It is made available	under a CC-	BY 4.0	International	license.

1	The effects of left vagus nerve block on postoperative nausea
2	and vomiting in patients undergoing thoracic or abdominal
3	laparoscopic surgery: A randomized controlled trial
4	
5	Chen Chen ¹ , Zhongyu Yang ¹ , Qi Zheng ¹ , Yanghao Ren ¹ , Tianyu Yang ¹ , Xinyue Zhen
6	¹ , Liang Ding ¹ , Bingqian Fan ¹ , Tianhai Wang ¹ *, Hongyan Dai ² **
7	¹ Department of Anesthesiology, Affiliated Cancer Hospital of Xinjiang Medical
8	University, Urumqi, Xinjiang, China
9	² Basic Medical College Functional Center, Xinjiang Medical University, Urumqi,
10	Xinjiang, China
11	
12	* Corresponding author. E-mail: wangth007@163.com (TW)
13	** Corresponding author. E-mail: 277865891@qq.com (HD)
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

2

23 Abstract

Purpose To explore the influence of preoperative vagus nerve block (VNB) on postoperative nausea and vomiting (PONV) in patients undergoing thoracic or abdominal laparoscopic surgery.

27 **Methods** Patients were randomly divided into the VNB group (V group, n=60) and 28 the control group (C group, n=60). The V group received left VNB before anesthesia 29 induction, while the C group did not receive any intervention. The incidence and 30 severity of PONV within one day after surgery were compared between the two groups 31 to evaluate the effect of left VNB on PONV in patients.

Results The incidence of PONV in the V group (25%) was significantly lower than that in the C group (60%) ($\chi^2 = 15.038$, P < 0.001). The incidences of mild and severe

PONV in the V group were 16.67% and 8.33%, respectively, while those in the C group

were 36.67% and 23.33%, respectively. The differences between the two groups were

36 significant (mild: $\chi^2 = 6.136$, P = 0.013; severe: $\chi^2 = 5.065$, P = 0.024).

37 Conclusion Left VNB can reduce the incidence and severity of PONV caused by
 38 thoracic or abdominal laparoscopic surgery.

Keywords Laparoscopic surgery; Vagus nerve block; Postoperative nausea and
 vomiting.

41 Trial registration Trial was prospectively registered in the Chinese Clinical Trial
42 Registry (number: ChiCTR2100044470).

43

44

45 Introduction

Postoperative nausea and vomiting (PONV) is a common complication following
surgery. PONV not only prolongs the hospital stay of patients, increases hospitalization
costs, and reduces patient satisfaction and quality of life, but also is one of the problems
that plague anesthesiologists and surgeons [1-3].

Some studies have shown that the vagus nerve mediates the communication 50 between the gut and brain, which is a key pathway in the occurrence of PONV [4-5]. 51 Scholar Xie et al. established a novel paradigm using a mouse model to study the 52 53 "nausea-vomiting" response and found that vomiting depends on the "gut-to-brain axis," with the vagus nerve playing an important role [6]. Additionally, an observational 54 cohort study by Li et al. indicated that vagus nerve resection during esophagectomy or 55 56 gastrectomy reduced the incidence of PONV from 28.7% to 11.9% compared to procedures without vagus nerve resection [7]. Although this result suggests that 57 blocking the vagus nerve that controls the gastrointestinal tract may inhibit the 58 59 occurrence of PONV, the high technical demands on the surgeon, significant visceral trauma, and potential damage to surrounding normal tissue structures limit its clinical 60 application. With the development of ultrasound technology, vagus nerve block (VNB) 61 through the neck has made the injection process visualized, ensuring the safety of the 62 63 procedure. Additionally, the nerve is surrounded by the carotid sheath, which limits the spread of local anesthetics. Therefore, the dose of local anesthetic required to block this 64 65 nerve is relatively small, and the block duration is long, which has begun to be applied clinically [8-9]. 66

4

67	Therefore, this study aims to explore the effect of left VNB on PONV in patients
68	undergoing thoracic or abdominal laparoscopic surgery, to provide a new choice for the
69	multimodal prevention and treatment strategy of PONV.
70	
71	
72	
73	
74	
75	
76	
77	
78	
79	
80	
81	
82	
83	
84	
85	
86	
87	
88	

