Ultrasound-Guided Lumbar Erector Spinae Plane Block compared to Quadratus Lumborum Block for Postoperative Analgesia in Inguinal Hernia repair operations

Tamer S. Mohamed, Reda K. Kamel, Saad Ibrahim Saad and Eslam A. Shabob

Anesthesia, Surgical intensive care, and Pain Management Department, Faculty of Medicine-Benha University

E-Mail: tamersaadoun691@gmail.com

Abstract

Background: More The correction of inguinal hernias is a technique that is performed on more than 20 million individuals annually and is a very common surgery all over the globe. In the study, a comparison was made between the Quadratus Lumborum Block and the Lumbar Erector Spinae Plane Block for Inguinal Hernia Repair Operations. The purpose of the study was to evaluate the consumption of morphine over a period of twenty-four hours and to determine the occurrence of postoperative issues such as the formation of hematomas and the toxicity of local anesthetics. A number of approaches: This prospective randomized clinical research included sixty persons who were scheduled to have surgery to treat an inguinal hernia. The participants were required to undergo surgery. Patients were divided into two groups that were identical to one another. Every single patient in the L-ESP group, which consisted of thirty individuals, was given a unilateral L-ESP block. In the QLB group, which consisted of thirty patients, a unilateral QLB block was successfully performed. According to the findings, the L-ESP group used considerably smaller quantities of morphine and ketorolac in the first twenty-four hours after surgery in compared to the QLB group (P values = 0.010 and 0.002, respectively). When it came to success rate, patient satisfaction, postoperative nausea and vomiting, hypotension, and bradycardia, the two groups exhibited findings that were quite comparable among themselves. In conclusion, when there is a comparison between the Quadratus Lumborum Block and the Lumbar Erector Spinae Plane Block, it is found that the latter is more advantageous for inguinal hernia repair procedures. In comparison to the QLB group, the L-ESP group drank a considerably smaller quantity of morphine and ketorolac during the first twenty-four hours of the observation period.

Keywords: Ultrasound-Reconstruction of the inguinal hernia, quadratus lumborum block, postoperative analgesia, and guided lumbar erector spinae plane block are all procedures that are performed.

1. Introduction

Located the region of the groin The repair of hernias is a surgical technique that is done rather regularly. At every single location on the planet. [1] There is a risk that you may have moderate to severe postoperative pain, which may result in a lengthier hospital stay and a delay in the return of your usual daily activities. Inadequate care of acute postoperative pain is a substantial risk factor for chronic pain, which may last for months. Chronic pain can be a serious problem. When postoperative pain is not well managed, it may have adverse effects not only on the body but also on the psyche. The effective management of acute pain helps reduce the need for opioids and general anesthetics, decreases the stress reaction that occurs during surgical procedures, and concurrently protects the immune system. Additionally, regional anesthetic has the ability to lessen the stress response that is brought on by surgical trauma. Therefore, many pain reduction treatments might lessen acute discomfort after a surgical surgery. Systemic analgesics, which include acetaminophen, opioids, gabapentinoids, and nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAID), are required for the management of this pain. Additionally, a number of locoregional procedures, such as the transversus abdominis plane block, the erector spinae plane block, the quadratus lumborum block, the ilioinguinal-iliohypogastric nerve block, and the local anesthetic infiltration, are employed [4-6]. [7-8]" Blanco first reported the quadratus lumborum muscle block (QLB) in 2007. He said that

the QLB was performed by injecting a local anesthetic into the anterolateral junction of the quadratus lumborum muscle (QLB type 1)[10[.

Injecting into the posterior segment of the quadratus lumborum muscle (QLB type 2), using the trans muscular approach between the quadratus lumborum muscle and the fascia of the psoas muscle (QLB type 3), and injecting into the quadratus lumborum muscle itself (QLB type 4) were all additional enhancements that were accomplished with this technique.

In spite of the most current update given to the block. The safety profile and practicality of use of the 11-erector spinae plane block have contributed to its swift development in popularity. The first use of ESPB was for the treatment of persistent discomfort in the thoracic area [12, 13].

Following that, its range of applications expanded to include both immediate and long-lasting pain, which was subsequently documented in the lower back [14], neck [15], and lower back [16] regions in that order. The benefits and drawbacks of thoracic ESPB have been the subject of a number of reviews and studies; however, there is a dearth of data on lumbar ESPB.

The purpose of this study is to conduct a literature analysis on the efficacy of lumbar ESPB in postoperative pain management and to investigate the possible opioid-sparing benefits of ESPB over QLB for patients who are having inguinal hernia surgeries [17]. In the study, a comparison was made between the Quadratus Lumborum Block and the Lumbar

Erector Spinae Plane Block for Inguinal Hernia Repair Operations. The purpose of the study was to evaluate the consumption of morphine over a period of twenty-four hours and to determine the occurrence of postoperative issues such as the formation of hematomas and the toxicity of local anesthetics.

