et al	11	40	7	40	4.7%	1.57 [0.68, 3.64]		
Belzarena et al	4	30	3	30	2.9%	1.33 [0.33, 5.45]		
Bharti et al	4	20	2	20	2.5%	2.00 [0.41, 9.71]		
Bhattacharje et al	13	30	2	30	2.9%	6.50 [1.60, 26.36]		
Bhure et al	2	30	3	30	2.2%	0.67 [0.12, 3.71]		
Charan et al	1	25	5	25	1.7%	0.20 [0.03, 1.59]		
Farzi et al	2	33	5	33	2.5%	0.40 [0.08, 1.92]		
Hassani et al	7	30	1	30	1.7%	7.00 [0.92, 53.47]		
Kazemnejad et al	14	25	8	25	5.4%	1.75 [0.90, 3.42]	+	
Khezri et al	7	30	4	30	3.7%	1.75 [0.57, 5.36]		
Motiani et al	4	30	3	40	2.8%	1.78 [0.43, 7.36]		
Pallavi et al	10	40	15	40	5.4%	0.67 [0.34, 1.30]		
Paulraj et al	0	30	3	30	1.0%	0.14 [0.01, 2.65]	+	
Rahimzadeh et al	1	30	4	30	1.6%	0.25 [0.03, 2.11]		
Safari et al	11	28	6	28	4.7%	1.83 [0.79, 4.27]		
Seewal et al(B)	1	12	2	12	1.5%	0.50 [0.05, 4.81]		
Subtotal (95% CI)		575		585	51.7%	1.16 [0.78, 1.72]	*	
Total events	96		81					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.24; Ch	$i^2 = 27$.42, df =	17 (P	= 0.05);	$l^2 = 38\%$		
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.74 (P = 0.46)								
T-+-1 (05% CI)		1055		1000	100.00	0.74 (0.55 1.01)		
Total (95% CI)	171	1053	252	1063	100.0%	0.74 [0.55, 1.01]	•	
I otal events	1/1	.2	253	24.0				
Heterogeneity, rau = 0.55, thr = 69.71 , df = $51 (P < 0.0001)$; P = 56% 0.01 0.1 1 10 100								
Test for overall effect:	2 = 1.91	(P = 0)	.06]			1. 17 01 700	Favours IT Fentanyl Favours Placebo	
rest for subgroup differences: Uni* = 17.69, df = 1 (P < 0.0001), P = 94.3%								

Figure 3: Forest plot comparing fentanyl versus placebo for the outcome Nausea and postoperative vomiting. Source: Original

vomiting. According to our systematic review, of the 32 articles included in the meta-analysis, n = 2116 patients, 427 of these (21%) manifested nausea and/or vomiting. There are very varied estimates of the incidence of PONV, the probable result of the diverse set of patients, surgical procedures and chemical products used during anesthesia, giving an estimated incidence of PONV of approximately 30%.^[17]

Many trials have been published, but the relative benefits/ advantages of prophylactic antiemetic interventions remain unclear. Experimental studies on the relationship of opioids and their antiemetic effect have been described based on multiple reasons: 1) dose-dependent effect, 2) selectivity of opioids for different opioid receptors and their location, and 3) genetic polymorphisms.^[17] Fentanyl, being more lipid soluble, is more potent and binds to μ receptors with high affinity; These μ receptors are located in different parts of the central nervous system (CNS), such as in the nucleus of the solitary tract, which when stimulated, have an antiemetic effect. Therefore, the potential antiemetic effect of fentanyl has been established from this explanation.^[17,18] In addition to this, the μ receptors have different μ 1 and μ 2 subunits which mediate emetic and antiemetic effects respectively.

Due to the fact that PONV has become a problem after surgery due to patient satisfaction, discharge and financial impacts, a large number of investigations have focused on the efficacy of individual drugs and antiemetic drug combinations.^[19,20] According to our meta-analysis, we observed that there were significant differences in the reduction of nausea and vomiting events in those patients who had been anesthetized with a combination of fentanyl plus HB. It should be noted that low doses of fentanyl (10 to 15 μ g), with an average of 12.5 μ g, showed a greater antiemetic effect compared with doses of 20 to 25 µg. This same pattern could be observed in the secondary event " shivering ", where low doses of fentanyl had a higher protective effect over this adverse event [Figures 3 and 4]. These results can be attributed to the low dose used, the fentanyl itself, or both factors combined, have an influence on the low incidence of PONV and shivering. However, as with this study, we cannot know for certain which hypothesis is most accurate, it is appropriate to continue investigations regarding this matter.

