

Preemptive Analgesia in Children with Caudal Blocks

Corresponding Author:

Dr. Antigona Hasani,
Anesthesiology and Reanimation, Pediatric Anesthesiologist, University Clinical Centre of Kosovo, Arberia ,
Zagrebit no.5, 10000 - Albania

Submitting Author:

Dr. Antigona Hasani,
Anesthesiology and Reanimation, Pediatric Anesthesiologist, University Clinical Centre of Kosovo, Arberia ,
Zagrebit no.5, 10000 - Albania

Article ID: WMC001679

Article Type: Original Articles

Submitted on:09-Mar-2011, 09:46:34 PM GMT **Published on:** 10-Mar-2011, 10:35:34 PM GMT

Article URL: http://www.webmedcentral.com/article_view/1679

Subject Categories:PAIN

Keywords:Preemptive Analgesia, Caudal Blocks, Midazolam, Postoperative Pain, Children

How to cite the article:Hasani A , Soljakova M . Preemptive Analgesia in Children with Caudal Blocks .
WebmedCentral PAIN 2011;2(3):WMC001679

Source(s) of Funding:

None

Competing Interests:

None

Preemptive Analgesia in Children with Caudal Blocks

Author(s): Hasani A , Soljakova M

Abstract

Introduction: The aim of this study was to evaluate the preemptive analgesic effect and duration of postoperative analgesia after caudal blocks in children.

Methods: Forty-five children who underwent distal hypospadias surgery were assigned to group one (n=23) received caudal bupivacaine (0.25%) 0.5 mg kg⁻¹ and midazolam 0.05 mg kg⁻¹ before the surgical incision, and group two (n=22) who received caudal bupivacaine (0.25%) 0.5 mg kg⁻¹ and midazolam 0.05 mg kg⁻¹, after the surgical incision. Anesthesia was induced with propofol and fentanyl and maintained with sevoflurane and nitrous oxide. Postoperative pain was rated on objective pediatric pain scale.

Results: Analgesic requirement was higher in the second group.

Conclusion: Preemptive analgesia with caudal blocks may prevent the intensity and frequency of postoperative wound pain.

Introduction

Preemptive analgesia involves the introduction of an analgesic before the onset of noxious stimuli. Prevention of the initial neural cascade could lead to eliminating the hypersensitivity produced by noxious stimuli (1-3). One of the techniques for prevention of postoperative pain in children involves the use of caudal block.

Single-shot caudal epidural blockade is one of the most widespread techniques to provide intra and postoperative analgesia in pediatric patients, which is relatively easy to perform (4-6). Caudal block can be performed prior to surgery in combination with general anesthesia, after surgery to be used for postoperative analgesia, or instead of general anesthesia for low abdominal and lower extremity procedures (7).

The aim of this study was to evaluate the preemptive analgesic effect and duration of postoperative analgesia after caudal blocks with bupivacaine and midazolam, given before or after surgical incision, during the surgical treatment for hypospadias in children.

Methods

This prospective, randomized, double-blinded study was approved by our institution's ethics committee and written informed consent was obtained from the parents of each participant. The subjects were 45 boys aged 1 to 9 years. All were ASA physical status I or II. Each patient was assigned randomly to either group, once for each operation. Patients were excluded if they had a known allergy to any of the drugs involved in the study, patients with ASA physical status >II and if caudal block failed.

Each child was premedicated with oral midazolam (0.5 mg.kg⁻¹) 30 minutes before anesthesia induction. The intravenous line was put in both groups of children before the induction of anesthesia. Anesthesia was induced with propofol and fentanyl and laryngeal mask was inserted. Anesthesia was maintained with sevoflurane in 50% nitrous oxide and oxygen. After induction, in a lateral decubitus position a 22 gauge intravenous catheter was inserted in the caudal space. Patients in group one received 0.25% caudal bupivacaine 0.5 mg kg⁻¹ and midazolam 0.05 mg kg⁻¹ before the surgical incision, and patients in group two (n=22) received 0.25% caudal bupivacaine 0.5 mg kg⁻¹ and midazolam 0.05 mg kg⁻¹, after the surgical incision.

Pressure-controlled ventilation was administered throughout the operation. Anesthesia was discontinued after the last suture was tied. The laryngeal mask was removed when the child was breathing spontaneously (on 100% oxygen) and airway reflexes were restored.