It is made available under a GO BT 4.0 internation

89 Methods

90 Study design and ethics

- 91 This study adheres to the Declaration of Helsinki, as revised in 2013 for human trials,
- 92 and follows the applicable CONSORT guidelines. The study was registered on March
- 93 18, 2021, in the Chinese Clinical Trial Registry (Registration No: ChiCTR210004447
- 94 0), which is accessible at <u>https://www.chictr.org.cn/searchproj.html</u>. Additionally, on S
- 95 eptember 20, 2021, the Ethics Committee of the Affiliated Cancer Hospital of Xinjian
- 96 g Medical University (Chair: Professor Xiu Hua Zhang) granted ethical approval for th
- 97 is study (Ethics No: K-2021053). The recruitment period of this study was from Septe
- mber 21, 2021 to October 30, 2022. Written informed consent was obtained from patie
- 99 nts or their families before anesthesia and nerve block.
- 100

101 Setting

The trial will be conducted in the Anesthesia and Perioperative Medicine Center of
the Affiliated Cancer Hospital of Xinjiang Medical University in Urumqi, Xinjiang,
China.

105

106 **Patients**

107 A total of 130 patients scheduled for elective thoracic or abdominal laparoscopic 108 surgery were included. A researcher (XZ) who was unaware of the group assignments 109 learned about the patient's medical histories one day before surgery and signed the 110 informed consent forms for anesthesia and nerve block with the families or patients.

6

The inclusion criteria were: (1) ASA class I-III; (2) aged 25-65 years; (3) no history of
PONV; (4) patients undergoing elective thoracic or abdominal laparoscopic surgery.
The exclusion criteria were: (1) surgery duration less than 1 hour; (2) intraoperative
blood loss over 800 ml; (3) allergy to medications used in the study; (4) neck or
systemic infection; (5) neck deformity or large tumors; (6) hoarseness or deaf-muteness;
(7) refusal to participate before nerve block.

117

118 Randomization and blinding

119 A researcher (CC) numbered the patients according to their order of surgery and used randomization software (https://www.randomizer.org) to randomly assign the patients 120 to the VNB group (V group) or the control group (C group) in a 1:1 ratio. For each 121 122 patient, a sealed opaque envelope was prepared. Before the surgery, a researcher (ZY) opened the envelope in the pre-anesthesia room outside the operating room and decided 123 whether to perform VNB. Both groups of patients were handed over to an 124 125 anesthesiologist (TY), who administered general anesthesia according to the same procedure. The anesthesiologists (excluding CC and ZY), surgeons, nurses, post-126 anesthetic care unit (PACU), and outcome assessors were all unaware of the group 127 assignments. 128

129

130 Perioperative management and intervention

Patients did not receive preoperative medications on the day of surgery or the night
before. Patients first entered the pre-anesthesia room outside the operating room, where

they underwent standard monitoring procedures. A central venous access was established, and peripheral arterial puncture and catheterization were performed to monitor the patient's mean arterial pressure (MAP). The patient was connected to a monitor to detect electrocardiogram (ECG), heart rate (HR), pulse oxygen saturation (SpO2), and other indicators.

The V group received ultrasound-guided left VNB in the pre-anesthesia room 138 before anesthesia induction. The patient's head was turned to the right. The 139 anesthesiologist (ZY) used a high-frequency linear ultrasound probe to perform short-140 141 axis scanning at the level of the fourth cervical vertebra transverse process. The internal jugular vein and carotid artery were found. The carotid artery, internal jugular vein, and 142 vagus nerve are all surrounded by the carotid sheath. A round structure with stronger 143 144 peripheral echoes and weaker central echoes can be detected posterior to the internal jugular vein and lateral to the carotid artery. This structure is the vagus nerve. The 145 needle tip was inserted next to the vagus nerve in the carotid sheath. 0.5 ml of normal 146 147 saline was injected to determine the needle tip position. After confirming that the needle tip position was correct, 3 ml of 0.5% ropivacaine was injected. During the injection 148 process, attention should be paid to the direction of local anesthetic diffusion. Ideally, 149 the diffusion should be towards the caudal end of the patient. If the drug diffuses 150 towards the cephalic end, the upper part of the puncture site can be gently pressed to 151 prevent the drug from diffusing towards the cephalic end to prevent excessive block 152 level and affecting other nerves. A successful block was indicated by hoarseness within 153 154 2-5 minutes. The C group did not undergo VNB, but all other procedures were the same

155 as those for the V group.

