International Journal Dental and Medical Sciences Research
Volume 3, Issue 6, Nov-Dec 2021 pp 106-113 www.ijdmsrjournal.com ISSN: 2582-6018

Peripheralnerveblocksinthemanagementof postoperativepain:challenges, Prospects andopportunities

Dr. Ruttuika Panda, Dr.Subhadarshini Dash, Dr. Yogesh Kumar Chetty, Dr. Sabyasachi Tripathy,

Junior Resident,Dept of Anaesthesiology,Hitech medical college and hospital,Bhubaneswar.
Junior Resident,Dept of Anaesthesiology,Hitech Medical College and hospital,Bhubaneswar.
Associate Professor,Dept of Anaesthesiology,Hitech medical college and hospital,Bhubaneswar.
Assistant Professor,Dept of Anaesthesiology,Hitech medical college and hospital,Bhubaneswar.

Submitted: 01-11-2021 Revised: 12-11-2021 Accepted: 15-11-2021

ABSTRACT

Peripheral nerve blocks (PNBs) are increasingly used as a component of multimodal analgesia and may be administered as a single injection (sPNB) or continuous infusion via a perineural catheter (cPNB). We undertook a qualitative review focusing on sPNB and cPNB with regard to benefits, risks, and opportu- nities for optimizing patient care. Meta-analyses of randomized controlled trials have shown superior pain control and reductions in opioid consumption in patients receiving PNB compared with those receiving in- travenous opioids in a variety of upper and lower extremity surgical procedures. cPNB has also been asso- ciated with a reduction in time to discharge readiness compared with sPNB. Risks of PNB, regardless of technique or block location, include vascular puncture and bleeding, nerve damage, and local anesthetic sys- temic toxicity. Site-specific complications include quadriceps weakness in patients receiving femoral nerve block, and pleural puncture or neuraxial blockade in patients receiving interscalene block. The major limi- tation of sPNB is the short (12-24 hours) duration of action. cPNB may be complicated by catheter obstruc- tion, migration, and leakage of local anesthetic as well as accidental removal of catheters. Potential infectious complications of catheters, although rare, include local inflammation and infection. Other consid- erations for ambulatory cPNB include appropriate patient selection, education, and need for 24/7 availability of a health care provider to address any complications. The ideal PNB technique would have a duration of action that is sufficiently long to address the most intense period of postsurgical pain; shouid be associated
with minimal risk of infection, neurologic complications, bleeding, and local anesthetic systemic toxicity; and should be easy to perform, convenient for patients, and easy to manage in the postoperative period.

I. INTRODUCTION

Multimodal analgesia refers to the use of combinations of analgesics acting via different mechanisms and thus taking ad- vantage of additive or synergistic activity while minimizing adverse events with larger doses of a single analgesic [1]. Evidence-based multimodal techniques are procedure specific and may include combinations of systemic analgesics (eg, opi- oids, acetaminophen, nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs), neuraxial analgesia (spinal, epidural, and combination spinal/ epidural), local infiltration, and peripheral nerve blocks (PNBs).

The benefits of PNBs are numerous and include improve- ment in clinical, economic, and humanistic outcomes (Table 1). PNBs have been associated with improvement in postopera- tive pain control and reduction in the use of opioids in a variety of surgical procedures [2-7]. Avoidance of opioids not only minimizes the risk of adverse events but also has important public health implications given that opioids prescribed at hospital discharge, which are often in excess of the amount required to manage postoperative pain, may serve as a source for diversion [8,9]. Other benefits of PNBs include reduction in hospital resource utilization [10,11], improved postoperative recovery [10,12,13], and improvementinpatient satisfaction [2].