2. Patients and Methods

Study design: This is a Prospective, randomized clinical trial. The study took place at the Prince Mansour Military Hospital starting in November 2021. Study population: We had sixty patients scheduled for elective surgery to repair an inguinal hernia. Criteria for selecting patients: Criteria for inclusion: Age group: 18 to 65. State of ASA (I-III). Individuals undergoing surgery to correct a hernia on one side of the groin. Criteria for exclusion: ASA physical status >III. Body mass index (BMI) > 35 kg/m2. Limitations on the application of local anesthesia: Examples of coagulopathy involve the patient declining local anesthetic, thrombocytopenia (platelet count less than 100,000 per microliter), an international normalized ratio higher than 1.5, therapeutic anticoagulation, and skin infection or hematoma around the puncture site. Having an allergic reaction to any of the trial medicines. Utilizing blinding and randomization, a computer-generated list was employed to determine assignments, which were subsequently stored in a sealed envelope. Two identical groups were assigned to the patients. In a group of 30 patients, one patient had a unilateral blockage of L-ESP. Within the QLB group of 30 patients, one individual received a unilateral QLB block. Employing multiple methodologies led to an open label study.Study design: This is a Prospective, randomized clinical trial. The study took place at the Prince Mansour Military Hospital starting in November 2021. Study population: We had sixty patients scheduled for elective surgery to repair an inguinal hernia. Criteria for selecting patients: Criteria for inclusion: Age group: 18 to 65. State of ASA (I-III). Individuals undergoing surgery to correct a hernia on one side of the groin. Criteria for exclusion: ASA physical status >III. Body mass index (BMI) > 35 kg/m2. Limitations on the application of local anesthesia: Examples of coagulopathy involve the patient declining local anesthetic, thrombocytopenia (platelet count less than 100,000 per microliter), an international normalized ratio higher than 1.5, therapeutic anticoagulation, and skin infection or hematoma around the puncture site. Having an allergic reaction to any of the trial medicines. Utilizing blinding and randomization, a computer-generated list was employed to determine assignments, which were subsequently stored in a sealed envelope. Two identical groups were assigned to the patients. In a group of 30 patients, one patient had a unilateral blockage of L-ESP. Within the QLB group of 30 patients, one individual received a

unilateral QLB block. Employing multiple methodologies led to an open label study.

Methods:

Preoperative Procedures: We collected a thorough medical history and demographic details. The research's objective and approach, as well as the utilization of the visual analogue score (VAS) to assess pain, were clarified to every patient.

General anesthesia include the monitoring of noninvasive arterial blood pressure, pulse oximeter, and capnography, in addition to the administration of general anesthetic in the operating room. An intravenous line with a gauge of 22 was placed, and then an intravenous infusion of balanced crystalloid solution was started at a rate of 15 milliliters per kilogram per hour with the patient. Following preoxygenation with 100% oxygen, the administration of anesthesia was began by administering 2-4 mg/kg of propofol and 2-3 µg/kg of fentanyl. Additionally, the administration of atracurium at a dosage of 0.5 mg/kg helped the intubation of the endotracheal tube. Following surgical procedures, patients were given intravenous ondansetron 4 mg and dexamethasone 8 mg to alleviate feelings of nausea and vomiting. Anesthesia was maintained by administering sevoflurane in a combination of air and oxygen that was fifty percent, with a minimum alveolar concentration of four. Ventilation settings were adjusted such that end-tidal carbon dioxide levels remained between thirty-five and forty-five millimeters of mercury. Fentanyl was administered intravenously at a dose of 1 µg/kg on an hourly basis, and the dosage was recorded. The monitoring of hemodynamic parameters began prior to the beginning of the surgery and continued at regular intervals of five minutes until the treatment was finished. A 100 mm 21G needle guided by a linear US probe with a frequency range of 6–13 MHz (Siemens, ACUSON P500, USA) was used to perform the studied block in each group. This was done under direct anesthetic induction and fifteen minutes previous to the skin incision. The procedure was carried out in ideal aseptic conditions.

After being transferred to the post-operative care unit (PACU), the patients were subjected to strict monitoring, and their hemodynamic parameters were collected at regular intervals of fifteen minutes for a period of one hour. It was soon after the patients' arrival at the PACU that the VAS was used to quantify the amount of pain that they were experiencing. At two, four, six, twelve, and twenty-four hours after surgery, the VAS score was used to evaluate the hemodynamics of each patient on the ward as well as the level of pain they were experiencing. In cases where the pain score was three or greater, an intravenous dosage of thirty milligrams of ketorolac was administered. In the event that the pain score remained higher than or equal to 3, a dosage of 0.05 mg/kg of morphine was administered until the pain

score dropped below 3. All of the information that was collected included the total amount of morphine that was used within a day, the patients who need pain treatment, and the amount of time that passed before the first pain medicine was required. Each patient was given morphine by intravenous administration, and the amount of morphine that was consumed 24 hours after surgery was documented. After calculating the failure rate of the block, it was determined that a block was deemed ineffective if the patient needed more than two doses of rescue analgesia during the first hour after the procedure. The total amount of time required for both the general anesthetic procedure and the surgical procedure (from beginning to conclusion). Problems such as bradycardia, hypotension, intravascular injection, hematoma development, local anesthetic toxicity, and postoperative nausea and vomiting (PONV) are often seen in patients who have completed surgical procedures.Patients were allowed to participate in the study after receiving approval from both the scientific and ethical committees respectively. Prior to the operation, each patient was required to fill out a paper requesting their informed permission, and they were then randomly allocated to one of the two groups. While the study was being conducted, the anonymity of the data was maintained at all times.