Fifteen minutes after the block was completed, the patient was pushed into the 156 operating room. All patients were anesthetized and induced by the same 157 anesthesiologist (TY). Anesthesia induction included midazolam (0.05 mg/kg), 158 propofol (1.5 mg/kg), sufentanil (0.3 µg/kg), and rocuronium (0.6 mg/kg), followed by 159 tracheal intubation. Mechanical ventilation was used for both groups, with a respiratory 160 rate of 10-12 breaths/min, tidal volume of 6-8 ml/kg, and an I: E ratio of 1:2. Anesthesia 161 was maintained with continuous infusions of propofol (2-4 mg/kg/h), remifentanil (0.5 162 µg/kg/h), and rocuronium (0.5 mg/kg/h). Additional sufentanil (0.15 µg/kg) was 163 administered at the end of surgery. All patients were given patient-controlled 164 intravenous analgesia pumps after surgery. The drugs for patient-controlled analgesia 165 166 were all 4 mg of butorphanol tartrate and 100 µg of sufentanil diluted to 100 ml with normal saline, with a flow rate of 2 ml/h. 167

After extubation, the patient was transferred to the PACU, where the same 168 169 anesthesiologist (YR) was responsible for monitoring for at least 30 minutes until the modified Aldrete score reached more than 9 points as the discharge standard from the 170 PACU. After the patient was sent back to the ward, the same clinician (QZ) was 171 responsible. Whether in the PACU or the ward, no antiemetic drugs were given to the 172 patient before the occurrence of postoperative nausea and vomiting. In addition, 173 patients and their families were informed in advance to pay attention to the occurrence 174 of nausea and vomiting within 24 hours after surgery, and the patient was arranged in a 175 quiet ward to keep them away from factors that may induce nausea and vomiting. 176

Observation indicators

The collection of data was uniformly carried out by trained researchers (BF and LD). Preoperative general data of the two groups of patients were recorded: age, gender, weight, body mass index (BMI), American Society of Anesthesiologists (ASA) classification, and smoking history. Postoperative data recorded included the site of surgery, type of surgery, time of surgery, and the dosage of sufentanil used intraoperatively.

The primary outcomes were the incidence and severity of PONV on the first 184 185 postoperative day. PONV is defined as the occurrence of nausea and vomiting within 24 hours after surgery. Nausea is assessed based on the patient's subjective feeling of 186 nausea or the urge to vomit. Both retching and vomiting are recorded as vomiting 187 188 episodes. Retching is defined as the absence of gastric content expulsion, while any expulsion of gastric contents is recorded as vomiting. The severity is classified as mild 189 (< 3 episodes/day) and severe (\geq 3 episodes/day). Patients with only retching 190 191 symptoms are recorded as having mild vomiting [10].

The secondary outcomes included: (1) the duration of hoarseness in the V group.
(2) HR and MAP at T0 (10 minutes before nerve block), T1 (5 minutes before nerve
block), T2 (during nerve block), T3 (5 minutes after nerve block), T4 (10 minutes after
nerve block), and T5 (15 minutes after nerve block).

