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Abstract

Background. Single-injection transversus abdominis plane (TAP) block provides postoperative analgesia and decreases supplemental analgesic requirements. However, there is currently no evidence from randomized, controlled studies investigating the possible benefits of continuous TAP blocks. Therefore, the aim of this randomized, triple-masked, placebo-controlled study was to determine if benefits are afforded by adding a multiple-day, ambulatory, continuous ropivacaine TAP block to a single-injection block following hernia surgery.

Methods. Preoperatively, subjects undergoing unilateral inguinal (N = 19) or peri-umbilical (N = 1) hernia surgery received unilateral or bilateral TAP perineural catheter(s), respectively. All received a ropivacaine 0.5% (20 mL) bolus via the catheter(s). Subjects were randomized to either postoperative perineural ropivacaine 0.2% or normal saline using portable infusion pump(s). Subjects were discharged home where the catheter(s) were removed the evening of postoperative day (POD) 2. Subjects were contacted on POD 0–3. The primary endpoint was average pain with movement (scale: 0–10) queried on POD 1.

Results. Twenty subjects of a target 30 were enrolled due to the primary surgeon’s unanticipated departure from the institution. Average pain queried on POD 1 for subjects receiving ropivacaine (N = 10)
was a mean (standard deviation) of 3.0 (2.6) vs 2.8 (2.7) for subjects receiving saline (N = 10; 95% confidence interval difference in means −2.9 to 3.4; \( P = 0.86 \)). There were no statistically significant differences detected between treatment groups in any secondary endpoint.

Conclusions. The results of this study do not support adding an ambulatory, continuous ropivacaine infusion to a single-injection ropivacaine TAP block for hernia surgery. However, the present investigation was underpowered, and further study is warranted.
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Introduction

Over 60% of ambulatory patients undergoing inguinal hernia surgery experience moderate to severe postoperative pain at home [1]. The transversus abdominis plane (TAP) block [2] has been shown to provide analgesia and opioid sparing in the early postoperative period for surgeries involving the abdominal wall [3,4]. While a single-injection TAP block provides up to 12 hours of analgesia following surgical procedures, the surgical pain often outlasts the duration of even the longest-acting local anesthetic available for use in peripheral nerve blocks [5,6]. However, the block may be prolonged nearly indefinitely using a percutaneously inserted perineural catheter and subsequent local anesthetic infusion [7]. Case reports of such a “continuous” TAP block have been published for both in and outpatients (using a portable infusion pump) following abdominal, pelvic, and inguinal surgical procedures [8–12].

Although it might seem self-evident that a continuous infusion of local anesthetic would extend the duration of analgesia, there are reasons to question the degree of spread of local anesthetic in the TAP. In cadavers, 20 mL of dye injected in the TAP midway between the iliac crest and costal margin only consistently spread to cover T11, T12, and L1, with T10 only being covered 50% of the time [13]. Because of the extremely low volume, injection pressure, and dose of an infusion relative to a single injection, it is unlikely that the spread of a continuous infusion would cover more levels than a single injection. Unfortunately, there is no published randomized, controlled trial investigating continuous TAP blocks, and it therefore remains unknown if this technique provides benefits in addition to single-injection TAP blocks.

We therefore designed and executed this randomized, triple-masked, placebo-controlled clinical study to determine the efficacy of continuous TAP blocks in providing analgesia following inguinal and abdominal ambulatory surgical procedures. The primary endpoint was average pain with movement on postoperative day (POD) 1.

Secondary endpoints included the least, average, and worst pain as well as opioid consumption on POD 0–3.

Methods

The local Institutional Review Board (Human Research Protection Program, University California San Diego, San Diego, California) approved the protocol and oversaw the study through data analysis. The investigation was prospectively registered on ClinicalTrials.gov prior to beginning enrollment (NCT00944151). Patients offered enrollment included adults (>18 years) undergoing unilateral ambulatory inguinal and/or abdominal surgery who desired a peripheral nerve block for postoperative analgesia. Exclusion criteria included preexisting pain remote from the surgical site, history of chronic opioid use or substance abuse, pregnancy, known hepatic or renal insufficiency, peripheral neuropathy involving the surgical site, morbid obesity (body mass index > 40 kg/m²), incarceration, and inability to communicate with the investigators and hospital staff.