Primary outcome
- VAS score.

Secondary outcomes:
- The first pain alleviation is about to be administered.
- A significant number of the patients requested analgesics.
- Concerns that arose after the operation.
- The total amount of morphine that was supplied during the first twenty-four hours after the surgical operation was completed.
- There are percentages of both success and failure.

Measurements:
- The Factors such as the patient's age, gender, weight, height, body mass index (BMI), ASA

physical condition, and side are taken into consideration when determining the length of the treatment. Time in minutes required for the operation Total amount of time spent doing the block (in minutes).
- At the postoperative care unit (PACU), the patient's heart rate and mean arterial pressure are monitored at predetermined intervals for a period of up to twenty-four hours.
- Two hours, four hours, six hours, twelve hours, and twenty-four hours are the PACU VAS.
- It is time for the first dosage of pain relieving medication.
- The morphine was stopped twenty-four hours following the operation.
- The quantity of ketorolac that was ingested during the first twenty-four hours after the surgical procedure.
- Success rate.
- The patient has a very positive attitude.
- unlucky occurrences having taken place.

Statistical analysis
At Chicago, Illinois, in the United States of America, using IBM IncSPSS version 26, statistical analysis was carried out. In order to ascertain whether or not the data distribution was normal, the Shapiro-Wilks test and histograms were used throughout the analysis. For the goal of comparing the groups, the unpaired Student's t-test was used, and the mean and standard deviation (SD) were utilized in order to describe the quantitative parametric variables. The results were presented as the median and the interquartile range (IQR), and it was decided that the Mann Whitney test was the approach that was the best suitable for assessing quantitative non-parametric data. Evaluation of the frequency and percentage (%) features of qualitative variables was accomplished via the use of both the Fisher's exact test and the Chi-square test. The evaluation of whether or not the finding was statistically significant was carried out by using a two-tailed P value that was lower than 0.05.

3. Results
Table (1) Postoperative heart rate measurements of the studied groups

	L-ESP group (n=30)	QLB group (n=30)	P value	Sig
PACU	76.13±7.47	78.5±9.55	0.290	NS
15min	77.6±7.5	79±9.48	0.528	NS
30min	74.5±7.47	77±9.77	0.270	NS
45min	78.67±7.45	80.9±9.42	0.313	NS
60min	77.63±7.53	80±9.66	0.294	NS
2h	76.17±7.73	78.53±9.31	0.288	NS
4h	77.5±7.91	77.23±9.21	0.905	NS
6h	78.47±7.96	84.2±10.32	**0.019***	S
12h	79.33±8.9	85.43±11.73	**0.027***	S
24h	84.03±9.13	88.83±13.61	0.114	NS

The information is provided in the form of mean ± standard deviation, where NS denotes non-significant and S denotes significant, and P values are less than or equal to 0.05.

Heart rate measures taken in the PACU after surgery were comparable across the two groups for the majority of time periods, with the exception of six and twelve hours, when the L-ESP group had substantially lower heart rates compared to the QLB group (P value = 0.019 and 0.027, respectively) (Table 1).

Table (2) The postoperative mean arterial blood pressure values for each of the research groups are presented to the reader**.**

	L-ESP group (n=30)	QLB group (n=30)	P value	Sig
PACU	91.5±7.19	95.2±9.01	0.084	NS
15min	91.67±8.28	95.6±9.08	0.085	NS
30min	93.17±7.17	93.77±9.12	0.778	NS
45min	94.1±7.19	97.87±9.17	0.082	NS
60min	92.9±7.13	96.67±9.1	0.079	NS
2h	90.87±8.8	93.67±9.26	0.235	NS
4h	91.97±8.45	95.1±9.15	0.173	NS
6h	93.6±8.99	101.3±12.37	**0.008***	S
12h	94.47±9.63	104.83±13.18	**0.001***	S
24h	102.5±10.42	108.33±13.05	0.061	NS

The information is provided in the form of mean ± standard deviation, where NS denotes non-significant and S denotes significant, and P values are less than or equal to 0.05.

Following the surgical procedure, measures of arterial blood pressure were collected in the post-operative care unit (PACU) at a number of different time intervals, including 15, 30, 45, 60, 2 hours, 4 hours, and 24 hours. The results showed that there was no significant difference between the two groups. Following a period of six and twelve hours, the L-ESP group exhibited a substantially reduced mean arterial blood pressure in comparison to the QLB group (P value = 0.008 and 0.001, respectively) (Table 2).

