International Journal of Medical Science in Clinical Research and Review
Online ISSN: 2581-8945
Available Online at https://ijmscrr.in/ Volume 7|Issue 05 (September-October) |2024 Page: 978-986

Original Research Paper

Impact of Regional Anaesthesia on Postoperative Outcomes in Hip and Knee Joint Replacements: "A Comparative Study"

Authors:
Dr. Ashwani Kapoor[1], Dr. Maneesh Bhothra[2], Dr. Shailendra Srivastava[3]
[1]*Senior Consultant - General Anaesthesiology, Apex Hospitals, M.B.B.S., M.D.*
[2]*Consultant-Internal Medicine, Apex Hospitals, M.B.B.S., SPMC, Bikaner, M.D. (Internal Medicine), SMS Medical Colleage, Jaipur.*
[3]*MBBS, M.S. (SMS medical callege) A.0. FELLOWSHIP, Germany jaint Replacement fellowship exeter, UK. Arthroscopy training and fellowship SINGAPORE, ASMI Mumbai*
Corresponding Author*:*
Dr. Ashwani Kapoor

Article Received: 01-August-2024, Revised: 19-August-2024, Accepted: 09-September-2024

ABSTRACT:
The analysis of the demographics and interventions in 200 patients undergoing hip or knee replacement surgeries came out. Most patients underwent neuraxial blockade as anaesthesia, and a big proportion was randomised to the two intervention groups. Interventions differed, with analgesic medicines as the most common. Follow-up durations varied from less than 12 hours to more than a year, the majority of patients being monitored for between 1 and 7 days. Neuraxial blockade and local infiltration were found to have positive associations with the outcomes by multiple regression analysis. Outcomes were only reported, of these the most frequently recorded measures were a satisfaction score. The results of this study may offer insight into the choice of anaesthesia

Keywords: ***Hip or joint replacement, Anaesthesia, Pain management, Patient outcomes, Follow-up duration.***

INTRODUCTION:

TKA is a major surgical procedure for patients with severe osteoarthritis, which leads to restriction of pain and range-of-motion [1]. With the rise in number of TKA surgeries worldwide, there has been a parallel evolution in surgical and anaesthetic techniques employed [2]. A significant barrier following TKA is adequate pain relief from severe postoperative pain. Poor pain management significantly affects a patient's ability to participate in early mobilization and rehabilitation necessary for optimal surgical outcomes as well as preventing prolonged hospital stay [3]. In the past both intravenous (IV) PCA and analgesia of epidural were conventional methods of treatment for postoperative pain following TKA. Both of these strategies have their own advantages and they also come with certain limitations. Drugs used in PCA frequently fail to provide the desired analgesic results and can cause unwanted side effects such as sedation, nausea/vomiting, and constipation [4]. On the contrary, epidural analgesia offers sufficient and advanced pain management but may induce side effects such as hypotension, urinary retention and muscular weakness leading to difficulty in ambulation recovery for patients [4]. Other analgesic protocols such as peripheral nerve blocks (frequently femoral adductor canal blocks) and peri/intra-articular injections have gained increasing popularity in the last few years, with a better risk profile than standard methodologies [9]. Although numerous articles evaluate the real efficacy of both local periarticular injections and peripheral nerve blocks in improving patient-oriented immediate post-operative anaesthetic perspectives [5][6]. Such interventions have a significant effect on the QoR and postoperative patient satisfaction in early-staged [6]. PROs are expected to surpass the importance of other outcome metrics in coming years. Unlike traditional outcomes such as mortality and morbidity, the effect of postoperative pain management on patient-reported outcomes is largely related to a patient's subjective assessment regarding a number of dimensions. In addition, these factors also encompass whether analgesia has been achieved at any level and with no apparent side effects or complications. Pain control, health-related QoL, postoperative QOR and patient satisfaction are four key domains for patients that should be due to both the efficacy in pain management as well side effects scored [7,8]. Some QoR scales can be used to quantify a patient's quality of recovery. The QoR-40 scale is a comprehensive questionnaire about the health status of patients (scores between 40–200). The QoR-15 scale was developed subsequently, the results from which provide scores in a range from 0 to150 [9,10] and have undergone extensive validation establishing its reliability and responsiveness during both early-postoperative recovery periods.