196

197 Sample size calculation and statistical analysis

198 We calculated the number of enrolled patients based on the incidence of PONV using

		10
199	PASS2021 software. Firstly, we assessed that the incidence of PONV in 34 patients	
200	undergoing laparoscopic surgery was 50% (these 34 patients were not included in the	
201	subsequent trial). After patients received the intervention, the reduction in the incidence	
202	of PONV showed differences in different studies. The recorded differences were 26%	
203	[11], 28% [12], and 37.7% [13]. Therefore, We believe that a 30% reduction in the	
204	incidence of PONV is clinically significant. We hypothesized that after implementing	
205	left VNB, the incidence of PONV would be 20%, with an α level of 0.05, power (1- β)	
206	of 0.90, and an attrition rate of 20%, resulting in a required sample size of 65 patients	
207	per group.	
208	In this study, IBM SPSS Statistics 26 software was used for data processing.	
209	Continuous variables that conformed to a normal distribution were expressed as mean	
210	\pm standard deviation and compared between groups using the two independent samples	
211	t-test. Continuous variables that did not conform to a normal distribution were	
212	expressed as Median (Q1, Q3) and compared between groups using the Mann-Whitney	
213	U test. Categorical variables were described as number (percentages) and compared	
214	between groups using the chi-square test. A P-value less than 0.05 was considered	
215	statistically significant.	
216		
217		

221 **Results**

222 Patients' characteristic

223 Between September 2021 and October 2022, a total of 130 patients were enrolled, of whom 2 were excluded based on exclusion criteria and 4 refused to participate. A total 224 of 124 patients were recruited and randomly assigned to one of two groups, with 62 225 226 patients in each group. One patient in the V group refused to accept the block before the procedure. Three patients were later excluded due to failure to complete follow-up. 227 A total of 120 patients completed the study, including 60 in the V group and 60 in the 228 229 C group (Fig.1). There were no significant differences in patient characteristics such as age, weight, BMI, gender, ASA classification, smoking status, site of surgery, type of 230 surgery, time of surgery, and intraoperative sufentanil dosage between the two groups 231

232 **(Table 1)**.

- 233
- 234

Fig.1. Trial flow chart.

235

236

Table 1 Demographic and surgical characters.

	V group	C group	P-value
	(n=60)	(n=60)	
Age, mean \pm SD	55.15±11.60	51.63±12.64	0.115
Male gender, n (%)	21(35.00)	18(30.00)	0.559
Weight (kg), mean \pm SD	62.40 ± 7.58	64.77±9.51	0.134
BMI (kg/m ²), mean \pm SD	23.48 ± 3.16	23.24 ± 2.97	0.659
Smoking history, n (%)	21(35.00)	16(26.66)	0.323
ASA class, n (%)			0.244
Class I	0(0.00)	2(3.33)	

12

Class II	45(75.00)	43(71.67)	
Class III	15(25.00)	15(25.00)	
Surgery site, n (%)			0.146
Right	22(36.67)	28(46.67)	
Left	35(58.33)	32(53.33)	
Mediastinum	3(5.00)	0(0.00)	
Surgery type, n (%)			0.166
Laparoscopic surgery	38(63.33)	45(75.00)	
Thoracoscopic surgery	22(36.67)	15(25.00)	
Surgery time (min), mean \pm S	179.47±52.64	186.80 ± 47.10	0.423
D			
Intraoperative sufentanil used	46.00(45.00, 46.0	46.00(45.00, 46.	0.924
(ug), median (Q1, Q3)	0)	00)	
Postoperative hoarseness durati	8.3 ± 3.4	-	
on (hour), mean \pm SD			

237 Data are presented as mean \pm standard deviation, median (Q1, Q3), or number (percen

238 tage).

239 Abbreviations: BMI, body mass index; ASA, American Society of Anesthesiologists. S

240 D, standard deviation.

241

242 **Primary outcomes**

243 The incidence of PONV in the V group (25%) was significantly lower than that in the

244 C group (60%) ($\chi^2 = 15.038$, P < 0.001, Table 2). The incidences of mild and severe

PONV in the V group were 16.67% and 8.33%, respectively, while in the C group, they

246 were 36.67% and 23.33%, respectively. The differences between the two groups were

247 statistically significant (mild: $\chi^2 = 6.136$, P = 0.013; severe: $\chi^2 = 5.065$, P = 0.024,

248 Table 2).

	V group	C group	χ^2	P-value
	(n=60)	(n=60)		
Incidence of PONV, n (%)	15(25.00)	36(60.00)	15.038	< 0.001
Severity of PONV, n (%)				
Mild	10(16.67)	22(36.67)	6.136	0.013
Severe	5(8.33)	14(23.33)	5.065	0.024