Table (3) Evaluations of the VAS for the groups that are being researched**.**

	L-ESP group (n=30)	QLB group (n=30)	P value	Sig
PACU	1 (0 - 1)	1 (0 - 1)	0.288	NS
2h	1 (1 - 1)	1 (0 - 2)	0.249	NS
4h	1.5 (1 - 2)	2 (1 - 2)	0.440	NS
6h	2 (1 - 3.5)	2 (2 - 5)	**0.004***	S
12h	2 (1 - 4)	4 (2 - 5.75)	**0.006***	S
24h	4 (2.5 - 4)	4.5 (2.25 - 5.75)	0.267	NS

NS stands for "not significant" if the P value is larger than 0.05, * stands for "significant" if the P value is less than or equal to 0.05, and the data is shown as the median (interquartile range).

The values on the Visual Analog Scale were considerably lower in the L-ESP group compared to the QLB group at 6 and 12 hours (P value 0.004 and 0.006, respectively), as well as at PACU, 2 hours, 4 hours, and 24 hours (Table 3). This was the case at all three time points discussed.

Table (4) The total amount of morphine consumed, the total amount of ketorolac consumed, and the first 24-hour postoperative analgesic period are all for the groups that were being investigated.

		L-ESP group (n=30)	QLB group (n=30)	P value	Sig
First analgesic request time (h)	Mean ± SD	9 ± 2.27	7.03 ± 0.93	<0.001*	S
	Range	6 - 12	6 - 8		
Total amount of morphine used in the first twenty-four hours after surgery (mg)	Mean ± SD	0.9 ± 1.58	2.4 ± 2.34	0.010*	S
	Range	0 - 4.4	0 - 7		
Total amount of ketorolac consumed in the first 24 hours after surgery (mg)	Mean ± SD	52.8 ± 13.08	67.2 ± 17.92	0.002*	S
	Range	30 - 60	30 - 90		

Based on the data presented in Table 4, it is obvious that the L-ESP group experienced a significantly longer duration to the first request for analgesics when compared to the QLB group (P value <0.001). Over the course of the first twenty-four hours after the surgical procedure, the L-ESP group used a total of 0.9 ± 1.58 mg of morphine, whereas the QLB group consumed 2.4 ± 2.34 mg of morphine. During the first twenty-four hours after the surgical procedure, the L-ESP group consumed a total of 52.8 ± 13.08 mg of ketorolac, whereas the QLB group used 67.2 ± 17.92 mg of the medication.

Table (5) The presence of non-significant findings (NS) is indicated by a P value that is larger than 0.05.

		L-ESP group (n=30)	QLB group (n=30)	P value	Sig
Rate of success	Success	26 (86.67%)	24 (80%)	0.488	NS
	Failure	4 (13.33%)	6 (20%)		
patient contentment	Very satisfied	11 (36.67%)	7 (23.33%)	0.260	NS
	Satisfied	19 (63.33%)	23 (76.67%)		
nausea and vomiting after surgery	Yes	3 (10%)	8 (26.67%)	0.095	NS
	No	27 (90%)	22 (73.33%)		
Low blood pressure	Yes	8 (26.67%)	6 (20%)	0.542	NS
	No	22 (73.33%)	24 (80%)		
Bradycardia	Yes	5 (16.67%)	3 (10%)	0.448	NS
	No	25 (83.33%)	27 (90%)		
toxicity of local anesthetics	Yes	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	---	
	No	30 (100%)	30 (100%)		
development of hematomas	Yes	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	---	
	No	30 (100%)	30 (100%)		
intravascular administration	Yes	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	---	
	No	30 (100%)	30 (100%)		

The presence of non-significant findings (NS) is indicated by a P value that is larger than 0.05.
When it came to success rate, patient satisfaction, postoperative nausea and vomiting, hypotension, and bradycardia, the two groups exhibited findings that were quite comparable among themselves. In neither the L-ESP group nor the QLB group did any of the patients have intravascular injections, local anesthetic toxicity, or the formation of a hematoma (Table), respectively.

4. Discussion

In At a number of different time periods during the inquiry, there was not a discernible difference between the two groups in terms of the postoperative heart rate readings that were taken. The L-ESP group, on the other hand, exhibited substantially lower heart rates at 6 hours and 12 hours compared to the QLB group (P value = 0.019 and 0.027, respectively). There were no significant differences between the two groups in terms of mean arterial blood pressure readings taken at different time periods after surgery in the post-operative blood pressure unit (PACU). On the other hand, as compared to the QLB group, the L-ESP group exhibited significantly lower mean arterial blood pressure at certain time intervals.

For this reason, Sayouh et al. [18] conducted a randomized controlled research in which they evaluated the effects of both blocks on 102 patients of both genders who were having open kidney surgeries. The patients ranged in age from 21 to 64 years old. According to the findings, there were notable variations in the hemodynamic recordings between the groups that were blocked and the group that did not get a block.

