Published in final edited form as:

J Pediatr Oncol Nurs. 2014 July ; 31(4): 230–238. doi:10.1177/1043454214532026.

Evidence-Based Practice Recommendations to Prevent/Manage Post-lumbar Puncture Headaches in Pediatric Patients Receiving Intrathecal Chemotherapy

Rebecca Rusch, RN, MSN, APNP,

Pediatric Nurse Practitioner- Oncology, Medical College of Wisconsin, 8701 Watertown Plank Road, Milwaukee, WI 53226

Christina Schulta, RN, MS, APNP,

Pediatric Nurse Practitioner- Oncology, Medical College of Wisconsin, 8701 Watertown Plank Road, Milwaukee, WI 53226

Laura Hughes, RN, MSN, and

Oncology Nurse, Children's Hospital of Wisconsin, PO Box 1997, MS 787, Milwaukee, WI 53201

Janice S. Withycombe, PhD, RN, MN, CCRP

Research Nurse, Palmetto Health, 9 Richland Medical Park Drive, Columbia, SC, 29203

Abstract

Post lumbar puncture headaches (PLPH) are a known complication of lumbar puncture procedures. Children undergoing treatment for cancer often undergo multiple lumbar punctures placing them at increased risk for PLPHs. There are currently no guidelines for the prevention or management of PLPH in children. A team was therefore assembled to conduct a systematic review of the evidence in relationship to PLPHs in the pediatric population. Clinical questions were developed and used to guide the literature review. Twenty four articles were deemed appropriate for use and were evaluated utilizing the Grades of Recommendation, Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) criteria. Based on the review of evidence, strong recommendations are made for the use of smaller needle sizes and for the use of pencil point needles during lumbar puncture procedures. Weak recommendations are made for needle orientation and positioning following the procedure as well as for interventions utilized to treat PLPH once they occur. There is a need for additional, pediatric-specific, studies to further examine the issue of PLPH prevention and treatment.

Keywords

pediatric; lumbar puncture; headache; treatment; prevention

Authors' disclosure of potential conflicts of interests:

The authors declare no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Introduction

Scientific advancements in the field of pediatric oncology have led to a dramatic rise in the number of childhood cancer survivors in the United States over the last 50 years (O’Leary, Krailo, Anderson & Reaman, 2008). This improved survival rate, due in part to studies completed during the 1970s, proved that central nervous system (CNS) disease could be controlled through the administration of intrathecal chemotherapy to patients with acute lymphoblastic leukemia (ALL) (Nesbit, Sather, Robison, Donaldson, Littman, Ortega & Hammond, 1982). Today, CNS therapy continues to be an important component of treatment for children and adolescents diagnosed with acute lymphoblastic leukemia, acute myeloid leukemia (AML), and non-Hodgkin lymphoma (NHL).

Recent Children’s Oncology Group (COG) high-risk, acute lymphoblastic leukemia protocols include as many as 27 lumbar punctures with intrathecal chemotherapy administration throughout treatment. This CNS-directed therapy is not without risk. Post-lumbar puncture headaches (PLPHs) are a debilitating side effect and one of the most commonly reported procedural complications (Chi-Yan Lee, Sennett, & Erickson, 2007; Sudlow & Warlow, 2006; Turnbull & Shepherd, 2003). PLPHs, also referred to as post-dural puncture headaches, were first described in 1898 by Dr. August Bier (Chi-Yan Lee et al., 2007; Turnbull & Shepherd, 2003). By definition, a PLPH is a headache that develops within five days of a lumbar puncture, worsens within 15 minutes of assuming the upright position and improves within 15 minutes of resuming a recumbent position (Olsen, Bousser, Diener, Dodick, First, Goadsby et al., 2004). Other identifiable characteristics of PLPHs include the following: nausea, vomiting, ache or stiffness of the neck, photophobia, diplopia, blurred vision, tinnitus, vertigo, ataxia, hearing loss, and hyperacusis (sensitivity to certain sounds) (Ahmed, Jayawarna, & Jude, 2006; Bezov, Lipton, & Ashina, 2010; Olsen et al., 2004). To date, the underlying pathophysiology of PLPHs remains relatively unclear. General consensus is that a hole created in the dura by the introduction of a needle, leads to persistent leakage of cerebral spinal fluid (CSF) which results in decreased intracranial pressure and subsequent pain when patients are in the upright position (Ahmed et al., 2006; Chi-Yan Lee et al., 2007; Lavi et al., 2010).

