



## Commentary

## Interventional pain procedures and vasovagal reactions: Proceed with vigilance



Eric J. Wang

*Department of Anesthesiology and Critical Care Medicine, Johns Hopkins Hospital, Baltimore, MD, USA*

Trigger point injections (TPI) are one of the most common procedures performed in pain medicine. Over 674,400 TPIs were performed in the United States in 2020, according to Medicare Part B claims data from the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services Physician/Supplier Procedure Summary [1]. This represents a procedural volume greater than that of peripheral nerve blocks, sympathetic nerve blocks, disc procedures, and interlaminar cervicothoracic epidural injections [2,3], and rivals that of interlaminar lumbar epidural injections [3]. Interventional spine injections (e.g. medial branch blocks, epidurals, intra-articular injections) are associated with potential risks that are rare but catastrophic (e.g. epidural hematoma, spinal cord injury, quadriplegia [4–6]). Because TPIs target specific portions of skeletal muscle [7] rather than nerves, joints, or non-compressible structures, it is perhaps reasonable that TPIs may appear innocuous by comparison.

In this issue of the Journal, two publications should give pause to any perception that TPIs are risk-free. Hattenbach and colleagues [8] present a case report in which they describe a 36-year-old female with myofascial pain scheduled for an ultrasound-guided trapezius, levator scapulae, and rhomboid trigger point injection. Her medical history was unremarkable for any neurologic or cardiovascular diagnoses. A 27-gauge, 1.5-inch needle was placed into a taut myofascial band via ultrasound guidance, and 1 mL of preservative-free 1% lidocaine without epinephrine was injected. Immediately after the needle was removed and re-inserted into an adjacent trigger point, the patient lost consciousness and became pulseless. Chest compressions were performed and an automated external defibrillator reported a non-shockable rhythm. Return of spontaneous circulation occurred after 1 min of cardiopulmonary resuscitation, and the patient quickly regained consciousness. A subsequent cardiac evaluation yielded no evidence of an underlying arrhythmia or ischemic event, leading to a diagnosis of vasovagal syncope complicated by asystole.

Debrosse and colleagues [9] present a systematic review that compares analgesic and functional outcomes from among a variety of TPI injectates (e.g. local anesthetic versus botulinum toxin A) and

summarizes reported harms. Out of the 15 studies selected for inclusion in the safety analysis, only three of them reported zero complications. Although the adverse effects described were usually mild and transient (e.g. discomfort or pain with injection), some symptoms initially suggested a potential nerve injury (e.g. limb heaviness and numbness [10], paresthesias [11], dysphonia [12]). Other potentially dangerous complications from TPIs have been reported elsewhere in the literature (e.g. pneumothorax [13], cervical epidural abscess [14], pneumocephalus [15]).

Vasovagal reactions merit particular attention. Their estimated incidence during interventional pain procedures can approach 10% [16,17], and they can quickly progress to a life-threatening emergency (e.g. cardiac arrest). Perhaps even more alarmingly, any patient undergoing any procedure is at potential risk. Vasovagal cardiac arrest in apparently healthy patients has been reported in the context of intrathecal injections for anesthesia [18], as well as with needle placement without the administration of any injectate [19,20]. Periprocedural pain and anxiety, a history of syncope, and a sitting position used for the procedure are putative risk factors [20,21], and the cessation of verbal responsiveness along with the onset of bradycardia, hypotension, and cyanosis may herald an impending cardiac arrest [18], but vasovagal reactions are rarely predictable. It should be noted that in the case report presented by Hattenbach and colleagues, the patient was also apparently healthy and of a relatively young age, in a sitting position for the procedure, and reported pre-procedural anxiety. However, the patient had no previous history of syncope, and her anxiety was not of such severity that pharmacologic anxiolysis was deemed necessary. This illustrates the reality that patients usually present with some, but not all, risk factors for a given complication, and clinicians must make decisions without the benefit of hindsight.

Nonetheless, there are valuable lessons to be learned. Likely the most important is the recognition that all procedures in pain medicine are associated with risks. Pain physicians must recognize that for any procedure, no matter how “small,” the spectrum of possible complications

DOIs of original article: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.inpm.2022.100076>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.inpm.2022.100077>.

E-mail address: [ewang29@jhmi.edu](mailto:ewang29@jhmi.edu).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.inpm.2022.100107>

Received 21 May 2022; Received in revised form 25 May 2022; Accepted 26 May 2022

2772-5944/© 2022 The Author. Published by Elsevier Inc. on behalf of Spine Intervention Society. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

includes serious harms such as vasovagal cardiac arrest. Some straightforward precautions should be followed with every patient, such as taking a comprehensive history and physical (e.g. asking for a history of syncope, arrhythmias, or severe periprocedural anxiety), monitoring vital signs, and considering a recumbent procedural position if tolerated by the patient (or using a procedural table on which a sitting position may be quickly converted into a recumbent position).

Despite taking all reasonable precautions, an adverse event may occur regardless. In this circumstance, immediate detection and responsiveness are essential for preventing further clinical deterioration and minimizing the risk of long-term harm to the patient [8,18]. Serious complications from interventional pain procedures may be uncommon, but it remains incumbent on pain physicians to stay vigilant and prepared.

## Funding

There was no financial support for the completion of this effort, and the author reports no potential conflict of interest with this project. The author receives salary support from Scilex Pharmaceuticals, Inc., paid directly to the institution, for research unrelated to this topic.

## Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare the following financial interests/personal relationships which may be considered as potential competing interests:

Eric J. Wang, MD reports a relationship with Scilex Pharmaceuticals, Inc. that includes: funding grants.

## References

- [1] Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services Data. May 21, 2022, <https://data.cms.gov/summary-statistics-on-use-and-payments/physiciansupplier-procedure-summary>.
- [2] Manchikanti L, Pampati V, Falco FJE, Hirsch JA. An updated assessment of utilization of interventional pain management techniques in the Medicare population: 2000-2013. *Pain Physician* 2015;18. E115–27.
- [3] Manchikanti L, Sanapati MR, Soin A, Manchikanti MV, Pampati V, Singh V, et al. An updated analysis of utilization of epidural procedures in managing chronic pain in the Medicare population from 2000 to 2018. *Pain Physician* 2020;23:111. 26.
- [4] Bogduk N. *ISIS practice guidelines for spinal diagnostic and treatment procedures*. second ed. 2014.
- [5] Bogduk N, Dreyfuss P, Baker R, Yin W, Landers M, Hammer M, et al. Complications of spinal diagnostic and treatment procedures. *Pain Med* 2008;9:S11–34. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1526-4637.2008.00437.x>.
- [6] Carr CM, Plastaras CT, Pingree MJ, Smuck M, Maus TP, Geske JR, et al. Immediate adverse events in interventional pain procedures: a multi-institutional study. *Pain Med* 2016;17:2155. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pm/pnw051>. 61.
- [7] Shah JP, Thaker N, Heimur J, Aredo JV, Sikdar S, Gerber L. Myofascial trigger points then and now: a historical and scientific perspective. *Pharm Manag PM R* 2015;7:746. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmrj.2015.01.024>. 61.
- [8] Cardiac arrest in a 36 year-old after trigger point injection with lidocaine. Case report. *Interventional Pain Medicine* 2022:100077. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.inpm.2022.100077>.
- [9] Trigger point injection therapies for chronic myofascial neck and back pain. A systematic review. *Interventional Pain Medicine* 2022:100076. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.inpm.2022.100076>.
- [10] Wheeler AH, Goolkasian P, Gretz SS. A randomized, double-blind, prospective pilot study of botulinum toxin injection for refractory, unilateral, cervicothoracic, paraspinal, myofascial pain syndrome. *Spine* 1998;23:1662. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00007632-199808010-00009>. 6, discussion 1667.
- [11] Kamanli A, Kaya A, Ardicoglu O, Ozgocmen S, Zengin FO, Bayik Y. Comparison of lidocaine injection, botulinum toxin injection, and dry needling to trigger points in myofascial pain syndrome. *Rheumatol Int* 2005;25:604. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00296-004-0485-6>. 11.
- [12] Porta M. A comparative trial of botulinum toxin type A and methylprednisolone for the treatment of myofascial pain syndrome and pain from chronic muscle spasm. *Pain* 2000;85:101. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0304-3959\(99\)00264-x](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0304-3959(99)00264-x). 5.
- [13] Ahiskalioglu EO, Alici HA, Dostbil A, Celik M, Ahiskalioglu A, Aksoy M. Pneumothorax after trigger point injection: a case report and review of literature. *J Back Musculoskelet Rehabil* 2016;29:895. <https://doi.org/10.3233/BMR-160666>. 7.
- [14] Elias M. Cervical epidural abscess following trigger point injection. *J Pain Symptom Manag* 1994;9:71. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0885-3924\(94\)90156-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0885-3924(94)90156-2). 2.
- [15] Nelson LS, Hoffman RS. Intrathecal injection: unusual complication of trigger-point injection therapy. *Ann Emerg Med* 1998;32:506. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0196-0644\(98\)70183-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0196-0644(98)70183-0). 8.
- [16] Trentman TL, Rosenfeld DM, Seamans DP, Hentz JG, Stanek JP. Vasovagal reactions and other complications of cervical vs. lumbar translaminal epidural steroid injections. *Pain Pract* 2009;9:59–64. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-2500.2008.00242.x>.
- [17] Kennedy DJ, Schneider B, Casey E, Rittenberg J, Conrad B, Smuck M, et al. Vasovagal rates in fluoroscopically guided interventional procedures: a study of over 8,000 injections. *Pain Med* 2013;14:1854. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pme.12241>. 9.
- [18] Caplan RA, Ward RJ, Posner K, Cheney FW. Unexpected cardiac arrest during spinal anesthesia: a closed claims analysis of predisposing factors. *Anesthesiology* 1988; 68:5–11. <https://doi.org/10.1097/0000542-198801000-00003>.
- [19] Tizes R. Cardiac arrest following routine venipuncture. *JAMA* 1976;236:1846. 7.
- [20] Sprung J, Abdelmalak B, Schoenwald PK. Vasovagal cardiac arrest during the insertion of an epidural catheter and before the administration of epidural medication. *Anesth Analg* 1998;86:1263. <https://doi.org/10.1097/0000539-199806000-00024>. 5.
- [21] Kinsella SM, Tuckey JP. Perioperative bradycardia and asystole: relationship to vasovagal syncope and the Bezold–Jarisch reflex. *Br J Anaesth* 2001;86:859. 68 <https://doi.org/10.1093/bja/86.6.859>.