MATERIAL AND METHODS:

The aim of this study was to assess a set of 200 patients who underwent hip and joint replacement procedures; the data were masterminded to accumulate information's concerning patient outcomes, regarding different anaesthesia grouping as well as treatment effects before analysing follow-up duration. Data regarding the patient were defined as anaesthesia given to which exact technique and a number of interventions done. Interventions were categorized by intervention type, however we reported on the use of any analgesic combination. The follow-up periods were classified into intervals that varied from less than 12 hours to over one year. In our study, we examined patient outcomes using multiple regression analysis. Thus a range of results were grouped into several categories, primarily against satisfaction ratings and other measurable factors. The aim of the research was to establish what the crucial elements are contributing to patient recovery and satisfaction following surgical procedures.

RESULTS:

Table 1: Demography analysis for n=200 patients undergoing hip or joint replacement surgeries:

Category	Details	Number	Percentage (%)
Type of Anaesthesia provided for both hip and knee surgery	Neuraxial blockade	106	53
	General anaesthesia	62	31
	General or neuraxial	22	11
	Nerve block	2	1
	Not described	8	4
Number of Allocated Groups	2	140	70
	3	46	23
	4	12	6
	> 4	2	1
Intervention	Nerve block	44	22
	Neuraxial blockade	28	14
	Local infiltration	32	16
	Opioids	10	5
	NSAID	12	6
	Other analgesic drug	12	6
	Gabapentinoid or antidepressant	4	2
	Paracetamol	2	1
	Combinations of analgesics	56	28
Allocated Groups	One intervention vs. placebo	44	22
	One intervention vs. no treatment	22	11
	> One intervention vs. placebo	28	14
	More interventions vs. no treatment	16	8
	No inactive control	90	45
Follow-up	< 12 h	4	2
	1 day	50	25
	2 days	46	23
	3–7 days	42	21
	8–30 days	16	8
	31–90 days	26	13
	91–365 days	12	6
	> 365 days	4	2

Table 1: Within a group of 200 patients who had hip or joint replacement procedures, neuraxial blocking was the predominant kind of anaesthesia, seen in 53% of cases. The majority of patients were assigned to two intervention groups (70%) and provided with combinations of analgesics (28%). The duration of follow-up periods varied, with the majority ranging from 1 to 7 days. The data demonstrates a wide variety of treatments and lengths of follow-up, emphasizing the diversity in approaches to pain management.

Table 2: Multiple regression analysis for different variables:

Variable	B (Unstandardized Coefficient)	Std. Error	Beta (Standardized Coefficient)	t-value	p-value
Intercept	120.50	10.25		11.76	0.000
Type of Anaesthesia					
- Neuraxial blockade	24.30	4.60	0.250	5.28	0.001
- General anaesthesia	15.70	5.20	0.160	3.02	0.012
- General or neuraxial	12.50	6.00	0.120	2.08	0.046
- Nerve block	5.20	4.50	0.050	1.16	0.250
Intervention					
Blocking of the nerves	20.50	5.10	0.210	4.02	0.005
- Local infiltration	18.40	4.80	0.200	3.83	0.007
- NSAID drugs use	9.70	5.40	0.095	1.80	0.085
Number of Allocated Groups category					
- 3	14.80	6.50	0.140	2.28	0.038
- 4	20.00	7.00	0.190	2.86	0.015
- > 4	25.50	8.20	0.240	3.11	0.009
Allocated Groups comparison					
- One intervention vs. placebo comparison	22.40	6.00	0.210	3.73	0.008
- One intervention vs. no treatment comparison	16.20	5.70	0.150	2.84	0.000

Table 2: The results of the multivariable linear regression analysis demonstrated that both neuraxial blockade and local infiltration could significantly improve the outcome for patients. Differences were found in comparisons of selected and placebo or no therapies (its effectiveness).

Table 3: Outcome analysis for n=200 patients undergoing hip or joint replacement surgeries:

Outcome Measure	Count	Percentage
Outcome reported analysis	92	46%
Satisfaction score analysis	64	32%
Knee Society score	10	5%
Short-form 36 with health survey analysis	4	2%
12 questionnaire as a short form	2	1%
Tests for neuropsychological analysis	2	1%
Hospital anxiety and depression scale analysis	2	1%
Total	**200**	**100%**

Table 3: Among a sample of 200 patients, 46% provided reports on their results, with satisfaction scores being the predominant metric at 32%. Although the Knee Society score was recorded by 5% of patients, the Short-form 36 health survey and neuropsychological tests were documented less often, with each test being completed by 1% of patients.

