Review Article

Analgesia in esophagectomy: a narrative review

Minke L. Feenstra[1,2,3,4]^, Mark I. van Berge Henegouwen[1,3,4], Markus W. Hollmann[2], Jeroen Hermanides[2#], Wietse J. Eshuis[1,3,4#]

[1]Department of Surgery, Amsterdam UMC location AMC, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands; [2]Department of Anesthesiology, Amsterdam UMC location AMC, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands; [3]Cancer Center Amsterdam, Cancer Treatment and Quality of Life, Amsterdam, The Netherlands; [4]Amsterdam Gastroenterology Endocrinology Metabolism, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Contributions: (I) Conception and design: ML Feenstra, WJ Feenstra, J Hermanides; (II) Administrative support: None; (III) Provision of study materials or patients: None; (IV) Collection and assembly of data: ML Feenstra; (V) Data analysis and interpretation: None; (VI) Manuscript writing: All authors; (VII) Final approval of manuscript: All authors.

[#]These authors contributed equally to this work.

Correspondence to: Dr. Wietse J. Eshuis, MD, PhD. Department of Surgery, Amsterdam UMC location AMC, University of Amsterdam, ZH7F De Boelelaan 1117, 1081 HV Amsterdam, The Netherlands; Cancer Center Amsterdam, Cancer Treatment and Quality of Life, Amsterdam, The Netherlands; Amsterdam Gastroenterology Endocrinology Metabolism, Amsterdam, The Netherlands. Email: w.j.eshuis@amsterdamumc.nl.

Background and Objective: Optimal pain management for esophagectomy facilitates prevention of postoperative complications such as pneumonia, but also chronic pain. Historically, multimodal intravenous analgesia was employed. In the last decades, regional anesthesia including epidural and paravertebral analgesia is frequently used. In this narrative review, we provide a comprehensive overview of the available evidence for the different analgesia regimens for esophagectomy.

Methods: A search was conducted in the PubMed/MEDLINE database in November 2022. Only reports in English or Dutch were included. Editorials or articles lacking full text were excluded. A review of different analgesia regimens after esophagectomy is provided.

Key Content and Findings: Epidural analgesia (EA) was suggested to reduce postoperative pneumonia and prevent chronic postsurgical pain (CPSP) as compared to opioid-based systemic analgesia and was considered the gold standard of pain management for esophagectomy. In the last decades, the side-effects of EA became more evident. Next to mild or moderate side-effects such as hypotension and urinary retention, several reports emphasized the incidence of serious neurologic complications to be much higher than estimated before. In addition, minimally invasive surgery fostered that other regional analgesia (RA) techniques are potential alternatives for EA. Paravertebral catheter placement can be performed under videoscope view during the thoracic phase of esophagectomy, making it a safe and easily placed block. Evidence on the effectiveness of erector spinae plane block (ESPB) is limited in this context.

Conclusions: Several analgesia regimens after esophagectomy are described. EA is most common, however paravertebral analgesia is a good alternative. Other techniques are also gaining ground but randomized clinical trials are lacking. Future studies should focus on the efficacy of paravertebral and erector spinae blocks for postoperative pain management for esophagectomy.

Keywords: Esophagectomy; analgesia; epidural; paravertebral

Submitted Feb 21, 2023. Accepted for publication Aug 17, 2023. Published online Sep 01, 2023.

doi: 10.21037/jtd-23-241

View this article at: https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/jtd-23-241

^ ORCID: 0000-0002-1947-9475.

Introduction

Esophageal cancer is the seventh most common and sixth most lethal cancer (1). Esophagectomy with lymphadenectomy is the cornerstone of curative treatment in combination with neoadjuvant chemo(radio)therapy. Most esophagectomies are performed transthoracically. Thoracic surgery is, in general, considered a painful procedure due to muscular and intercostal nerve damage and is accompanied by a high risk of acute and chronic postsurgical pain (CPSP), increasing the risk of postoperative pulmonary complications (2,3). In the last decades of the twentieth century, esophagectomy for esophageal cancer was predominantly performed by a transhiatal approach (4,5). This approach requires an abdominal and a cervical incision. However, to increase lymph node yield and improve oncological outcomes, a transthoracic approach has become the procedure of choice (6,7). Minimally invasive surgery has gained ground for esophagectomy (8). *Table 1* represents an overview of the different surgical approaches for esophagectomy. Minimally invasive esophagectomy is associated with less tissue damage and is therefore accompanied with less pain and pulmonary complications postoperatively (9,10). However, effective pain relief remains important for reduction of postoperative complications and patient comfort (9,11).

