

Comparing the steam engine with a horse-drawn carriage? [Letter]

Axel R. Heller, Michael Patrick Müller, R. J. Litz

Angaben zur Veröffentlichung / Publication details:

Heller, Axel R., Michael Patrick Müller, and R. J. Litz. 2007. "Comparing the steam engine with a horse-drawn carriage? [Letter]." *Anesthesia and Analgesia* 104 (4): 994–95.
<https://doi.org/10.1213/01.ane.0000256081.65451.2c>.

Nutzungsbedingungen / Terms of use:

licgercopyright

Dieses Dokument wird unter folgenden Bedingungen zur Verfügung gestellt: / This document is made available under these conditions:

Deutsches Urheberrecht

Weitere Informationen finden Sie unter: / For more information see:

<https://www.uni-augsburg.de/de/organisation/bibliothek/publizieren-zitieren-archivieren/publiz/>



Comparing the Steam Engine With a Horse-Drawn Carriage?

To the Editor:

For several reasons, we take issue with the study of Liguori et al. (1) who described postoperative neurological symptoms (PONS) in patients receiving interscalene brachial plexus blockade using either mechanical paresthesia or electrical nerve stimulation for nerve localization.

First, a nonsignificant difference between groups in a comparative study may not necessarily mean that two procedures are equal. Absence of evidence is not evidence of absence. A type II error may be present especially when a power analysis is performed using two prior studies with different methodology from different groups, with a time delay of 7 yr, and when each one influenced the case load calculation for one of the two groups of the present trial. One further cause

for a missed difference, theoretically, may be found in an inability to differ between electrically or mechanically induced paresthesia produced by electric stimulation cannula.

Second, the percentage of patients with PONS in this study is strikingly high when compared with a recent study of 256 prospective patients receiving interscalene brachial plexus blockade guided by electric stimulation (2). No patient had PONS as opposed to 3% in patients in whom paresthesias had been elicited (3). Among European opinion leaders in regional anesthesia, electric nerve stimulation enjoys broad acceptance regarding its safety in comparison with the mechanical paresthesia technique (4). "When performing nerve blocks paresthesia... should be avoided in order to reduce nerve lesions" (5).

Third, in the light of most recent publications, high resolution and real-time ultrasound-guided regional anesthesia allows clear visualization of the target as well as adjacent structures and, thus, safe positioning of the needle, as well as observation of local anesthetic spread (6). Since even with neurostimulation peripheral nerve injury may occur, the clear depiction of the nerve and the maintenance of a distance between needle and nerve should reduce the incidence of regional anesthesia-related PONS (7). Furthermore, because observation of local anesthetic spread and, therefore, dosing on demand is now possible, administration of 50–60 mL of local anesthetic, as done in the present study, seems largely outdated and potentially toxic.

In summary, given the acceptance of high resolution ultrasound it must be questioned whether such studies comparing these two techniques (1) are justified especially in light of published closed claim analysis concerning regional anesthesia-related nerve injury (8).

Axel R. Heller, MD, PhD, DEAA

Michael P. Müller, MD, DEAA

Rainer J. Litz, MD

Department of Anaesthesiology and Critical
Care Medicine

University Hospital Carl Gustav Carus
D-01307 Dresden
Germany
axel.heller@uniklinikum-dresden.de

REFERENCES

1. Liguori GA, Zayas VM, YaDeau JT, et al. Nerve localization techniques for interscalene brachial plexus blockade: a prospective, randomized comparison of mechanical paresthesia versus electrical stimulation. *Anesth Analg* 2006;103:761–7.
2. Capdevila X, Pirat P, Bringuier S, et al. Continuous peripheral nerve blocks in hospital wards after orthopedic surgery: a multicenter prospective analysis of the quality of postoperative analgesia and complications in 1,416 patients. *Anesthesiology* 2005;103:1035–45.
3. Choyce A, Chan VW, Middleton WJ, et al. What is the relationship between paresthesia and nerve stimulation for axillary brachial plexus block? *Reg Anes Pain Med* 2001;26:100–4.
4. Kaiser H, Niesel HC, Hans V. Fundamentals and requirements of peripheral electric nerve stimulation. A contribution to the improvement of safety standards in regional anesthesia. *Reg Anaesth* 1990;13:143–7.
5. Selander D. Peripheral nerve injury caused by injection needles. *Br J Anaesth* 1993;71:323–5.
6. Litz RJ, Roessel T, Wiessner D, et al. Ultrasound guided interscalene cervical block for carotid surgery. *Eur J Anaesthesiol* 2006;23 (Suppl 37):128.
7. Soeding PE, Sha S, Royse CE, et al. A randomized trial of ultrasound-guided brachial plexus anaesthesia in upper limb surgery. *Anaesth Intensive Care* 2005;33:719–25.
8. Lee LA, Posner KL, Domino KB, et al. Injuries associated with regional anesthesia in the 1980s and 1990s: a closed claims analysis. *Anesthesiology* 2004;101:143–52.

DOI: 10.1213/01.ane.0000256081.65451.2c