Given the many benefits of PNBs in practice, it is not sur- prising that their use has expanded over the last several de- cades. PNBs are now a common component of analgesia for both upper extremity (eg, brachial plexus block using intersca- lene, supra- or infraclavicular, and axillary nerve approaches)

[14] and lower extremity (eg, lumbar plexus, femoral, sciatic, and popliteal sciatic blocks, among others) procedures [15]. Technical advances include the use of ultrasound-guided nee- dle placement and the movement from the use of single injec- tions of local anesthetic (single-shot PNB

[sPNB]) to a

Table 1 Benefits of PNB as a component of multimodal post-operative analgesia regimen

- Improvement in postoperative pain control and reduction in the use of opioids [2-7]
- Reduction in hospital length of stay [10,11]
- Prevention of hospital readmissions [16]
- Reduction in postoperative nausea and vomiting [2]
- Faster movement to phase 2 recovery and/or postanesthesia care unit bypass [13]
- Earlier participation in physical therapy [10]
- Improved patient satisfaction [2]

continuous infusion administered using a perineural catheter (continuous PNB [cPNB]). One recent study showed that the use of femoral nerve block (FNB, both cPNB and sPNB) after total knee arthroplasty (TKA) among Medicare patients in-creased dramatically between 2008 and 2009 [16]. As this use has expanded both within the hospital and in ambulatory settings, a greater understanding of the potential risks of these procedures and unmet needs has been achieved.

The objective of this article is to review the recent literature on sPNB and cPNB as a component of multimodal postopera- tive analgesia, highlighting benefits, risks, and opportunities for optimizing patient care. A search of the literature was per- formed using PubMed, including citations published up to March 2015. Search terms included nerve block [MeSH term], combined with efficacy or effectiveness, safety or complication or adverse event, and cost or economic. From the search re-sults and the references cited in articles identified in the search, we selected articles most relevant to our objective. The assess- ment of efficacy focused on systematic reviews and meta- analyses comparing sPNB and cPNB to opioid-based analge- sia and to each other. Additional information on risks and complications was gathered primarily from PNB registries and retrospective database analyses, which represent the use of PNB in current clinical practice.

II. CLINICAL EFFICACY OF PNB

PNB vsopioids

The efficacy of sPNB in improving short-term pain control has been shown in a number of upper and lower extremity sur- gical procedures. In a Cochrane review of randomized trials in patients undergoing major knee surgery, PNB used in combi-nation with systemic analgesics (primarily opioids) was asso- ciated with significantly lower pain scores at rest from 0 to 72 hours after surgery, but no difference in pain on movement until 48 to 72 hours postoperatively, compared with systemic analgesics alone [6]. This review included a broad range of surgical procedures (TKA, anterior cruciate ligament [ACL] repair, and meniscectomy), block techniques (sPNB and cPNB), and locations (femoral, femoral/sciatic, adductor ca- nal), many of which have been investigated in more focused systematic reviews. A meta-analysis of randomized trials com- paring single-shot FNB to intravenous patient-controlled anal- gesia opioids showed a significant reduction in pain at rest and on movement for up to 24 and 48 hours, respectively, with sig-nificantly less opioid consumption for up to 48 hours [2]. When continuous FNB was compared with intravenous patient-controlled analgesia, pain at rest and pain on move- ment were significantly reduced for 48 and 72 hours, respec- tively [2]. In a meta-analysis comparing single and continuous psoas compartment block to oral opiates in patients undergoing total hip arthroplasty, visual analogue scale pain scores was significantly reduced in patients receiving either type of psoas compartment block at up to 24 hours postopera- tively [3]. Pain outcomes were not reported for any subsequent time points. One retrospective study found a significantly low- er 30-day all-cause readmission rates in Medicare patients un- dergoing TKA with cPNB (hazard ratio = 0.43, P b .001) or sPNB (hazard ratio = 0.49, P b .001) compared with no PNB; 90-day and 365-day readmission rates were also signif-icantly reduced [16].

The impact of PNB on pain intensity in patients undergoing ACL repair is not as clear. In a Cochrane review comparing PNB in combination with systemic analgesia to systemic anal- gesia alone (n = 3 randomized controlled trials), pain intensities at rest and on movement were not significantly improved in patients undergoing ACL repair receiving PNB [6]. In a sys- tematic review of 13 randomized trials comparing FNB to sham or placebo blocks in patients undergoing ACL surgery, Mall and Wright [17] found that pain relief was greater with FNB in only 5 trials and that opioid-related nausea and seda- tion occurred less frequently in the FNB group in only 1 trial. Differences in study designs and outcomes have largely prevented studies of upper extremity surgical procedures to be combined using meta-analysis [4]; however, several sys- tematic reviews have provided qualitative summaries of the existing evidence. In a review of trials comparing single-shot and continuous interscalene block (ISB) to saline injection or opioids for shoulder surgery, pain control was superior with single-shot ISB for up to 24 hours in 4 of 4 trials and with con- tinuous ISB for up to 48 hours in 2 of 2 trials [18]. A more re- cent review focusing on arthroscopic shoulder surgery reported that all of the 10 studies included found significant re- ductions in pain for up to 24 hours after surgery, with signifi- cant reductions in opioid use seen in 8 of 9 studies reporting this outcome [7].