For open transthoracic esophagectomy, epidural analgesia (EA) was suggested to be the preferred analgesia technique over systemic opioid based analgesia. Although evidence was weak, EA became the gold standard of perioperative pain management for open transthoracic esophagectomy (2,12). More recently, less invasive regional analgesia (RA) techniques are being applied and studied, including paravertebral, erector spinae plane, intercostal and serratus anterior block (13-16). In this narrative review, we provide a comprehensive overview of the available evidence for the different analgesia regimens for esophagectomy. We present this article in accordance with the Narrative Review reporting checklist (available at https://jtd.amegroups.com/article/view/10.21037/jtd-23-241/rc).

Methods

A search was conducted in the PubMed/MEDLINE database in November 2022. The following keywords were used: esophagectomy, epidural, paravertebral, intercostal, serratus anterior, cryoanalgesia and analgesia. The search yielded 225 references. Only studies in English or Dutch were included. Editorials or articles lacking full text were excluded. *Table 2* illustrates the search strategy summary.

Multimodal systemic analgesia

Multimodal pain management entails multiple drugs working on different pain pathways to foster pain reduction. The basis for multimodal pain management is paracetamol (acetaminophen) (17). Paracetamol is commonly combined with a Non Steroid Anti Inflammatory Drug (NSAID) or metamizole. Employing NSAIDs for esophagectomy is a topic of ongoing discussion. Fjederholt and colleagues reported an association for NSAIDs and anastomotic leakage after esophagectomy in a cohort of 557 patients (18). However, increased anastomotic leakage was not found in larger clinical studies by Hirano *et al.* and Corsini *et al.* (19,20). Metamizole is often categorized as an NSAID. However, its mechanism of action and more important its side effect profile differs from traditional NSAIDs, not allowing for classification as a traditional NSAID (21-23). Though no data on the effectiveness of metamizole after esophagectomy are available, more general evidence suggests a superior safety profile as compared to traditional NSAIDs with regard to gastro-intestinal or renal side-effects making it a good option for esophagectomy (24). Lastly, opioids are often used as part of a multimodal analgesia regime. Fares *et al.* described mean Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) scores at rest below 30 in patients with systemic opioids during the first three postoperative days after Ivor Lewis esophagectomy (25). The mean VAS score at rest in the study by Flisberg *et al.* for patients after thoracoabdominal esophagectomy (exact approach not described) with PCA morphine was also low: below 20 (12).

However, opioids can lead to opioid-induced hyperalgesia (OIH), chronic pain and opioid dependence and should therefore be limited where possible (26). Co-analgesics such as clonidine, ketamine, lidocaine and magnesium sulfate can also be used in the context of multimodal pain management (27-29).

Though RA techniques are now preferred for esophagectomy, systemic multimodal analgesia leads to adequate pain relief in the majority of patients and serves as a valuable alternative when RA is not preferred by the patient, contraindications are present or when minimally invasive surgery is used (2).

EA

Thoracic epidural catheters are usually placed percutaneously

Table 1 Overview of surgical approaches for esophagectomy and their incisions

Surgical approach	Incisions
Transhiatal esophagectomy	Open: midline laparotomy and cervical incision
	Minimally invasive: upper abdominal laparoscopy, cervical incision
Transthoracic esophagectomy	
McKeown	Open: midline laparotomy, right thoracotomy, cervical incision
	Minimally invasive: upper abdominal laparoscopy, right thoracoscopy, cervical incision
Ivor Lewis	Open: midline laparotomy, right thoracotomy
	Minimally invasive: upper abdominal laparoscopy, right thoracoscopy, generally with minithoracotomy
Left thoracoabdominal esophagectomy	Left lateral thoracoabdominal incision (open)