The incidence of PLPHs in adults has been reported as high as 36% following diagnostic and therapeutic lumbar punctures (Lavi et al., 2006). Studies in the pediatric oncology population report an 8–14 % incidence in PLPHs following diagnostic or therapeutic lumbar punctures (Keidan et al., 2005; Ramamoorthy, Geiduschek, Bratton, Miser, & Miser, 1998). Despite these incidence rates, there is a lack of evidence-based guidelines for prevention and management of PLPH in pediatrics. The scope and purpose of this project was to perform a systematic review of all existing evidence related to the prevention and management of PLPH in children and young adults and to develop practice recommendations for the prevention and management of PLPHs in pediatric oncology patients.

Evidence-Based Development Methods

Evidence-Based Project Review Team

This evidence-based practice project was submitted to the COG Nursing Discipline in response to a call for proposals under the COG Nursing Evidence-Based Practice Initiative which was guided by the Nursing Discipline's blueprint (Landier, Leonard, & Ruccione, 2013). The goal of this initiative was to develop evidence-based tools to guide clinicians in aspects of care not typically broached in COG protocols, but that are pertinent to the delivery of quality care. After a competitive review process, the PLPH proposal was selected for development. The evidence-based review team consisted of three nurses from the Children's Hospital of Wisconsin (two outpatient oncology nurse practitioners, and an outpatient oncology registered nurse) along with a PhD prepared nurse researcher who served as the project mentor. All team members received training on the evidence-based review process through webcasts and other written material. A more detailed description of the rigorous evidence-based process conducted for this study can be found within the introductory article of this journal. In regards to stakeholder involvement, the initial concept and the final manuscript were reviewed by COG leadership and the COG Committee Chairs with oversight related to the topic area.

Question Development

Prior to beginning the evidence-based review, clinical questions were developed per the method outlined by Fineout-Overt and Johnston (2005) utilizing the PICOT (population, intervention, comparison, outcome, time) format. The following PICOT questions were used to guide the literature search for this project:

Prevention

1. In pediatric oncology patients receiving intrathecal chemotherapy (P), how does hydration, needle type (design and size), and position of the patient during and after the procedure (I), affect the development of post-lumbar puncture headache (O) within one week of the procedure?

Treatment

1. In pediatric oncology patients with post-lumbar puncture headaches (P), how do pharmacologic interventions (narcotics, non-narcotic medications, caffeine) (I) affect the duration and severity of post-lumbar puncture headaches (O)?
2. In pediatric oncology patients with post-lumbar puncture headaches (P), how do non-pharmacologic interventions (bed rest, positioning, fluids, blood patch) (I) affect the duration and severity of post-lumbar puncture headaches (O)?

Literature Search Strategy

For this evidence-based project, a professional medical librarian assisted in searching the electronic databases of Scopus, CINAHL, Ovid Medline, and Cochrane for literature published between the years of 1993–2013. Additional databases included The National Guideline Clearing House, American Academy of Neurology, and Google Scholar. Key

search terms included: spinal injection, spinal puncture, epidural anesthesia, caudal anesthesia, spinal anesthesia, intrathecal chemotherapy, lumbar puncture, headache, post-dural puncture headache, post-lumbar puncture headache, water, fluids, fluid therapy, hydration, patient positioning, positioning, needle, bed rest, blood patch, epidural blood patch, drug therapy, pharmacologic, narcotic, non-narcotic, analgesic, medication, and caffeine. Articles utilized in the review consisted of meta-analyses, systematic reviews, research studies, and case studies. Basic review articles were excluded. In addition, obstetric patients, non-human subject research, and non-English language publications were excluded.

Using these key search terms, a total of 1488 articles were initially identified. The three team members at Children's Hospital of Wisconsin met to collectively review the articles and apply the inclusion/exclusion criteria (Figure 1). Titles were reviewed and included based on relevance to the topic, yielding a total of 153 articles. Due to a lack of literature specific to the pediatric oncology population, studies with any pediatric subjects undergoing lumbar puncture were included, even if the median age was that of an adult. Articles containing adult only patients were excluded as recommendations for the management and prevention of PLPH, in adults, already exist. The initial search was limited to articles published within the last ten years, 2003–2013, but was expanded to include the past 20 years, 1993–2013, secondary to a low yield of initial articles. Duplicate articles were removed leaving 24 articles for inclusion in this evidence-based guideline.

Review Approach

All authors independently reviewed each of the publications selected for inclusion. An appraisal of evidence was cumulated into a matrix table that included article title, authors, purpose, design and variables, subjects, measurements and results. For each article, the matrix tables were compared, discussed and points of disagreement resolved, ending with a consensus regarding the level of evidence and strength of recommendation using the GRADE approach (Guyatt, Oxman, Vist, Kunz, Falck-Ytter, Alonso-Coello, Schünemann; GRADE Working Group, 2008). The GRADE criteria was selected for use as it provides a transparent method for scoring the quality of evidence and the strength of associated recommendations for patient management.