In contrast to the results of Zanfini et al. [19], which investigated the effect of pQLB and ESPB on postoperative pain, these findings contradict the conclusions of the investigation. According to the results of the study, there was no significant difference between the two groups in terms of hemodynamic markers such as postoperative mean arterial blood pressure and postoperative heart rate. It is possible that this discrepancy is the result of a number of different surgical operations.

In addition, Priya and her colleagues [20] investigated the effects of the erector spinae plane block (ESPB) and the quadratus lumborum type-II block (QLB-II) on the alleviation of pain in women who were giving delivery. The average arterial pressure and heart rate stayed the same during the whole research, regardless of which group was being examined. In addition, the patients were constantly evaluated for a variety of disorders, including apnea, hypoventilation, arrhythmia, hypotension, and allergies. During the postoperative period, we looked for signs of nausea and vomiting, hypotension, pruritis, altered sensorium, postoperative urine retention, respiratory depression, cardiac arrest, or

anaphylaxis. We also looked for any other manifestations of these conditions.

Readings revealed substantially lower levels in the L-ESP group compared to the QLB group at 6 and 12 hours, with P values of 0.004 and 0.006, respectively. However, there was no significant difference between the two groups at PACU, 2 hours, 4 hours, or 24 hours from the time of the readings.

Our result is in agreement with the work conducted by Saadawi and colleagues, which suggests that ESP block may be able to function via a variety of channels, such as the diffusion of local anesthetic to a number of different locations. It would seem, on the basis of the evidence that is now available, that ESP block has the potential to successfully reduce postoperative pain and the amount of opioids that are required for various thoracic and abdominal procedures in comparison to control groups. Although they need injections at numerous levels, intercostal blocks are now the favored alternative over ESP blocks. This is due to the fact that they provide analgesia that is comparable to that of ESP blocks.

Furthermore, Sayouh et al. [18] investigated the influence that both blocks had on the amount of opioids consumed and the degrees of pain experienced. In terms of the analgesics that were administered during surgery and postoperatively, as well as the satisfaction score, hemodynamics, and VAS score data, the findings confirmed that there were no significant differences between the two groups of patients who received blocks. However, there were significant differences between the groups that received blocks and those who did not receive blocks. ESPB and QLB both give comparable pain relief during open kidney surgery that is performed under general anesthesia. This results in a decreased need for opiate medication both during and after the procedure.

The results shown here are in contrast to those of the research conducted by Aygun et al. [22] in which the analgesic effects of ESPB and QLB-II were evaluated in patients who were undergoing LC. When it came to giving patients with appropriate postoperative pain management, the authors discovered that there was no discernible difference between QLB-II and ESPB. This was the conclusion reached after doing an analysis of the data. It was never the case that the VAS ratings of the groups changed at any point in time. There might be a number of other procedures that can explain this disparity.

The findings that we got are in contrast to the findings that Roy et al. [23] acquired, who found that QL block offered greater perioperative pain reduction than TAP block did for patients who were having laparoscopic hernia repair. Furthermore, it results in a higher dermatomal spread; yet, three months after surgery, there is no reduction in the incidence of chronic discomfort. It was investigated by the authors whether or not a posterior TAP block was more effective in providing pain relief to these people than

a bilateral QL block. In comparison to the TAP group, the QL group had a significantly longer duration of analgesia (282.5 ± 89.9 minutes for the TAP group vs 354.8 ± 107 minutes for the QL group), as well as a considerable decrease in the total amount of fentanyl used during a 24-hour period. The QL group had a greater number of individuals who had pain reduction at the T8 and T9 dermatomes. After twenty-four hours and three months of follow-up, the quality of recovery remained the same and remained steady.

Within the context of this investigation, it was observed that the L-ESP group had a substantially longer duration before seeking the first pain medication, in comparison to the QLB group (P value <0.001). When compared to the QLB group, the L-ESP group used a considerably lesser quantity of morphine and ketorolac in the first twenty-four hours after surgery (P values = 0.010 and 0.002, respectively).

Our findings are supported by Yang et al. [24] who conducted an investigation into the effects of a particular block on the alleviation of pain in adult patients who were having laparoscopic cholecystectomy. In all, there were 947 people who participated in the fifteen different randomized controlled experiments that were included in the research. At both 12 and 24 hours after surgery, the group that had an erector spinae plane block had a lower postoperative pain level compared to the group that received a controlling procedure. In comparison to the group that served as the control, the group that was given the erector spinae plane block had a decreased cumulative opioid consumption twenty-four hours after the operation concluded. When compared to the group that served as the control, the group that was given the erector spinae plane block had a much reduced incidence of postoperative nausea and vomiting. The group that was given the erector spinae plane block and other block groups, such as the oblique subcostal transversus abdominis plane block and the quadratus lumborum block groups, had comparable levels of opioid use and rates of postoperative nausea and vomiting. In order to offer excellent postoperative pain treatment for patients who are having laparoscopic cholecystectomy, an ultrasound-guided erector spinae plane block is used.