cPNB vssPNB

Administration of local anesthetics via continuous infusion allows for a duration of analgesia significantly longer than that of a single injection. In a pooled analysis of 21 studies compar- ing cPNB to sPNB for postoperative analgesia, worst visual analogue scale pain scores and pain at rest were significantly lower in patients receiving cPNB on postoperative days 0, 1, and 2 but not day 3 [19]. Opioid consumption was also signif- icantly reduced in the cPNB group on days 1 and 2.

The availability of cPNB has allowed for appropriate pa- tients to be discharged home with an ambulatory infusion pump rather than stay in the hospital or receive alternative an- algesics (eg, oral opioids) at home. In 3 similarly designed tri- als in patients undergoing TKA, total hip arthroplasty, or total shoulder arthroplasty, Ilfeld and colleagues [20-22] found that readiness for hospital discharge, as measured by adequate an- algesia, not requiring IV opioids, and ability to walk at least 30 m, was achieved significantly faster among patients receiving cPNB until postoperative day 4 compared with those receiving cPNB until the morning after surgery.

III. RISKS AND LIMITATIONS OF PNB

Potential risks of PNB, regardless of technique or block lo- cation, include vascular puncture and bleeding, nerve damage, and local anesthetic systemic toxicity (LAST). PNB placement using ultrasound guidance has been shown to reduce the inci- dence of vascular puncture [23]. Neurologic complications are of particular concern because the duration of symptoms can extend for weeks or months after surgery [24,25]. These events are typically described by patients as tingling, pain on pressure, or pins and needles, and are associated with both sPNB and cPNB [24]. The incidence has been reported to be as high as 8.2% [26], with mixed evidence regarding the rela- tive risk with sPNB vs cPNB. One study showed a higher in- cidence with sPNB vs cPNB in patients receiving femoral blocks [24], one showed no difference in risk among a popula- tion receiving PNB at various locations [26], and one showed higher rates of neurological complications lasting at least 6 months with cPNB, although this difference did not reach statistical significance (P = .08) [27]. Rates of long-term neu- rologic symptoms have been shown to be higher in patients re- ceiving ISBs (3.5% vs 0.5% with other blocks, P = .002) [27]. Signs and symptoms of LAST are dose dependent and range from metallic taste, tinnitus, and perioral numbness to seizure, cardiac arrest, and death [28]. Registry-based studies that included either exclusively or primarily sPNB have report- ed seizure incidence of 0.08 to 0.28 case per 1000 blocks [27,29,30], whereas studies evaluating exclusively cPNB have found no cases of seizure [25,31]. Because of significant over- lap in the range of incidence, it is difficult to determine wheth- er seizure risk is reduced with cPNB. LAST without seizure is reported at rates of 0.25%-0.9% in patients receiving cPNB [25,31].