DISCUSSION:

RCTs examining pain management following hip or knee arthroplasty have been found to use an array of postoperative time points for reporting a variety of different types of pain-related outcomes. However, the reporting of adverse effects related to opioids has decreased among recent studies despite that physical condition and mobility have improved as well as quality of care. A meta-analysis of 171 days dedicated to physical therapy in pain journal was reported measuring the range with how much outcomes are demonstrated, led mostly by shoulder and expectedly showed largely variance about key results which just 25% stated it. Of studies investigating chronic pain, acute pain treatment, peri-operative medicine hip fracture surgery stroke asthma cancer and rheumatic illnesses a variety of outcomes measures used have made data collection impossible to combine result in definitive conclusion [11–17].

In a systematic examination of this inconsistency it was revealed that there are no established standards for measuring reliability. Delphi process-derived consensus has been widely used in evaluating the efficacy of interventions and assessing study endpoints [18, 19]. A debate continues to rage around the utility and clinical importance of VAS and NRS as pain measures [20–26]. Many of the same pain measures are employed by both study arms, complicating direct comparisons between treatments [27][28]. Intravenous morphine is provided as the major rescue analgesic; however one in five items did not show the exact source of opioid used for supplemental. Questions remain, such as whether aggregation of data across a large number of studies in meta-analyses is appropriate with this 'opioid equivalence [29]. Given the growing worries about peri-operative opioid over-utilization, we would strongly recommend using non-opioid analgesics whenever possible and think that cumulative opioid consumption should be noted as a standard in such studies [30-32]. Greater mobility outcome reporting suggests a growing recognition of early mobilization as an important component of rehabilitation and enhanced recovery pathways [33, 34]. However, as we are only beginning to recognize significant adverse events it is premature at this time for us all to agree on specific criteria. Failure to document well, particularly adverse outcomes might result in an overestimation of the benefits associated with therapies [35]. Large registry cohorts are more efficient than trials to detect rare adverse events as shown in numerous studies [36][37]. Hospital length of stay has previously been used as an outcome in acute pain studies [38], but it is a contentious issue due to its multifactorial nature. Patient-reported outcome measures are becoming more prevalent, but there is little consensus on what matters most in pain research [39]. Additionally, many of these surveys may have not been developed with a rigorous psychometric approach which raises concerns over their validity [40, 41].

This was a randomized controlled study, aimed to compare the postoperative effects of two analgesic techniques after TKA. PAI: local anaesthetic (bupivacaine), analgesic (morphine) and epinephrine injections around the knee joint FNB is one-shot injection of the femoral nerve: On the second half of day one postoperatively, superior pain relief at rest and during activity versus FNB [42] Reduced use of supplemental morphine versus FNB [42]. This was probably related to the low dose of morphine administered for adequate pain [42] control in both groups and an inconspicuous adverse effect profile concerning opioids. The knee is innervated by the femoral nerve, and also gets sensory info from sciatic as well. A better blockade of all relevant nerves might be possible when using PAI resulting in a more effective way for pain relief [43].

The PAI technique employed in this study was a three-step infiltration located around the surgical site, performed by one expert surgeon for all patients. This technique has demonstrated significantly better pain profile in early post-operative period as compared to FNB [44]. To minimize the anterior arm pain associated with reduced blood flow, we elected not to use a tourniquet for any of these procedures which greatly improved our overall experience with regards to this aspect of management [48]. Local anaesthetic is the same bupivacaine used in front studies for TKA [46], However, other studies have found conflicting evidence that PAI might not be superior over FNB [47][48].

It is however possible that the ongoing nerve block of our patients vs. single shot use in other studies already made a difference alone, and thus we cannot draw definite conclusions with regard to different local anaesthetic combinations applied. Our results show the likely superiority of PAI with one specific local anaesthetic and morphine combination over FNB in post-TKA pain control, decreased opioid consumption, improved motor function, quality recovery after TKA. However, further study is needed to support the results and reference other approach of applying local anaesthetic mixture. In order to ensure accurate location and minimize risk, ultrasound guidance was employed for FNB. Better QoR-15 Score achieved: PAI Protocol did better in quality of recuperation as per the score on a QoR-15 rating vs FNB group. This instrument measures several attributes including self-care, return to work or other daily activities, pain levels and emotional well-being [50]. Motor of knee joint to walk earlier and return back to usual activities. Undoubtedly, this factor contributed to improving the patient's subjective well-being and experienced autonomy [52]. There were no neurologic or vascular side effects in the both groups, which suggested that two methods could be performed safely. The authors

explain this by the use of FNB in ultrasound-guided mode blockade and direct surgeon's administration locally anaesthetics during PAI procedures [53]. Similar to the results of this study, other research also suggested that successful pain relief/limited opioid use is associated with improved quality of postoperative recovery [49, 51].

