LETTER



A Response to: Letter to the Editor Regarding "The Effect of Ultrasound-Guided Erector Spinae Plane Block Combined with Dexmedetomidine on Postoperative Analgesia in Patients Undergoing Modified Radical Mastectomy: A Randomized Controlled Trial"

Xunxun Wang · Guo Ran · Xia Chen · Cuiyu Xie · Jing Wang · Xuesheng Liu · Yao Lu 💿 · Weiping Fang

Received: January 28, 2022 / Accepted: February 7, 2022 / Published online: February 25, 2022 \odot The Author(s) 2022

Keywords: Dexmedetomidine; Postoperative analgesia; Ultrasound; Erector spinae plane block; Mastectomy

To the Editor,

We thank Prof. Xue and his colleagues for their kind comments on the rigor of our recently published clinical study suggesting the effect of ultrasound-guided erector spinae plane block (ESPB) combined with dexmedetomidine on postoperative analgesia in patients undergoing modified radical mastectomy: a randomized controlled trial [1]. We agree that their comments would further clarify some details of the study protocol.

Xunxun Wang and Guo Ran contributed equally to this study.

X. Wang · X. Chen · C. Xie · J. Wang · X. Liu · Y. Lu (\boxtimes) · W. Fang (\boxtimes) Department of Anesthesiology, The First Affiliated Hospital of Anhui Medical University, No.218 Jixi Road, Hefei 230022, Anhui Province, People's Republic of China e-mail: luyao-mz@163.com

W. Fang e-mail: planner@vip.sina.com

G. Ran

Department of Anesthesiology, Eye & ENT Hospital, Fudan University, Shanghai, China

First, we actually did the power analysis to determine the group size based on our pilot study. The primary outcome of this study is the cumulative dosage of flurbiprofen at 48 h after surgery. Our pilot study showed a mean $(\pm SD)$ flurbiprofen consumption of $100 \text{ mg} (\pm 25)$ at 48 h postoperatively in group R. For 90% power and an error of 0.01, the sample size necessary to detect a 30% difference in postoperative flurbiprofen requirements at 48 h using dexmedetomidine as an adjuvant combined with ESPB (group DR) compared with group R was calculated as 23 subjects for each group. We included 30 patients in each group to allow for patient dropouts. Although the sample size in this study is enough for avoidance of type 1 and type 2 statistical errors, it would be better to include this issue in the article. A flow diagram was already shown in Fig. 2 of the publication of interest [1]; thus, a total of 75 patients who underwent modified radical mastectomy were assessed as eligible, 15 of whom were excluded; 60 patients were randomly divided into two groups.

Second, general anesthesia for the patients in this study was conducted by total intravenous anesthesia without inhalation anesthetics. The anesthesiologist injected $0.2 \mu g/kg$ of sufentanil intravenously when the patient's hemodynamic parameters (mean arterial blood pressure or heart rate) exceeded 20% of the baseline. If the additional sufentanil could not prevent this

20% increase in hemodynamic parameters, the patients then received an intravenous infusion of remifentanil according to the hemodynamic values. Since the nerve block anesthesia team in our department is experienced in ESPB, our previous studies have shown that ESPB could significantly reduce the opioid (sufentanil and remifentanil) consumption during surgery [2, 3]. In accordance with the recommendation [4], the bispectral index system value during anesthesia maintenance was between 40 and

60, which is the conventional anesthesia depth in this study. Third, Table 1 shows the proportion of patients with a visual analog scale (VAS) score of greater than 4 who needed rescue analgesia using intravenously administered flurbiprofen 50 mg. Although slightly more patients received flurbiprofen in group R than in group DR during the postoperative 48 h, the difference between the groups is not significant. These results suggest that dexmedetomidine as an adjunctive to ESPB can effectively relieve pain in patients undergoing breast cancer surgery.

Fourth, in this study, the patients with pain scale of greater than 4 were given 50 mg of flurbiprofen. The primary outcome is the cumulative dosage of flurbiprofen at 48 h after surgery. Gürkan et al. [5] have shown that ESPB is effective in reducing pain after modified radical mastectomy for breast cancer. However, the duration of this block is no more than 24 h [6]. Dexmedetomidine can assist local anesthetic agents by accelerating the onset and extending the duration of block in the brachial plexus block [7]. Therefore, the objective of this study is to determine the effect of dexmedetomidine on the ESPB 48 h after breast cancer surgery.

Moreover, as Prof. Xue and his colleagues suggested, the proportion of patients with a VAS score of greater than 4 who needed rescue analgesia using intravenous administration of flurbiprofen 50 mg is more valuable than the postoperative flurbiprofen consumption dose per kilogram body weight or per 24 h. Table 1 shows that fewer patients in group DR received flurbiprofen treatment.