Site-specific limitations of PNBs include quadriceps weak- ness in patients receiving FNB, which may increase risk of falls, although this is controversial. Retrospective studies have found no increased risk of falls in patients undergoing TKA with PNB [16,32,33]. However, in a pooled analysis of 3 ran- domized, placebo-controlled trials, patients with lower ex- tremity cPNB with ropivacaine had significantly more falls than patients receiving perineural saline (7% vs 0%; P =.013) [34]. In a meta-analysis of 5 studies comparing fall risk among patients receiving lumbar plexus (either femoral or psoas) cPNB to sPNB or no PNB, cPNB was associated with a nearly 4-fold increase in the risk of falls [35]. However, the authors note that avoiding the use of cPNB is unlikely to elim- inate the risk of falls and may have a negative impact on pain management and recovery. A retrospective analysis of falls in 2197 patients undergoing primary TKA found an overall fall rate of 2.7%; independent risk factors for falls included contin- uous FNB (4.4; 95% confidence interval [CI], 1.04-18.2), in- creased age (odds ratio, 1.04; 95% CI, 1.0-1.07), and body mass index N30 kg/m^2 (2.4; 95% CI, 1.3-4.5) [36]. Single- shot FNB was not associated with an increased risk of fall. Ad- ductor canal blocks are associated with less quadriceps weak- ness [37-39], greater ability to ambulate [40,41], and similar pain control compared with FNB in patients undergoing TKA [38-41]; however, it is not yet clear whether these differ- ences directly impact fall risk.

Upper extremity PNBs may be complicated by pleural puncture and central neuraxial needle placement [18]. Pneu- mothorax has been recently reported in 0.2% of patients re- ceiving continuous ISB [42]. In a systematic review of 13 prospective and retrospective studies in patients receiving ISBs, Moore and colleagues [43] reported that adverse effects including dyspnea, hoarseness, Horner syndrome, and failed block occurred in 8.14% of patients. However, a retrospective analysis of 17 157 patients undergoing total shoulder arthro- plasty found no increase in the risk of pulmonary complica- tions or need for mechanical ventilation among patients receiving ISB in combination with general anesthesia com- pared with general anesthesia alone [44].

Single-shot PNB

The major limitation of sPNB is the short duration of action of most local anesthetics. As such, sPNB is best suited for surgi- cal procedures in which postoperative pain is not expected to ex- ceed 12-24 hours in duration; otherwise, patients are at risk for significant rebound pain after discharge [45]. Administration of larger volumes or higher concentrations of local anesthetics may increase the duration of block but also increase the risk of motor block and LAST [45]. Thus, alternative methods of overcoming these limitations for surgical procedures with pain persisting past the first postoperative day are required.

Continuous PNB

The incidence of cPNB complications is highly dependent on the insertion technique and block location, and thus, it is difficult to make generalizations across studies. Minor compli- cations include catheter dislodgement, obstruction, and fluid leakage at the catheter site [46]. Rates of catheter dislodgment in studies of volunteers engaging in activities of daily living were as high as 25% [47]. One study found that 2 of the 9 pa- tients with dislodged interscalene catheters were readmitted to the hospital, with the remaining 7 patients experiencing no sig- nificant pain [42].

Although rates of catheter bacterial colonization appear high, clinically relevant infection is rare (Table 2) [46]. Risk factors for colonization among patients receiving ultrasound-guided catheter insertion include catheter duration N48 hours,

Table 2 Infection-related complications of continuous PNB [46,48]

Complication	Incidence from observational studies	Notes
Colonization	6%-69%	Most common organisms are coagulase-negative Staphylococcus; others include gram-negative bacilli, including Escherichia coli and Enterococcus, and S aureus.
Inflammation	3%-9.6%	
Infection	0%-3%	

diabetes, and antibiotic administration during the month prior to surgery [48]. In contrast, single-injection PNB conducted under ultrasound guidance has not been associated with infection [49].

The costs associated with cPNB are an important consider- ation for providers and hospitals implementing this technique. These costs include infusion pumps, catheters, and other sup- plies; local anesthetic medications; and provider time required for patient education and follow-up. Sites using cPNB may re- alize cost savings with the use of reusable vs disposable pumps and using fixed-rate, basal-only pumps compared with variable-rate, bolus-capable pumps [50]. Ultrasound-guided sciatic cPNB has been shown to be more cost-effective than nerve stimulation guidance for catheter placement, with an in- crease in equipment costs being offset by a reduction in post- operative nursing time [51].

