Major lower limb amputation audit – introduction and implementation of a multimodal perioperative pain management guideline

British Journal of Pain
2018, Vol 12(4) 257–258
© The British Pain Society 2018
Article reuse guidelines:
sagepub.com/journals-permissions
DOI: 10.1177/2049463718800736
journals.sagepub.com/home/bjp

Dear Editor

We read with interest the study by Aladin et al.¹ Amputees suffer significant postoperative pain, and the recent National Confidential Enquiry into Patient Outcome and Death (NCEPOD) audit has highlighted that less than 40% of patients experience ‘good’ post-amputation pain relief.² The authors should be commended on their implementation of a protocolised multimodal approach to optimising pain relief, comprising preoperative pain team review, intraoperative placement of a perineural catheter and a careful review of gabapentinoids and nerve catheter infusion in the postoperative period. We have recently completed recruitment to the Perineural Local Anaesthetic Catheter after Major lowEr limb amputationN Trial (PLACEMENT; ISRCTN85710690; EudraCT no. 2016-003544-37),³ which randomised 50 amputees to placement of a sciatic/tibial nerve catheter with a 5-day postoperative infusion of local anaesthetic with best postoperative pain relief, or best postoperative pain relief alone. This feasibility study was designed to determine if a fully powered randomised controlled trial (RCT) was possible, but will also look at both immediate and long-term pain outcomes, alongside the parallel development of a dedicated amputation Core Outcome Set.⁴

While there are some low-quality data to suggest that perineural catheters reduce postoperative opioid consumption,⁵ their effect on pain (phantom and non-phantom) in the long term is almost completely absent from the literature,⁶ and should it be possible, the effect of Aladin et al.’s multimodal protocol on longer term outcomes would be very welcome. We hope that our study will pave the way for future work to unpick the complex interplay between both patient characteristics and treatment options, and resultant pain. It is also interesting to note the improvement in pain seen in patients undergoing neuraxial blockade. There are limited data to corroborate this observation elsewhere.⁷

Despite this, the recent NCEPOD review showed that the majority of amputations were performed under General Anaesthesia.² We wonder if this is an area worthy of further research. Finally, we are keen to emphasise that while pain relief is of significant importance to patients, the overall effect of any intervention on quality of life can be (and often is) overlooked. The anecdotal observation of the authors, highlighting the improvements seen in patient’s engagement with physiotherapy with better pain relief, is crucial, and unpicking exactly what factors the postoperative amputee finds important is paramount in planning future trials in amputees.

David C Bosanquet¹ , Graeme K Ambler^{1,2},
Cherry-Ann Waldron³, Emma Thomas-Jones³,
Lucy Brookes-Howell³, Mark Kelson⁴,
Debbie Harris³, Timothy Pickles³, Sarah Milosevic³,
Deborah Fitzsimmons⁵, Neeraj Saxena^{6,7,8}
and Christopher P Twine^{1,2}

¹Aneurin Bevan University Health Board, Royal Gwent Hospital, Newport, UK

²Division of Population Medicine, Cardiff University, Cardiff, UK

³Centre for Trials Research, Cardiff University, Cardiff, UK

⁴Department of Mathematics, College of Engineering, Mathematics and Physical Sciences, University of Exeter, Exeter, UK

⁵Swansea Centre for Health Economics, College of Human Health Sciences, Swansea University, Swansea, UK

⁶Department of Anaesthetics, Royal Glamorgan Hospital, Cwm Taf Local Health Board, Llantrisant, UK

⁷School of Psychology, Cardiff University, Cardiff, UK

⁸Psychology and Therapeutic Studies, University of South Wales, Pontypridd, UK

Acknowledgements

D.C.B., G.K.A., M.K. and C.P.T. provided the idea for correspondence. D.C.B. wrote the first draft of the manuscript. All authors reviewed and edited the manuscript and approved the final version of the manuscript. The guarantor of this article is D.C.B.

Conflict of interest

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship and/or publication of this article.

Funding

This project was funded by the Welsh Government through Health and Care Research Wales. This is through the Patient and Public Benefit (RfPPB) scheme (reference no. 1198) and was sponsored by Aneurin Bevan University Health Board, Newport, South Wales (protocol no. ABUHB/01/0816/1, version 1.3 dated 1 June 2017).

ORCID iD

David C Bosanquet <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2304-0489>

References

1. Aladin H, Jennings A, Hodges M, et al. Major lower limb amputation audit – introduction and implementation of a multimodal perioperative pain management guideline. *Br J Pain*. Epub ahead of print 18 April 2018. DOI: 10.1177/2049463718769339.
2. National Confidential Enquiry into Patient Outcome and Death. *Lower limb amputation: working together*. London: National Confidential Enquiry into Patient Outcome and Death, 2014.
3. Bosanquet DC, Ambler GK, Waldron CA, et al. Perineural local anaesthetic catheter after major lower limb amputation trial (PLACEMENT): study protocol for a randomised controlled pilot study. *Trials* 2017; 18: 629.
4. Ambler GK, Bosanquet DC, Brookes-Howell L, et al. Development of a core outcome set for studies involving patients undergoing major lower limb amputation for peripheral arterial disease: study protocol for a systematic review and identification of a core outcome set using a Delphi survey. *Trials* 2017; 18: 628.
5. Bosanquet DC, Glasbey JC, Stimpson A, et al. Systematic review and meta-analysis of the efficacy of perineural local anaesthetic catheters after major lower limb amputation. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg* 2015; 50: 241–249.
6. Srivastava D. Chronic post-amputation pain: perioperative management – review. *Br J Pain* 2017; 11: 192–202.
7. Ong BY, Arneja A and Ong EW. Effects of anesthesia on pain after lower-limb amputation. *J Clin Anesth* 2006; 18: 600–604.