Finally, we do agree that this study would be better at showing the improvement in postoperative analgesic efficacy for patients had patient satisfaction been included. Then, the primary outcome of this study would be the consumption of flurbiprofen at 48 h after surgery. The VAS scores at rest and at 90° shoulder abduction after surgery were also recorded. This study indicated an effective and safe postoperative analgesia strategy for patients undergoing modified radical mastectomy. Well-performed postoperative analgesia management will improve patient recovery, and it also could indirectly reflect the patients' satisfaction [8–10].

From what is stated above, we deeply thank Prof. Xue and his colleagues for identifying and reporting these issues. These issues have no further effects on the findings and conclusions.

Time frame (h)	Group R (<i>n</i> , %)	Group DR (<i>n</i> , %)	χ^2 value	P value
0-1	0	0	NA	NA
1–6	2 (6.7)	0	0.517	0.472
6–12	5 (16.7)	0	3.491	0.062
12–24	8 (26.7)	4 (13.3)	1.667	0.197
24-48	4 (13.3)	1 (3.3)	0.873	0.350

 Table 1 Postoperative rescue analgesic requirement in the two groups

Group R erector spinae plane block with ropivacaine; *Group* DR erector spinae plane block with ropivacaine plus dexmedetomidine

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Funding. No funding was received for publication of this letter.

Authorship. All named authors meet the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) criteria for authorship for this article, take responsibility for the integrity of the work as a whole, and have given their approval for this version to be published.

Author Contributions. Xunxun Wang: concept and design, statistical analysis, drafting the manuscript. Guo Ran: concept and design, statistical analysis, drafting the manuscript. Xia Chen: patient recruitment, data collection, drafting the manuscript. Cuiyu Xie: patient recruitment, data collection, drafting the manuscript. Jing Wang: patient recruitment, data collection, drafting the manuscript. Xuesheng Liu: design, editing the manuscript. Yao Lu: concept and design, editing the manuscript. Weiping Fang: concept and design, editing the manuscript. ing the manuscript.

Disclosures. Xunxun Wang, Guo Ran, Xia Chen, Cuiyu Xie, Jing Wang, Xuesheng Liu, Yao Lu, and Weiping Fang have nothing to disclose.

Compliance with Ethics Guidelines. This article is based on previously conducted studies and does not contain any new studies with human participants or animals performed by any of the authors.

Data Availability. All the extra data presented are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Open Access. This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial 4.0 International License, which permits any non-commercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit http:// creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/.

REFERENCES

- 1. Wang X, Ran G, Chen X, et al. The effect of ultrasound-guided erector spinae plane block combined with dexmedetomidine on postoperative analgesia in patients undergoing modified radical mastectomy: a randomized controlled trial. Pain Ther. 2021;10(1):475–84.
- 2. Wang L, Wu Y, Dou L, et al. Comparison of two ultrasound-guided plane blocks for pain and post-operative opioid requirement in lumbar spine fusion surgery: a prospective, randomized, and controlled clinical trial. Pain Ther. 2021;10: 1331–41.
- 3. Chen K, Wang L, Liu X, et al. Ultrasound-guided erector spinae plane block reduces perioperative opioid consumption in lumbar spinal fusion. Am J Ther. 2021;28:e266–8.
- 4. Kelley SD. Monitoring level of consciousness during anesthesia and sedation: a clinician's guide to the Bispectral Index. Aspect Medical Systems. 2004. http://www.aspectmedical.com/resources/ handbook/default. Accessed 18 Apr 2004.
- 5. Gürkan Y, Aksu C, Kuş A, et al. Ultrasound guided erector spinae plane block reduces postoperative opioid consumption following breast surgery: a randomized controlled study. J Clin Anesth. 2018;50:65–8.
- 6. Yildiz M, Kozanhan B, Iyisoy MS, et al. The effect of erector spinae plane block on postoperative analgesia and respiratory function in patients undergoing laparoscopic cholecystectomy: a doubleblind randomized controlled trial. J Clin Anesth. 2021;74:110403.
- 7. Hussain N, Grzywacz VP, Ferreri CA, et al. Investigating the efficacy of dexmedetomidine as an adjuvant to local anesthesia in brachial plexus block: a systematic review and meta-analysis of 18

randomized controlled trials. Reg Anesth Pain Med. 2017;42:184–96.

- 8. Canitez A, Kozanhan B, Aksoy N, et al. Effect of erector spinae plane block on the postoperative quality of recovery after laparoscopic cholecystectomy a prospective double-blind study. Br J Anaesth. 2021;127:629–35.
- 9. Finnerty D, Ní EA, Ahmed M, et al. A randomised trial of bilateral erector spinae plane block vs. no

block for thoracolumbar decompressive spinal surgery. Anaesthesia. 2021;76:1499–503.

10. Uda Y, Byrne K, Brahmbhatt A, et al. A pilot randomized-controlled trial evaluating the erector spinae plane block in thoracic and breast surgery. Can J Anaesth. 2020;67:1371–80.