Moreover, a research was conducted to determine if TQLB and ESPB might lower the amount of opiate that was used and the amount of pain that was experienced after surgery. Within the first twelve hours after surgery, Jiang et al. [25] discovered that Group ESPB had a considerably lower sufentanil use than the other groups. A steady reduction in pain ratings was seen with both ESPB and TQLB until 6 and 4 hours following surgery, respectively (P < 0.05). The two groups of those who received blocks, on the other hand, did not vary significantly in terms of their levels of pain. Through the use of TQLB and ESPB, the quality of the multimodal analgesic was enhanced. Because it provides pain relief for a

longer period of time and reduces the need for opioids, ESPB may provide additional advantages.

Verma et al. [26] conducted a further research in which they examined the effectiveness of ultrasound-guided bilateral erector spinae plane block (ESPB) in patients who were having laparoscopic corticotomy (LC). Additionally, they investigated the length of postoperative discomfort and the incidence of chronic pain for a period of up to six months after the operation. In both static and dynamic assessments, the VAS ratings of the ESPB group demonstrated a reduction that was statistically significant. Within the ESPB group, there was a greater number of patients who were able to walk after four hours, and there was a lesser number of patients who required fentanyl and diclofenac while they were undergoing surgery. After one week and one month, there was a reduction in the number of patients who reported experiencing pain within the ESPB group. Following LC, ESPB offers good pain relief and has the ability to mobilize the patient quickly. Immediately after that, the benefit will continue to be in effect for a week.

Aygun et al. [22] came to the opinion that postoperative pain management after laparoscopic cholecystectomy (LC) may be effectively achieved with both ESPB and Quadratus Lumborum block type II (QLB-II). This was the result obtained by the researchers. This research project included a total of eighty individuals who were classified as ASA I–II. The patients were divided into two groups that were similar to one another: ESB and QLB-II. During the QLB-II and ESPB procedures, ultrasound guiding was used with them. There was documentation of the average amount of opioid ingestion as well as the Numeric Rating Scores during the first twenty-four hours after the procedure. There was a constant level of opioid usage and NRS scores across all of the groups at each hour. ESPB and QLB-II do not differ significantly from one another in any meaningful way.

In the most recent research, it was found that there were no significant differences between the two groups in terms of the success rate, patient satisfaction, postoperative nausea and vomiting, hypotension, or bradycardia. Intravascular injections, the formation of hematomas, or local anesthetic toxicity were not experienced by any of the patients in either the L-ESP group or the QLB group.

A prior research that was carried out by Priya and colleagues [20] evaluated the analgesic effectiveness of the erector spinae plane block (ESPB) and the quadratus lumborum type-II block (QLB-II). The results of this investigation were consistent with the findings of that study. We used random allocation to divide 52 patients who shared similar demographic features into two groups: ESPB (n = 26) and QLB-II (n = 26). Both groups consisted of the same number of patients. The amount of fentanyl that was delivered, pain ratings, postoperative complications within twenty-four hours, and the quality of recovery

(QoR-15) on the first and second days following surgery as well as on the day of discharge were the major outcomes of the comparison of the efficacy of analgesics. On postoperative days one and two, as well as on the day of discharge, there was a consistent quantity of data on the total number of fentanyl doses, the numerical rating pain score at rest or during movement, and the QoR-15 scores. According to the authors, patients who received ESPB or QLB-II encountered comparable problems, as well as equal levels of pain reduction and quality of recovery outcomes.

Aksu et al. [27] did a research that compared the analgesic effects of quadratus lumborum block with erector spinae plane (ESP) block in juvenile lower abdomen operations. Their results were consistent with our own findings. An equal number of sixty participants were randomly allocated to either the QLB or ESPB group. The FLACC scale was used to evaluate the level of pain experienced at 0, 1, 3, and 6 hours after the surgical procedure. A record was kept of the quantity of pain medicines that were necessary as well as the length of time that passed before the first dosage was required. There were a total of fifty-seven participants that were included into the conclusions of the study. There was no significant difference in the FLACC scores found between the groups at 0 hours, 1 hour, 3 hours, or 6 hours after the operation (p>0.05). Additionally, there was no discernible difference in the durations of time it took for each group to get the first signs of pain reduction (p>0.05). ESPB and QLB both provide comparable levels of postoperative pain relief for children patients who have had lower abdominal surgery, according to the findings of this research.

Additionally, Zanfini et al. [19] investigated the effectiveness of pQLB and ESPB in reducing the amount of pain experienced by patients after undergoing an elective cesarean section (CS). A total of fifty-two ladies were present in the room. There was no discernible difference in the total cumulative dose of morphine between the two patient groups that were included in the study. There were no statistically significant differences between the two groups with regard to the amount of time that passed before the first administration of morphine, the levels of NPRS, or the hemodynamic parameters. Significant increases in NPRS values were seen over a variety of time periods. A lower number of morphine rescue doses were required for the ESPB group in comparison to the pQLB group. No adverse consequences were seen or documented. It would seem that ESPB is just as effective as pQLB in terms of delivering pain relief after CS has been administered.