Catheter Insertion

Following written, informed consent, a TAP catheter was placed by an attending anesthesiologist or a regional anesthesia fellow under the direct supervision of an attending physician using a standardized ultrasound-guided technique [12]. A posterior approach, targeting the most lateral/posterior section of the TAP, was used to place the catheter at a point where the T10-L1 nerves are closest to each other [14]. Patients were placed in a lateral decubitus position with the operative side up and a pillow placed under the dependent side to extend the space between the iliac crest and costal margin on the nondependent side. Standard American Society of Anesthesiologists monitors and oxygen via facemask were applied. Intravenous fentanyl and midazolam were titrated to patient comfort. The skin was prepared with chlorhexidine gluconate (Chioraprep One Step, Medi-Flex Hospital Products, Inc, Overland Park, KS, USA) and a sterile fenestrated drape applied.

A 6- to 13-MHz linear ultrasound transducer (HFL38, Fujifilm Sonosite M-Turbo, Bothell, WA, USA) in a sterile sheath was placed at the midaxillary line in a transverse orientation in the space between iliac crest and costal margin, and the external oblique, internal oblique, and transversus abdominis muscles identified in the ultrasound plane. After anesthetizing the skin with 1% lidocaine, a 17-gauge Tuohy-tip epidural needle was introduced posterior to the ultrasound transducer and advanced in-plane in an anterior direction, with a final needle tip position between the internal oblique and transversus abdominis muscles. Ten milliliters of normal saline was injected via the needle under direct visualization to confirm proper positioning of the needle tip. A flexible 19-gauge, single-orifice, open-tipped catheter (Arrow FlexTip Plus, Teleflex Medical, Research Triangle Park, NC, USA) was advanced 3–5 cm past the needle tip. The needle was withdrawn over the catheter and the catheter
secured to the patient’s ipsilateral chest wall with an anchoring device and sterile occlusive dressings. Twenty milliliters of ropivacaine 0.5% with epinephrine 5 μg/mL was injected through the catheter with gentle, intermittent aspiration and visual confirmation of local anesthetic in the TAP on ultrasound. The TAP block was considered successful if the patient exhibited a decreased sensation to cold (alcohol swab) in the ipsilateral T10-L1 distribution within 30 minutes of the local anesthetic bolus. Patients who did not demonstrate a successful block had their catheter replaced or were removed from the study.

**Bilateral Catheters**

For subjects undergoing surgery affecting both sides of the body (e.g., umbilical hernia repair), a catheter using the same protocol was subsequently inserted on the contralateral side.

**Randomization**

Subjects were randomized preoperatively following confirmation of a successful initial block. A computer-generated table was used by the Investigational Drug Service to assign patients to one of two treatment groups: ropivacaine 0.2% or normal saline (placebo) perineural infusion. The portable infusion pumps and study solutions were prepared by the same pharmacy service. Randomization was stratified by both the number of catheters (unilateral vs bilateral) and surgeon. For unilateral infusions, a portable infusion pump (ON-Q C-bloc, I-Flow Corporation, Lake Forest, CA, USA) with a 400-mL internal reservoir (basal 10 mL/h; no patient-controlled bolus) was filled with study fluid. For bilateral infusions, a similar portable infusion pump was filled with 600 mL and attached to a Y-connector that infused 7 mL/h (total flow: 14 mL/h) to each of the two bilateral catheters. Subjects, investigators, and all clinical staff were masked to treatment group assignments.

**Intraoperative Management**

Intraoperatively, all subjects received a general anesthetic comprised of inhaled volatile anesthetic mixed in oxygen. Intravenous fentanyl was administered for cardiovascular responsiveness to noxious stimuli. No local anesthetic infiltration was permitted within the operating room.

**Postoperative Management**

Intravenous fentanyl was administered for breakthrough pain in the postanesthesia care unit. The portable infusion pump was attached to the perineural catheter(s) in the recovery room. Subjects were discharged home with a prescription for a synthetic oral opioid (oxycodone 5 mg tablets). No additional analgesics such as acetaminophen or nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory medications were permitted. The subject and caretaker were given standard postoperative outpatient instructions as well as verbal and written instructions on the use of the infusion pump and catheter. Subjects were provided with telephone and pager numbers for an Acute Pain Service physician available at all times.

**Follow-Up and Outcomes**

Subjects were contacted by telephone beginning the afternoon/evening of surgery, and each afternoon thereafter through the third POD. Information obtained included average and worst pain scores (Numeric Rating Scale 0–10; 0 = no pain, 10 = worst pain imaginable), oral opioid use, and sleep disturbances (both difficulty sleeping because of pain [yes/no] and number of awakenings due to pain [#]). Patients were also questioned about symptoms of local anesthetic toxicity and the appearance of the catheter site(s). On POD 2, after exhaustion of the local anesthetic reservoirs, patients’ caretakers were instructed on removal of the catheter(s), with a physician in telephone contact throughout.