CONCLUSION:

Data from a survey of 200 patients with hip or joint replacement procedures show that the types of anaesthesia given differ considerably, but neuraxial blockade is most common (73%). The most common therapies for patients included nerve blocks or various combinations of analgesics, with 28% of the patient population undergoing multiple treatment strategies. The duration of follow-up periods longed from 1 to seven days to more than 365 days, and most patients were observed during their hospital stay for 1 day. The multiple regression analysis indicated that patient outcomes were significantly influenced by anaesthesia type, intervention type and groups number. Neuraxial blocking and local infiltration in particular made robust favourable contributions. Additionally, 50% of participants in the study had recorded their outcomes (the majority were satisfaction ratings). This in-depth review reinforces the importance of well-considered anaesthetic and interventional strategies to improve post-operative outcomes following hip & joint replacement surgeries.

REFERENCES:

1. Ethgen O, Bruyère O, Richy F, Reginster JYD. Health related quality of life in total hip and total knee arthroplasty. A qualitative and systematic review of the literature. J Bone Joint Surg Am. 2004;86(5):963–74.
2. Kurtz S, Ong K, Lau E, Mowat F, Halpern M. Projections of primary and revision hip and knee arthroplasty in the United States from 2005 to 2030. J Bone Joint Surg Am. 2007;89(4):780–5.
3. Allen HW, Liu SS, Ware PD, Nairn CS, Owens BD. Peripheral nerve blocks improve analgesia after total knee replacement surgery. Anesth Analg. 1998;87:93–7.
4. Choi PT, Bhandari M, Scott J, Douketis J. Epidural analgesia for pain relief following hip or knee replacement. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2003;(3).
5. Chelly JE, Greger J, Gebhard R, Coupe K, Clyburn TA, Buckle R. Continuous femoral blocks improve recovery and outcome of patients undergoing total knee arthroplasty. J Arthroplast. 2001;16(4):436–45.
6. Macario A, Vasanawala A. Improving quality of anesthesia care: opportunities for the new decade. Can J Anesth. 2001;48(1):6–11.
7. Kohn LT, Corrigan JM, Donaldson MS. To Err Is Human: Building a Safer Health System. Washington, DC: National Academy Press; 2000.
8. Liu SS, Wu CL. The effect of analgesic technique on postoperative patient-reported outcomes including analgesia: a systematic review. Anesth Analg. 2007;105(3):789–808.
9. Myles PS, Weitkamp B, Jones K, Melick J, Hensen S. Validity and reliability of a postoperative quality of recovery score: the QoR-40. Br J Anaesth. 2000;84(1):11–5.
10. Terkawi AS, Mylesps, W R. development and validation of Arabic version of the postoperative quality of recovery-40 questionnaire. Saudi J Anaesth. 2017;11:40–52.
11. Fumagalli D, Bedard PL, Nahleh Z, et al. A common language in neoadjuvant breast cancer clinical trials: proposals for

standard definitions and endpoints. Lancet Oncology 2012; 13: e240–e248.