Table 2 Incidence and severity of PONV between the two groups. 249

Data are presented as numbers (percentages). 250

251 Abbreviations: PONV, postoperation nausea and vomiting.

252

Secondary outcomes 253

There were no significant differences in HR and MAP between the two groups at the 254

same time points and between T1-T5 and T0 within each group (Fig. 2). The duration 255

of hoarseness in the V group was 8.3 ± 3.4 hours (Table 1). 256

257

Fig.2. Comparison of HR and MAP at the same time points between the two groups 258

and before and after nerve block within each group. T0: 10 minutes before nerve 259

block; T1: 5 minutes before nerve block; T2: during nerve block; T3: 5 minutes after 260

nerve block; T4: 10 minutes after nerve block; T5: 15 minutes after nerve block. MAP: 261

Mean arterial pressure; HR: Heart rate. 262

263

264

265

266

14

267 **Discussion**

In this study, we tracked the incidence of PONV within postoperative 24 hours. The results showed that the V group had a significantly lower incidence of PONV than the C group by 35% (Table 2). Additionally, comparing the severity of PONV between the two groups, the V group had fewer cases of mild and severe PONV, indicating that VNB can reduce the incidence and severity of PONV.

The vagus nerve, which is widely distributed in the gastrointestinal tract, 273 transmits signals to the vomiting centers in the medulla's lateral reticular formation 274 275 upon stimulation, enhancing the excitability of these centers [14]. These centers send instructions through the vagus nerve, sympathetic nerve, and phrenic nerve 276 277 to the stomach and other related organs, triggering the vomiting response [15]. 278 Related studies suggest that the gut-vagus-brain reflex pathway, a typical emetic neural conduction pathway, plays a key role in PONV occurrence [6]. Studies have 279 shown that gastrointestinal-related surgeries or traumas can cause the release of 5-280 281 HT_3 from enterochromaffin cells, leading to the activation of 5-HT₃ receptors at the vagus nerve afferent nerve endings, which in turn induces vagus nerve reflexes, 282 nausea, and vomiting [16-17]. Similarly, anesthetics can enhance vagal afferent 283 excitation by activating substance P and 5-HT₃ receptors [14]. Additionally, 284 285 patients undergoing thoracic or abdominal laparoscopic surgery typically have higher intrathoracic and intra-abdominal pressures, and hypercapnia can activate 286 related vagal reflexes, inducing nausea and vomiting [18-19]. The release of 287 inflammatory mediators and cytokines caused by surgery mainly occurs within 24 288

15

hours after surgery [20-21], which suggests that the vagus nerve of patients may be in 289 a state of high stimulation within 24 hours after surgery. We observed the duration of 290 291 postoperative hoarseness in the V group (Table 1) and speculated that the average duration of left VNB was about 8 hours. Based on this, we hypothesize that left VNB 292 can reduce the conduction of signals to the vomiting centers such as the dorsolateral 293 margin of the lateral reticular formation of the medulla within 8 hours after surgery, 294 thereby maintaining the excitability of the vomiting center at a lower level. The 295 vomiting signals sent by the vomiting center to the efferent nerves are reduced, 296 297 ultimately reducing the incidence and severity of PONV in patients. Therefore, we conclude that the left vagus nerve pathway in the neck may be one of the key factors in 298 the occurrence of PONV. Blocking this neural conduction pathway can effectively 299 300 reduce the incidence and severity of PONV.

In this study, we observed the effects of left VNB on the HR and MAP of patients 301 at six-time points from T0 to T5. The results showed that there was no significant 302 303 difference in HR and MAP before and after the block within the same group and at the same time points between the two groups (Fig. 2), indicating that left VNB has limited 304 effects on HR and MAP. Considering the reasons: The heart is regulated by bilateral 305 vagus nerves. The right vagus nerve dominates the function of the sinoatrial node and 306 is more closely related to the atrium. The left vagus nerve is mainly related to the 307 ventricle, and the vagus nerve innervation of the ventricle is not as dense as that of the 308 309 atrium [22]. Therefore, left VNB generally does not have a significant impact on the 310 heart.