In each case, we recorded heart rate, blood pressure, arterial O₂ saturation, and end-tidal CO₂ concentration (Compact 5XL, Medical ECONET, Germany), at fixed intervals throughout the operation.

In order to keep the study double-blinded, two separate anesthesiologists were involved in each case. First blinded anesthesiologist collected following data: age, weight, premedication, preoperative anxiety, type of anesthesia, type of surgery, and duration of surgery and anesthesia. The anesthesiologist was blinded to the specificity of the caudal solution. In the post-anesthesia care unit, the second anesthesiologist, blinded as to the specificity of caudal solution, observed

and collected following data: recovery time, pain and adverse effects.

Objective Pain Scale (OPS) (minimum score: 0 = no pain; maximum score: 10 = extreme pain) was used to assess pain severity (8). This scale is composed of 5 items and each are scored (Illustration 1). Assessments were made at 15-min intervals for the first hour, 30-min intervals for the second hour and 3, 4, 5, 6, and 24 hr recovery from anesthesia. The observer scored pain on each time (none/insignificant pain (1-3); moderate pain (4-6); severe pain (7-10)). Patients with pain score ≥ 4 were treated with additional dose of analgesics. Patients with pain score ≥ 4 , received diclofenac suppository (1-2 mg kg⁻¹).

Recovery time (defined as the time until eye opening on command or the time of first response to command after anesthesia), preoperative anxiety, agitation during the emergence period and time to first analgesia administration, were also noted. Preoperative anxiety was assessed (after premedication until the anaesthetic induction) using observational scale, the modified Yale Preoperative Anxiety Scale (YPAS-m) (9). The child was considered anxious if the YPAS-m > 30 .

Adverse effects during surgery, hypotension and bradycardia and after removal of laryngeal mask (intense coughing, hypersalivation, laryngospasm), nausea and vomiting and muscle weakness were also recorded.

Demographic data (age, sex, weight), duration of surgery, recovery time, preoperative anxiety, intraoperative data and pain are presented as median and percentiles, and differences between the 2 groups were analyzed using paired t tests. Nonparametric data, incidence of adverse events, are expressed as median and range, and differences between the 2 groups were analyzed using the Wilcoxon ranked-sum test, exact Fisher test and chi-squared test. P values less than 0.05 were considered significant.

Results

Group I (n = 23) represented 51% of the total children in the study and group II (n = 22) represented 49%. There were no significant differences between the 2 study groups with respect to age, sex distribution, weight, proportions of patients with physical status ASA I and physical status ASA II, or type of operation, and frequency of preoperative anxiety or emergence agitation (P > 0.05) (Illustration 2).

Illustration 3 lists the frequencies of different adverse effects that were noted in the 2 groups. Four patients (17.4%) in group I and 3 (13.6%) in group II developed

hypotension intraoperatively. These differences were significant. None of the 45 children required treatment with vasoactive agents. Motor block was present only in one child in group I and one in second groups.

Table 4 shows the results for first requirement of analgesics. The mean time for group II was significantly shorter than the corresponding mean for group I (4.6 ± 1.3 vs 5.2 ± 2.4 hours respectively; P < 0.01).

Group II had a significantly higher proportion of patients who exhibited postoperative pain than group I (40.9% vs. 8.7%, respectively; P < 0.05). The OPS score in group I was 3 (range, 0–10), whereas the corresponding in group II was 8 (range, 1–10). The difference between these results was statistically significant (P < 0.01) (Illustration 4).

Discussion

Knowledge that preemptive analgesic interventions are more effective than conventional treatment in managing acute postoperative pain remains controversial. Several reviews have very different conclusions. For example, some reviews have concluded that preemptive analgesia is effective as such (10,11), but some have concluded it to be effective only for certain analgesic drugs (1,12). The evidence on preemptive analgesia in animal studies is very credible (13); results from human clinical studies remain controversial.

Our study with comparison of pre-incisional and post-incisional caudal block with bupivacaine and midazolam revealed an effectiveness of preemptive analgesia. The significantly higher frequency of postoperative pain was during realizing a block after surgical incision (40.9% vs. 8.7%, respectively).

Several studies have compared the effect of preoperative and postoperative anesthesia infiltration for inguinal herniorrhaphy. No firm evidence was observed regarding the timing of analgesic treatment that has important effects on postoperative pain control (14, 15).