Evidence Review

The final 24 articles retained for this review consisted of 18 research studies and 6 case studies. Of the 18 research studies, only 11 were exclusively pediatric in nature and only 2 were specific to pediatric oncology. Despite the presence of guidelines for the prevention and management of PLPHs in adults, no clinical guidelines were found for PLPH in pediatrics. The included articles for this review were grouped together based on the PICOT question that they addressed, as summarized below.

Needle Size

The size of the needle used to perform lumbar puncture may vary based upon purpose for the procedure and provider preference. Needle size theoretically influences the risk of developing a PLPH due to the diameter of the needle and the resulting hole left in the dura.

Table 1 displays the five studies that assessed the size (gauge) of the needle used during a lumbar puncture and the prevalence of PLPHs. Three studies supported the use of a smaller size needle (Kokki, Turunen, Heikkinen, Reinikainen, & Laisalmi, 2005; Hammond, Wang, Bhulani, McArthur, & Levy, 2011; Shah & Bhosale, 2010). One study demonstrated statistical significance in favor of using smaller size (higher gauge) needles (Shah & Bhosale, 2010). Two additional studies supported the use of smaller size needles, but were not statistically significant (Kokki et al., 2005; Hammond et al., 2011). Only one study, conducted by Lowery and Oliver (2008), assessed two needle sizes specifically in pediatric oncology patients in relation to PLPH, but no statistical significant difference was noted between the sizes.

Needle Design

Figure 2 displays the two most common types of spinal needles used to perform a lumbar puncture, which are cutting point and pencil point needles. Cutting point needles, such as Quincke and Atraucan, have an obliquely sliced tip that cuts through the dura. In contrast, pencil-point needles, such as Whitacre and Sprotte, are thought to penetrate and then separate the dural fibers, resulting in a less traumatic hole.

Table 2 displays the seven articles that examined the design of the needle used to perform the lumbar puncture and the prevalence of PLPH. Three articles showed statistical significance supporting the use of pencil point needles to decrease the incidence of PLPH (Apiliogullari, Duman, Gok, & Akillioglu, 2010; Hammond et al., 2011; Shah & Bhosale, 2010). Three additional research articles supported the trend of decreased PLPH rates with the use of pencil point needles, but were not statistically significant (Kokki, Hendolin, & Turunen, 1998; Kokki, Salonvaara, Herrgård, & Riikonen, 1999; Kokki, Heikkinen, Turunen, Vanamo, & Hendolin, 2000). Only one prospective study assessed needle design specifically in pediatric oncology patients receiving intrathecal chemotherapy and this study found no statistical significance between needle types and incidence of PLPHs (Hashem, Heydarian, Gharavi, & Khoshnod, 2012).

Orientation of Needle Bevel

Direction of the bevel either parallel or perpendicular to the long access of the spinal column is thought to influence the risk of developing a PLPH. Anatomically, the dural fibers run in the longitudinal fashion. Inserting the bevel parallel with the dural fibers may decrease the incidence of PLPH due to fewer dural fibers being cut (Mihic, 1986). Three articles were found that assessed the orientation of the lumbar puncture needle to the long access of the spine and the prevalence of PLPHs (Amorim, Gomes De Barros, & Valença, 2012; Ebinger, Kosel, Pietz, & Rating, 2004a; Hashem et al., 2012). A cross sectional study with 640 patients, 8–65 years of age, found that bevel orientation perpendicular to the long access of the spinal column was significantly associated with increased PLPHs ($p=0.03$) (Amorim et al., 2012). Two additional studies examined this issue, but found no significant difference in the prevalence of PLPH in relation to the bevel orientation (Ebinger et al., 2004a; Hashem et al., 2012). The prospective, observational study by Ebinger et al (2004), included 112 subjects (ages 2–16 years) and reported no significant difference in the rate of headache in relationship to the orientation of the needle bevel ($p=0.435$). Likewise, a prospective study

by Hashem et al (2012), found no difference in the rate of headache in relationship to bevel orientation ($p=0.52$) in 280 subjects all less than 15 years of age.

Position of Patient after Lumbar Puncture

Bed rest following lumbar punctures is a common practice at many facilities for patients undergoing lumbar punctures, either as the result of sedation for the procedure or secondary to provider preference. Two randomized, prospective studies were identified that assessed position of the patient following a lumbar puncture and the prevalence of PLPHs (Ebinger, Kosel, Pietz, & Rating, 2004b; Tejavaniya, Sithinamsuwan, Sithinamsuwan, Nidhinandana, & Swantemee, 2006). Ebinger et al. (2004b) reported significantly more PLPHs in patients ages 2–17 years who were randomized to 24 hours of bed rest as compared to free mobility ($p = 0.018$). Another study conducted by Tejavaniya et al. (2006), found bed rest to be of no benefit in decreasing the incidence of PLPHs between two groups of patients, those who remained recumbent for six hours vs. those who ambulated within one hour of the lumbar puncture. Position of the patient during a lumbar puncture (sitting vs. lateral decubitus) was included in the literature search, but no pediatric literature was found.