311	This study has the following limitations: First, as a single-center study, the sample
312	size is limited. Broader research and clinical validation are needed to confirm the
313	universality of these findings. Second, this study only focused on the incidence and
314	severity of PONV within the first day after surgery. No in-depth study was conducted
315	on the situation for a longer time after surgery. In the future, the long-term effects of
316	left VNB on PONV still need to be considered.
317	In summary, preoperative left VNB can prevent the incidence and severity of
318	PONV caused by thoracic or abdominal surgery. Additionally, left VNB has no
319	significant impact on hemodynamics (HR and MAP). Left VNB can be considered as
320	a new option for preventing the occurrence of PONV.
321	
322	
323	
324	
325	
326	
327	
328	
329	
330	
331	
332	

333	Author contributions Chen Chen: data curation, formal analysis, method
334	ology, project administration, software, validation, visualization, writing - original dra
335	ft, writing - review & editing. Zhongyu Yang: performing VNB, methodology, writing
336	original draft, review & editing. Qi Zheng: patient management, investigation, metho
337	dology. Yanghao Ren: patient management, investigation, methodology. Tianyu Yang:
338	patient management, investigation, methodology. Xinyue Zhen: investigation, metho
339	dology. Liang Ding: data collection. Bingqian Fan: data collection. Tianhai Wang: c
340	onceptualization, formal analysis, funding acquisition, methodology, project administr
341	ation, resources, supervision, validation, writing - review & editing; Hongyan Dai: co
342	nceptualization, formal analysis, methodology, project administration, resources, softw
343	are, supervision, validation.
344	Acknowledgments None.
345	Disclosures The authors report no conflicts of interest.
346	Funding statement None.
347	
348	
349	
350	
351	
352	

355 **References**

- 356 [1] Gress K, Urits I, Viswanath O, et al. Clinical and economic burden of postoperati
- 357 ve nausea and vomiting: Analysis of existing cost data [J]. Best Pract Res Clin An
- aesthesiol. 2020 Dec;34(4):681-686.
- 359 [2] Huh H. Postoperative nausea and vomiting in spinal anesthesia [J]. Korean J Anes
- 360 thesiol. 2023 Apr;76(2):87-88.
- 361 [3] Cho YJ, Choi GJ, Ahn EJ, et al. Pharmacologic interventions for postoperative na
- usea and vomiting after thyroidectomy: a systematic review and network meta-an
- 363 alysis [J]. PLoS One. 2021;16:e0243865.
- 364 [4] Karakan T, Ozkul C, Küpeli Akkol E, *et al.* Gut-Brain-Microbiota Axis: Antibioti
- 365 cs and Functional Gastrointestinal Disorders [J]. Nutrients. 2021 Jan 27;13(2):38
 366 9.
- 367 [5] Browning KN, Carson KE. Central Neurocircuits Regulating Food Intake in Resp
- 368 onse to Gut Inputs-Preclinical Evidence [J]. Nutrients. 2021 Mar 11;13(3):908.
- 369 [6] Xie Z, Zhang X, Zhao M, *et al.* The gut-to-brain axis for toxin-induced defensive
 370 responses [J]. Cell. 2022 Nov 10;185(23):4298-4316.e21.
- [7] Li N, Liu L, Sun M, et al. Predominant role of gut-vagus-brain neuronal pathway
- in postoperative nausea and vomiting: evidence from an observational cohort stud
- 373 y [J]. BMC Anesthesiol. 2021 Sep 29;21(1):234.
- [8] Gong WY, Zhang JY, Wang AZ, *et al.* The combination of paravertebral block and
 cervical vagus nerve block applied alone for anaesthesia of open appendectomy d
- uring COVID-19 [J]. Anaesth Crit Care Pain Med. 2022 Aug;41(4):101091.

