

# We are IntechOpen, the world's leading publisher of Open Access books Built by scientists, for scientists

6,900

Open access books available

185,000

International authors and editors

200M

Downloads

Our authors are among the

154

Countries delivered to

TOP 1%

most cited scientists

12.2%

Contributors from top 500 universities



WEB OF SCIENCE™

Selection of our books indexed in the Book Citation Index  
in Web of Science™ Core Collection (BKCI)

Interested in publishing with us?  
Contact [book.department@intechopen.com](mailto:book.department@intechopen.com)

Numbers displayed above are based on latest data collected.  
For more information visit [www.intechopen.com](http://www.intechopen.com)



---

# Acute Pain Management in the Emergency Department

---

Ivan Samcam MD and Linda Papa MD, MSc

Additional information is available at the end of the chapter

<http://dx.doi.org/10.5772/62861>

---

## Abstract

The most common presenting complaint to the emergency department (emergency room) is pain. Unfortunately, pain is still undertreated in this setting. Literature has shown that treatment of pain not only improves patient satisfaction but also improves mood, decreases length of hospital stay, and decreases mortality. Various pharmacological options are available for treating acute pain, ranging from oral, intravenous, and intramuscular medications; topical agents; and peripheral nerve blocks. Objectively assessing and documenting a patient's pain is the key to determining treatment. The approach to a patient with acute pain requires an experienced clinician who is aware of the pharmacology of analgesics and anesthetics, contraindications, precautions, side effects, administration methods, and monitoring requirements.

This chapter briefly covers the pathophysiology of acute pain and the different treatment modalities available to the emergency physician.

**Keywords:** pain, acute, emergency, treatment, management

---

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1. Epidemiology

The most common presenting complaint to the emergency department (ED) room is pain. From 1996 to 2015, ED visits have risen over 46%, from 90.3 million to [1] 136 million [1, 2]. As emergency room visits continue to grow every year, so does the need to treat patients in pain. Roughly, 45% of ED visits involves either moderate or severe pain [3]. The most common pain-related chief complaints in descending order are chest pain, back pain, and headache. Furthermore, the most frequently ordered analgesics, both in the ED and at discharge, are acetaminophen (alone or in combination with hydrocodone), ketorolac, and ibuprofen [3].

## 1.2. Oligoanalgesia

Despite the trend in increasing ED visits of which the majority involves pain, pain is still undertreated in the ED. Oligoanalgesia is a term used to describe the inadequate treatment of pain and was first studied in a retrospective chart analysis in 1989 by Wilson and Pendleton [4]. In this study, a total of 198 patients were evaluated, and of those who received analgesics, 32% received less than optimal doses [5]. An additional retrospective study, done a few years later, revealed that only 30% of 401 patients treated for bone fractures received analgesics [6]. In a separate study, patients were surveyed after treatment in a fast-track area of the emergency room, and 60% of patients went home with more pain than they were willing to accept [7]. More recently, a prospective, multicenter study enrolled 842 patients (aged 8 years and older) across 20 US and Canadian EDs with presenting pain intensity scores of 4 or greater on an 11-point numerical rating scale and found that only 60% of patients received analgesics, and 74% of patients were discharged in moderate to severe pain. Furthermore, reassessments were uncommon, and analgesics were administered after lengthy delays (median, 90 minutes; range, 0–962 minutes) [8].

## 1.3. Why is treating pain important?

The Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals Organization (JCAHO) has recommended that assessment and treatment of pain be improved. Moreover, patients expect to have their pain treated fairly quickly and to have it significantly reduced. Studies have shown that patients want their pain treated in less than half an hour, yet the mean time of treatment is at least 78 minutes [9]. Acknowledging and treating pain in the ED improves the rapport between physician and patient. Patients are more likely to characterize physicians who treat their pain as warm and friendly and inspire more confidence to discuss their private health concerns [10]. Inadequately treating pain can contribute to the development of comorbidities such as depression, hypertension, and immune system dysfunction [10].

There are numerous potential reasons for which pain is inadequately treated in the ED, such as concern of masking symptoms, poor communication between clinician and patient (language, cultural), lack of documentation and reassessment of pain, and fear of contributing to and causing addiction. One of the most cited reasons is the concern that analgesics, particularly opioids, may mask symptoms of a surgical abdomen. This concern has been refuted by a number of studies. A randomized double-controlled trial conducted in 2002 evaluated pain control in the diagnosis of appendicitis. Pain was adequately treated, and patients continued to have pain upon palpation on physical examination [11]. An additional study studied the surgeon's confidence in physical signs after administration of morphine to patients with appendicitis. Despite the morphine, these surgeons continued to illicit examination signs such as the obturator sign, Rovsing, and pain upon jumping [12]. Other physicians may argue that opioids may mask the intensity of pain allowing for the progression of the illness to complications such as perforation and formation of an intra-abdominal abscess. A systematic review of six randomized controlled trials evaluating the safety of opioid administration to children with acute abdominal pain showed no significant difference in the rate of perforation or abscess formation [13].

The concern over causing addiction plays an important role in oligoanalgesia in the ED. In 2012, health care providers wrote 259 million prescriptions for painkillers. This is equivalent to every American adult having a bottle of pills. Furthermore, each day, 46 people die from an overdose of prescription painkillers in the United States [14].

In 2007 the cost of prescription opioid abuse was estimate to be \$56 billion dollars [15]. Those with a prior history of depression, anxiety, and substance use were most likely to have a propensity for prescription opioid abuse [16]. An additional study confirmed mental disease as risk factor for opioid abuse, as well as males, younger adults, and individuals with greater days of supply of prescription opioid abuse. Thus, the emergency physician must do a full history, including a psychiatric history, prior to considering opioids.

Screening programs not only elucidate a patient's past-filled prescriptions but can also give the physician an idea of the different pharmacies and health clinics the patient has gone to. This information gives the prescriber insight into any drug-seeking behavior and may change their propensity into prescribing a certain analgesic [17].

#### **1.4. Documentation of pain**

The effective management of acute pain in the ED requires appropriate assessment of the pain based on the patient's perception of pain using a validated pain scale. Additionally, reassessment of pain is essential to determine the effect of treatment. Pain has been described as a vital sign, and as such it should be documented in the initial assessment of a patient. Verbal pain scores (VPSs) may reveal those who are truly in pain but who may not voice their discomfort, as well as influence the physician to inquire about the patient's pain. One study revealed, that in patients who did not receive analgesics, 42% desired them, but only 31% voiced their concern [8]. A prospective study introducing VPSs in an ED revealed that of those trauma patients who had VPS scores documented, 60% received analgesics versus 33% in those who did not have a VPS score documented. Furthermore, those with higher VPS scores were more likely to receive analgesics [18]. ED crowding has been shown to increase time to analgesic administration and mortality [19]. The use of VPS in this setting may identify those individuals in need of quicker treatment.

## **2. Pathophysiology**

Pain can be divided into acute and chronic, with acute pain being incited by a traumatic injury or pathologic condition. As the causative issue is addressed, acute pain is usually resolved. Acute pain is mediated through nociceptors, of which there are various types ranging from mechanical to thermoreceptors. These receptors are stimulated by chemical, thermal, or mechanical stimuli [20]. As these receptors are stimulated, sensory neurons transmit the stimulus through neuronal pathways made up of various peripheral nerve fibers. "First Pain," which is well localized and sharp, is modulated by A $\delta$ -fibers. The second component of pain,

or the slow phase, is conducted by C fibers and is characterized by dull and poorly localized pain [21].