Interventions for PLPH

Four articles were found that contained information related to interventions for PLPH. One of these, a non-randomized pilot study found no statistical significance for the use of frovatriptan, an anti-migraine medication, in reducing the duration of PLPHs (Bussone et al., 2007). Three case reports assessed other interventions including tramadol, oral and intravenous hydration, caffeine, ibuprofen, and acetaminophen (Liley, Manoharan, & Upadhyay, 2003; Raiger, Naithani, Gupta, & Pareek, 2012; Stephenson, Varness, Schroeder, & Ford, 2012). One case study found these interventions to be ineffective and the patient required an epidural blood patch to relieve the PLPH (Liley et al., 2003). There is no statistically significant evidence for use of these interventions in managing post-lumbar puncture headaches in pediatric patients. Prophylactic hydration (pre and post procedure) was also included in the literature search, but no pediatric literature was found.

Epidural Blood Patch

An epidural blood patch is an injection of autologous blood into the epidural space at the same vertebral interspace as the suspected CSF leak. In this procedure, the injected blood will clot at the site of the leak and prevent further leakage (Sudlow & Warlow, 2006; Turnbull & Sheperd, 2003). Table 3 displays eight articles that were identified on the use of epidural blood patches in treating PLPHs in pediatric patients. There were four research articles and four case studies. Only one research study, a randomized controlled trial, demonstrated statistical significance for the use of a blood patch to decreased duration of PLPH (Van Kooten, Oedit, Bakker, & Dippel, 2008). In this study, patients presented with PLPHs and were randomized to an epidural blood patch or 24 hours of bed rest and adequate fluid intake. The percentage of patients with persistent headache after an epidural blood patch was decreased when compared to patients receiving conservative treatment ($p = 0.03$). An additional three retrospective chart review studies reported that the use of an epidural blood patch was effective in relieving post-lumbar puncture headaches in a high percentage of patients (Kokki, Sjovall, & Kokki, 2012; Ylonen & Kokki, 2002^A; Ylonen & Kokki;

2002^B). Four case studies also supported this trend (Cassady, Lederhaas, Turk, & Shanks, 2000; Kara et al., 2012; Liley et al., 2003; Roy, Vischoof, & Lavoie, 1995).

Overall Summary of Recommendations

As described in the introduction article of this journal issue, recommendation statements were developed from the synthesized evidence and labeled as strong or weak. The strength of each recommendation was determined by the desirable and undesirable effects of the evidence and were made independently of the quality level of the evidence (Andrews et al., 2013). Based on the available evidence the following recommendations are made for the prevention and treatment of PLPH. Table 4 provides an overview of these recommendations.

Recommendation 1

There is a strong recommendation, based on an overall moderate quality of evidence, for the use of smaller size (higher gauge) spinal needles for performing lumbar punctures in pediatric patients to prevent PLPHs, when clinically applicable. Needle sizes ranged from 19 to 27 gauge in the articles reviewed, making it difficult to recommend a standard needle size. Patient weight and body characteristics, need for intrathecal chemotherapy, and experience of the provider performing the procedure need to be considered when choosing the appropriate needle size.

Recommendation 2

There is a strong recommendation, based on an overall moderate quality of evidence, for the use of pencil point needles in pediatric patients undergoing lumbar puncture to prevent post-lumbar puncture headaches, when clinically applicable. Patients at risk for PLPH, such as a prior history of PLPH, should be considered for pencil point needle use with subsequent lumbar punctures.

Recommendation 3

There is a weak recommendation, based on an overall low quality of evidence, that bevel orientation of the lumbar puncture needle parallel to the long access should be used to decrease the incidence of PLPHs. In theory, placing the bevel of the spinal needle parallel to the long access of the spine causes less trauma to the dural fibers.

Recommendation 4

There is a weak recommendation, based on an overall low quality of evidence, against the use of extended bed rest following lumbar puncture to prevent PLPH. The two studies that examined bed rest following the lumbar puncture utilized exceptionally long periods of bed rest (6 – 24 hours). No studies were identified that examined shorter periods of bed rest in pediatric patients, which may be more comparable to modern day practices. There is therefore insufficient evidence to make a recommendation regarding shorter periods of bed rest (60 min) immediately following a lumbar puncture.