Researchers Hu et al. [28], who conducted a study, found that patients who received local infiltration analgesia in conjunction with ultrasound-guided transmuscular quadratus lumborum block (QLB) experienced significantly lower VAS scores during motion at various time points after surgery.

Additionally, these patients had lower resting VAS scores in the post-operative care unit (PACU) and after surgery. Moreover, patients needed much fewer quantities of morphine and intraoperative opioids post-surgery, reported less sleep disruptions owing to pain the night before the operation, and were able to move sooner. As a result of the fact that ultrasound-guided transmuscular QLB in combination with LIA has been shown to greatly reduce the need for intraoperative opioids and to prevent the weakening of the quadriceps femoris muscle, it has been established as a superior option for the management of postoperative pain in comparison to LIA treatment alone. There is a possibility that this contradictory outcome is due to the fact that the study group and the control group are different.

5. Conclusion

It has been shown that the Lumbar Erector Spinae Plane Block is more successful than the Quadratus Lumborum Block when it comes to the correction of inguinal hernias. When compared to the QLB group, the L-ESP group consumed much less morphine and ketorolac during the first twenty-four hours of the experiment.

References

[1] **F. Köckerling and MP. Simons**. Current Concepts of Inguinal Hernia Repair. Visc Med. 2018;vol,34(2):pp.145-50.

[2] **F. Köckerling and C. Schug-Pass**. Early Surgical Intervention following Inguinal Hernia Repair with Severe Postoperative Pain. Front Surg. 2017;vol,4:pp.67-80.

[3] **J. Bruce and J. Quinlan**. Chronic Post Surgical Pain. Rev Pain. 2011;vol,5(3):pp.23-9.

[4] **EO. Ahiskalioglu, A. Ahiskalioglu, P. Aydin, Z. Arslan, M. Aksoy and A. Temiz**. Effects of a single-dose preemptive pregabalin on acute and chronic pain after inguinal hernia repair with mesh under spinal anaesthesia: A randomised controlled trial. Eur J Anaesthesiol. 2016;vol,33(8):pp.605-7.

[5] **G. Alfano, M. Grieco, A. Forino, G. Meglio, MC. Pace and M. Iannotti**. Analgesia with paracetamol/tramadol vs. paracetamol/codeine in one day-surgery: a randomized open study. Eur Rev Med Pharmacol Sci. 2011;vol,15(2):pp.205-10.

[6] **B. Stessel, M. Boon, C. Pelckmans, EA. Joosten, JP. Ory, W. Wyckmans, et al.** Metamizole vs. ibuprofen at home after day case surgery: A double-blind randomised controlled noninferiority trial. Eur J Anaesthesiol. 2019;vol, 36(5):pp.351-9.

[7] **GP, Joshi, N, Rawal, H, Kehlet, F, Bonnet, F, Camu, HB, Fischer, et al.** Evidence-based management of postoperative pain in adults undergoing open inguinal hernia surgery. Br J Surg. 2012;vol , 99(2):pp.168-85.

[8] **C. Aksu, MC. Şen, MA. Akay, C. Baydemir and Y. Gürkan**. Erector Spinae Plane Block vs Quadratus Lumborum Block for pediatric lower abdominal surgery: A double blinded, prospective, and randomized trial. J Clin Anesth. 2019;vol,57:pp.24-8.

[9] **Y .Zhou, M. Chen, Y. Zhang, H. Zhou, X. Yu and G. Chen**. Ilioinguinal/iliohypogastric nerve block versus transversus abdominis plane block for pain management following inguinal hernia repair surgery: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Medicine (Baltimore). 2019;vol,98(42):pp.17-25.

[10] **R, Blanco**. Tap block under ultrasound guidance: the description of a "no pops" technique: 271. Reg Anesth Pain Med. 2007;vol,32(5):pp.130-7.

[11] **M ,Forero, SD, Adhikary, H ,Lopez, C. Tsui and KJ. Chin**. The Erector Spinae Plane Block: A Novel Analgesic Technique in Thoracic Neuropathic Pain. Reg Anesth Pain Med. 2016;vol, 41(5):pp.621-7.

[12] **W. Huang, W. Wang, W. Xie, Z. Chen and Y. Liu**. Erector spinae plane block for postoperative analgesia in breast and thoracic surgery: A systematic review and meta-analysis. J Clin Anesth. 2020;vol,66:pp.10-9.

[13] **S. Tulgar, A. Ahiskalioglu, A. De Cassai and Y. Gurkan**. Efficacy of bilateral erector spinae plane block in the management of pain: current insights. J Pain Res. 2019;vol,12:2597-pp.613.