All pain starts as acute pain; however, not all pain progresses to chronic pain. Acute pain becomes chronic when pain persists despite the resolution of the inciting event. There may be many causative factors that account for prolonged pain. Apart from the psychosocial influences on chronic pain development, physiologic factors that contribute to chronic pain include alterations in the spinal cord that occur when acute pain is inadequately treated. These changes lead to increased excitability, decreased inhibition, and reorganization of certain spinal tracts [22]. The time frame for defining chronic pain varies from 3 to 6 months of ongoing pain. However, some would argue that chronic pain is any pain that persists longer than the reasonably expected healing time for the involved tissues. It is also important to understand that an individual's perception of pain may be influenced by culture, previous painful experiences, beliefs, mood, and ability to cope.

### **2.1. Somatic and visceral pain**

Somatic pain is made up of mostly A-fibers and is located in cutaneous tissues as well as deep tissues such as fascia, tendons, or bone. This pain is described as initially sharp and then as burning or throbbing. On the contrary, visceral pain is primarily composed of C f-fibers, and its primary afferent neuron endings are usually found in internal organs such as intestines, gonads, or heart [21]. For example, at presentation, pain from appendicitis may initially be poorly localized around the periumbilical site and characterized as dull, indicating primarily a visceral pain. However, as inflammation continues, the above fascia tissues become inflamed. At this point, pain is now located at the right lower quadrant and may be sharp. This later presentation of appendicitis is now primarily involving the somatic cutaneous nerves in the corresponding dermatome. Asking the patient to initially describe the pain may hint toward the initial causative pathologic condition. For instance, in a patient with sharp and clearly localized back pain, the causative agent may be musculoskeletal in nature. However, those with dull, achy, and poorly localized pain, back pain radiating to the groin may be due to an internal cause such as pyelonephritis or nephrolithiasis.

### **2.2. Neuronal pathway**

The initiating stimulus of pain is conducted through these peripheral nerve fibers. There are a number of neuronal pathways through neuronal pathways, but the spinothalamic tract is the main pathway. These pathways converge into primary afferent neurons found in the dorsal root ganglion. Afferent neurons have two endings: one signaling the peripheral system and the second signaling second-order neurons in the dorsal horn. The second-order neurons' axons cross the midline of the spinal cord into the contralateral spinothalamic tract, where they ascend into the thalamus. Third-order neurons in the thalamus synapse with the second-order neurons and send signals to the post-central gyrus of the cerebral cortex [21]. As the nerve fibers ascend in the spinal cord, they organize into dorsolateral columns and anteromedial segments [20].

The dorsal columns and anterior medial segment are divided into different segments called laminae. This is done to organize the type of sensory information sent into each section [23]. Laminae 1 through 6 are located in the dorsal horn, 7 through 10 in the intermediate zone, and 8 through 9 in the anterior/ventral horn. The gray matter surrounding the central cord composes lamina 10. All afferent nerve activity is received in the dorsal horn. Specifically, lamina 1 receives mostly noxious stimuli from cutaneous tissues and deep somatic tissues. Visceral afferent fibers are transmitted to laminae 5 and 1. However, lamina 5 also receives somatic afferent fibers, and it is this convergence that leads to referred pain [21]. Lamina 2, or the substantia gelatinosa of Rolando, mediates the activity of pain and temperature afferent fibers. Next, lamina 3 and 4, known as the nucleus proprius, receive input from lamina 2 and also help regulate pain, temperature, as well as crude touch. Lamina 7 receives afferent input from muscle fibers and joints [24].

Furthermore, the spinothalamic tract is subdivided into a lateral and a medial tract. The lateral tract projects to the ventral posterolateral nucleus of the thalamus and carries fibers sensory input that transmits location, intensity, and duration of pain. The medial tract projects to the medial nucleus of the thalamus and mediates the emotional and autonomic aspects of pain. Collateral fibers from the spinothalamic tract are also projected to the RAS, or reticular activating system, as well as the hypothalamus [21]. These collateral fibers may be responsible for the arousal aspect of pain.

### **2.3. Modulation of pain**

Descending tracts originating from the midbrain and medulla feed into the spinal cord through the dorsolateral funiculus, modulating pain [20]. For example, stimulation of the periaqueductal gray, through projections from the spinothalamic tract, provides widespread analgesia in humans [25, 26]. One investigator noted that stimulation of the periaqueductal gray leads to analgesia with such significance that one could perform an exploratory laparotomy without any chemical anesthesia [26, 27]. Furthermore, these tracts involve transmitters such as norepinephrine, serotonin, and opiates [20]. TCAs and SSRIs through these neurotransmitters have been shown in various studies to significantly reduce chronic pain, regardless of the patient's psychosocial status. A meta-analysis found there is no difference in pain relief from the use of these medications in the absence or presence of depression, and the size of analgesia is not significantly different in the presence or absence of anti-depressant effect [28].

Additional modulation of pain can be seen through the endorphin system. This system consists of neurons that secrete three types of opioids beta-endorphin, met-enkephalin, and leu-enkephalin, and dynorphins. These chemicals act on the mu, delta, and kappa receptors modulating pain relief [20].



### 3. Common analgesic agents used in the emergency department

#### 3.1. Opioids

Opioid prescriptions for the management of non-cancer pain have increased over the last 10–20 years. Concerns of opioid dependence and toxicity, such as respiratory depression, have led to the under-dosing of these agents in the ED and the use of other less effective analgesic agents.

##### 3.1.1. Mechanism

The term opioid refers to natural and synthetic substances that act at one of the three main opioid receptor systems ( $\mu$ ,  $\kappa$ ,  $\delta$ ). They can have analgesic and central nervous system (CNS) depressant effects as well as the potential to cause euphoria. The majority of opioids used clinically target  $\mu$ -opioid ( $\mu$ ) receptors. These receptors mediate analgesia as well as common side effects such as euphoria, constipation, and respiratory depression [29]. One exception is the combination of agonist–antagonist agents such as buprenorphine. Another less commonly targeted receptor is the  $\kappa$ -opioid ( $\kappa$ ) receptor, which is important in regulating GI motility and dysphoria. The other endorphin receptors may regulate neuropathic pain, as well as spinal anesthesia.

##### 3.1.2. Morphine

One of the most commonly used opioids in the ED is morphine. It is considered safe and effective in the monitored setting in the ED [29].

Side effects can range from hypotension, pruritus, nausea, vomiting, and respiratory depression. It is believed that some of these side effects may be due to the destabilization of mast cells that lead to the release of histamine. Respiratory depression is caused by desensitization of the medulla to carbon dioxide, through opioids binding to the  $\mu$  receptor. The cardiovascular effects of opioids are mediated centrally at the central vagal nucleus and, in the case of morphine, directly into the sinoatrial node. Within the gastrointestinal system, opioids delay gastric emptying and cause constipation [29]. There appears to be no significant differences in side effects between dosages of 0.1 mg/kg and 0.15 mg/kg.

Weight-based dosing for morphine is not necessary in obese patients. A prospective observational study in the ED revealed that patient's weight was not predictive of pain reduction [30]. Thus one should start with the recommended dose of 0.1 mg/kg if side effects are of concern; however, one should be ready to rebolus in 5–15 minutes as studies have revealed this initial dosing is inadequate. A prospective cohort study of 119 patients revealed that 67% of patients who received 0.1 mg/kg of morphine stated less than 50% reduction of pain 30 minutes later [31]. A later study evaluating trauma patients revealed that a dose of 0.15 mg/kg when compared to 0.1 mg/kg significantly reduces pain without any significant difference in adverse events [32].

In the setting of trauma, hypotension may reduce tissue perfusion in patients with significant blood loss. However, in a randomized controlled study in acute trauma patients, hypotension only occurred in 10% of patients who received morphine [32]. A study investigating the use of morphine in the pre-hospital setting in ST segment elevation myocardial infarction patients found no worsening of in-hospital complications or 1-year mortality [33]. The cancer literature has also shown the value and safety of morphine infusions for pain control [34].