19

- 377 [9] Gong WY, Yue XF, Cheng C, *et al.* The application of cervical vagus nerve block
- in the awake video-assisted thoracic surgery for bullectomy [J]. Anaesth Crit Care
 Pain Med. 2021 Apr;40(2):100823.
- [10] Manahan MA, Basdag B, Kalmar CL, et al. Risk of severe and refractory postope
- rative nausea and vomiting in patients undergoing deep flap breast reconstruction
- 382 [J]. Microsurgery. 2014 Feb;34(2): 112-21.
- 383 [11] Ham SY, Shim YH, Kim EH, et al. Aprepitant for antiemesis after laparoscopic g
- 384 ynaecological surgery: A randomised controlled trial [J]. Eur J Anaesthesiol. 2016
- 385 Feb;33(2):90-5.
- [12] Jung WS, Kim YB, Park HY, et al. Oral administration of aprepitant to prevent po
- stoperative nausea in highly susceptible patients after gynecological laparoscopy
 [J]. J Anesth. 2013 Jun;27(3):396-401.
- [13] de Morais LC, Sousa AM, Flora GF, *et al*. Aprepitant as a fourth antiemetic proph
- 390 ylactic strategy in high-risk patients: a double-blind, randomized trial [J]. Acta An
 391 aesthesiol Scand. 2018 Apr;62(4):483-492.
- 392 [14] Zhong W, Shahbaz O, Teskey G, et al. Mechanisms of Nausea and Vomiting: Cur
- 393 rent Knowledge and Recent Advances in Intracellular Emetic Signaling Systems
- 394 [J]. Int J Mol Sci. 2021 May 28;22(11):5797.
- [15] Browning KN, Carson KE. Central Neurocircuits Regulating Food Intake in Resp
 onse to Gut Inputs-Preclinical Evidence [J]. Nutrients. 2021 Mar 11;13(3):908.
- [16] Denholm, L, Gallagher, G. Physiology and pharmacology of nausea and vomiting
- 398 [J]. Anaesthesia & Intensive Care Medicine. 2021 Oct;22(10):663-666.

399	[17] Browning KN. Role of central vagal 5-HT3 receptors in gastrointestinal physiolo
400	gy and pathophysiology [J]. Front Neurosci. 2015 Oct 29;9:413.

- 401 [18] Besir A, Tugcugil E. Comparison of different end-tidal carbon dioxide levels in pr
- 402 eventing postoperative nausea and vomiting in gynaecological patients undergoin
- 403 g laparoscopic surgery [J]. J Obstet Gynaecol. 2021 Jul;41(5):755-762.
- 404 [19] Fujimoto D, Egi M, Makino S, et al. The association of intraoperative end-tidal ca
- rbon dioxide with the risk of postoperative nausea and vomiting [J]. J Anesth. 202
- 406 0 Apr;34(2):195-201.
- 407 [20] Bain CR, Myles PS, Corcoran T, et al. Postoperative systemic inflammatory dysre
- 408 gulation and corticosteroids: a narrative review [J]. Anaesthesia. 2023 Mar;78(3):
 409 356-370.
- 410 [21] Hirsch J, Vacas S, Terrando N, et al. Perioperative cerebrospinal fluid and plasma
- 411 inflammatory markers after orthopedic surgery [J]. J Neuroinflammation. 2016 A
- 412 ug 30;13(1):211.
- 413 [22] Ramani R. Vagus nerve stimulation therapy for seizures [J]. J Neurosurg Anesthes
 414 iol. 2008 Jan;20(1):29-35.

CONSORT 2010 Flow Diagram



Figure 1

a 90 (mdq) a 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10		V group C group	b 110 (gHmm) APM 90 80			 V group C group
T0 T1	T2 T3	T4 T5	-	T0 T1	T2 T3	T4 T5
Indicators Group T	0	T1	T2	Т3	T4	Т5
HR V group 74 (n=60)	4.63±10.01	73.70±10.16	72.78 ± 10.04	75.65 ± 9.42	74.47 ± 10.01	74.88 ± 10.38
C group 73 (n=60)	3.50 ± 10.21	74.77±10.90	74.25 ± 11.06	74.52 ± 10.63	75.38 ± 10.34	74.35 ± 10.93
P-value 0.	.540	0.580	0.449	0.538	0.623	0.785
MAP V group 92 (n=60)	2.72±9.05	92.99±8.69	92.40±8.61	92.72±8.45	92.19±8.87	92.58 ± 8.00
C group 92 (n=60)	2.97 ± 6.35	94.20±7.37	94.04±7.49	93.53±7.79	92.76±8.19	92.23±7.63
<i>P</i> -value 0.	.861	0.414	0.266	0.588	0.717	0.807

Figure 2