Table 2 The search strategy summary

Items	Specification
Date of search	29th November 2022
Databases	PubMed/MEDLINE
Search terms used	("Esophagectomy"[Mesh] OR esophagectomy[tiab] OR oesophagectomy[tiab]) AND ("Analgesia, Epidural"[Mesh] OR epidural[tiab] OR paravertebral[tiab] OR erector spinae block[tiab] OR intercostal block[tiab] OR serratus anterior block[tiab] OR cryoanalgesia[tiab] OR "Anesthesia, Conduction"[Mesh] OR "Analgesia"[Mesh] OR analgesia[tiab])
Timeframe	–
Inclusion and exclusion criteria	Only studies in English or Dutch were included. Studies only containing abstracts and editorials were excluded
Selection process	Feenstra ML selected the studies. Studies found in references were also included. All authors reviewed the final list of studies included in the review

at an intervertebral level between T5-T8 with the loss of resistance technique, which is described extensively elsewhere (30,31). Landmarks such as the nipple line (T4) and the inferior border of the scapula (T7) can be used to determine the correct intervertebral level (32). When the epidural space is identified, a catheter is placed 3–5 cm in the epidural space. In terms of drug choice, several forms of EA are possible (33,34). Most commonly, a local anesthetic (LA) such as bupivacaine or ropivacaine is used in combination with an opioid, either epidurally or intravenously administered. The PROSPECT guideline recommends both a LA and an opioid epidurally with continuous infusion for thoracotomy (35).

The advantage of EA is an extended nerve block, providing good bilateral analgesia over multiple dermatomes, covering the thorax and abdomen. A meta-analysis by Visser *et al.* reported, in (mostly open) esophagectomy, mean difference in Numeric Rating Scale (NRS) score 0.89 with 95% confidence interval (CI): −0.47 to 2.24 for EA compared to systemic analgesia and no additional beneficial effect on postoperative complications (2). This difference in NRS is not considered clinically important (36). The incidence of major complications after EA ranges from 1:6,000 to 1:1,000 epidural procedures. Associated complications of epidural placement are epidural hematoma (22.9 per 100,000 thoracic catheterizations), epidural abscess (9.7 per 100,000 thoracic catheterizations), accidental high block and dural puncture (37-39). Potential side effects include hypotension and urinary retention (40,41). Urinary retention may result in prolonged use of urinary catheters and impaired mobility, which counteracts the aims of enhanced recovery after surgery (ERAS) protocols (42). It can be caused by epidural LAs, as well as epidural opioids (43). Hu *et al.* showed that early removal of urinary catheters in thoracic EA for thoracotomy leads to higher re-catheterization rates (26.7%) (44).

EA is not always successful, due to incorrect primary catheter placement, secondary migration of the catheter after correct placement or suboptimal dosing of LA, leading to failure rates of 14% to 47% for thoracic epidurals (34). In some patients epidural catheter placement is contraindicated, such as patients with a coagulant disorder or those using anticoagulants. According to the European Society of Anaesthesiology and Intensive Care (ESAIC) guideline, in high doses of direct oral anticoagulants (DOACs), the last intake should be at least 72 hours before epidural placement. Last vitamin K antagonist (VKA) intake three days (Acenocoumarol), five days (Warfarin, Fluindione) and seven days (Phenprocoumon) before surgery is proposed. Clopidogrel (a P2Y12 inhibitor) should be stopped five to seven days before epidural placement and low dose of low molecular weight Heparine (LMWH) and high dose LMWH 12 and 24 hours, respectively (45). These restrictions in anticoagulant use and placing or removing an epidural catheter provide challenges as the patients need to stop their anticoagulant in the home setting prior to surgery. Also, ceasing the anticoagulant carries its own risk, depending on the reason for anticoagulation. Additionally, surgery leads to a hypercoagulatory state with an increased risk of thromboembolic events, making the interruption of anticoagulant use unwanted. In patients with previous spinal surgery or spinal anomalies placement of an epidural catheter may be relatively contraindicated or technically challenging (46).

Thus, even though EA provides effective pain relief when the catheter is at the right place, certainly for minimally invasive approaches the benefits do not outweigh the risks. Alternative strategies should be taken into consideration.