	IT Fent	anyl	Place	bo		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	M-H, Random, 95% CI
1.2.1 10-15 mcg							
Biswas et al	1	40	4	40	3.3%	0.25 [0.03, 2.14]	
Kumar et al	1	50	7	50	3.6%	0.14 [0.02, 1.12]	
Meshram et al	5	50	0	50	1.8%	11.00 [0.62, 193.80]	++
Rudra et al	2	40	4	40	5.7%	0.50 [0.10, 2.58]	
Shaikh et al	0	30	3	30	1.8%	0.14 [0.01, 2.65]	•
Shashikala et al	3	45	9	45	9.9%	0.33 [0.10, 1.15]	
Uike et al	2	40	8	40	6.9%	0.25 [0.06, 1.11]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		295		295	32.9%	0.35 [0.16, 0.77]	•
Total events	14		35				
Heterogeneity. Tau ² =	0.21; Ch	$1i^2 = 7.4$	40, df =	6 (P =	0.29); 12	= 19%	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.62	(P = 0)	.009)				
1.2.2 20-25 mcg							
Ahmed et al	2	82	2	82	4.1%	1.00 [0.14, 6.93]	
Akanmu et al	7	30	10	30	22.5%	0.70 [0.31, 1.59]	
Belzarena et al	3	30	4	30	7.7%	0.75 [0 18 3 07]	
Bhure et al	3	30	4	30	7.7%	0.75 [0.18. 3.07]	
Charan et al	0	25	2	25	1.7%	0.20 [0.01. 3.97]	
Farzi et al	3	33	5	33	8.4%	0.60 [0.16, 2.31]	
Khezri et al	1	30	4	30	3.3%	0.25 [0.03, 2.11]	
Motiani et al	3	30	8	30	10.1%	0.38 [0.11, 1.28]	
Paulraj et al	0	30	2	30	1.7%	0.20 [0.01, 4.00]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		320		320	67.1%	0.58 [0.36, 0.93]	•
Total events	22		41				
Heterogeneity. Tau ² =	0.00; Ch	11 ² = 2.1	87, df =	8 (P =	0.94); I ²	= 0%	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.25	(P = 0)	.02)				
Total (95% CI)		615		615	100.0%	0.49 [0.33, 0.72]	•
Total events	36		76				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.00; Ch	ni ² = 11	.40, df =	15 (P	= 0.72);	$ ^2 = 0\%$	has at the sec
Test for overall effect:	Z = 3.60	(P = 0)	.0003)				Eavours IT Fontanyl Eavours Placebo
Test for subgroup diff	erences.	$Chi^2 = 3$	1.12, df :	= 1 (P =	= 0.29), 1	$^{2} = 10.8\%$	ravours il relitaliyi ravours riacebo
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup diffe	0.00; CH Z = 3.60 erences	$hi^2 = 11$ $hi^2 = 0$ $hi^2 = 0$ $hi^2 = 0$	40, df = .0003) 1.12, df :	= 15 (P	= 0.72); = 0.29), l	$l^2 = 0\%$ $l^2 = 10.8\%$	0.01 0.1 10 100 Favours IT Fentanyl Favours Placebo

Figure 4: Forest plot comparing fentanyl versus placebo for the outcome shivering. Source: Original

Based on the results of the studies included in this systematic review and meta-analysis, it was observed that most of the research on PONV has been performed in patients undergoing cesarean sections; 50% of the articles evaluated were focused on the improvement of vomiting and nausea in the parturient. Of the 1062 patients who were included in these studies, 28% (n = 298) reported vomiting. The percentage of patients with PONV coincides with that reported in the literature.^[17] It should be noted that, in the 16 studies on cesarean sections included in our analysis, the group of women who were anesthetized with the combination of HB plus fentanyl, showed a 67% reduction in PONV during spinal anesthesia in comparison to those that were only anesthetized with HB and saline solution.