Recommendation 5

There is a weak recommendation, based on an overall very low quality of evidence, against the use of caffeine, oral and intravenous hydration, frovatripan, ibuprofen, and tramadol to reduce the duration of PLPHs. Limited studies are present in the pediatric population; of those reviewed there was no evidence to support the effectiveness of these agents in decreasing the duration of PLPHs.

Recommendation 6

There is a weak recommendation, based on an overall very low quality of evidence, for the use of epidural blood patch in managing PLPHs in pediatric patients. Of the articles reviewed, no adverse events were reported in association with the epidural blood patch.

Conclusion

These recommendations are based on evidence primarily from the general pediatric population. Careful consideration is needed when applying the recommendations specifically to pediatric oncology. For example, bed rest following the instillation of intrathecal chemotherapy may be indicated for reasons other than the prevention of PLPHs. It is the practice at some institutions for patients to lay flat or in Trendelenburg position for a defined period of time to theoretically facilitate the distribution of intrathecal chemotherapy throughout the CNS. It was not within the scope of this current project to evaluate the evidence related to patient positioning for intrathecal chemotherapy distribution; only the evidence related to patient positioning and post lumbar puncture headaches was reviewed to answer the PICOT question.

Careful consideration must also be applied prior to the use of epidural blood patches to manage PLPHs in pediatric oncology patients. Remission status should be evaluated and factored into the decision of using an epidural blood patch. In theory, utilizing epidural blood patches in patients with leukemia could cause neoplastic seeding into the central nervous system (Bucklin, Tinker & Smith, 1999). In addition, epidural blood patches are usually not considered for patients with suspected infection or in those with bleeding risks.

Limited evidence was found that specifically related to the pediatric population in regard to PLPHs. In order to address this important clinical issue, further research is recommend on PLPHs in pediatrics and specifically in pediatric oncology patients. Within this review, only two articles were specific to pediatric oncology (Hashem et al., 2012; Lowery & Oliver, 2008). Future studies should include well-designed clinical trials assessing needle size and design specific to pediatric patients receiving intrathecal chemotherapy. In addition, multi-institutional, randomized, controlled trials designed to evaluate treatment strategies or interventions to reduce the duration of post-lumbar puncture headaches in pediatric patients with cancer would be beneficial in impacting practice by reducing pain and enhancing quality of life in patients with PLPHs.

Acknowledgments

The authors offer thanks and recognition to Barbara Ruggeri, MLIS, Clinical Services Librarian, at the Medical College of Wisconsin Libraries and to Wendy Landier, PhD, RN, and the nursing leadership within COG.

Funding:

Supported by the National Cancer Institute – Children’s Oncology Group Chair’s Grant (U10 CA098543) and Alex’s Lemonade Stand Foundation.

Biographies

Rebecca Rusch is a pediatric nurse practitioner in the outpatient oncology clinic at Children’s Hospital of Wisconsin.

Christina Schulta is a pediatric nurse practitioner in the outpatient oncology clinic at Children’s Hospital of Wisconsin.

Laura Hughes is a pediatric nurse in the outpatient oncology clinic at Children’s Hospital of Wisconsin.

Janice Withycombe is a pediatric oncology nursing researcher at Palmetto Health Children’s Hospital.

References

- Andrews J, Guyatt G, Oxman A, Alderson P, Dahm P, Falck-Ytter Y, Schunemann HJ. Grade guidelines: 14. Going from evidence to recommendations: the significance and presentation of recommendations. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*. 2013; 66:719–725. [PubMed: 23312392]
- Ahmed SV, Jayawarna C, Jude E. Post lumbar puncture headache: diagnosis and management. *Postgrad Medicine Journal*. 2006; 82:713–716.
- Amorim JA, Gomes De Barros MV, Valença MM. Post-dural (post-lumbar) puncture headache: Risk factors and clinical features. *Cephalalgia*. 2012; 32(12):916–923. [PubMed: 22843225]
- Apiliogullari S, Duman A, Gok F, Akillioglu I. Spinal needle design and size affect the incidence of postdural puncture headache in children. *Paediatric Anaesthesia*. 2010; 20(2):177–182. [PubMed: 20015139]
- Bezov D, Lipton RB, Ashina S. Post-dural puncture headache: Part I diagnosis, epidemiology, etiology, and pathophysiology. *Headache*. 2010; 50(7):1142–1152.
- Bucklin BA, Tinker JH, Smith CV. Clinical dilemma: a patient with postdural puncture headache and acute leukemia. *Anesthesia & Analgesia*. 1999; 88(1):166–167. [PubMed: 9895086]
- Bussone G, Tullo V, D’Onofrio F, Petretta V, Curone M, Frediani F, Omboni S. Frovatriptan for the prevention of postdural puncture headache. *Cephalalgia*. 2007; 27(7):809–813. [PubMed: 17598763]
- Cassady JF Jr, Lederhaas G, Turk WR, Shanks DE. Unusual presentation and treatment of postlumbar puncture headache in an 11-yr-old boy. *Anesthesiology*. 2000; 92(6):1835–1837. [PubMed: 10839939]
- Chi-Yan Lee L, Sennett M, Erickson J. Prevention and management of post-lumbar puncture headaches in pediatric oncology patients. *Journal of Pediatric Oncology Nursing*. 2007; 24(4):200–207. [PubMed: 17588892]
- Ebinger F, Kosel C, Pietz J, Rating D. Headache and backache after lumbar puncture in children and adolescents: A prospective study. *Pediatrics*. 2004a; 113(6 I):1588–1592. [PubMed: 15173478]
- Ebinger F, Kosel C, Pietz J, Rating D. Strict bed rest following lumbar puncture in children and adolescents is of no benefit. *Neurology*. 2004b; 62(6):1003–1005. [PubMed: 15037713]