Paravertebral block (PVB)

The paravertebral space is located on either side of the spinal canal and includes the area between the parietal pleura on the ventral side and the superior costotransverse ligament on the dorsal side. The paravertebral space contains spinal nerves (ramus dorsalis and the intercostal nerves), adipose tissue, intercostal vessels and the sympathetic border cord.

The paravertebral space communicates with the intercostal space on the lateral side, and with the epidural space on the medial side, through the intervertebral foramen. The caudal border of the paravertebral space is the origin of the major psoas muscle (47).

For paravertebral catheter placement, the same needle as for epidural catheter placement can be used, for example an 18–19 gauche Tuohy needle. Bupivacaine is the LA of choice in most studies on PVB (48-50). The spread of the LA appears to be volume-dependent, therefore a higher bolus volume of approximately 20 cc is preferred (51,52). In case of inadequate analgesia, a higher LA concentration is recommended, taking into account that a maximal dose of 2 mg/kg bupivacaine or 3 mg/kg ropivacaine is not exceeded (53). Continuous PVB is usually maintained for two to three days postoperatively. Existing literature on adjuvant drugs administered paravertebrally, such as opioids or clonidine, is limited. However, both seem to further reduce postoperative pain scores (54-58). Finally, Karmakar and colleagues showed that epinephrine slows down the uptake of LA, decreasing systemic toxicity of LA (59).

Video assisted technique

There are various techniques for placement of the paravertebral catheter. However, in minimally invasive esophagectomy, placement of the catheter by the surgeon under direct videoscopic view is an appealing option due to its time efficiency and more importantly: safety. The needle is placed percutaneously one or two intercostal spaces higher, or in line with and ipsilateral to the mini-thoracotomy, about four centimeters from the midline. To visualize the placement of the paravertebral catheter and to avoid pleural puncture, the pleura stays in view from inside the thorax (*Figure 1*). The tip of the needle is brought close to the sympathetic chain. An initial bolus of LA is administered in the right subpleural space to create a LA pocket, spreading over two to three dermatomes, achieving total coverage of the mini-thoracotomy. Afterwards, the catheter is advanced through the needle. Additional patient controlled systemic analgesia with an opioid can be applied.

A Cochrane review by Yeung and colleagues (including mostly studies with the video assisted technique) showed that PVB leads to similar postoperative pain scores (measured with the NRS) as EA in thoracotomy (both minimally invasive and open surgery) at 24 and 48 hours after surgery (standardized mean difference of 0.16 and 0.12 respectively) (41). According to this review, the risk of hypotension [risk ratio (RR): 0.16], urinary retention (RR: 0.22), itching (RR: 0.29), nausea and vomiting (RR: 0.48) is lower for PVB compared to EA.



Figure 1 Thoracoscopic view of pleura.

In minimally invasive esophagectomy, a retrospective study comparing PVB (87 patients) using the video assisted technique versus patient controlled intravenous analgesia (146 patients) revealed that PVB resulted in lower VAS pain scores (60). A retrospective cohort study from our center (n=50) compared video assisted PVB with EA in minimally invasive esophagectomy and showed that pain scores on the first day after surgery (NRS of 3 *vs.* 1, P=0.05), were adequate for both PVB and EA, although lower when EA was employed (61). The ongoing PEPMEN trial is the first multi-center randomized clinical trial comparing EA with PVB after minimally invasive esophagectomy (48). Results are expected in 2023.

Landmark based technique

Aside from placement under thoracoscopic view, the paravertebral catheter can also be placed 'blindly' or with ultrasound guidance. To place the paravertebral catheter blindly, the 'landmark based approached' can be performed (62). Most, but not all studies, reported that PVB employing the landmark-based technique results in lower postoperative morphine consumption as compared to EA (63-65).

Lönnqvist and colleagues evaluated both thoracic and lumbar PVBs (placed based on a landmark technique without ultrasound) for all types of surgery in a prospective study and reported a failure rate of 11% (66,67).

Ultrasound guided technique

With ultrasound-guiding, the para-sagittal and the transversal approach are most common and described extensively elsewhere (68,69). Depending on the transducer position, either the lateral rib, the tip of the transverse process or the inferior articular process needs to be identified. Cadaver studies showed that, even when the tip of the needle is correctly placed in the paravertebral space using an ultrasound guided technique, the catheter for continuous analgesia is often misplaced, being distant from the tip of the needle (70,71).