On the basis of different comparative clinical studies, it has been shown that the addition of 12.5 μ g of fentanyl and 0.5% isobaric bupivacaine for spinal anesthesia produces minimal intraoperative and postoperative side effects,^[21,22] and that fentanyl is a good option for the prevention of perioperative nausea and vomiting in the parturient undergoing cesarean section compared to other anesthetics.^[23] It is known that fentanyl, a short-acting, lipophilic synthetic opioid, improves the quality of spinal anesthesia and has been used both widely and successfully. The effect of adding a small dose of fentanyl to the local anesthetic solution is profound and decreases the possible side effects of neuraxial anesthesia.^[24]

Orthopedic surgeries in the lower limb were the second most common group of surgeries included in our review (n = 7).

We found that in those seven articles only 17% of patients presented postoperative vomiting; furthermore, when studying the number of patients with PONV treated with the different combinations of medications, it was found that the group of patients treated with the placebo (HB + saline), presented a decrease in vomiting when compared with the intervention group. Although in our meta-analysis a significant antiemetic effect was found when using spinal fentanyl at low doses in the intervention group [Figure 3], the results of subgroup analysis with this type of surgery show one of the limitations of our study, since in this meta-analysis we did not consider the influence of each particular type of surgery. It has been shown that the addition of 25 μ g of fentanyl to 10 mg of 0.5% HB significantly prolonged the duration of complete analgesia, as well as effective analgesia, thus reducing the need for an early use of postoperative analgesics without an increase in adverse effects due to administration of fentanyl in spinal anesthesia during these type of surgeries.^[25,26]

Several studies have shown the synergism and efficacy of opioid and local anesthetics when used in combination, for the control of PONV. Although in some cases, medication alone appears to be similar in efficacy when used as individual agents; ^[23,26,28] the addition of opioids such as fentanyl to HB in spinal anesthesia reduces latency, significantly prolongs duration and improves the efficacy of analgesia, when compared to bupivacaine alone.^[29] Being an opioid, Fentanyl exerts its effects when combined with opioid receptors in the dorsal horn of the spinal cord and may have supraspinal action and propagation. The addition of 12.5 µg of fentanyl to 13 mg of 0.5% HB for spinal anesthesia in cesarean section provides good intraoperative treatment and significantly reduces the demand for analgesics, producing minimal intraoperative and postoperative side effects.^[23] Other systematic reviews have been published in regards to the use of fentanyl in different surgeries,^[30-32] but we focused not only on cesarean section, but also on other surgeries such as orthopedic surgery in the lower limb, hysterectomy, and transurethral resection of the prostate, to evaluate the effect of spinal fentanyl as an adjuvant on the incidence of PONV and shivering.

Conclusions

The combination of HB and spinal fentanyl at doses of 10 to 15 μ g significantly decreased PONV in patients who received spinal anesthesia. Therefore, spinal fentanyl helps in decreasing the incidence of postoperative nausea and vomiting. Moreover, our results suggest a significant antiemetic effect with spinal fentanyl at low doses. The criteria for spinal anesthesia should be defined in future research, considering the type of surgery.

Financial support and sponsorship Nil.

Conflicts of interest

There are no conflicts of interest.