Whether cPNB is used in an inpatient or ambulatory set- ting, the resources required to provide this therapy safely and effectively are substantial. Facilities implementing cPNB pro- grams must first invest in developing the appropriate infra- structure (policies and protocols, communication channels) and then commit resources to patient and provider education and follow-up to ensure the best possible outcomes for pa- tients. Practical considerations for home use of cPNB include appropriate patient selection, follow-up, and education on pump management and removal. Patients for whom ambulato- ry cPNB may be inappropriate include those with known renal and hepatic insufficiency [52], heart and/or lung disease (among patients with ISBs) [52], altered mental status or psy- chosocial issues [53], inability to be contacted after discharge or to access a medical facility in case of emergency [45], and unwillingness to accept responsibility for pump management [52]. Prior to discharge, patients must be educated on the ap- propriate care of the catheter site and dressing, when to stop the pump for signs of toxicity, how to troubleshoot any cathe- ter or pump issues, when to call the physician or nurse for signs of infection or problems with the infusion system, and in- structions for catheter removal [53,54]. Ambulatory cPNB protocols differ in the frequency and mode of contact with pa- tients after discharge, ranging from written instructions only to home nursing visits [55], and the appropriate strategy should be determined on a case-by-case basis with consideration for the type of surgery and patient characteristics. Regardless of planned follow-up, however, a health care provider is required to be available 24 hours per day, 7 days per week to address patient concerns and questions. Catheter removal can usually be performed by the patient or a caregiver [45].

IV. OPPORTUNITIES

The ideal PNB technique would have a duration of action sufficient to provide pain relief for the most intense period of postoperative pain but not result in a dense motor block that could be unpleasant to the patient or lead to safety issues such as falls. Moreover, the risk of infection, neurologic complica- tions, bleeding, and LAST should be minimized to the extent possible. The technique should be easy to perform and thus in- dependent of the technical skill of the anesthesiologist and with minimal chance of failed procedures. Finally, the ideal PNB technique should be convenient for patients and easy to manage in the postoperative period.

Currently available PNB techniques fall short of this ideal in a number of ways. sPNB is simple to perform, avoids the concerns associated with indwelling cPNB catheters, and does not require the patient to be responsible for medication admin- istration at home, but the duration of block is often insufficient to manage pain beyond the first postoperative day. cPNB has the advantages of a prolonged duration of analgesia while ad- ministering more dilute local anesthetic solutions (and thus minimizing risk of LAST). However, catheter dislodgement rates may be unacceptable, not all patients are willing to accept the responsibility of home cPNB, and extensive education and follow-up are required for successful use.

V. DISCUSSION

Peripheral nerve block techniques are now commonly incor- porated into multimodal postoperative analgesic strategies. The consequences of expanded use of PNB include improvement in pain relief and postoperative opioid requirements, in addition to improved postoperative recovery and fewer opioid-related ad- verse events. As an extension of these benefits, patients are able to be discharged from the hospital earlier, and surgical proce- dures are able to be performed in outpatient settings.

Despite these advances, there is room for improvement in the provision of postoperative pain management. Although cPNB addressed the primary limitation of sPNB, it has intro- duced a new set of technical difficulties, patient education needs, and complications. For carefully selected patients and well-trained anesthesiologists, cPNB can be a safe and effec- tive postoperative pain management strategy. Unfortunately, the increased complexity associated with an indwelling cathe- ter and pump assembly increases the likelihood of technique failure (ie, catheter dislodgement, kinking, or leaking), and there are many patients for whom cPNB is not appropriate ei- ther because of comorbid conditions, logistical issues, or unwillingness to participate in management. Additional PNB modalities are needed to reach this population, in addition to minimizing risks of complications and costs among patients who are cPNB candidates.

REFERENCES

[1] Joshi GP, Schug SA, Kehlet H. Procedure-specific pain management and outcome strategies. Best Pract Res Clin Anaesthesiol 2014;28:191-201.

[2] Chan EY, Fransen M, Parker DA, Assam PN, Chua N. Femoral nerve blocks for acute

International Journal Dental and Medical Sciences Research
Volume 3, Issue 6, Nov-Dec 2021 pp 106-113 www.ijdmsrjournal.com ISSN: 2582-6018

postoperative pain after knee replacement surgery. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2014;5:Cd009941.

[3] Touray ST, de Leeuw MA, Zuurmond WW, Perez RS. Psoas compart- ment block for lower extremity surgery: a meta-analysis. Br J Anaesth 2008;101:750-60.