Literature on PVB and the use of anticoagulants is limited. The American Society of Regional Anesthesia and Pain Medicine (ASRA) guidelines state that a paravertebral bleeding in anticoagulated patients may lead to significant blood loss albeit without neurological complications. Because of the risk of blood loss, the same guidelines regarding cessation of anticoagulants as for EA are recommended. The evidence for these guidelines is low quality, based on case reports/series (72). Furthermore, using the video-assisted technique should be safer because of the visual placement, however, safety data for this technique are even more scarce. Zhang *et al.* placed the paravertebral catheter with the video-assisted technique and showed that in one out of 87 patients a puncture bleeding occurred, with still a successful placement of the paravertebral catheter afterwards and no excessive bleeding (60).

Erector spinae plane block (ESPB)

ESPB has become increasingly popular for analgesia after thoracic surgery. For ESPB, LA is administered between two fascia sheets below the erector spinae muscle after ultrasound guided needle insertion. The needle is placed in plane in caudal direction through the erector spinae muscle (and the more superficial muscles; the trapezius muscle and the major rhomboid muscle) towards the transverse process (73). Literature mostly describes use of 20 to 30 mL of 0.25% bupivacaine or 0.5% ropivacaine (74-76). Continuous analgesia is possible with a catheter, similarly to PVB. Data are of low-quality evidence, mostly reported in case series. No studies on additives to LA for ESPB have been found.

An advantage of ESPB is the distance from the neuraxium and the pleura with a low risk for epidural hematoma or abscess. A meta-analysis on ESPB in breast surgery showed that it resulted in similar pain scores compared to PVB (77). The incidence of pneumothorax was 2.6% in the PVB group and there were no complications after ESPB (77). Recently, two trials compared paravertebral with ESPB and intercostal nerve blocks (INBs) in thoracoscopic lung surgery (78,79). Turhan and colleagues reported lower pain scores for PVB (n=35) versus ESPB (n=35) in patients undergoing video assisted thoracoscopic lung surgery (median VAS 1 *vs.* 3 at 12 hours and 1 *vs.* 2 at 24 hours, respectively) (79). PVB (n=24) led to less morphine consumption than ESPB (n=24) (median difference −7.5; 95% CI: −12 to −4.5; P=0.000) (78). So far, there are no studies on the effectiveness of ESPB in esophagectomy.

Serratus anterior block (SAB)

For SABs, the interfascial plane between the serratus anterior muscle and the external intercostal muscle is visualized employing ultrasound guidance. The probe is placed on the rib cage in the mid-axillary line identifying the fifth rib. The needle is inserted in plane with the probe directed towards the interfascial space (80). Alternatively, the needle can be placed through the serratus anterior muscle (deep block). Ropivacaine 0.5% and levobupivacaine 0.25% are mostly described in literature (16,81-85).

Literature on SAB in esophagectomy is very limited. One study was found, describing SAB in open transthoracic esophagectomy. This pilot study included 37 patients. SAB was placed in seven patients intraoperatively upon closing the chest wound. A bolus of 30 cc levobupivacaine 0.25% was administered between the serratus muscle and the rib cage followed by a continuous infusion of levobupivacaine 0.125% 7 cc/h. Based on this study, SAB in these seven patients led to maximum dynamic VAS pain scores on the first postoperative day of 50 mm and a VAS of 0 mm on postoperative day four. No complications in SAB were reported (16). A retrospective study evaluated SAB in 35 cardiac surgery patients. Those patients received unfractionated heparin 300 UI/kg intraoperatively and vitamin K anticoagulants postoperatively, to achieve an International Normalized Ratio (INR) of 2–2.5. No major adverse effects were reported in this study (86).