### 3.1.3. Hydromorphone

Hydromorphone is a semisynthetic derivative of morphine that is seven times more potent than morphine. Despite the increased potency, studies have shown that nurses who are concerned about side effects may give a lower dose of morphine versus hydromorphone since the “total milligrams” given in hydromorphone is less when compared to an equal analgesic dose of morphine [35]. Despite the dosing difference, hydromorphone appears to offer better pain control. In a retrospective study involving the use of patient-controlled analgesia (PCA) with either morphine or hydromorphone, more patients receiving morphine required rescue analgesia due to initial inadequate pain control [36].

Pruritus occurs less frequently with hydromorphone. Hydromorphone is conjugated by the liver to hydromorphone-3-glucoronide, an inactive metabolite. However, morphine’s metabolite is active, and as a result, hydromorphone is better tolerated [20]. With regard to adverse effects, hydromorphone has not been shown to have an increased risk, and its use does not necessitate increased naloxone administration [37].

### 3.1.4. Fentanyl

When pain relief is needed quickly for acute severe pain, such as in trauma, fentanyl may be of use. Its time of onset is 1–2 minutes and lasts typically about 30 minutes [20]. The initial IV dose is 1.5 µg/kg, and it has the advantage of a short half-life. This is particularly useful if serial examinations are needed. Fentanyl causes minimal histamine release, making it ideal in patients in whom blood pressure must be maintained. For example, in severe traumatic brain injury patients, in whom MAP must be kept above 80 to maintain cerebral perfusion pressure, and must be examined serially, fentanyl may be a useful analgesic. The safety profile is favorable, particularly in the pre-hospital setting. A retrospective chart review of 2,129 patients transported by Emergency Medical Services revealed that fentanyl affected vital signs in less than 1% of patients [38]. Despite its favorable hemodynamic profile, fentanyl may cause chest wall rigidity when given in doses above 15 µg/kg leading to inadequate ventilation. This is a rare complication and can be remedied through neuromuscular blockade or naloxone [39, 40].

## 3.2. Non-opioid medications

Non-opioid analgesics include acetaminophen, non-selective nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs), and cyclooxygenase 2 (COX-2) inhibitors. NSAIDs and COX 2 inhibitors have anti-inflammatory properties.



### 3.2.1. *Acetaminophen*

A common over-the-counter analgesic for mild to moderate pain is acetaminophen (paracetamol) or paracetamol (in Europe). Its mechanism of action is through the inhibition of prostaglandin endoperoxide  $H_2$  synthase and cyclooxygenase activity [20, 41]. Its central anti-pyretic effect is of great use when fever needs to be reduced. It has been shown to have good analgesic effects; however, acetaminophen is not anti-inflammatory. Systematic reviews have shown that acetaminophen can significantly reduce pain; however, it may be less effective than NSAIDs in conditions such as back pain and osteoarthritis [42–44]. Acetaminophen can also be combined with opioid medications to reduce the amount of opioid needed. However, concerns about unintentional acetaminophen overdose have led to combination drug products with more than 325 mg acetaminophen per tablet to be withdrawn from the market. Acetaminophen overdose can lead to severe hepatotoxicity and should be used cautiously in patients with chronic alcohol use or liver disease.

Intravenous acetaminophen is being studied for acute pain such as in acute traumatic limb injuries [45] or rib fractures [46] or in postoperative patients [47, 48]. It has also been shown to reduce the need for rescue pain medications such as opioids [49, 50].

### 3.2.2. *Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs*

NSAIDs provide analgesia for mild to moderate pain and also work synergistically when paired with opioids. They work through the inhibition of cyclooxygenase by decreasing the production of prostaglandins and prostacyclins, primarily cyclooxygenase 1 (COX-1) and COX-2. COX-1 mediates platelet aggregation and maintenance of gastrointestinal mucosal integrity. By contrast, COX-2 generates prostaglandins that mediate pain and inflammation [29]. The different NSAIDs can be either selective COX-2 inhibitors or non-selective, thus differing in their side-effect profile. There are many NSAIDs to choose from, but there is little literature showing improved efficacy of one NSAID over another.

Main adverse side effects of NSAIDs include gastrointestinal insult, renal insult, inhibition of platelets, cardiovascular effects, and anaphylaxis. Renal failure is caused by the decreased production of prostaglandins, which aid in afferent glomerular arteriole vasodilation. NSAIDs contribute to arteriolar vasoconstriction, leading to decreased renal perfusion pressure and decreased glomerular filtration rates [51]. This is worsened by dehydration. As selectivity of COX inhibition increases, the renal effects decrease. NSAIDs such as ketorolac and diclofenac have fewer effects on the kidney than naproxen or ibuprofen [51, 52].

The most common side effect of NSAIDs is gastrointestinal injury, such as bleeding or dyspepsia and gastric ulceration. Patients who are at high risk for peptic ulcer disease or its complications, such as the elderly, those with bleeding diathesis, or patients on glucocorticoids, have a relative contraindication to the use of an NSAID. Each NSAID has variability in the risk of gastrointestinal injury it poses. This is due to the selectivity of COX-1 inhibition, so that the relative risk of for ibuprofen is 2.6, while the relative risk for ketorolac is 14.5 [51, 53].

Various studies have shown that COX-2 inhibition is related to increased cardiovascular risk. This is believed to be the result of decreased prostacyclin (prostaglandin  $I_2$ ) and increased

thromboxane A<sub>2</sub>. The effects lead to hypertension, accelerated atherogenesis, and increased thrombotic response to plaque rupture [54]. Myocardial infarction was found to be increased in this class of NSAIDs, resulting in the discontinuation of rofecoxib [55, 56]. Furthermore, it has been shown that specific COX-2 inhibitors may also further inhibit renal perfusion and lead to decreased sodium excretion, which may further worsen congestive heart failure and renal function [57, 58]. Due to COX-2 specific inhibitor side-effect profile and no proven increased efficacy over non-selective NSAIDs, there is minimal to no advantage in using this class in the ED.

There has been no proven efficacy over one type of NSAID, including the route of administration such as intra-muscular versus oral [29, 59, 60]. One should select a particular NSAID based on its side-effect profile and the route of administration that is the most feasible for the patient. Furthermore, prior to using NSAIDs, one must also take into consideration that this class of pharmaceuticals is most useful when used in pain mediated by prostaglandins or inflammation, not in other situations such as neuropathic pain. For instance, NSAID, particularly ketorolac, has been shown to significantly reduce pain in renal colic, and has similar efficacy in pain reduction as morphine [61]. When used in combination, opiates and NSAIDs may reduce the need of additional doses of analgesic rescue therapy in renal colic and have greater pain efficacy than either drug used alone [62]. In acute lower back pain, NSAIDs have been shown to significantly reduce pain and improve daily function [63]. The addition of opioids in this setting of pain was not proven to be more effective than NSAIDs alone [64].

### 3.2.3. Antispasmodics (muscle relaxants)

Muscle relaxants have been used by the physicians with the intention of alleviating musculoskeletal pain. However, data on this class of medications have produced mixed results since their action may be more the result of sedation rather than muscle relaxation. A systematic review, evaluating the effectiveness of cyclobenzaprine in lower back pain, revealed short-term improvement of pain at 7 days. However, there was no improvement of pain at 14 days, and there was no statistical difference when compared to diazepam [65]. Furthermore, in a second review evaluating the effectiveness of muscle relaxants in neck pain, there was no difference when compared to placebo at 2 weeks [66].

When compared to NSAIDs, muscle relaxants have been shown to have no significant difference in pain relief or improvement in daily function. Moreover, there is little to no added benefit when using muscle relaxants together with NSAIDs [64, 67]. Given the limited data on muscle relaxants, one should consider the side effects. Major side effects range from drowsiness, dizziness, dry mouth as well as other anticholinergic effects. These medications should only be prescribed for short-term use, given the limited data regarding efficacy past 1 week. In addition, one should refrain from prescribing these medications in the elderly, as they are at higher risk of falls and delirium.