- Fineout-Overholt E, Johnston L. Teaching EBP: asking searchable, answerable clinical questions. *Worldviews on Evidence-Based Nursing*. 2005; 2:157–160. [PubMed: 17040536]
- Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, Kunz R, Falck-Ytter Y, Alonso-Coello P, Schünemann HJ, GRADE Working Group. GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. *BMJ*. 2008; 336(7650):924–926. [PubMed: 18436948]
- Hammond ER, Wang Z, Bhulani N, McArthur JC, Levy M. Needle type and the risk of post-lumbar puncture headache in the outpatient neurology clinic. *Journal of the Neurological Sciences*. 2011; 306(1–2):24–28. [PubMed: 21549395]
- Hashem AB, Heydari F, Gharavi M, Khoshnod M. Postdural puncture headache: Incidence and risk factors in children following intrathecal chemotherapy. *Iranian Journal of Child Neurology*. 2012; 6(1):19–22.
- Kara I, Ciftci I, Apiliogullari S, Arun O, Duman A, Celik JB. Management of postdural puncture headache with epidural saline patch in a 10-year-old child after inguinal hernia repair: A case report. *Journal of Pediatric Surgery*. 2012; 47(10):e55–7.
- Keidan K, Bieloreia B, Berkenstadt H, Aizenkraft A, Harel R, Huna-Baron R, et al. Prospective evaluation of clinical and laboratory effects of intrathecal chemotherapy on children with acute leukemia. *Journal of Pediatric Hematology/Oncology*. 2005; 27:307–310. [PubMed: 15956882]
- Kokki H, Heikkinen M, Turunen M, Vanamo K, Hendolin H. Needle design does not affect the success rate of spinal anaesthesia or the incidence of postpuncture complications in children. *Acta Anaesthesiologica Scandinavica*. 2000; 44(2):210–213. [PubMed: 10695916]
- Kokki H, Hendolin H, Turunen M. Postdural puncture headache and transient neurologic symptoms in children after spinal anaesthesia using cutting and pencil point paediatric spinal needles. *Acta Anaesthesiologica Scandinavica*. 1998; 42(9):1076–1082. [PubMed: 9809091]
- Kokki H, Salonvaara M, Herrgård E, Riikonen P. Postdural puncture headache is not an age-related symptom in children: A prospective, open-randomized, parallel group study comparing a 22-gauge quincke with a 22-gauge whitacre needle. *Paediatric Anaesthesia*. 1999; 9(5):429–434. [PubMed: 10447907]
- Kokki H, Turunen M, Heikkinen M, Reinikainen M, Laisalmi M. High success rate and low incidence of headache and neurological symptoms with two spinal needle designs in children. *Acta Anaesthesiologica Scandinavica*. 2005; 49(9):1367–1372. DOI: 10.1111/j.1399-6576.2005.00837.x [PubMed: 16146477]
- Kokki M, Sjövall S, Kokki H. Epidural blood patches are effective for postdural puncture headache in pediatrics - A 10-year experience. *Paediatric Anaesthesia*. 2012; 22(12):1205–1210. [PubMed: 23013060]
- Landier W, Leonard M, Ruccione KS. Children's Oncology Group's 2013 blueprint for research: Nursing discipline. *Pediatric Blood & Cancer*. 2013; 60(6):1031–1036. [PubMed: 23255369]
- Liley A, Manoharan M, Upadhyay V. The management of a postdural puncture headache in a child. *Paediatric Anaesthesia*. 2003; 13(6):534–537. [PubMed: 12846712]
- Lowery S, Oliver A. Incidence of postdural puncture headache and backache following diagnostic/therapeutic lumbar puncture using a 22G cutting spinal needle, and after introduction of a 25G pencil point spinal needle. *Paediatric Anaesthesia*. 2008; 18(3):230–234. [PubMed: 18230066]
- Mihic DN. Postspinal headaches, needle surfaces and longitudinal orientation of the dural fibers: results of a survey. *Reg Anaesth*. 1986; 9:54–56. [PubMed: 3715092]
- Nesbit ME, Sather H, Robinson LL, Donaldson M, Littman P, Ortega JA, Hammond GD. Sanctuary therapy: a randomized trial of 724 children with previously untreated acute lymphoblastic leukemia: A report from Children's Cancer Study Group. *Cancer Research*. 1982; 42(2):674–780. [PubMed: 7034927]
- O'Leary M, Krailo M, Anderson JR, Reaman GH. Progress in childhood cancer: 50 years of research collaboration, a report from the Children's Oncology Group. *Seminars in Oncology*. 2008; 35(5):484–493. [PubMed: 18929147]
- Olsen J, Boussier MG, Diener HC, Dodick D, First M, Goadsby PJ, ...Stiner TJ. The international classification of headache disorders. *Cephalgia*. 2004; 24(1):1–150.
- Raiger LK, Naithani U, Gupta M, Pareek SK. Post dural puncture headache in children: A report of two cases. *Anaesthesia, Pain and Intensive Care*. 2012; 16(1):67–70.