INB

Similar to PVB, the INB can be placed under direct videoscopic view or with ultrasound guidance. Lateral to the paravertebral space, the proximal intercostal space emerges. Placing the INB under videoscopic view is therefore similar to the placement of the PVB. For INB, the tip of the needle should be placed a few centimeters more laterally to the sympathic chain. Using ultrasound with the probe in plane, the inferior margin of the rib is localized (78). For each intercostal space to be blocked, a 1.5 to 5 mL bolus of ropivacaine 0.3–0.5% or bupivacaine 0.25–0.5% is recommended in literature; commonly one to five intercostal segments are blocked (15,79,87-90).

A systematic review and meta-analysis evaluated INB for thoracic surgery, including mostly studies in patients undergoing thoracotomy. INB led to lower pain scores (in NRS) during the first 24 postoperative hours when compared to systemic analgesia. INB leads to similar pain scores as EA (mean difference of 0.41 at rest, 0.79 during movement at 24 hours after surgery), but at the cost of a higher opioid consumption [mean difference 3.77 Morphine Milligram Equivalents (MMEs) at 24 h and 48.31 MMEs at 48 h postoperatively]. When comparing INB with PVB, INB resulted in higher pain scores (difference of 1.29 points at 7–24 hours postoperatively) and higher opioid consumption only after 48 hours postoperatively (mean difference 3.87 MMEs) (91). A randomized study including 106 patients compared INB, PVB and ESPB for thoracoscopic surgery. All blocks were placed with ultrasound guidance. Thirty-six patients were allocated to the INB group and the median pain VAS for the first 48 hours after surgery was 4. Pain scores at 12 hours postoperatively were higher compared to PVB (median VAS 2 *vs.* 1), but lower than for ESPB (median VAS 3). Though statistically significantly different, all pain scores were still moderate in this study (79). In a randomized trial of 81 patients, Zhu *et al.* used INB following esophagectomy as a rescue analgesic for patients with a VAS ≥5 and compared this to patient-controlled intravenous analgesia (PCIA) with sufentanil. INB was placed two intercostal spaces above and below the incision. The VAS pain scores were significantly lower in the INB group for the first four hours after nerve block placement (15).

A clear disadvantage of the INB is its temporary effect, as catheter placement is usually not feasible due to the multiple costal levels. As such, INB is an inferior alternative for EA, ESPB, SAB or PVB, but may be employed when other techniques are contra-indicated.

Cryoanalgesia

Cryoanalgesia involves cooling of nerves to inhibit peripheral nerve function, with subsequent pain relief. It is usually performed by intraoperatively exposing the intercostal nerves and freezing these nerves with a cryoprobe using nitrous oxide or carbon oxide of −20 to −70 ℃.

A randomized trial by Momenzadeh *et al.* evaluated cryoanalgesia −70 ℃ in 60 patients undergoing thoracotomy with systemic analgesia postoperatively compared with a control group receiving systemic analgesia only. On the second postoperative day, the frequencies of severe pain score were 0% in the cryoanalgesia and 33% in the control group. This study also evaluated hypoesthesia over time and found the incidence of hypoesthesia to be 90% after seven days, 76.7% at one month and 16.6% at two months (92). Gwak *et al.* randomized 50 thoracotomy patients to either receive cryoanalgesia in combination with intravenous analgesia or intravenous analgesia alone. No differences were found in pain scores in the first postoperative week (93). Randomly allocation of 200 patients to cryoanalgesia or parenteral opioids revealed a difference in pain scores for the first seven days postoperatively with superior pain scores and less opioid use for cryoanalgesia (94). A randomized study including 160 esophagectomy patients with posterolateral thoracotomy demonstrated that cryoanalgesia, freezing the fourth up to eighth intercostal nerve with −60 ℃, led to similar pain scores, for both acute pain during the first postoperative week and chronic pain at one year postoperatively compared to non-divided intercostal muscle flap (95). Cryoanalgesia in combination with EA increased postoperative pain in comparison to EA only in the first postoperative weeks. Six months after surgery when pain scores were similar in a randomized clinical trial including 42 thoracotomy patients (96). However, Yang *et al.* performed a similar trial with 80 patients and found no differences in acute postoperative pain scores, although a week postoperatively, pain scores in patients with cryoanalgesia were superior. The latter study employed cryoanalgesia with nitrous oxide of −20 ℃ (97). A randomized trial of 114 patients undergoing pulmonary surgery or esophagectomy (n=54) compared EA with intercostal nerve cryoanalgesia. No significant difference for pain at rest or on motion between the two groups were reported for the first three postoperative days. Patient satisfaction was also similar between the groups (98).