References

- Stoops S, Kovac A. New insights into the pathophysiology and risk factors for PONV. Best Pract Res Clin Anaesthesiol. Published online 2020. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j. bpa.20200.06.001.
- Suleiman Obsa M, Chemeda Edosa D, Muluken Desalegn Z, Desalegn Fanta N, Mulugeta Tamiru S, Tesfaye Mokenin G. Incidence of post-operative nausea and vomiting and it's predictors among adult elective surgical patients at Jimma Medical Center, South West Ethiopia. Res Sq. Published online 2020. doi: 10.21203/rs. 3.rs-19271/v1.
- Atallah F, Riu B, Nguyen L, Seguin P, Fourcade O. Boerhaave's syndrome after postoperative vomiting. Anesth Analg 2004;98:1164-6.
- 4. Gan TJ. Risk Factors for postoperative nausea and vomiting. Anesth Analg 2006;102:1884-98.
- 5. Le TP, Gan TJ. Update on the management of postoperative nausea and vomiting and postdischarge nausea and vomiting in ambulatory surgery. Anesthesiol Clin 2010;28:225-49.
- 6. Macario A, Weinger M, Carney S, Kim A. Which clinical anesthesia outcomes are important to avoid? The perspective of patients. Anesth Analg 1999;89:652-8.
- Swain A, Nag DS, Sahu S, Samaddar DP. Adjuvants to local anesthetics: Current understanding and future trends. World J Clin Cases 2017;5:307.
- 8. Shiraishi-Zapata CJ, Arellano-Adrianzén SJ, Rodríguez-Velarde GJ. Cumulative incidence and risks factors for postoperative nausea and vomiting in adult patients undergoing cholecystectomy under

balanced general anesthesia: A prospective cohort study. Rev Colomb Anestesiol 2020;48:3-11.

- Gempeler Rueda F, Miranda Pineda N, Garrido Hartmann A, Echeverry Lombana M, Tobos González L, Acosta Fernández C. Incidencia de náusea y vómito postoperatorio y factores asociados en el Hospital Universitario de San Ignacio. Univ Médica 2016;57:11-21.
- Borgeat A, Ekatodramis G, Schenker CA. Postoperative nausea and vomiting in regional anesthesia. A review. Anesthesiol J Am Soc Anesthesiol 2003;98:530-47.
- Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Welch VA, editors. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. 2nd ed. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons; 2019.
- Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: Elaboration and explanation. BMJ Br Med J 2015;349:g7647.
- 13. Seewal R, Shende D, Kashyap L, Mohan V. Effect of addition of various doses of fentanyl intrathecally to 0.5% hyperbaric bupivacaine on perioperative analgesia and subarachnoid-block characteristics in lower abdominal surgery: A dose-response study. Reg Anesth Pain Med 2007;32:20-6.
- Shaikh SI, Govindaraju C, Hegade G. Comparison of intrathecal fentanyl and midazolam for prevention of nausea-vomiting during cesarean section under spinal anesthesia. Anaesth Pain Intensive Care 2015;19:124-9.
- Shaikh S, Nagarekha D, Hegade G, Marutheesh M. Postoperative nausea and vomiting: A simple yet complex problem. Anesth Essays Res 2016;10:388-96.
- Apfel CC. A factorial trial of six interventions for the prevention of postoperative nausea and vomiting. N Engl J Med 2004;351:1493-501.
- 17. Horn CC, Wallisch WJ, Homanics GE, Williams JP Pathophysiological and neurochemical mechanisms of postoperative nausea and vomiting. Eur J Pharmacol 2014;722:55-66.
- Johnston K. The potential for m -opioid receptor agonists to be anti-emetic in humans: A review of clinical data. Acta Anaesthesiol Scand 2010;54:132-40.
- Hassani V, Movassaghi G, Safaian R, Safari S, Zamani MM, Hajiashrafi M, *et al.* Bupivacaine-sufentanil versus bupivacaine-fentanyl in spinal anesthesia of patients undergoing lower extremity surgery. Anesthesiol Pain Med 2014;4:1-6.
- 20. Farzi F, Mirmansouri A, Naderi Nabi B, Atrkar Roushan Z, Ghazanfar Tehran S, Nematollahi Sani M, *et al.* Comparing the Effect of Adding Fentanyl, Sufentanil, and Placebo with Intrathecal Bupivacaine on Duration of Analgesia and Complications of Spinal Anesthesia in Patients Undergoing Cesarean Section. Anesth Pain Med 2017;7:e12738.
- 21. Jain P, Jigar J, Raval B. Comparision of intrathecal fentanyl and intravenous ondansetron for prevention of perioperative nausea and vomiting during cesarean delivery under spinal anesthesia. Int J Curr Pharm Clin Res 2015;5:109-13.
- 22. Bhattacharjee A, Singh NR, Singh SS, Debbrama B, Debbarma P, Singh TH. A comparative study of intrathecal clonidine and fentanyl along with bupivacaine in spinal anesthesia for cesarean section. J Med Soc 2015;29:145-9.
- 23. Uike S, Choudhary S, Jain A. Comparative study of analgesic effect of intrathecal bupivacaine and bupivacaine with fentanyl during and after cesarean delivery. Int J Med Res Rev 2015;3:256-62.
- 24. Akhtar N, Quadir A, Athar M, Singh N. Recovery profile of intrathecal ropivacaine with or without fentanyl: A randomized double-blind controlled trial in equivalent doses. Int J Heal Allied Sci 2016;5:158-63.
- 25. Akanmu ON, Soyannwo OA, Sotunmbi PT, Lawani-osunde AS,