[14] **S. Tulgar and O. Senturk**. Ultrasound guided Erector Spinae Plane block at L-4 transverse process level provides effective postoperative analgesia for total hip arthroplasty. J Clin Anesth. 2018;vol,44:pp.68-77.

[15] **S. Tulgar, ME. Aydin, A. Ahiskalioglu, A .De Cassai and Y. Gurkan**. Anesthetic techniques: focus on lumbar erector spinae plane block. Local Reg Anesth. 2020;vol,13:pp.121-33.

[16] **S. Tulgar, O. Senturk, DT. Thomas, U. Deveci and Z. Ozer**. A new technique for sensory blockage of posterior branches of sacral nerves: Ultrasound guided sacral erector spinae plane block. J Clin Anesth. 2019;vol,57:pp.129-30.

[17] **KJ. Chin, S. Adhikary, N. Sarwani and M. Forero**. The analgesic efficacy of pre-operative bilateral erector spinae plane (ESP) blocks in patients having ventral hernia repair. Anaesthesia. 2017;vol,72(4):pp.452-60.

[18] **EF. Sayouh, MAER. Shahin, HMO. Ahmed and MGM. EL-Sayed**. Intraoperative and Postoperative Opioid-Sparing Effect of Ultrasound Guided Quadratus lumborum Block versus Erector Spinae Plane Block in Renal Surgeries under General Anesthesia. Egypt J Hosp Med. 2023;vol, 91(1):pp. 4137-44.

[19] **BA. Zanfini, M. Di Muro, M . Biancone, S. Catarci, A. Piersanti, L. Frassanito, et al.** Ultrasound-Guided Bilateral Erector Spinae Plane Block vs. Ultrasound-Guided Bilateral Posterior Quadratus Lumborum Block for Postoperative Analgesia after Caesarean Section: An Observational Closed Mixed Cohort Study. J Clin Med. 2023;vol, 12(24):pp.7720-33.

[20] **TK. Priya, D. Singla, P. Talawar, RS. Sharma, S. Goyal and G. Purohit**. Comparative efficacy of quadratus lumborum type-II and erector spinae plane block in patients undergoing caesarean section under spinal anaesthesia: a randomised controlled trial. Int J Obstet Anesth. 2023;vol, 53:pp.70-9.

[21] **M, Saadawi, S ,Layera, J, Aliste, D. Bravo, P. Leurcharusmee and DQ. Tran**. Erector spinae plane block: A narrative review with systematic analysis of the evidence pertaining to clinical indications and alternative truncal blocks. J Clin Anesth. 2021;vol, 68:pp.11-20.

[22] **H. Aygun, N. Kavrut Ozturk, AS. Pamukcu, A. Inal, I. Kiziloglu, DT. Thomas, et al.** Comparison of ultrasound guided Erector Spinae Plane Block and quadratus lumborum block for postoperative analgesia in laparoscopic cholecystectomy patients; a prospective randomized study. J Clin Anesth. 2020;vol,62:pp.20-9.

[23] **A. Roy, D. Bhoi, A. Chhabra, VK. Mohan, V. Darlong and G. Prasad**. Quadratus lumborum block vs. transversus abdominis plane block in laparoscopic trans-abdominal pre-peritoneal repair of inguinal hernia in adults: A randomised controlled trial. Indian J Anaesth. 2023;vol, 67(2):pp. 207-15.

[24] **X. Yang, Y. Zhang, Y. Chen, M. Xu, X . Lei and Q. Fu**. Analgesic effect of erector spinae plane block in adults undergoing laparoscopic cholecystectomy: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. BMC Anesthesiology. 2023;vol, 23(1):pp.7-15.

[25] **W, Jiang, M, Wang, X, Wang, S, Jin, M, Zhang, L, Zhang, et al.** Effects of Erector Spinae Plane Block and Transmuscular Quadratus Lumborum Block on Postoperative Opioid Consumption in Total Laparoscopic Hysterectomy: A Randomized Controlled Clinical Trial. Pain and Therapy. 2023;vol,12(3):pp.811-24.

[26] **R. Verma, D. Srivastava, R. Saxena, TK. Singh, D. Gupta, A .Agarwal, et al.** Ultrasound-guided Bilateral Erector Spinae Plane Block for Postoperative Analgesia in Laparoscopic Cholecystectomy: A Randomized Controlled Trial. Anesth Essays Res. 2020;vol, 14(2):pp.226-32.

[27] **C. Aksu, MC. Şen, MA. Akay, C. Baydemir and Y. Gürkan**. Erector Spinae Plane Block vs Quadratus Lumborum Block for pediatric lower abdominal surgery: A double blinded, prospective, and randomized trial. Journal of Clinical Anesthesia. 2019;vol,57:pp. 24-8.

[28] **J. Hu, Q. Wang, Y. Zeng, M. Xu, J. Gong and J. Yang**. The impact of ultrasound-guided transmuscular quadratus lumborum block combined with local infiltration analgesia for arthroplasty on postoperative pain relief. J Clin Anesth. 2021;vol, 73:pp. 11-44.