### 3.2.4. Topical analgesics

There are various topical agents ranging from patches, gel, sprays to creams, which may aid in relieving pain. They appear to have several potential advantages over systemic drugs such as delivery at the site of injury, lower levels of systemic absorption, and fewer systemic effects. Although systemic side effects are not as frequent as oral formulations, significant systemic concentration can be achieved by topical application.

Often, these agents have similar efficacy to their oral preparations. For example, a randomized controlled trial comparing a gel preparation of ibuprofen versus oral tablets revealed comparable improvement in patient's pain and functional status at 2 weeks [68]. Topical agents often have fewer side effects than their oral counterparts, and most adverse events are primarily cutaneous in nature such as rashes or pruritus. Decreased adverse events may be due to lower bioavailability in the plasma [69, 70]. Many factors may influence the penetration of the topical agent into the local site. Variability in an individual's skin properties such as the thickness of stratum corneum may be a limiting factor. Furthermore, the agent must be lipophilic and water-soluble [71]. Local site pH, such as acidity in a local cellulitis, may also limit penetration of the agent.

Topical NSAIDs have been shown to have rare incidences of gastrointestinal adverse events such as ulcer formation, as opposed to oral formulations [69]. Topical diclofenac and ibuprofen have been shown to be effective in acute soft tissue injuries, such as ankle sprains as well as arthritic knee pain [68, 72, 73]. Furthermore, topical diclofenac has been shown to be effective in reducing myofascial pain, however, with no effect on the myofascial trigger point pain threshold [74]. Topical NSAIDs have been shown to have equal efficacy as oral NSAIDs, yet various studies have shown topical diclofenac to reduce pain within 2–3 days of treatment [72, 75–77].

Neuropathic pain has been shown to respond to topical agents. For example, topical lidocaine, when used in post-herpetic neuralgia (PHN), has been associated with improved quality of life, improvement of pain and allodynia [78]. Moreover, when compared with oral pregabalin, response rates were higher in patients with either PHN or diabetic neuropathy. The same studies also showed a lower rate of adverse events and improved quality of life [77, 79, 80]. Topical capsaicin cream has also been studied to reduce neuropathic pain; nonetheless, application of this cream has been associated with a burning sensation in up to 81% of patients [81]. Randomized controlled studies of high concentration topical capsaicin revealed significant pain relief in patients with PHN with relief lasting up to 12 weeks [77, 82, 83].

Topical opioids have not been shown to significantly reduce pain. For example, a randomized controlled trial comparing the use of topical morphine sulfate versus traditional Jelonet dressings in burn patients revealed increased need of rescue analgesia and higher pain scores in the topical morphine group [84]. Another study revealed no significant reduction in pain with patients with skin ulcers when topical morphine was compared to placebo [85]. However, in patients with mucositis undergoing chemoradiotherapy for head and neck cancer, oral morphine mouthwash has been shown to significantly reduce pain and reduce length of functional impairment [86].

In summary, topical analgesics may provide additional analgesia in patients who may not be able to tolerate the adverse effects of systemic analgesics. Those with PHN may benefit from topical lidocaine when amitriptyline fails to provide relief. Those with peptic ulcer disease may benefit from topical NSAIDs to treat arthritis, as oral NSAIDs may worsen their condition. By contrast, topical opioids have not been shown to provide significant relief in burns or skin conditions, limiting their role in the ED.

### 3.3. Peripheral nerve blocks

There are two types of nerve blocks: single injection and continuous nerve blocks.

Single-injection nerve blocks are one-time injections of local anesthetic adjacent to the nerve or plexus for anesthesia and/or analgesia and are most commonly used in the ED. Continuous infusion nerve blocks involve the placement of catheter adjacent to the peripheral nerve or plexus. These are useful in patients who are expected to have prolonged need for analgesia. The effectiveness and duration of the block depend upon the pharmacology of the analgesic/anesthetic agent used, the dose, and the concentration.

Peripheral nerve blocks are important tools for pain management in the ED and have been shown to significantly reduce pain. Analgesia from peripheral nerve blocks can be reached more quickly than intravenous narcotics and often with more efficacy and less rescue analgesics. A randomized controlled trial compared the use of femoral nerve blocks versus intravenous narcotics in femoral fractures and found lower pain scores within 90 minutes in the femoral nerve block group. The incidence of infections was the same in both groups, and there were no reports of paresthesias [87]. In fact, the total amount of morphine required to produce adequate analgesia was up to three times higher in intravenous narcotics group than in patients with a peripheral nerve block [88].

The benefits of peripheral nerve blocks have not only been seen in femoral fractures but also in other traumatic injuries such as hand lacerations, upper extremity fractures, and dislocations. For reduction of forearm fractures, studies have shown that children have less distress and pain when a brachial plexus block was performed versus procedural sedation [89]. Furthermore, length of stay in the ED was also significantly reduced when brachial plexus block was performed with length of stay being reduced almost 3 hours [90]. Similarly, patients with shoulder dislocation that underwent a brachial plexus block also showed reduction in ED length of stay, without any increased adverse events or reduction in patient satisfaction [91].

One of the most concerning complications of peripheral nerve blocks is nerve damage. In a peripheral nerve block, the goal is to position the local anesthetic around the nerve and not “into” the nerve. One should avoid intra-neural injection that may cause direct trauma or toxicity to the nerve. The incidence of nerve damage in the days following the block (including temporary paresthesias) ranges from 0.5 to 15% [92, 93]. However, in significant nerve damage resulting in peripheral neuropathy or symptoms lasting longer than 6 months, incidence was reported to be less than 0.1% in a prospective study [92, 94]. Most complications of nerve damage are transient, with most patients recovering by 3 weeks. Localized infection has been



noted to be rare, with 3% of peripheral nerve catheters in anesthesia studies showing signs of infection or abscess formation [95]. On the contrary, vascular puncture is not uncommon, and incidences of up to 5.7% and 6.6% have been noted when investigators placed femoral or sciatic nerve peripheral catheters [92, 96]. Systemic toxicity, such as cardiac arrest, was found to be rare, with all cases of cardiac arrest noted to be in central spinal anesthesia. Additionally, seizures were noted in 6 out of 50,223 cases [94].


Ultrasound and nerve stimulator techniques have been shown to reduce the complications from peripheral nerve blocks. One study investigating the use of ultrasound or electrical stimulation in the placement of a brachial plexus peripheral nerve catheter resulted not only in decreased time performing the procedure but also no vascular punctures in the ultrasound-guided group [97]. Furthermore, a Cochrane systematic review also confirmed faster procedure times and reduced local anesthetic volume and improved quality of nerve block [98].

Emergency physicians are adept at using ultrasound in central line placement, as well as in other diagnostic procedures, such as in FAST abdominal examinations, in trauma patients. Emergency physicians can be trained in ultrasound-guided peripheral nerve blocks as well. Ultrasound imaging permits direct visualization of needle location relative to target nerves, blood vessels, and related structures, as well as observation of the local anesthetic during and after the injection. A prospective observational study trained emergency physicians in the use of ultrasound guided peripheral nerve blocks in patients with traumatic limb emergencies and found that trained physicians were able to perform the ultrasound-guided nerve blocks in about 9 minutes with no complications and no need of rescue procedural sedation [99].

Prior to the decision to perform a peripheral nerve block, a careful medical history should be obtained including allergies, use of anticoagulants, preexisting nerve damage, active infections at the site, and ability to cooperate with the procedures. During the placement of peripheral nerve blocks, patients should be carefully monitored. It is important to assess for preexisting sensory or motor deficits in the distribution of the block. A patient with neurologic deficits prior to the nerve block may be at higher risk for developing new neurologic deficits following a nerve block than a patient without preexisting deficits. A brief overview of the femoral and brachial plexus peripheral nerve will be explained in the section below.