Katz and colleagues studied patients scheduled for elective thoracic surgery, which received epidural fentanyl before incision and the same dose of epidural fentanyl after incision. They found that pain scores were significantly less in patients who applied epidural block before surgical incision (16).

The other study which supports our findings was from Amr et al. they applied pre-incisional epidural bupivacaine and fentanyl in patients undergoing thoracic surgery and demonstrate the significant lower score of postoperative pain (17).

Arici et al. demonstrates that preemptively administered iv paracetamol 1 g in patients undergoing a total abdominal hysterectomy operation, ensures an effective analgesia during the postoperative period and reducing postoperative morphine consumption and side effects (18).

As mentioned, research has established that multiple factors are associated with postoperative pain. Some of the possible causes include anxiety just prior to surgery, or emergence delirium. A number of groups have looked at the correlation between preoperative anxiety, postoperative agitation and postoperative pain. Kain and colleagues evaluated the relationship between preoperative anxiety and both postoperative delirium and new maladaptive behaviours using data from several previous studies (19). They found that higher levels of preoperative anxiety put patients at increased risk for postoperative pain. In our study, our data demonstrate a similar incidence of preoperative anxiety (8.7% versus 4.5% respectively) and emergence agitation (1.3 ± 0.6 versus 1.4 ± 0.7 respectively) in first and second group (Tab.2).

The incidence rates of adverse effects were low in both our treatment groups (Tab.3).

Findings in our study demonstrate the significant difference in time until first anesthesia request in group I and II (4.6 ± 1.3 vs 5.2 ± 2.4 hours respectively; $P < 0.01$).

Conclusion(s)

In summary, postoperative pain in children remains a significant problem. Our results indicate that, caudal block with bupivacaine and midazolam before surgical incision is associated with a lower incidence of postoperative pain intensity and reduced postoperative analgesics requirements when compared with the caudal block applied after surgical incision. Preemptive analgesia may prevent the intensity and frequency of postoperative wound pain.

References

- Igor Kissin. Preemptive analgesia at the crossroad. *Anesth Analg* 2005; 100: 754-6.
- Bachiocco V, Scesi M, Morselli AM, Carli G. Individual pain history and familial pain tolerance models: relationships to post-surgical pain. *Clin J Pain* 1993; 9:266-71.
- Kissin I. Preemptive analgesia. *Anesthesiology* 2000; 93: 1138-43.
- Miller RD, Fleisher LA, Johns RA, Savarese JJ, Weiener-Kronish JP, Young WL. *Miller's Anesthesia*, USA, Elsevier, 2005; 1732-4.
- Litman RS. *Pediatric Anesthesia the Requisites in Anesthesiology*, USA, Mosby, 2004; 160-5.
- Tobias JD. Therapeutic application of regional anesthesia. *Paediatr Anaesth* 2002; 12:272-7.
- Zaglaniczny K, Aker J. *Clinical Guide to Pediatric Anesthesia*. USA. Saunders Company, 1999; 359-412.
- Norden J, Hanallah R et al. Reliability of an objective pain scale in children. *J Pain and Symptom Management*. 1991; 6: 196.
- Kain ZN, Caldwell-Andrews AA, Maranets I, McClain BC, et al. Preoperative anxiety and emergency delirium and postoperative maladaptive behaviors. *Anesth Analg* 2004; 99:1648-54.
- Wilder-Smith OH. Pre-emptive analgesia and surgical pain. *Prog Brain Res* 2000; 129:505-24.
- Kelly DJ, Ahmad M, Brull SJ. Preemptive analgesia. II. Recent advances and current trends. *Can J Anaesth* 2001; 48:1091-101.
- Moiniche S, Kehlet H, Dahl JB. A qualitative and quantitative systematic review of preemptive analgesia for postoperative pain relief. *Anesthesiology* 2002;96:725-41.
- Simone DA, Sorkin LS, Oh O et al. Neurogenic hyperalgesia: central neural correlates in responses of spinothalamic tract neurons. *J Neurophys* 1991; 66: 228-246.
- Rice LJ, Pudimat MA, Hanallah RS. Timing of caudal block placement in relation to surgery does not affect duration of postoperative analgesia in pediatric ambulatory patients. *Can J Anaesth* 1990; 37: 429-431.
- Goodarzi M. The effect of perioperative and postoperative caudal block on pain control in children. *Paediatr Anaesth* 1996; 6: 475-477.
- Katz J, Kavanagh BP et al. Pre-emptive analgesia. Clinical evidence of neuroplasticity contributing to postoperative pain. *Anesthesiology* 1992; 77: 439-446.
- Amr YM, Yousef AA, Alzeftawy AE et al. Effect of preincisional epidural fentanyl and bupivacaine on postthoracotomy pain and pulmonary function. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2010 Feb; 89:381-5.
- Arici S, Gurbet A, Türker G et al. Preemptive analgesic effects of intravenous paracetamol in total abdominal hysterectomy. *Agri*. 2009 Apr; 21(2):54-61.
- Kain ZN, Caldwell-Andrews AA, Maranets I, McClain BC, et al. Preoperative anxiety and emergency delirium and postoperative maladaptive behaviors. *Anesth Analg* 2004; 99:1648-54.