- Ramamoorthy C, Geiduschek JM, Bratton SL, Miser AW, Miser JS. Postdural puncture headache in pediatric oncology patients. *Clinical Pediatrics*. 1998; 37:247–252. [PubMed: 9564574]
- Roy L, Vischoff D, Lavoie J. Epidural blood patch in a seven-year-old child. *Canadian Journal of Anaesthesia*. 1995; 42(7):621–624. [PubMed: 7554001]
- Shah VR, Bhosale GP. Spinal anaesthesia in young patients: Evaluation of needle gauge and design on technical problems and postdural puncture headache. *Southern African Journal of Anaesthesia and Analgesia*. 2010; 16(3):24–28.
- Stephenson LL, Varness DC, Schroeder KM, Ford MP. Tramadol for postdural puncture headache treatment in a pediatric patient following failed blood patch. *Journal of Clinical Anesthesia*. 2012; 24(2):171–172. [PubMed: 22414719]
- Sudlow C, Warlow C. Posture and fluids for preventing post-dural puncture headache. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2006; (Issue 1) Art. No CD001790.
- Tejavanija S, Sithinamsuwan P, Sithinamsuwan N, Nidhinandana S, Suwantamee J. Comparison of prevalence of post-dural puncture headache between six hour- supine recumbence and early ambulation after lumbar puncture in thai patients: A randomized controlled study. *Journal of the Medical Association of Thailand*. 2006; 89(6):814–820. [PubMed: 16850682]
- Turnbull D, Shepherd D. Post-lumbar puncture headache. Pathogenesis, prevention and treatment. *British Journal of Anesthesia*. 2003; 91:916–920.
- Van Kooten F, Oedit R, Bakker SL, Dippel DW. Epidural blood patch in post dural puncture headache: A randomised, observer-blind, controlled clinical trial. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry*. 2008; 79(5):553–558.
- Ylonen P, Kokki H. Management of postdural puncture headache with epidural blood patch in children. *Paediatric Anaesthesia*. 2002a; 12(6):526–529. [PubMed: 12139594]
- Ylonen P, Kokki H. Epidural blood patch for management of postdural puncture headache in adolescents. *Acta Anaesthesiologica Scandinavica*. 2002b; 46:794–798. [PubMed: 12139533]

FIGURE 1.
Evidence search strategy

FIGURE 2.

Needle Types

Top= Cutting Point Needle; Bottom = Pencil Point Needle

Illustrations by: Aimee D. Ermel, Eugene and Ruth Roberts Academy Student, City of Hope

Table 1

Summary of Articles Examining Needle Size

First Author, Year	Subjects/Design	Needle Size	Findings	Grade of Evidence
Ebinger, 2004a	N=112 Ages 2–16 years Prospective/ Observational study	19G 20G 22G	No significant difference in rate of headache in relationship to gauge. Not statistically significant.	Low
Kokki, 2005	N=303 Ages 9 months–17 years Randomized study	26G Atraucan 27G Whitacre	Decreased incidence of PLPH with 27G (4%) vs. 26G (5%). Not statistically significant.	High
Lowery, 2008	N=99 Ages 2–17 years Prospective, descriptive study	22G Quincke 25G Pencan	No significant difference in incidence of PLPH between 22G and 25G. $p=0.8$	Low
Shah, 2010	N=800 Ages 16–40 years Randomized study	25G Quincke 27G Quincke 25G Whitacre 27G Whitacre	The incidence of spinal headache was 14% (25G Quincke), 7% (27G Quincke), 1% (25G Whitacre), and 0.5% (27G Whitacre). $p=0.0001$	High
Hammond, 2011	N=187 Ages 15–88 years Prospective	20G Quincke 22G Quincke 22G Sprotte	Decreased PLPH with 22 Sprotte (195) compared to the 20 Quincke (32%). No difference between 20 Quincke and 22 Quincke (both 32%). Not statistically significant.	Low