**Statistical Analysis**

Sample size calculations were centered around our primary hypothesis that a continuous TAP block will decrease “average pain” with movement on POD 1 by 2 points on the numeric rating scale of 0–10. Based on a standard deviation of 1 for the ropivacaine group and 2.5 for the placebo group [5], and assuming a two-sided type I error protection of 0.05 and a power of 0.80, approximately 15 patients in each group were required to reveal a 50% reduction in mean pain scores. To allow for a higher degree of intersubject endpoint variability, we set a goal of randomizing 20 subjects in each treatment group.

All analyses were executed using the open source statistical software R (2013)\(^1\)\(^2\) and performed according to the intention-to-treat principle [15]. For the primary endpoint, we compared average pain scores on POD 1 with a t-test and report the associated type II error. For the secondary endpoints, we used generalized estimating equation (GEE) methods to account for correlated repeated measures over time. Repeated measures proportional odds logistic regression was used for each 0–10 score, coarsened down to three categories (mild [0–3], moderate [4–6], or severe [7–10]) using the R package repolr [16]. We used a Poisson and logistic GEE models for count and binary data, respectively.

**Results**

Twenty subjects enrolled, and all had unilateral (N = 19) or bilateral (N = 1) catheter(s) inserted successfully per protocol. There were no statistically significant differences among the demographic and surgical variables between the treatment groups (Table 1). All subjects underwent unilateral inguinal hernia repair with the exception of a single subject undergoing a small umbilical hernia repair who received bilateral catheters. Enrollment was curtailed
prior to attaining full enrollment due to the primary surgeon’s unanticipated departure from the institution.

**Primary Endpoint**

Average pain queried on POD 1 for subjects receiving ropivacaine (N = 10) was a mean (SD) of 3.0 (2.6) vs 2.8 (2.7) for subjects receiving saline (N = 10; 95% CI difference in means −2.9 to 3.4; \( P = 0.86 \)).

**Secondary Endpoints**

There were no statistically significant differences detected between treatment groups in any of the secondary endpoints, including least, average, and worst pain scores (Figure 1), as well as supplemental opioid requirements (Figure 2) and sleep disturbances (Table 2). By POD 2, three subjects from each treatment group were experiencing leakage from the catheter site. There were no other adverse events.

**Discussion**

The results of this randomized, triple-masked, placebo-controlled study do not support adding a continuous TAP block to a single-injection ropivacaine TAP block for outpatients undergoing hernia surgery. While there are multiple case reports and small series asserting the analgesic benefit of continuous TAP blocks, ours is the first randomized, controlled trial to investigate this technique. Given our results with pain scores for the placebo group in the range that we expected based on our experience with historic controls, further supportive evidence is needed to justify catheter placement and maintenance for this surgical population to outweigh potential risks [17].

**Single-Injection TAP Blocks**

In contrast to our negative findings for the continuous perineural infusion, there is a good deal of evidence from multiple high-quality studies that single-injection TAP techniques do provide analgesic and opioid-sparing benefits. However, the value of the block appears dependent on the surgical procedure and resulting pain intensity. Single-injection TAP blocks have been used for cesarean section, laparoscopic cholecystectomy, total abdominal hysterectomy, retropubic prostatectomy, and large bowel resections with midline incisions [2,5,9,18–22]; however, well-designed randomized, controlled trials are available for few of these indications. A study by Aveline and colleagues demonstrated improvement in results using ultrasound-guided TAP block vs a blind ilioinguinal/iliohypogastric nerve block technique for open hernia repairs [23]. Salman and colleagues found a significant reduction in opioid use when a single-injection TAP block was administered in the setting of spinal anesthesia and dex-ketoprofen for inguinal herniorraphy [24]. However, Petersen and colleagues found no

---

**Table 1  Population data and procedural information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perineural Infusion</th>
<th>Ropivacaine</th>
<th>Placebo</th>
<th>( P ) Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>61 (20)</td>
<td>60 (21)</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (female/male)</td>
<td>8/2</td>
<td>10/0</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (cm)</td>
<td>175 (7)</td>
<td>176 (6)</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight (kg)</td>
<td>77 (12)</td>
<td>80 (12)</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>25.1 (4.6)</td>
<td>25.9 (3.7)</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unilateral catheters (#)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catheter insertion (min)</td>
<td>7.8 (5.1)</td>
<td>5.2 (1.5)</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worst pain during insertion (0–10)</td>
<td>1.6 (1.8)</td>
<td>2.0 (1.9)</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgical time (min)</td>
<td>85 (50)</td>
<td>95 (30)</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydromorphone (mg)</td>
<td>0.0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0.1 (0.4)</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphine (mg)</td>
<td>0.0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1.1 (3.0)</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midazolam (mg)</td>
<td>2.6 (2.3)</td>
<td>3.0 (1.8)</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fentanyl (( \mu )g)</td>
<td>182 (73)</td>
<td>254 (96)</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values are reported as mean (standard deviation) or number of subjects, as indicated. BMI = body mass index; N/A = not applicable.