### 3.4. Femoral nerve block

The femoral nerve block is used to anesthetize the hip, anterior thigh, and knee. This nerve passes beneath the inguinal ligament and travels lateral to the femoral artery within the femoral triangle (**Figure 1**) [100]. The fascia iliaca separates the femoral nerve from the femoral vascular bundle [101]. The patient is initially positioned in a supine position. The affected extremity is then externally rotated and abducted. With the probe marker to the patient's right, a linear probe is then placed at the inguinal crease parallel to the inguinal ligament, the femoral nerve will then be visualized (it may appear as a hyper echoic, honeycombed structure). Medially, the femoral artery and then the femoral vein will be present. The iliopsoas muscle will be present posteriorly and the fascia lata superiorly (**Figure 2**) [101, 102].



**Figure 1.** Femoral triangle.




**Figure 2.** Placement of the ultrasound linear probe for the femoral nerve block. The patient is laid in a supine position with the affected extremity externally rotated and abducted. The linear probe is placed in a transverse fashion inferiorly to the inguinal crease.

Once the structures and anatomical landmarks mentioned above have been identified, aseptic skin preparation is performed and anatomic structures at the block site are again identified using an ultrasound probe in a sterile plastic sheath with sterile conductive gel (**Figure 3**). The structures are once again confirmed on ultrasound and then a skin wheal is made with local anesthetic. When the optimal ultrasound view is achieved, the probe is held immobile; the




block needle is then inserted at the skin on the lateral edge of the probe in-plane, aiming for the space behind the nerve. It is then advanced, with movement only when the needle tip is seen. Often a “pop” will be felt as the fascia iliaca is penetrated with the needle. Next, aspiration of the needle is done to confirm no vascular penetration. About 1–2 ml of local anesthetic is injected to visualize the placement of the needle on the ultrasound screen. The anesthetic should be seen surrounding the nerve. Once correct placement is confirmed, 10–20 ml of the selected anesthetic is injected. It may take up to 10–20 minutes to take effect [101–103].




**Figure 3.** Ultrasound view of the femoral nerve. FA, femoral artery; FV, femoral vein; FN, femoral nerve.

### 3.5. Brachial plexus block

The brachial plexus block, or interscalene block, can be used to facilitate reduction of upper extremity fractures, lacerations, and even reduce shoulder dislocations. Nerve roots of C5–T1 are the initial part of the brachial plexus, forming a complex configuration before they enter the terminal nerves of the arm (**Figure 4**) [104]. The more proximal one blocks to the plexus, the more proximal the anesthesia is on the arm. Nerve roots of C5–T1 form the superior, middle, and inferior trunks of the plexus at the level of the cricoid cartilage. At this location, the plexus is found superior and posterior to the subclavian artery, with the dome of the lung located anteromedial to the inferior trunk. The interscalene space is the groove between the anterior and middle scalene muscles. This is where one will find the structures mentioned above. However, since the inferior trunk is often not included in this block, one cannot use this procedure for injuries below the elbow [105].



**Figure 4.** Brachial plexus.




**Figure 5.** Placement of the ultrasound linear probe for the interscalene brachial plexus block. The patient is laid in a supine position with head turned away. The probe is then placed in a transverse fashion and used to identify the sternocleidomastoid muscle first. Next, one then sweeps posterior laterally to bring into view the interscalene groove.

The patient is initially positioned supine with the head turned 45 degrees to the contralateral side. With a linear probe, one first identifies the sternocleidomastoid muscle (SCM), which is located anteriorly to the carotid artery and internal jugular vein. One then sweeps posterior laterally bringing into view the middle scalene muscle and anterior scalene muscles. This is where the trunks of the brachial plexus may be visualized between the anterior and middle interscalene muscles. As with peripheral nerves, these trunks may appear as hyper echoic honeycombed structures (**Figure 5**) [105, 106]. Once the structures are identified, aseptic skin preparation is performed and anatomic structures at the block site are again identified using an ultrasound probe in a sterile plastic sheath with sterile conductive gel. A skin wheal is made using local anesthetic. Then, in an in-plane approach, the block needle is inserted posterior-

laterally to the probe, at an angle of 45 degrees to the skin. The needle is advanced toward the plexus, aiming toward the space between the top and middle trunks. Next, aspiration is done to check for any vascular puncture, and then placement is confirmed with movement of the trunks on injection of anesthetic. Depending on the agent used, the volume of local anesthetic is about 15–45 ml (**Figure 6**) [105, 106].


A second approach to the brachial plexus block is a supraclavicular block. To perform this block, the patient is once again laid in a supine position with the head turned away from the side being blocked. A linear probe transducer is then placed immediately superior to the clavicle at its midpoint (**Figure 7**). Tilting the probe caudally will bring into view a transverse view of the subclavian artery. Laterally to the artery, one will be able to see a collection of hypoechoic, honeycombed structures, which is the brachial plexus. Underneath these structures, the first rib is visible as a linear hyper echoic structure with lung underneath (**Figure 8**) [107, 108]. After the correct anatomy is identified, the skin is prepped in a sterile manner, and using a sterile probe cover, this area is once again identified. A 27-gauge needle is then used to inject the skin with 1–2 ml of local anesthetic just lateral to the probe. The block needle, 22-gauge, is then advanced in an in-plane approach toward the brachial plexus from a lateral to medial direction. At times one may feel a “pop” once the brachial sheath has been penetrated. One then aspirates to confirm non-vascular penetration and injects 1–2 ml of anesthetic to view the brachial plexus. Next, one then injects about 20–25 ml of anesthetic, until adequate spread is seen surrounding the brachial plexus [107].



**Figure 6.** Interscalene view of the brachial plexus. ISG, interscalene groove with the brachial plexus present; SCM, sternocleidomastoid muscle; ASM, anterior scalene muscle; MSM, middle scalene muscle.



**Figure 7.** Placement of the ultrasound linear probe for the supraclavicular brachial plexus block. The patient is placed in a supine position or slightly seated position. The linear probe is then placed immediately superior to the clavicle at its midpoint. Tilting the probe caudally will bring into view the subclavian artery with the brachial plexus seen lateral to it, and the first rib and lung underneath.



**Figure 8.** Supraclavicular view of the brachial plexus. SA, subclavian artery; BP, brachial plexus; MSM, middle scalene muscle.

Peripheral nerve blocks are a valuable asset to the emergency physician trained in these procedures. These procedures reduce pain quicker than intravenous narcotics, decrease the amount of sedation needed, and decrease ED length of stays. Peripheral nerve blocks may offer an alternative to avoid respiratory and cardiovascular depression encountered with procedural sedation or intravenous narcotics.

## 4. Conclusion

Pain is the most common presenting complaint to the emergency room. Appropriate treatment affects not only patient satisfaction and well-being but also patient outcomes. The choice of an appropriate initial therapeutic strategy is dependent upon an accurate evaluation of the cause of the pain and the type of pain syndrome. Effective management of acute pain in the ED requires a systematic approach. First, an accurate assessment of the patient's pain should involve the use of validated pain scales. Second, suitable analgesics given in an acceptable time frame are essential in the diagnosis and treatment. This should include proper monitoring for adverse side effects. Third, pain should be reassessed and documented regularly to determine the effect of treatment.

## Author details

Ivan Samcam MD and Linda Papa MD, MSc\*

\*Address all correspondence to: lpstat@aol.com

Orlando Regional Medical Center, Orlando, FL, USA

## References

- [1] McCaig LF, Stussman BJ. National Hospital Ambulatory Medical Care Survey: 1996 Emergency Department Summary. Advance Data from Vital and Health Statistics. National Center for Health Statistics. 1997;293. <http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/ad/ad293.pdf>
- [2] CDC. Emergency Department Visits 2015 [cited 12/28/2015]. Available from: <http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/fastats/emergency-department.htm>.
- [3] Pitts S, Niska RW, Xu J, Burt C. National Hospital Ambulatory Medical Care Survey: 2006 Emergency Department Summary. National Health Statistics Report. 2008;7:1–39.
- [4] Motov SM, Khan AN. Problems and barriers of pain management in the emergency department: are we ever going to get better? J Pain Res. 2009;2:5–11.
- [5] Wilson J, Pendleton J. Oligoanalgesia in the emergency department. Am J Emer Med. 1989;7(6):620–3.
- [6] Lewis L, Lasater L, Brooks C. Are emergency physicians too stingy with analgesics? South Med J. 1994;87:7–9.