[4] Ullah H, Samad K, Khan FA. Continuous interscalene brachial plexus block versus parenteral analgesia for postoperative pain relief after major shoulder surgery. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2014;2:Cd007080.

[5] Fredrickson MJ, Ball CM, Dalgleish AJ. Analgesic effectiveness of a continuous versus single-injection interscalene block for minor arthro- scopic shoulder surgery. Reg Anesth Pain Med 2010;35:28-33.

[6] Xu J, Chen XM, Ma CK, Wang XR. Peripheral nerve blocks for postop- erative pain after major knee surgery. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2014; 12:CD010937.

[7] Hughes MS, Matava MJ, Wright RW, Brophy RH, Smith MV. Intersca- lene brachial plexus block for arthroscopic shoulder surgery: a systematic review. J Bone Joint Surg Am 2013;95:1318-24.

[8] Bates C, Laciak R, Southwick A, Bishoff J. Overprescription of postop- erative narcotics: a look at postoperative pain medication delivery, con- sumption and disposal in urological practice. J Urol 2011;185:551-5.

[9] Rodgers J, Cunningham K, Fitzgerald K, Finnerty E. Opioid consump- tion following outpatient upper extremity surgery. J Hand Surg Am 2012;37:645-50.

[10] Liu Q, Chelly JE, Williams JP, Gold MS. Impact of peripheral nerve block with low dose local anesthetics on analgesia and functional outcomes fol- lowing total knee arthroplasty: a retrospective study. Pain Med 2014.

[11] Lenart MJ, Wong K, Gupta RK, Mercaldo ND, Schildcrout JS, Michaels D, et al. The impact of peripheral nerve techniques on hospital stay fol- lowing major orthopedic surgery. Pain Med 2012;13:828-34.

[12] Chan EY, Fransen M, Sathappan S, Chua NH, Chan YH, Chua N. Com- paring the analgesia effects of single-injection and continuous femoral nerve blocks with patient controlled analgesia after total knee arthro- plasty. J Arthroplasty 2013;28:608-13.

[13] Williams BA, Kentor ML, Vogt MT, Vogt WB, Coley KC, Williams JP, et al. Economics of nerve block pain management after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: potential hospital cost savings via associated postanesthesia care unit bypass and same-day discharge. Anesthesiology 2004;100:697-706.

[14] Srikumaran U, Stein BE, Tan EW, Freehill MT, Wilckens JH. Upper- extremity peripheral nerve blocks in the perioperative pain management of orthopaedic patients: AAOS exhibit selection. J Bone Joint Surg Am 2013;95 e197(1–13).

[15] Stein BE, Srikumaran U, Tan EW, Freehill MT, Wilckens JH. Lower- extremity peripheral nerve blocks in the perioperative pain management of orthopaedic patients: AAOS exhibit selection. J Bone Joint Surg Am 2012;94:e167.

[16] Lovald S, Ong K, Lau E, Joshi G, Kurtz S, Malkani A. A comparison of complications associated with catheter and injection femoral nerve blocks in knee arthroplasty. J Arthroplasty 2016 [In press].

[17] Mall NA, Wright RW. Femoral nerve block use in anterior cruciate liga- ment reconstruction surgery. Arthroscopy 2010;26:404-16.

[18] Fredrickson MJ, Krishnan S, Chen CY. Postoperative analgesia for shoulder surgery: a critical appraisal and review of current techniques. Anaesthesia 2010;65:608-24.

[19] Bingham AE, Fu R, Horn JL, Abrahams MS. Continuous peripheral nerve block compared with single-injection peripheral nerve block: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Reg Anesth Pain Med 2012;37:583-94.

[20] Ilfeld BM, Mariano ER, Girard PJ, Loland VJ, Meyer RS, Donovan JF, et al. A multicenter, randomized, triple-masked, placebo-controlled trial of the effect of ambulatory continuous femoral nerve blocks on discharge-readiness following total knee arthroplasty in patients on gen- eral orthopaedic wards. Pain 2010;150:477-84.

[21] Ilfeld BM, Ball ST, Gearen PF, Le LT, Mariano ER, Vandenborne K, et al. Ambulatory continuous posterior lumbar plexus nerve blocks after hip arthroplasty: a dual-center, randomized, triple-masked, placebo- controlled trial. Anesthesiology 2008;109:491-501.