Illustrations

Illustration 1

Objective Pain Scale (OPS) of Hanallah et al. for Postoperative Pain Assessment

Parameter	Finding	Points
systolic blood pressure	Increase <20% of preoperative blood pressure	0
	Increase 20-30% of preoperative blood pressure	1
	Increase >30% of preoperative blood pressure	2
crying	Not crying	0
	Responds to age appropriate nurturing (tender loving care)	1
	Does not respond to nurturing	2
movements	No movements relaxed	0
	Restless moving about in bed constantly	1
	Thrashing (moving wildly)	2
	Rigid (stiff)	2
agitation	Asleep or calm	0
	Can be comforted to lessen the agitation (mild)	1
	Cannot be comforted (hysterical)	2
complains of pain	Asleep	0
	States no pain	0
	Cannot localize	1
	Localizes pain	2

Illustration 2

Demographic data, durations of surgery and anesthesia, recovery time, frequencies of preoperative anxiety and emergence agitation scores in the first and second groups (groups I and II)

	Group I (n =23)	Group II (n =22)
Age (y)	5.0 ± 1.5	5.0 ± 1.6
Weight (kg)	19.4 ± 6.1	19.0 ± 5.7
Sex (F/M)	0/23	0/22
ASA (I/II)	12/11	10/12
Duration of surgery (min)	40.6 ± 9.0	42.2± 11.3
Duration of anesthesia (min)	68.1± 23.2	69.0 ± 28.5
Preoperative anxiety <i>n</i> (%)	2 (8.7%)	1 (4.5%)
Emergence agitation	1.3 ± 0.6	1.4 ± 0.7
Recovery time (min)	16.1 ± 4.3	15.5 ± 5.4
Values are listed as median (percentile), number of patients, or mean ± SD		

Illustration 3

Side effects noted in the 2 study groups.

	Group I (n = 23)	Group II (n = 22)	P value
Hypotension	4 (17.4%)	3 (13.6%)	0.041*
Bradycardia	5 (21.7%)	5 (22.7%)	0.864
Cough	2 (8.7%)	2 (9.1%)	0.925
Laryngospasm	2 (8.7%)	1 (4.5%)	0.609
Hypersalivation	3 (13.0%)	3 (13.6%)	0.924
Nausea/Vomiting	2 (8.7%)	2 (9.1%)	0.817
Muscle weakness	1 (4.4%)	1(4.5%)	0.934
* significant difference			

Illustration 4

Results postoperative pain scored using the Objective Pain Scale (OPS) and incidence and recovery to first analgesic time, in group I and group II.

	Group I (n = 23)	Group II (n = 22)	P value
OPS score	2 (0-10)	8 (0-10)	<0.01*
Pain n (%)	2 (8.7%)	9 (40.9%)	<0.05*
Recovery to first analgesic time (h)	5.2 ± 2.4	4.6 ± 1.3	<0.01*
* significant difference			

Disclaimer

This article has been downloaded from WebmedCentral. With our unique author driven post publication peer review, contents posted on this web portal do not undergo any prepublication peer or editorial review. It is completely the responsibility of the authors to ensure not only scientific and ethical standards of the manuscript but also its grammatical accuracy. Authors must ensure that they obtain all the necessary permissions before submitting any information that requires obtaining a consent or approval from a third party. Authors should also ensure not to submit any information which they do not have the copyright of or of which they have transferred the copyrights to a third party.