Table 2

Summary of Articles Examining Needle Design

First Author, Year	Subjects/Design	Needle Design	Findings	Grade of Evidence
Kokki, 1998	N=200 Ages 2 -128 months Randomized study	25G Quincke (C) 26G Atraucan (C) 25G Whitacre (P) 24G Sprotte (P)	Overall 10 patients developed PLPH. 3 with pencil point, 7 with cutting needles. Not statistically significant.	Moderate
Kokki, 1999	N=57 Ages 8 months to 15 years Randomized study	22G Quincke (C) 22G Whitacre (P)	11 patients (12%) developed a PLPH, 7 (15%) with cutting needles and 4 patients (9%) with pencil point needles. P=0.42	Low
Kokki, 2000	N=215 Ages 1–18 years Randomized study	25–27 gauge Pencil-point or cutting point needles	8 patients developed PLPH (4%). 2 patients with pencil point needles and 6 with cutting point needles. No statistical significance.	Moderate
Apiliogullari, 2010	N=414 Ages 2–17 years Retrospective study	26G Atraucan (C) 27G Pencan (P)	Pencil point needles had less PLPH (0.4%) than cutting point needles (4.5%). p=0.005	Low
Shah, 2010	N=800 Ages 16–40 yrs Randomized study	25G Quincke (C) 27G Quincke (C) 25G Whitacre (P) 27G Whitacre (P)	Less PLPH with pencil point needles. 14% (25G Quincke), 7% (27G Quincke), 1% (25G Whitacre), 0.5% (27G Whitacre). p=0.0001	High
Hammond, 2011	N=187 Ages 15–88 yrs Prospective study	20G Quincke (C) 22G Quincke (C) 22G Sprotte (P)	Decreased risk of PLPH with 22G Sprotte (19%) vs. 20G Quincke (32%). 4 fold increase in odds of PLPH with the 22G Quincke versus the 22G Sprotte. p=0.014	Low
Hashem, 2012	N=280 Less than 15 years of age	LP needle vs. syringe needle	No significance between needle types and incidences of PLPH. P=0.46	Low

Table 3

Summary of Articles Examining Blood Patch

First Author, Year	Subjects/Design	Intervention	Findings	Grade of Evidence
Roy, 1995	N=1 Age 7 years Case Study	EBP	Resolved PLPH	Very Low
Cassady, 2000	N=1 Age 11 years Case Study	EBP	Resolved PLPH	Very Low
Ylonen, 2002a	N=42 Ages 13–18 years Retrospective chart review	EBP	The first EBP successfully relieved headache in 37/40 patients (93%).	Very Low
Ylonen, 2002b	N=7 Age 6–12 years Retrospective chart review	EBP	EBP gave some relief of symptoms in every child.	Very Low
Liley, 2003	N=1 Age 11 years Case study	Hydration Recumbent position Oral caffeine EBP	Conservative therapy failed, EBP resolved PLPH.	Very Low
Van Kooten, 2008	N=42 Mean age 36 All patients 18 years Randomized study	EBP vs. conservative treatment of 24 hr bed rest, fluid intake of 2 liters.	Patients with PLPH randomization. 24 h after intervention, headache occurred in 58% of EBP and 90% of conservative treatment ($p = 0.03$).	Moderate
Kara, 2012	N=1 Age 10 years old Case study	Bed rest IVF Oral paracetamol Epidural saline patch	Epidural saline patch resolved PLPH	Very Low
Kokki, 2012	N=42 Age 3–18 years Retrospective chart review	EBP	90% of patients (37/41) had complete relief of symptoms.	Very Low

Notes: EBP=epidural blood patch

Table 4

Summary of Recommendations and Overall Quality of Evidence

Recommendations to Prevent/Manage PLPH	Grade of Recommendation	Overall Quality of Evidence
Needle Size: Smaller size (higher gauge)	Strong	Moderate
Needle Design: Pencil point	Strong	Moderate
Needle Orientation: Needle parallel to the long access	Weak	Low
Positioning: Extended bed rest is of no benefit for preventing PLPH	Weak	Low
Interventions: Caffeine, hydration, frovatriptan, ibuprofen, and tramadol do not influence duration of PLPH	Weak	Very Low
Epidural blood patch is of benefit in managing PLPH	Weak	Very Low