[22] Ilfeld BM, Vandenborne K, Duncan PW, Sessler DI, Enneking FK, Shuster JJ, et al. Ambulatory continuous interscalene nerve blocks de- crease the time to discharge readiness after total shoulder arthroplasty: a randomized, triple-masked, placebo-controlled study. Anesthesiology 2006;105:999-1007.

[23] Abrahams MS, Aziz MF, Fu RF, Horn JL. Ultrasound guidance com- pared with electrical neurostimulation for peripheral nerve block: a sys- tematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Br J Anaesth 2009;102:408-17.
[24] Widmer B, Lustig S, Scholes CJ, Molloy A, Leo SP, Coolican MR, et al. Incidence and severity of complications due to femoral nerve blocks per- formed for knee surgery. Knee 2013;20:181-5.
[25] Compere V, Rey N, Baert O, Ouennich A, Fourdrinier V, Roussignol X, et al. Major complications after 400 continuous popliteal sciatic nerve blocks for post-operative analgesia. Acta Anaesthesiol Scand 2009;53: 339-45.
[26] Fredrickson MJ, Kilfoyle DH. Neurological complication analysis of 1000 ultrasound guided peripheral nerve blocks for elective orthopaedic surgery: a prospective study. Anaesthesia 2009;64:836-44.
[27] Sites BD, Taenzer AH, Herrick MD, Gilloon C, Antonakakis J, Richins J, et al. Incidence of local anesthetic systemic toxicity and postoperative neurologic symptoms associated with 12,668 ultrasound-guided nerve blocks: an analysis from a prospective clinical registry. Reg Anesth Pain Med 2012;37:478-82.
[28] Morau D, Ahern S. Management of local anesthetic toxicity. Int Anesthe- siol Clin 2010;48:117-40.
[29] Auroy Y, Benhamou D, Bargues L, Ecoffey C, Falissard B, Mercier FJ, et al. Major complications of regional anesthesia in France: the SOS re- gional anesthesia hotline service. Anesthesiology 2002;97:1274-80.
[30] Barrington MJ, Watts SA, Gledhill SR, Thomas RD, Said SA, Snyder GL, et al. Preliminary results of the Australasian Regional Anaesthesia Collaboration: a prospective audit of more than 7000 peripheral nerve and plexus blocks for neurologic and other complications. Reg Anesth Pain Med 2009;34:534-41.
[31] Nye ZB, Horn JL, Crittenden W, Abrahams MS, Aziz MF. Ambulatory continuous posterior lumbar plexus blocks following hip arthroscopy: a review of 213 cases. J Clin Anesth 2013;25:268-74.
[32] Memtsoudis SG, Danninger T, Rasul R, Poeran J, Gerner P, Stundner O, et al. Inpatient falls after total knee arthroplasty: the role of anesthesia type and peripheral nerve blocks. Anesthesiology 2014;120:551-63.
[33] Sharma S, Iorio R, Specht LM, Davies-Lepie S, Healy WL. Complica- tions of femoral nerve block for total knee arthroplasty. Clin Orthop Relat Res 2010;468:135-40.
[34] Ilfeld BM, Duke KB, Donohue MC. The association between lower ex- tremity continuous peripheral nerve blocks and patient falls after knee and hip arthroplasty. Anesth Analg 2010;111:1552-4.
[35] Johnson RL, Kopp SL, Hebl JR, Erwin PJ, Mantilla CB. Falls and major orthopaedic surgery with peripheral nerve blockade: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Br J Anaesth 2013;110:518-28.
[36] Wasserstein D, Farlinger C, Brull R, Mahomed N, Gandhi R. Advanced age, obesity and continuous femoral nerve blockade are independent risk factors for inpatient falls after primary total knee arthroplasty. J Arthro- plasty 2013;28:1121-4.
[37] Kwofie MK, Shastri UD, Gadsden JC, Sinha SK, Abrams JH, Xu D, et al. The effects of ultrasound-guided adductor canal block versus femoral nerve block on quadriceps strength and fall risk: a blinded, randomized trial of volunteers. Reg Anesth Pain Med 2013;38:321-5.
[38] Jaeger P, Zaric D, Fomsgaard JS, Hilsted KL, Bjerregaard J, Gyrn J, et al. Adductor canal block versus femoral nerve block for analgesia after total knee arthroplasty: a randomized, double-blind study. Reg Anesth Pain Med 2013;38:526-32.
[39] Kim DH, Lin Y, Goytizolo EA, Kahn RL, Maalouf DB, Manohar A, et al. Adductor canal block versus femoral nerve block for total knee arthroplasty: a prospective, randomized, controlled trial. Anesthesiology 2014;120:540-50.
[40] Shah NA, Jain NP. Is continuous adductor canal block better than contin- uous femoral nerve block after total knee arthroplasty? Effect on ambula- tion ability, early functional recovery and pain control: a randomized controlled trial. J Arthroplasty 2014;29:2224-9.
[41] Machi AT, Sztain JF, Kormylo NJ, Madison SJ, Abramson WB, Monahan AM, et al. Discharge readiness after tricompartment knee arthroplasty: adductor canal versus femoral continuous nerve blocks—a dual-center, randomized trial. Anesthesiology 2015;123:444-56.
[42] Marhofer P, Anderl W, Heuberer P, Fritz M,