**Table 2  Data on sleep disturbances**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perineural Infusion</th>
<th>Ropivacaine</th>
<th>Placebo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty sleeping due to pain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First night (#)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second night (#)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third night (#)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awakenings due to pain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First night (#)</td>
<td>0 (0–0)</td>
<td>0 (0–0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second night (#)</td>
<td>0 (0–0)</td>
<td>0 (0–0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third night (#)</td>
<td>0 (0–0)</td>
<td>0 (0–0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values are reported as median (interquartile) or number of subjects, as indicated. There were no statistically significant differences between treatments at any time point.
Figure 1  Effects of a transversus abdominis plane infusion (ropivacaine, 0.2%, vs placebo) on average, least, and worst pain following inguinal and abdominal surgery (Numeric Rating Scale: 0–10). Perineural infusions were discontinued on postoperative day 2. Data are expressed as median (horizontal line), 25th–75th percentiles (box), and 10th–90th percentiles (whiskers). For tightly clustered data, the median horizontal line also represents 10th, 25th, 75th, and/or 90th percentile(s), as appropriate.
significant difference in pain scores when comparing local anesthetic infiltration, placebo infiltration, and single-injection TAP blocks for open hernia repair over the course of 24 hours [25].

Continuous TAP Blocks

Niraj and colleagues reported using TAP catheters for continuous local anesthetic infusions for sustained postoperative analgesia for inpatients [8]. Heil and colleagues published a case series of outpatient TAP catheters following inguinal hernia repair [12]. In this small series, all patients reported numeric rating scale pain scores less than 4 on a 0–10 Numeric Rating Scale of pain for the duration of the infusion, and none required opioid analgesics during the 2 days that the catheters were in place [12]. The negative results of the present study—the first randomized, controlled trial—may seem disappointing. The benefits of continuous peripheral nerve blocks in other anatomic locations besides the TAP are well documented [17]. It might seem a foregone conclusion that TAP infusions would provide similar benefits. However, such inference from studies involving other anatomic sites should be avoided as their local anesthetic effects are often specific to one anatomic site or target nerve [18]. Inguinal and lower abdominal surgical procedures often involve multiple dermatomes, and while a high-volume and pressure single-injection TAP block might spread to multiple nerves, a low-volume and pressure continuous infusion may affect only one to two nerves immediately adjacent to the catheter tip. For example, we provided exclusively a basal infusion of 7 or 10 mL/h (ropivacaine 0.2%) without patient-controlled bolus doses. The optimal delivery regimen for TAP infusions remains unknown; therefore, a higher basal infusion rate and/or local anesthetic concentration than used in this study may yield superior results. In addition, a possibility is that repeated, regularly scheduled/triggered bolus doses might spread the local anesthetic to a larger area than a continuous basal infusion.

Limitations

There are a number of limitations of our study. Our a priori power analysis suggested that 15 subjects in each treatment group were required to reveal a 50% reduction in mean pain scores. However, because the surgeon who was providing the subjects for this study left the institution prior to the completion of enrollment, we enrolled only 10 subjects in each treatment group. This resulted in an underpowered study that may explain the lack of observed treatment effect.

This study included exclusively inguinal and umbilical hernia procedures, and its results should be applied only to similar surgeries. Other more invasive surgical procedures may be more amenable to treatment with a continuous TAP block, and further study is definitely warranted. In addition, other infusion modalities might provide improved effectiveness. Similarly, the optimal TAP catheter insertion protocol and equipment remain uninvestigated and unknown. It is possible that a different technique than the one used in the present study and/or a different perineural catheter design may provide different results. Our results are applicable only to single-injection continuous TAP blocks using ropivacaine and not single-injection peripheral nerve blocks using ultra-long-acting liposomal bupivacaine [26]. Finally, of the 20 subjects enrolled in this study, 18 (90%) were women. It is possible that TAP catheters have different efficacy among men, which this study could not detect with only two men enrolled.

In summary, this investigation provides no evidence that following hernia surgery, adding a multiple-day,
ambulatory, continuous ropivacaine infusion to a single-injection ropivacaine TAP block results in improved analgesia or other benefits. However, further study with larger sample sizes, different surgical procedures, various infusion modalities, diverse catheter insertion techniques, and dissimilar catheter types is warranted.
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