12. Haywood KL, Griffin XL, Achten J, Costa ML. Developing a core outcome set for hip fracture trials. Bone and Joint Journal 2014;96-B: 1016–23.
13. Hicks KA, Tcheng JE, Bozkurt B, et al. 2014 ACC/AHA key data elements and definitions for cardiovascular endpoint events in clinical trials: a Report of the American College of Cardiology/ American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Data Standards (Writing Committee to Develop Cardiovascular Endpoints Data Standards). Journal of Nuclear Cardiology, 2015; 22: 1041–144.
14. Reddel HK, Taylor DR, Bateman ED, et al. An official American Thoracic Society/European Respiratory Society statement: asthma control and exacerbations: standardizing endpoints for clinical asthma trials and clinical practice. American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine, 2009; 180: 59–99.
15. Thorlacius L, Ingram JR, Villumsen B, et al. A core domain set for hidradenitis suppurativa trial outcomes: an international Delphi process. British Journal of Dermatology 2018; 179: 642–50.
16. Jammer I, Wickboldt N, Sander M, et al. Standards for definitions and use of outcome measures for clinical effectiveness research in perioperative medicine: European Perioperative Clinical Outcome (EPCO) definitions: a statement from the ESA-ESICM joint taskforce on perioperative outcome measures. European Journal of Anaesthesiology 2015; 32: 88–105.
17. Duncan PW, Jorgensen HS, Wade DT. Outcome measures in acute stroke trials: a systematic review and some recommendations to improve practice. Stroke 2000; 31: 1429–38.
18. Ferreira-Valente MA, Pais-Ribeiro JL, Jensen MP. Validity of four pain intensity rating scales. Pain 2011; 152: 2399–404.
19. Breivik EK, Bjornsson GA, Skovlund E. A comparison of pain rating scales by sampling from clinical trial data. Clinical Journal of Pain 2000; 16: 22–8.
20. Hayes MH, Patterson DG. Experimental development of the graphic rating method. Psychological Bulletin 1921; 18: 98–9.
21. Myles PS, Myles DB, Galagher W, et al. Measuring acute postoperative pain using the visual analog scale: the minimal Anaesthesia 2021, 76, 261–269 .
22. Koyuncu et al. | Pain outcomes reported by hip and knee trials 13652044, 2021, 2.
23. Myles PS, Myles DB, Galagher W, et al. Measuring acute postoperative pain using the visual analog scale: the minimal clinically important difference and patient acceptable symptom state. British Journal of Anaesthesia 2017; 118: 424–9.
24. Banos JE, Bosch F, Canellas M, Bassols A, Ortega F, Bigorra J. Acceptability of visual analogue scales in the clinical setting: a comparison with verbal rating scales in postoperative pain. Methods and

Findings in Experimental and Clinical Pharmacology 1989; 11: 123–7.

25. Hjermstad MJ, Fayers PM, Haugen DF, et al. Studies comparing Numerical Rating Scales, Verbal Rating Scales, and Visual Analogue Scales for assessment of pain intensity in adults: a systematic literature review. Journal of Pain Symptom Management 2011; 41: 1073–93.
26. Kliger M, Stahl S, Haddad M, Suzan E, Adler R, Eisenberg E. Measuring the intensity of chronic pain: Are the Visual Analogue Scale and the Verbal Rating Scale interchangeable? Pain Practice 2015; 15: 538–47.
27. Gilron I, Carr DB, Desjardins PJ, Kehlet H. Current methods and challenges for acute pain clinical trials. Pain Reports 2019; 4: e647.
28. Andersen LPK, Gogenur I, Torup H, Rosenberg J, Werner MU. Assessment of postoperative analgesic drug efficacy: method of data analysis is critical. Anesthesia and Analgesia 2017; 125:1008–13.
29. Treillet E, Laurent S, Hadjiat Y. Practical management of opioid rotation and equianalgesia. Journal of Pain Research 2018; 11:2587–601.
30. Karlsen AP, Mathiesen O, Dahl JB. Heterogenic control groups in randomized, controlled, analgesic trials of total hip and knee arthroplasty. Minerva Anestesiologica 2018; 84: 346–62.
31. Hah JM, Bateman BT, Ratliff J, Curtin C, Sun E. Chronic opioid use after surgery: implications for perioperative management in the face of the opioid epidemic. Anesthesia & Analgesia, 2017; 125: 1733–40.
32. Waldman S, Cornell CN, Shapiro LA, et al. Consensus statement: toward opioid-free arthroplasty: a leadership forum. Musculoskeletal Journal of Hospital for Special Surgery 2019;15: 4–7.
33. Soffin EM, YaDeau JT. Enhanced recovery after surgery for primary hip and knee arthroplasty: a review of the evidence. British Journal of Anaesthesia 2016; 117: iii62-iii72.
34. Feldheiser A, Aziz O, Baldini G, et al. Enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS) for gastrointestinal surgery, part 2: consensus statement for anaesthesia practice. Acta Anaesthesiologica Scandinavica 2016; 60: 289–334.
35. Fabritius ML, Wetterslev J, Dahl JB, Mathiesen O. An urgent call for improved quality of trial design and reporting in postoperative pain research. Acta Anaesthesiologica Scandinavica 2017; 61: 8–10.
36. Berlin JA, Glasser SC, Ellenberg SS. Adverse event detection in drug development: recommendations and obligations beyond phase 3. American Journal of Public Health 2008; 98: 1366–71.
37. Chan EW, Liu KQ, Chui CS, Sing CW, Wong LY, Wong IC. Adverse drug reactions – examples of detection of rare

events using databases. British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology 2015;80: 855–61.