Desalu I. Analgesic effects of intrathecally administered fentanyl in spinal anesthesia for lower limb surgery. Maced J Med Sci 2013;6:255-60.

- 26. Indurkar PS, Saibaba S. A comparative study of hyperbaric bupivacaine versus hyperbaric bupivacaine and fentanyl (12.5 mcg) in subarachnoid anesthesia for lower abdominal and lower extremity surgeries. Int J Res Med Sci 2015;3:3147-55.
- 27. Kazemnejad K, Soroudi P, Ghourchaie A. Comparison of analgesic effect and duration of midazolam and fentanyl addition to intrathecal bupivacaine 0.05% in lower limb orthopedic surgeries. Bali Med J 2018;7:234-9.
- 28. Charan P, Nanda S, Kumar Gouni U. International journal of scientific research comparative study of the effect of intrathecal fentanyl on the quality of hyperbaric bupivacaine induced subarachnoid block in Anesthesiology Dr. Uday Kumar Gouni. Int J Sci Res 2018;7:11-2.
- 29. Piñeiro Casado E, Domínguez González E, Muguercia Sarracen K, de Arma U. Anestesia espinal con bupivacaína más fentanyl en pacientes con fractura de cadera. MEDISAN 2017;21:250-7.
- Pöpping DM, Elia N, Marret E, Wenk M, Tramr MR. Opioids added to local anesthetics for single-shot intrathecal anesthesia in patients undergoing minor surgery: A meta-analysis of randomized trials. Pain 2012;153:784-93.
- Uppal V, Retter S, Casey M, Sancheti S, Matheson K, McKeen DM. Efficacy of intrathecal fentanyl for cesarean delivery: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials with trial sequential analysis. Anesth Analg 2020;130:111-25.
- 32. Sun SJ, Wang JM, Bao NR, Chen Y, Wang J. Comparison of dexmedetomidine and fentanyl as local anesthetic adjuvants in spinal anesthesia: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Drug Des Devel Ther 2017;11:3413-24.
- 33. Ahmed F, Khandelwal M, Sharma A. A comparative study of the effect of clonidine, fentanyl, and the combination of both as adjuvant to intrathecal bupivacaine for postoperative analgesia in total abdominal hysterectomy. J Anaesthesiol Clin Pharmacol 2017;33:102-6.
- Belzarena SD. Clinical effects of intrathecally administered fentanyl in patients undergoing cesarean section. Anesth Analg 1992;74:653-7.
- 35. Bharti N, Batra Y, Negi S. Efficacy of intrathecal midazolam versus fentanyl for endoscopic urology surgery. South African J Anaesth Analg 2015;21:13-6.
- 36. Bhure A, Kalita N, Ingley P, Gadkari CP. Comparative study of intrathecal hyperbaric Bupivacaine with Clonidine, Fentanyl and Midazolam for quality of anesthesia and duration of post opera- tive pain relief in patients undergoing elective cesarean section. Peoples J Sci Res 2012;5:19-23.
- 37. Biswas B, Rudra A, Bose B, Nath S, Chakrabarty S, Bhattacharjee S. Intrathecal fentanyl with hyperbaric bupivacaine improves analgesia during cesarean delivery and in early post- operative period. Indian J Anaesth 2002;46:469-72.
- Khan F, Hamdani G. Comparison of intrathecal fentanyl and buprenorphine in urological surgery. J Pak Med Assoc 2006;56:277-81.
- 39. Khezri MB, Tahaei E, Atlasbaf AH. Comparison of postoperative analgesic effect of intrathecal Ketamine and fentanyl added to bupivacaine in patients undergoing cesarean section: A prospective randomized double-blind study. Middle East J

Anesthesiol 2014;23:427-36.