- [7] Blank F, Mader T, Wolfe J, Keyes M, Kirschner R, Provost D. Adequacy of pain assessment and pain relief and correlation of patient satisfaction in 68 ED fast-track patients. *J Emerg Nurs*. 2001;27:327–34.
- [8] Todd K, Ducharme J, Choiniere M, Group PS. Pain in the emergency department: results of the pain and emergency medicine (PEMI) multicenter study. *J Pain*. 2007;8:460–6.
- [9] Fosnocht D, Heaps N, Swanson E. Patient expectations for pain relief in the ED. *Am J Emerg Med*. 2004;22:286–8.
- [10] Downey LVA, Zun LS. Pain management in the emergency department and its relationship to patient satisfaction. *J Emerg Trauma Shock*. 2010;3(4):326–30.
- [11] Kim M, Strait R, Sato T, Hennes H. A randomized clinical trial of analgesia in children with acute abdominal pain. *Acad Emerg Med*. 2002;9:281–7.
- [12] Yong Y, Jia-yong C, Hao G, Yi Z, Dao-Ming L, Dong Z, et al. Relief of abdominal pain by morphine without altering physical signs in acute appendicitis. *Chin Med J*. 2010;123(2):142–5.
- [13] Poonai N, Paskar D, Konrad S-L, Rieder M, Joubert G, Lim R, et al. Opioid analgesia for acute abdominal pain in children: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Acad Emerg Med*. 2014;21(11):1185–992.
- [14] CDC. Opioid Painkiller Prescribing 2014 [cited 01/20/2016]. Available from: <http://www.cdc.gov/vitalsigns/opioid-prescribing/>.
- [15] Birnbaum H, White A, Schiller M. Societal costs of prescription opioid abuse, dependence and misuse in the United States. *Pain Med*. 2011;12(4):657–67.
- [16] Wilsey B, Fishman SM, Tsodikov A, Ogden BS, Symreg I, Ernst A. Psychological comorbidities predicting prescription opioid abuse among patients in chronic pain presenting to the emergency department. *Pain Med*. 2008;9(8):1107–17.
- [17] Edlund M, Steffick D, Hudson T, Harris K, Sullivan M. Risk factors for clinically recognized opioid abuse and dependence among veterans using opioids for chronic non-cancer pain. *Pain*. 2007;129(3):355–62.
- [18] Silka PA, Mendel MR, Moreno G, Merrill L, Geiderman JM. Pain scores improve analgesic administration patterns for trauma patients in the emergency department. *Acad Emerg Med*. 2008;11(3):264–70.
- [19] Pines JM, Hollander JE. Emergency department crowding is associated with poor care for patients with severe pain. *Ann Emerg Med*. 2007;51(1):1–5.
- [20] Miner JR, Burton J. Pain Management. In: Marx JA, Hockberger RS, Walls RM, Birns MH, editors. *Rosen's Emergency Medicine* 1. 8th ed. Philadelphia, PA: Elsevier Saunders; 2014. pp. 31–49.



- [21] Rosenquist RW, Vrooman B. Chronic Pain Management. In: Butterworth JF, Mackey DC, Wasnick JD, editors. Morgan and Mikhail's Clinical Anesthesiology. Regional Anesthesia and Pain Management. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Companies; 2013.
- [22] Woolf CJ, Doubell TP. The pathophysiology of chronic pain—increased sensitivity to low threshold A $\beta$ -fibre inputs. *Curr Opin Neurobiol.* 1994;4(4):525–34.
- [23] Rexed B. The cytoarchitecture organization of the spinal cord in the cat. *J Comp Neurol.* 1952;96(3):414–95.
- [24] Schoenen, J., Grant G. Spinal Cord: connections. In Paxinos G, Mai JK, editors. *The Human Nervous System.* 2 ed. San Diego, 2004. Elsevier Academic Press, page 236.
- [25] Holstege G. Direct and indirect pathways to lamina 1 in the medulla oblongata and spinal cord of the cat. *Prog Brain Res.* 1988;77:47–94.
- [26] Behbehani MM. Functional characteristics of the midbrain periaqueductal gray. *Prog Neurobiol.* 1995;46:575–605.
- [27] Reynolds DV. Surgery in the rat during electrical analgesia by focal brain stimulation. *Science.* 1969;164:444–5.
- [28] Onghena P, Van Houdenhove B. Antidepressant-induced analgesia in chronic non-malignant pain: a meta-analysis of 39 placebo-controlled studies. *Pain.* 1992;49:205–19.
- [29] Thomas S. Management of Pain in the Emergency Department. *ISRN Emergency Medicine.* 2013;2013:19.
- [30] Patanwala AE, Edwards CJ, Stolz L, Amini R, Desai A, Stolz U. Should morphine dosing be weight based for analgesia in the emergency department? *J Opioid Manag.* 2012;8:51–5.
- [31] Bliur P, Kenny M, Gallagher E. Intravenous morphine at 0.1 mg/kg is not effective for controlling severe acute pain in the majority of patients. *Ann Emerg Med.* 2005;46(4): 362–7.
- [32] Farsi D, Movahedi M, Hafezimpghadam P, Abbasi S, Shahlaee A, Rahimi-Movaghar V. Acute pain management with intravenous 0.10 mg/kg vs. 0.15 mg/kg morphine sulfate in limb traumatized patients: a randomized double-blinded placebo-controlled trial. *Ulus Tarvma Acil Cerr Derg.* 2013;19(5):398–405.
- [33] Puymirat E, Lamhaut L, Bonnet N, Aissaoui N, Henry P, Cayla G, et al. Correlates of pre-hospital morphine use in ST-elevation myocardial infarction patients and its association with in-hospital outcomes and long-term mortality: the FAST-MI (French Registry of Acute ST-elevation and non-ST-elevation Myocardial Infarction) programme. *Eur Heart J.* 2015;10:1–9.
- [34] Citron ML, Johnston-Early A, Fossieck B, Krasnow SH, Franklin R, Spagnolo S, et al. Safety and efficacy of continuous intravenous morphine for severe cancer pain. *Am J Med.* 1984;77:199–204.