Kimberger O, Marhofer D, et al. A retrospective analysis of 509 consecutive interscalene catheter in- sertions for ambulatory surgery. Anaesthesia 2015;70:41-6.

[43] Moore DD, Maerz T, Anderson K. Shoulder surgeons' perceptions of interscalene nerve blocks and a review of complications rates in the liter- ature. Phys Sportsmed 2013;41:77-84.

[44] Stundner O, Rasul R, Chiu YL, Sun X, Mazumdar M, Brummett CM, et al. Peripheral nerve blocks in shoulder arthroplasty: how do they influ- ence complications and length of stay? Clin Orthop Relat Res 2014;472: 1482-8.

[45] Salinas FV, Joseph RS. Peripheral nerve blocks for ambulatory surgery. Anesthesiol Clin 2014;32:341-55.

[46] Ilfeld BM. Continuous peripheral nerve blocks: a review of the published evidence. Anesth Analg 2011;113:904-25.

[47] Marhofer D, Marhofer P, Triffterer L, Leonhardt M, Weber M, Zeitlinger

M. Dislocation rates of perineural catheters: a volunteer study. Br J Anaesth 2013;111:800-6.

[48] Aveline C, Le Hetet H, Le Roux A, Vautier P, Gautier JF, Cognet F, et al. Perineural ultrasound-guided catheter bacterial colonization: a prospec- tive evaluation in 747 cases. Reg Anesth Pain Med 2011;36:579-84.

[49] Alakkad H, Naeeni A, Chan VW, Abbas S, Oh J, Ami N, et al. Infection related to ultrasound-guided single-injection peripheral nerve blockade: a decade of experience at Toronto Western Hospital. Reg Anesth Pain Med 2015;40:82-4.

[50] Swenson JD, Davis JJ. Getting the best value for consumable supplies in regional anesthesia. Int Anesthesiol Clin 2011;49:94-103.

[51] Ehlers L, Jensen JM, Bendtsen TF. Cost-effectiveness of ultrasound vs nerve stimulation guidance for continuous sciatic nerve block. Br J Anaesth 2012;109:804-8.

[52] Aguirre J, Del Moral A, Cobo I, Borgeat A, Blumenthal S. The role of continuous peripheral nerve blocks. Anesthesiol Res Pract 2012;2012: 560879.

[53] Greengrass RA, Nielsen KC. Management of peripheral nerve block catheters at home. Int Anesthesiol Clin 2005;43:79-87.

[54] Swenson JD, Cheng GS, Axelrod DA, Davis JJ. Ambulatory anesthesia and regional catheters: when and how. Anesthesiol Clin 2010;28: 267-80.

[55] McGraw RP III, Ilfeld BM. Toward outpatient arthroplasty: accelerating discharge with ambulatory continuous peripheral nerve blocks. Int Anesthesiol Clin 2012;50:111-25.