- 40. Kumar K, Somani S, Babu K. Comparative study to evaluate antiemetic efficacy of intrathecal fentanyl and midazolam for lower segment cesarean section in subarchnoid block. IOSR J Dent Med Sci 2016;15:49-53.
- 41. Li Z, Tian M, Zhang CY, Li AZ, Huang AJ, Shi CX, *et al*. A randomised controlled trial to evaluate the effectiveness of intrathecal bupivacaine combined with different adjuvants (fentanyl, clonidine and dexmedetomidine) in cesarean section. Drug Res (Stuttg) 2015;65:581-6.
- 42. Lim Y, Jung J, Lim K, So K. Effect of intrathecal fentanyl with hyperbaric bupivacaine on unilateral spinal anesthesia for knee arthroscopy. Korean J Anesth 2006;50:530-5.
- 43. Meshram S. Comparison of intrathecal fentanyl and midazolam as an adjuvant to bupivacaine for enhancing the quality of subarachnoid block and thereby preventing nausea and vomiting in cesarean delivery. J Evid Based Med Healthc 2016;3:5393-9.
- 44. Motiani P, Chaudhary S, Bahl N, Sethi AK. Intrathecal sufentanil versus fentanyl for lower limb surgeries -A randomized controlled trial. J Anaesthesiol Clin Pharmacol 2010;26:507-13.
- 45. Pallavi P, Choubey S, Sarkar A. Comparison between Fentanyl as an adjuvant to Bupivacaine versus Bupivacaine alone among patients undergoing lower abdominal surgeries under sub arachnoid block. Central Journal of ISA 2017;1:64-71.
- 46. Paulraj S, Kumaran C. Evaluation of the efect of intrathecal fentanyl citrate as an adjuvant with hyperbaric bupivacaine for cesarean. Indian J Appl Res 2018;8:16-8.
- 47. Rahimzadeh P, Faiz SHR, Imani F, Derakhshan P, Amniati S. Comparative addition of dexmedetomidine and fentanyl to intrathecal bupivacaine in orthopedic procedure in lower limbs. BMC Anesthesiol 2018;18:1-7.
- 48. Randalls B, Broadway JW, Browne DA, Morgan BM. Comparison of four subarachnoid solutions in a needle-through-needle technique for elective cesarean section. Br J Anaesth 1991;66:314-8.
- 49. Rudra P, Rudra A. Comparison of intrathecal fentanyl and midazolam for prevention of nausea-vomiting during cesarean delivery under spinal anesthesia. Indian J Anaesth 2004;48:461-4.
- Sadegh A, Tazeh-kand NF, Eslami B. Intrathecal fentanyl for prevention of shivering in spinal anesthesia in cesarean section. Med J Islam Repub Iran 2012;26:85-9.
- 51. Safari F, Aminnejad R, Mohajerani SA, Farivar F, Mottaghi K, Safdari H. Intrathecal dexmedetomidine and fentanyl as adjuvant to bupivacaine on duration of spinal block in addicted patients. Anesthesiol Pain Med 2016;6:1-7.
- 52. Safavi M, Honarmand A, Rahmanikhah E, Badiei S, Attari M. Intrathecal Meperidine versus intrathecal Fentanyl for prevention of shivering in lower limb orthopedic surgeries under spinal anesthesia: A randomized double-blind placebo-controlled trial. J Res Pharm Pract 2014;3:137-41.
- 53. Shashikala T, Srinivas V. A clinical study of effect of spinal fentanyl on subarchnoid block in parturients. J Evol Med Dent Sci 2014;3:8980-90.
- 54. Shim S, Park J, Hyun D, Jeong E, Kim S, Lee H. The effects of adjuvant intrathecal fentanyl on postoperative pain and rebound pain for anorectal surgery under saddle anesthesia. Korean J Anesthesiol 2018;71:213-9.