- [35] O'Connor A, Lan V, Quil T. Underdosing of morphine in comparison with other parenteral opioids in acute hospital. A quality of care challenge. *Pain Med.* 2006;7:299–307.
- [36] DiGiusto M, Tarun B, David M, Derek F, Megan J, Joseph D. Patient-controlled analgesia in the pediatric population: morphine versus hydromorphone. *J Pain Res.* 2014;7:471–5.
- [37] Chang A, Bijur P, Meyer R, Kenny M, Solorzano C, Gallagher E. Safety and efficacy of hydromorphone as an analgesic alternative to morphine in acute pain: a randomized clinical trial. *Ann Emerg Med.* 2006;48(2):164–72.
- [38] Thomas SH, Benevelli W, Brown D, Wedel SK. Safety of fentanyl for analgesia in adults undergoing air medical transport from trauma scenes. *Air Med J.* 1996;15(2):57–9.
- [39] Jaffe TB, Ramsey FM. Attenuation of fentanyl-induced truncal rigidity. *Anesthesiology.* 1983;58:562–4.
- [40] Coruh B, Tonelli MR, Park DR. Fentanyl-induced chest wall rigidity. *Chest.* 2013;144(3):1083–4.
- [41] Scwab JM, Schluesener HJ, Laufer S. COX-3: just another COX or the solitary elusive target of paracetamol? *Lancet.* 2003;361:981–2.
- [42] Towheed TE, Hochberg MC, Judd MG, Wells G. Acetaminophen for osteoarthritis. The Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2003, Issue 1. Art. No.: CD004257. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD004257.Full
- [43] Bannuru RR, Schmid CH, Kent DM, Vaysbrot EE, Wong JB, McAlindon TE. Comparative effectiveness of pharmacologic interventions for knee osteoarthritis: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Ann Intern Med.* 2015;162(1):46–54.
- [44] Shen H, Sprott H, Aeschlimann A, Gay RE, Michel BA, Gay S. Analgesic action of acetaminophen in symptomatic osteoarthritis of the knee. *Oxford.* 2006;45:765–70.
- [45] Craig M, Jeavons R, Probert J, Bengner J. Randomised comparison of intravenous paracetamol and intravenous morphine for acute traumatic limb pain in the emergency department. *Emerg Med J.* 2012;29(1):37–9.
- [46] Esmailian M, Moshiri R, Majid Z. Comparison of the analgesic effect of intravenous acetaminophen and morphine sulfate in rib fracture: a randomized double-blind clinical trial. *Emergency.* 2015;3(3):99–102.
- [47] Sinatra RS, Jahr JS, Reynolds L, Groudine S, Royal M, Breitmeyer JB, et al. Intravenous acetaminophen for pain after major orthopedic surgery: an expanded analysis. *Pain Pract.* 2011;12(5):357–65.
- [48] Wininger SJ, Miller H, Minkowitz HS, Royal M, Ang R, Breitmeyer JB, et al. A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, multicenter, repeat-dose study of two intrave-

- nous acetaminophen dosing regimens for the treatment of pain after abdominal laparoscopic surgery. *Clin Ther*. 2010;32(14):2348–69.
- [49] Macario A, Royal M. A literature review of randomized clinical trials of intravenous acetaminophen (paracetamol) for acute postoperative pain. *Pain Pract*. 2010;11(3):290–6.
  - [50] Mernis D, Mehmet TI, Guksun K, Sezer A, Sut N. Intravenous paracetamol reduced the use of opioids, extubation time, and opioid-related adverse effects after major surgery in intensive care unit. *J Crit Care*. 2010;25(3):458–62.
  - [51] Golzari SE, Soleimanpour H, Rahmani F, et al. Therapeutic Approaches for Renal Colic in the Emergency Department: A Review Article. *Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine*. 2014;4(1):e16222. doi:10.5812/aapm.16222.
  - [52] Lafrance JP, Miller DR. Selective and non-selective non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and the risk of acute kidney injury. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf*. 2009;10:923–31.
  - [53] Masso Gonzalex EL, Patrignani P, Taconelli S, Garcia Rodriguez LA. Variability among nonsteroidal antiinflammatory drugs in risk of upper gastrointestinal bleeding. *Arthritis Rheum*. 2010;62(6):1592–601.
  - [54] Fitzgerald G. Coxibs and cardiovascular disease. *New Engl J Med*. 2004;351:1709–11.
  - [55] Solomon DH, Schneeweiss S, Glynn RJ, Kiyota Y, Levin R, Mogun H, et al. Relationship between selective cyclooxygenase-2 inhibitors and acute myocardial infarction in older adults. *Circulation*. 2004;109:2068–73.
  - [56] Ray WA, Stein CM, Daugherty JR, Hall K, Arbogast PG, Griffin MR. COX-2 selective non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and increased risk of serious coronary heart disease. *Lancet*. 2002;360:1071–3.
  - [57] Rios A, Vargas-Robles H, Gamez-Mendez AM, Escalante B. Cyclooxygenase-2 and kidney failure. *Prostag Oth Lipid Med*. 2012;98:86–90.
  - [58] Green T, Gonzalez AA, Mitchell KD, Navar LG. The complex interplay between cyclooxygenase-2 and angiotensin II in regulating kidney function. *Curr Opin Nephrol Hy*. 2012;21:7–14.
  - [59] Turturro MA, Paris PM, Seaberg DC. Intramuscular ketorolac versus oral ibuprofen in acute musculoskeletal pain. *Ann Emerg Med*. 1995;26(2):117–20.
  - [60] Wright JM, Price SD, Watson WA. NSAID use and efficacy in the emergency department: single doses oral ibuprofen versus intramuscular ketorolac. *Ann Pharmacother*. 1994;28(3):309–12.
  - [61] Jelinek G. Ketorolac versus morphine for severe pain. *BMJ*. 2000;321(7271):1236–7.

- [62] Safdar B, Degutis LC, Landry K, Vedere SR, Moscovitz HC, D'Onofrio G. Intravenous morphine versus ketorolac is superior to either drug alone for treatment of acute renal colic. *Ann Emerg Med*. 2006;48(2):173–81.
- [63] van Tulder MW, Scholten RJ, Koes BW, Deyo RA. Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs for low back pain. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2000;25(19):2501–13.
- [64] Friedman BW, Dym AA, Davitt M, Holden L, Solorzano C, Esses D, et al. Naproxen with cyclobenzaprine, oxycodone/acetaminophen, or placebo for treating low back pain: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA*. 2015;314(15):1572–80.
- [65] van Tulder MW, Touray T, Furlan AD, Solway S, Bouter LM, Group CBR. Muscle relaxants for nonspecific low back pain: a systematic review within the framework of the cochrane collaboration. *Spine*. 2003;28(17):1978–92.
- [66] Peloso PMJ, Gross A, Haines T, Trinh K, Goldsmith CH, Burnie SJ, Cervical Overview Group. Medicinal and injection therapies for mechanical neck disorders. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2007, Issue 3. Art. No.: CD000319. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD000319.pub4.
- [67] Khwaja SM, Minnerop M, Singer AJ. Comparison of ibuprofen, cyclobenzaprine, or both in patients with acute cervical strain: a randomized controlled trial. *Can J Emerg Med*. 2010;12(1):39–44.
- [68] Tiso RL, Tong-Ngork S, Fredlund KL. Oral versus topical ibuprofen for chronic knee pain: a prospective randomized pilot study. *Pain Physician*. 2010;13(5):457–67.
- [69] Heyneman CA, Lawless-Liday C, Wall GC. Oral versus topical NSAIDs in rheumatic diseases: a comparison. *Drugs*. 2000;60(3):555–74.
- [70] Paice JA, Von Roerin JH, Hudgins JC, Luong L, Krejcie TC, Avram MJ. Morphine bioavailability from a topical gel formulation in volunteers. *J Pain Symptom Manage*. 2008;35(3):314–20.
- [71] Jorge LL, Feres CC, Teles VE. Topical preparations for pain relief: efficacy and patient adherence. *J Pain Res*. 2011;4:11–24.
- [72] Constantino C, Kwarecki J, Samokhin AV, Mautone G, Rovati S. Diclofenac epolamine plus heparin plaster versus diclofenac epolamine plaster in mild to moderate ankle sprain, a randomized double blind, parallel-group, placebo-controlled, multi-centre, phase III trial. *Clin Drug Invest*. 2011;31(1):15–26.
- [73] Baer PA, Thomas LM, Shainhouse Z. Treatment of osteoarthritis of the knee with a topical diclofenac solution, a randomised controlled 6-week trial. *BMC Musculoskeletal Disord*. 2005;6:44.
- [74] Hsieh LF, Hong CZ, Chern SH, Chen CC. Efficacy and side effects of diclofenac patch in treatment of patients with myofascial pain syndrome of the upper trapezius. *J Pain Symptom Manage*. 2010;39(1):116–25.

