



Extended Research Article

Gabapentin as an adjunct to multimodal pain regimens in surgical patients: the GAP placebo-controlled RCT and economic evaluation

Sarah Baos,¹ Terrie Walker-Smith,¹ Mandy Lui,¹ Elizabeth A Stokes,²
Jingjing Jiang,² Maria Pufulete,³ Ben Gibbison^{3,4*} and Chris A Rogers¹
and on behalf of The GAP Investigators

¹Bristol Trials Centre, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

²Health Economics Research Centre, Nuffield Department of Population Health, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

³Bristol Heart Institute, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

⁴Bristol Royal Infirmary, University Hospitals Bristol and Weston NHS Foundation Trust, Bristol, UK

*Corresponding author ben.gibbison@bristol.ac.uk

Published February 2026
DOI: 10.3310/PLMH9787

Plain language summary

Gabapentin as an adjunct to multimodal pain regimens in surgical patients: the GAP placebo-controlled RCT and economic evaluation

Health Technology Assessment 2026; Vol. 30: No. 9
DOI: 10.3310/PLMH9787

NIHR Journals Library www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

Plain language summary

Background

Gabapentin is a medicine used to treat epilepsy and pain caused by damaged nerves. Doctors have recently been using gabapentin to treat pain after an operation, with the intention of reducing the amount of morphine-type drugs (called 'opioids') needed while maintaining good pain relief. Doctors want to try to reduce the amount of opioid drugs because they cause side effects (such as dizziness and reduced breathing rate), often delaying discharge from hospital and leading to slower recovery. There is uncertainty about whether adding gabapentin to the usual painkilling drugs will result in good pain relief, with fewer side effects, and therefore faster recovery after surgery.

Who participated?

One thousand one hundred and ninety-five adults having major heart, lung or abdominal surgery who were expected to stay in hospital for at least 2 days after their surgery.

What was involved?

The participants were given either gabapentin or placebo (the same tablet but with no active drug) just before and twice daily for 2 days after their surgery. We measured how long they stayed in hospital after the surgery, the amount of opioid drugs they used, the amount of pain they had, what their quality of life was and how much they cost the National Health Service. We measured these during their hospital stay and at 4 weeks and 4 months after the surgery.

What did the trial find?

The trial found that there was no difference in the length of hospital stay, the number of adverse health events, or National Health Service costs between people who took gabapentin and those who took the placebo. People who took gabapentin for abdominal and thoracic surgery used fewer opioid-type drugs in-hospital after their surgery – but this did not translate into better pain control or fewer side effects. Therefore, this trial tells us that doctors should stop routinely giving gabapentin to people to reduce their pain after major surgery.

Health Technology Assessment

ISSN 2046-4924 (Online)

Impact factor: 4

A list of Journals Library editors can be found on the [NIHR Journals Library website](#)

Launched in 1997, *Health Technology Assessment* (HTA) has an impact factor of 4 and is ranked 30th (out of 174 titles) in the 'Health Care Sciences & Services' category of the Clarivate 2022 Journal Citation Reports (Science Edition). It is also indexed by MEDLINE, CINAHL (EBSCO Information Services, Ipswich, MA, USA), EMBASE (Elsevier, Amsterdam, the Netherlands), NCBI Bookshelf, DOAJ, Europe PMC, the Cochrane Library (John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, USA), INAHTA, the British Nursing Index (ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, USA), Ulrichsweb™ (ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, USA) and the Science Citation Index Expanded™ (Clarivate™, Philadelphia, PA, USA).

This journal is a member of and subscribes to the principles of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (www.publicationethics.org/).

Editorial contact: journals.library@nihr.ac.uk

The full HTA archive is freely available to view online at www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/hta.

Criteria for inclusion in the *Health Technology Assessment* journal

Manuscripts are published in *Health Technology Assessment* (HTA) if (1) they have resulted from work for the HTA programme, and (2) they are of a sufficiently high scientific quality as assessed by the reviewers and editors.

Reviews in *Health Technology Assessment* are termed 'systematic' when the account of the search appraisal and synthesis methods (to minimise biases and random errors) would, in theory, permit the replication of the review by others.

HTA programme

Health Technology Assessment (HTA) research is undertaken where some evidence already exists to show that a technology can be effective and this needs to be compared to the current standard intervention to see which works best. Research can evaluate any intervention used in the treatment, prevention or diagnosis of disease, provided the study outcomes lead to findings that have the potential to be of direct benefit to NHS patients. Technologies in this context mean any method used to promote health; prevent and treat disease; and improve rehabilitation or long-term care. They are not confined to new drugs and include any intervention used in the treatment, prevention or diagnosis of disease.

The journal is indexed in NHS Evidence via its abstracts included in MEDLINE and its Technology Assessment Reports inform National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidance. HTA research is also an important source of evidence for National Screening Committee (NSC) policy decisions.

This article

The research reported in this issue of the journal was funded by the HTA programme as award number 15/101/16. The contractual start date was in June 2017. The draft manuscript began editorial review in October 2023 and was accepted for publication in January 2025. The authors have been wholly responsible for all data collection, analysis and interpretation, and for writing up their work. The HTA editors and publisher have tried to ensure the accuracy of the authors' manuscript and would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments on the draft document. However, they do not accept liability for damages or losses arising from material published in this article.

This article presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR). The views and opinions expressed by authors in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the NHS, the NIHR, the HTA programme or the Department of Health and Social Care. If there are verbatim quotations included in this publication the views and opinions expressed by the interviewees are those of the interviewees and do not necessarily reflect those of the authors, those of the NHS, the NIHR, the HTA programme or the Department of Health and Social Care.

This article was published based on current knowledge at the time and date of publication. NIHR is committed to being inclusive and will continually monitor best practice and guidance in relation to terminology and language to ensure that we remain relevant to our stakeholders.

Copyright © 2026 Baos *et al.* This work was produced by Baos *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This is an Open Access publication distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution CC BY 4.0 licence, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, reproduction and adaptation in any medium and for any purpose provided that it is properly attributed. See: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>. For attribution the title, original author(s), the publication source – NIHR Journals Library, and the DOI of the publication must be cited.

Published by the NIHR Journals Library (www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk), produced by Newgen Digitalworks Pvt Ltd, Chennai, India (www.newgen.co).