Contents on WebmedCentral are purely for biomedical researchers and scientists. They are not meant to cater to the needs of an individual patient. The web portal or any content(s) therein is neither designed to support, nor replace, the relationship that exists between a patient/site visitor and his/her physician. Your use of the WebmedCentral site and its contents is entirely at your own risk. We do not take any responsibility for any harm that you may suffer or inflict on a third person by following the contents of this website.

Reviews

Review 1

Review Title: Preemptive Analgesia in Children with Caudal Blocks

Posted by Dr. Serpil Ozgen on 08 Jun 2011 06:48:25 AM GMT

1	Is the subject of the article within the scope of the subject category?	Yes
2	Are the interpretations / conclusions sound and justified by the data?	Yes
3	Is this a new and original contribution?	No
4	Does this paper exemplify an awareness of other research on the topic?	Yes
5	Are structure and length satisfactory?	Yes
6	Can you suggest brief additions or amendments or an introductory statement that will increase the value of this paper for an international audience?	No
7	Can you suggest any reductions in the paper, or deletions of parts?	Yes
8	Is the quality of the diction satisfactory?	Yes
9	Are the illustrations and tables necessary and acceptable?	Yes
10	Are the references adequate and are they all necessary?	Yes
11	Are the keywords and abstract or summary informative?	Yes

Rating: 8

Comment:

Being a brief, clear, informative and useful article this study deserves to take part in literature.

Invited by the author to make a review on this article? : Yes

Experience and credentials in the specific area of science:

Paed Anaesthetist, have some studies on caudal blocks

Publications in the same or a related area of science: Yes

How to cite: Ozgen S. Preemptive Analgesia in Children with Caudal Blocks [Review of the article 'Preemptive Analgesia in Children with Caudal Blocks' by]. WebmedCentral 1970;2(6):REVIEW_REF_NUM809

Review 2

Review Title: Preemptive Analgesia in Children with Caudal Blocks

Posted by Prof. Arzu Gercek Irban on 11 Mar 2011 07:30:53 AM GMT

1	Is the subject of the article within the scope of the subject category?	Yes
2	Are the interpretations / conclusions sound and justified by the data?	Yes
3	Is this a new and original contribution?	Yes
4	Does this paper exemplify an awareness of other research on the topic?	Yes
5	Are structure and length satisfactory?	Yes
6	Can you suggest brief additions or amendments or an introductory statement that will increase the value of this paper for an international audience?	Yes
7	Can you suggest any reductions in the paper, or deletions of parts?	No
8	Is the quality of the diction satisfactory?	Yes
9	Are the illustrations and tables necessary and acceptable?	Yes
10	Are the references adequate and are they all necessary?	Yes
11	Are the keywords and abstract or summary informative?	Yes

Rating: 7

Comment:

In order to show preemptive analgesia effect, author did not use any parameter related to the total analgesic consumption except first analgesic requirement. That's why for prevention of any bias and improve strength of the paper first analgesic time has to be given according to caudal block application time. This way we can understand if delay in analgesic requirement due to either effect of caudal block or preemptive analgesia.

So, for statistical analysis, time difference between block application time and first analgesic requirements should be applied. If it is done in this way it is o.k then.

Competing interests: No

Invited by the author to make a review on this article? : Yes

Experience and credentials in the specific area of science:

Pediatric anesthesia, neuroanesthesia; pediatric anesthesia, algology

Publications in the same or a related area of science: Yes

References: I am just given my international publications for you; A1. Ay, B., A. Gercek, IV. Dogan, G. K?yan ve FY. Gogus, ?Pyloromyotomy in a Patient With Paramyotonia Congenita,? Anesth. Analg., 98, 68-69 (2004). A2. Ay, B., A. Gercek, D. Konya ve S. Ozgen, ??Spinal Abscess After Epidural Anesthesia: Need For More Vigilance And Better Patient Advice,?? J. Neurosurg. Anesthesiol., 16, 184-185 (2004). A3. Gercek, A., N. Baykan, A. Dacinar ve MM. Ozek, ?Does General Anesthesia Potentiate The Gaba-Ergic Action of Intrathecal Baclofen?,? J. Neurosurg. Anesthesiol., 16, 323-324 (2004). A4. Gercek, A., Z. Eti, FY. Gogus ve A. Sav, ?The Analgesic And Anti-Inflammatory Effects Of Subcutaneous Bupivacaine Morphine And Tramadol in Rats,? Agri, 16, 53-58 (2004). A5. Baykan, N., A. Gercek, IV. Dogan ve I. Usseli, ?Anesthetic Management of a Pregnant Patient Throughout The Emergent Craniotomy for Brain Tumor and Cesarean Section at The Same Session,? Int. J. Anesthesiol., 8, 1 (2004). A6. Baykan, N., O. Ispir, A. Gercek, A. Dacinar ve MM. Ozek, ?Ten Years of Experience with Pediatric Neuroendoscopic Third Ventriculostomy: Features and Perioperative Complications of 210 Cases,? J. Neurosurg. Anesthesiol., 17, 33-37 (2005). A7. Gercek, A., T. Umuroglu, M. Sari, S. Inan! ve FY.

Gogus, ?Is External Otitis an Overlooked Problem in Intensive Care Unit ?,? *Int. J. Emerg. Crit. Care.*, 8, 1 (2005). A8. Konya, D., S. Ozgen, A. Gercek, S. Tural ve MN. Pamir, ?Clinical Presentation of Lumbar Disc Herniation: We Must Keep Also Limbus Fracture in Mind As A Cause,? *Int. J. Neurosurg.*, 3, 1 (2006). A9. Gercek, A., D. Konya, A. Akakin, S. Ozgen ve MN. Pamir, ?Deep Venous Thrombosis in The Early Postoperative Period of Major Spine Surgery: A Case Report,? *Int. J. Neurosurg.*, 3, 2 (2006). A10. Konya, D., A. Dacinar, A. Akakin, A. Gercek, S. Ozgen ve MN. Pamir, ?Cervical Meningocele Causing Symptoms in Adulthood: Case Report and Review of The Literature,? *J. Spinal Disord. Tech.*, 19, 531-513 (2006). A11. Gercek, A. ve MM. Ozek, ?From The Anesthesiologist?s Perspective Placement of Vagal Nerve Stimulator,? *Anesth. Analg.*, 102, 1910 (2006). A12. Gulluoglu, BM., A. Cingi, T. Cakir, A. Gercek, A. Barlas ve Z. Eti, ?Factors Related To Post-Treatment Chronic Pain in Breast Cancer Survivors: The Interference of Pain With Life Functions,? *Int. J. Fertil. Womens Med.*, 51, 75-82 (2006). A13. Konya, D., A. Gercek, Z. Toktas, S. Ozgen, C. Yegen ve NM. Pamir, ?Sacroccygeal Chordoma Mimicking Lipoma: A Case Report,? *W. Spine J.*, 3, 149-151 (2007). A14. Gercek, A., B. Ay, IV. Dogan, T. Dagli ve FY Gogus, ?Esophageal Balloon Dilation in Children: Prospective Analysis of Hemodynamic Changes and Complications During General Anesthesia,? *J. Clin. Anesth.*, 19, 286-289 (2007). A15. Sun, I., A. Sun, A. Gercek ve T. Kilic, ?Desmopressin Induced Hypertension as a Rare Cause of Hypertensive Encephalopathy,? *J. Neurosurg. Anesthesiol.*, 19,289-290 (2007). A16. Gercek, A., O. Yildirim, D. Konya, S. Bozkurt, S. Ozgen, T. Kilic, A. Sav ve NM. Pamir, ?Effects Of Parenteral Fish-Oil Emulsion (Omegaven) on Cutaneous Wound Healing in Rats Treated With Dexamethasone,? *J. Parenter. Enteral Nutr.*, 31, 161-166 (2007). A17. Gercek, A., A. Dacinar ve MM. Ozek, ?Anesthetic Management of a Newborn with Mohr (Oro-Facial-Digital type II) Syndrome,? *Ped. Anesth.*, 17, 603-604 (2007). A18. Gercek, A., D. Konya, R. Babayev ve S. Ozgen, ?Delayed Recovery from General Anesthesia from Intracranial Tumor,? *Anesth. Analg.*, 104, 235-236 (2007). A19. Koc, D., A. Gercek, R. Gencosmanoglu ve N. Tozun, ?Percutaneous Enterogastroscopy in The Neurosurgical Intensive Care Unit: Complications and Outcomes,? *J. Parent. Ent. Nutr.