- [75] Mueller EA, Kirch W, Reiter S. Extent and time course of pain intensity upon treatment with a topical diclofenac sodium patch versus placebo in acute traumatic injury based on validated end-point: post hoc analysis of a randomized placebo-controlled trial. *Expert Opin Pharmacother*. 2010;11(4):493–8.
- [76] Galer BS, Rowbothan M, Perander J, Devers A, Friedman E. Topical diclofenac patch relieves minor sports injury pain: results of a multicenter controlled clinical trial. *J Clin Pharmacol*. 2000;19(4):287–94.
- [77] Argoff CE. Topical analgesics in the management of acute and chronic pain. *Mayo Clin Proc*. 2013;88(2):195–205.
- [78] Brider A, Bruxelles J, Rogers P, Hans G, Bosl I, Baron R. Topical 5% lidocaine (lignocaine) medicated plaster treatment for post-herpetic neuralgia: results of a double-blind, placebo-controlled, multinational efficacy and safety trial. *Clin Drug Invest*. 2009;29(6):393–408.
- [79] Baron R, Mayoral V, Leijon G, Binder A, Steigerwald I, Serpell M. 5% Lidocaine medicated plaster versus pregabalin in post-herpetic neuralgia and diabetic polyneuropathy: an open label, non-inferiority two-stage RCT study. *Curr Med Res Opin*. 2009;25(7):1663–76.
- [80] Baron R, Mayoral V, Leijon G, Binder A, Steigerwald I, Serpell M. Efficacy and safety of 5% lidocaine (lignocaine) medicated plaster in comparison with pregabalin in patients with post-herpetic neuralgia and diabetic polyneuropathy: interim analysis from an open-label, two-stage adaptive, randomized controlled trial. *Clin Drug Invest*. 2009;29(4):231–41.
- [81] McClean G. Topical application of doxepin hydrochloride, capsaicin and a combination of both produces analgesia in chronic human neuropathic pain: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study. *Br J Clin Pharmacol*. 2000;49(6):574–9.
- [82] Backonja MM, Malan TP, Vanhove GF, Tobias JK, Group CS. NGX-4010, a high concentration capsaicin patch, for the treatment of post-herpetic neuralgia: a randomized, double-blind, controlled study with an open-label extension. *Pain Med*. 2010;11(4):600–8.
- [83] Irving GA, Backonja MM, Duntzman E, Group N-CS. A multicenter randomized, double-blind, controlled study of NGX-4010, a high-concentration capsaicin patch, for the treatment of postherpetic neuralgia. *Pain Med*. 2011;12(1):99–109.
- [84] Welling A. A randomised controlled trial to test the analgesic efficacy of topical morphine on minor superficial and partial thickness burns in accident and emergency departments. *Emerg Med J*. 2007;24:408–12.
- [85] Vernassiere C, Cornet C, Trechot P, Alla F, Truchetet F, Cuny JF, et al. Study to determine the efficacy of topical morphine on painful chronic skin ulcers. *J Wound Care*. 2005;14(6):289–93.



- [86] Cerchietti L, Navigante AH, Bonomi MR, Zaderajko MA, Menendez PR, Pogany CE, et al. Study to determine the efficacy of topical morphine on painful chronic skin ulcers. *Cancer*. 2002;95(10):2230–6.
- [87] Mutty CE, Jensen EJ, Manka MA, Anders MJ, Bone LB. Femoral nerve block for diaphyseal and distal femoral fractures in the emergency department. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 2007;89:12.
- [88] Fletcher A, Rigby A, Heyes F. Three-in-one femoral nerve block as analgesia for fractured neck of femur in the emergency department: a randomized, controlled trial. *Ann Emerg Med*. 2003;41(2):227–33.
- [89] Kriwanek K, Wan J, Beaty J, Pershad J. Axillary block for analgesia during manipulation of forearm fractures in the pediatric emergency department: a prospective randomized comparative trial. *J Pediatr Orthop*. 2006;26(6):737–40.
- [90] Stone MB, Wang R, Price DD. Ultrasound-guided supraclavicular brachial plexus nerve block vs procedural sedation for the treatment of upper extremity emergencies. *Am J Emerg Med*. 2008;26(6):706–10.
- [91] Blaivas M, Adhikari S, Liander L. A prospective comparison of procedural sedation and ultrasound-guided interscalene nerve block for shoulder reduction in the emergency department. *Acad Emerg Med*. 2011;18(9):922–7.
- [92] Jeng CL, Torrillo TM, Rosenblatt MA. Complications of peripheral nerve blocks. *Br J Anaesth*. 2010;105:i97–i107.
- [93] Liguori GA. Complications of regional anesthesia: nerve injury and peripheral neural blockade. *J Neurosurg Anesthesiol*. 2004;16(1):84–6.
- [94] Auroy Y, Benhamou D, Bargues L, Ecoffey C, Falissard B, Mercier F, et al. Major complications of regional anesthesia in France. The SOS Regional Anesthesia Hotline Service. *Anesthesiology*. 2002;97:1274–80.
- [95] Capdevilla X, Bringuier S, Borgeat A. Infectious risk of continuous peripheral nerve blocks. *Anesthesiology*. 2009;110:182–8.
- [96] Wiegel M, Gottschaldt U, Hennebach R, Hirshberg T, Reske A. Complications and adverse effects associated with continuous peripheral nerve blocks in orthopedic patients. *Anesth and Analg*. 2007;104(6):1578–82.
- [97] Mariano ER, Loland VJ, Bellars RH, Sandhu NS, Bishop ML, Abrams RA, et al. Ultrasound guidance versus electrical stimulation for infraclavicular brachial plexus perineural catheter insertion. *J Ultrasound Med*. 2009;28:1211–8.
- [98] Walker KJ, McGrattan K, Aas-Eng K, Smith AF. Ultrasound guidance for peripheral nerve blockade. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2009, Issue 4. Art. No.: CD006459. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD006459.pub2.



- [99] Bhoi S, Sinha TP, Rodha M, Bhasin A, Ramchandani R, Galwankar S. Feasibility and safety of ultrasound-guided nerve block for management of limb injuries by emergency care physicians. *J Emerg, Trauma Shock*. 2012;5(1):28–32.
- [100] Anatomist 90. Femoral Triangle. In: File:Slide6888.JPG, editor. Wikipedia: Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike License; 2015. p. Femoral Triangle.
- [101] Otterness K, Vermeulen M. Practical tips: when and how to use a femoral nerve block. *EM Resident Magazine* [Internet] [cited 12/18/2015]; 2014.
- [102] Dewitz A, Jones RA, Goldsetin JG, Stone MB. Additional Ultrasound Guided Procedures. In: Ma O, Mateer JR, Reardon RF, Joing SA, editors. *Ma and Mateer's Emergency Ultrasound 3e*. New York: McGraw-Hill; 2014.
- [103] Bunting LV, Calvello EJB. Femoral Nerve Block, 3-in-1 Block Variation. *Ultrasound Guide for Emergency Physicians* [Internet] [cited 12/18/2008]; 2015.
- [104] Wikipedia Contributors. Brachial Plexus. In: Plexus B, editor. 694154506 ed: Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia; 2015. p. Brachial Plexus.
- [105] Bunting LV. Interscalene Plexus Block [cited 12/21/2015]; 2008. Available from: [http://www.sonoguide.com/interscalene\\_plexus\\_block.html](http://www.sonoguide.com/interscalene_plexus_block.html).
- [106] Borgeat A, Blumenthal S. Intersclane Plexus Block. *Textbook of Regional Anesthesia*. 2007. New York. McGraw-Hill. p. 413-5.
- [107] Ultrasound-Guided Supraclavicular Brachial Plexus Block 2013 [updated 09/19/2013; cited 01/22/2016]. Available from: <http://www.nysora.com/techniques/3015-ultrasound-guided-supraclavicular-brachial-plexus-block.html>.
- [108] Leech S, Samcam I. Supraclavicular view of the brachial plexus. In: Plexus SVOTB, editor. *Sonosite 2016*. p. Supraclavicular View of the Brachial Plexus.