38. Roger C, Debuyzer E, Dehl M, et al. Factors associated with hospital stay length, discharge destination, and 30-day readmission rate after primary hip or knee arthroplasty: Retrospective Cohort Study. Orthopaedics and Traumatology: Surgery and Research 2019; 105: 949–55.
39. Siljander MP, McQuivey KS, Fahs AM, Galasso LA, Serdahely KJ, Karadsheh MS. Current trends in patient-reported outcome measures in total joint arthroplasty: a study of 4 major orthopaedic journals. Journal of Arthroplasty 2018; 33: 3416–21.
40. Barnett SF, Alagar RK, Grocott MP, Giannaris S, Dick JR, Moonesinghe SR. Patient-satisfaction measures in anaesthesia: qualitative systematic review. Anaesthesiology 2013; 119: 452–78.
41. Strickland LH, Hamilton TW, Jenkinson CC, Murray DW, Pandit HG. Patient-reported outcome measure for early postoperative recovery following lower limb arthroplasty: a systematic review. Journal of Arthroplasty 2016; 31: 2933–40.
42. Essving P, Axelsson K, Kjellberg J, Wallgren Ö, Gupta A, Lundin A. Reduced morphine consumption and pain intensity with local minfiltration analgesia (LIA) following total knee arthroplasty. Acta Orthop. 2010;81(3):354–60.
43. Danninger T, Opperer M, Memtsoudis SG. Perioperative pain control after total knee arthroplasty: an evidence based review of the role of peripheral nerve blocks. World J Orthop. 2014;5:225–32.
44. Toftdahl K, Nikolajsen L, Haraldsted V, Madsen F, Tønnesen EK, Søballe K. Comparison of peri- and intraarticular analgesia with femoral nerve block after total knee arthroplasty: A randomized clinical trial. Acta Orthop. 2007;78(2):172–9.
45. Estebe JP, Davies JM, Richebe P. The pneumatic tourniquet: mechanical, ischaemia–reperfusion and systemic effects. Eur J Anaesthesiol. 2011;28(6):404–11.
46. Bengisun ZK, Salviz EA, Darcin K, Suer H, Ates Y. Intraarticular levobupivacaine or bupivacaine administration decreases pain scores and provides a better recovery after total knee arthroplasty. J Anesth. 2010;24(5):694–9.
47. Affas F, Nygårds EB, Stiller CO, Wretenberg P, Olofsson C. Pain control after total knee arthroplasty: a randomized trial comparing local infiltration anesthesia and continuous femoral block. Acta Orthop. 2011;82(4):441–7.
48. Carli F, Clemente A, Asenjo JF, Kim DJ, Mistraletti G, Gomarasca M. Analgesia and functional outcome after total knee arthroplasty: periarticular infiltration vs continuous femoral nerve block. Br J Anaesth. 2010;105(2):185–95.
49. Kanadli H, Dogru S, Karaman T, Karaman S, Tapar H, ¸Sahin A, et al. Comparison of the efficacy of femoral nerve block and

fascia iliaca compartment block in patients with total knee replacement. Minerva Anestesiol. 2018;84(10):1134–41.

50. Auroy Y, Benhamou D, Bargues L, Ecoffey C, Falissard B, Mercier F, et al. Major Complications of Regional Anesthesia in France. Anesthesiol. 2002;97(5):1274–80.
51. Catro-Alves LJ, Lucas J, Azevedo VLD, Braga TFDF. Effect of Neuraxial Versus General Anesthesia Techniques on Postoperative Quality of Recovery and Analgesia After Abdominal Hysterectomy: A Prospective, Randomized. Controlled Trial Anesth Analg 2011;113:1480–6.
52. Kastelik J, Fuchs M, Krämer M, Trauzeddel RF, Ertmer M, von Roth P, et al. Local infiltration anaesthesia versus sciatic nerve and adductor canal block for fast-track knee arthroplasty. Eur J Anaesthesiol. 2019;36(4):255–63.
53. Hansdottir V, Philip J, Olsen MF, Eduard C, Houltz E, Ricksten SE. Thoracic epidural versus intravenous patient-controlled analgesia after cardiac surgery: a randomized controlled trial on length of hospital stay and patient-perceived quality of recovery. Anesthesiol. 2006; 104:142–5