*, 31, 517-520 (2007). A20. Tural, S., D. Konya, IH. Sun, A. Gercek, S. Ozgen ve MN. Pamir, ?Foot Drop: Can It Be The First Sign of an Intracranial Tumor?,? *J. Clin. Neurosci.*, 14, 490-492 (2007). A21. Dacinar, A., D. Konya, A. Akakin, A. Gercek, S. Ozgen ve MN. Pamir, ?Congenital Dermal Sinus Of The Cervical Spine In An Adult: Case Report,? *J. Clin. Neurosci.*, 15, 73-76 (2008). A22. Gercek, A., D. Koc, B. Erol, B. Ay, M. Bezer ve Y. Gogus, ?Co-Existence Of Pott?s Disease and Alkaptonuria in A 21-Month-Old Child,? *Ped. Anesth.*, 18, 569-571 (2008). A23. Konya, D., A. Gercek, A. Akakin, D. Akakin, S. Tural, S. Cetinel, S. Ozgen, MN. Pamir, ?The Effects of Inflammatory Response Associated with Traumatic Spinal Cord Injury in Cutaneous Wound Healing and on Expression of Transforming Growth Factor-Beta1 (TGF- β 1) and Platelet-Derived Growth Factor (PDGF)-A at the Wound Site in Rats,? *Growth Factors*, 26, 74-49 (2008). A24. Konya, D., S. Ozgen, A. Gercek, Celebiler O and MN. Pamir, ?Transmandibular approach for upper cervical pathologies: report of 2 cases and review of the literature,? *Turk. Neurosurg*, 18, 271-275 (2008). A25. Gercek, A., D. Konya, H. Bagci, A. Genc, S. Tural, U. Yener, E. Akgun ve S. Ozgen, ?Does irrigation system (pulsavactplus)lead to intravascular passage of irrigation fluid during major spine surgery ?,? *J. Neurol. Sci. (Turkish)*, 25, 1-5 (2008) A26. Konya, D., A. Gercek, A. Dacinar, N. Baykan and MM. Ozek, Prevention Of Brisk Hyperactive Response During Selective Dorsal Rhizotomy In Spastic Children: Results With Isoflurane Versus Sevoflurane Maintenance Anesthesia,? *J. Clin. Neurosci*, 16, 241-245 (2009). A27. Konya, D., S. Ozgen, A. Gercek and MN. Pamir, ?Combined Anterior And Posterior Surgical Approaches For Patients With Multisegmental Cervical Spondylotic Myelopathy: Outcome Analysis,? *J. Clin. Neurosci.*, 16, 404-409 (2009). A28. Tural, S., A. Gercek, D. Konya, S. Ozgen, H. Toplamoglu and MM. Ozek, ?Cerebellar medulloblastoma in children: Assessment of microvessel density and vascular endothelial growth factor expression as predictors of survival,? *J. Clin. Neurosci.*, 16, 1199-202 (2009) A29. Tural, S., U. Tural, A. Gercek, D. Konya ve T. Kilic, ?Acute Dependency Reaction to Meperidine: A case report,? *J. Neurol. Sci. (Turkish)*, 17, 75-78 (2010)

How to cite: Gercek Irbn A.Preemptive Analgesia in Children with Caudal Blocks[Review of the article 'Preemptive Analgesia in Children with Caudal Blocks ' by].WebmedCentral 1970;2(3):REVIEW_REF_NUM572

Disclaimer

This article has been downloaded from WebmedCentral. With our unique author driven post publication peer review, contents posted on this web portal do not undergo any prepublication peer or editorial review. It is completely the responsibility of the authors to ensure not only scientific and ethical standards of the manuscript but also its grammatical accuracy. Authors must ensure that they obtain all the necessary permissions before submitting any information that requires obtaining a consent or approval from a third party. Authors should also ensure not to submit any information which they do not have the copyright of or of which they have transferred the copyrights to a third party.

Contents on WebmedCentral are purely for biomedical researchers and scientists. They are not meant to cater to the needs of an individual patient. The web portal or any content(s) therein is neither designed to support, nor replace, the relationship that exists between a patient/site visitor and his/her physician. Your use of the WebmedCentral site and its contents is entirely at your own risk. We do not take any responsibility for any harm that you may suffer or inflict on a third person by following the contents of this website.