Though evidence on cryoanalgesia in esophagectomy is still limited, studies in thoracotomy patients are conflicting. Studies found on cryoanalgesia are from 2001 to 2013. Most studies on cryoanalgesia use different probe settings with regard to temperature and duration, which may cause these conflicting results. With the right probe settings, further improvement may be possible. Trials assessing cryoanalgesia compared to RA techniques in esophagectomy alone are necessary to determine the role of cryoanalgesia in the pain management for esophagectomy.

Summary

Though evidence is lacking for various regional anesthesia techniques in esophagectomy, there is quite some evidence in thoracotomy patients. EA is most commonly used and preferred according to the ERAS guidelines (99). However, other regional techniques are gaining ground and PVB and ESPB are now recommended in the PROSPECT guidelines for thoracotomy (35). EA generally provides effective analgesia, but may come with serious adverse events. RA techniques are considered safer, but their effectiveness in esophagectomy is less conclusive. Of the RA techniques, most available evidence is on paravertebral analgesia. This seems to be non-inferior to EA regarding pain scores and has less side-effects. An overview of the benefits and disadvantages can be found in *Table 3*. *Table 4* shows an overview of studies focusing specifically on analgesia after esophagectomy.

When choosing an analgesia regimen, the patients' characteristics should be considered. For example, if a patient has chronic pain or is opioid dependent, systemic analgesia should be avoided. Also, the use of anticoagulants affects the choice of analgesia regimen. Aside from patients' characteristics, shared decision making is the cornerstone in choosing the analgesia regimen. If a patient is risk averse, then EA would be less appropriate.

Conclusions

This review describes different analgesia regimens that can be applied for patients undergoing esophagectomy. EA is most commonly used. PVB is a good alternative but also ESPBs are gaining ground. These safe RA alternatives are preferred over EA in current PROSPECT guidelines for

Table 3 Overview of benefits and disadvantages in systemic, epidural and paravertebral analgesia

Analgesia	Benefits	Disadvantages
Epidural analgesia	Extended nerve block covering both thorax and abdomen	Adverse events: epidural hematoma, epidural abscess, accidental high block, dural puncture Adverse effects: hypotension and urinary retention (Relatively) contraindicated in patients with: - Anticoagulant use - Spine anomalies
Paravertebral analgesia	Low risk of side-effects Video-assisted technique: Safe, lack of evidence on complications in patients with anticoagulant use, no pain during placement block	Less extensive nerve block than epidural analgesia
Systemic analgesia	Alternative for patients with contraindications for EA or RA techniques.	- High amount of opioid use - Potentially less effective than EA or other RA techniques

EA, epidural analgesia; RA, regional analgesia.

Table 4 Esophagectomy specific studies

Analgesia	Study	Surgical approach	Acute postoperative pain results
Systemic analgesia	Fares *et al.* 2014 (25)	Ivor Lewis (MIE or open not specified)	Mean VAS at rest below 30
	Flisberg *et al.* 2001 (12)	Thoracoabdominal esophagectomy (approach unspecified)	Mean VAS at rest below 20
Epidural analgesia	Visser *et al.* 2017 (2) (meta-analysis)	Various	Mean VAS at rest below 20
Paravertebral analgesia	Zhang *et al.* 2020 (60) (continuous PVB)	None specified	Mean VAS at rest below 30
	Feenstra *et al.* 2021 (61) (continuous PVB)	Minimally invasive Ivor Lewis	Median NRS at rest below 4
Erector spinae block	None found		
Serratus anterior	Barbera *et al.* 2017 (16)	Open transthoracic esophagectomy	Mean VAS at rest below 40
Intercostal nerve block	Zhu *et al.* 2018 (15)	Ivor Lewis (MIE or open not specified)	INB was placed as a rescue analgesic, with good effect
Cryoanalgesia	Lu *et al.* 2013 (95)	Posterolateral thoracotomy (detailed approach not described)	Mean VAS below 60

MIE, minimally invasive esophagectomy; VAS, Visual Analogue Scale; PVB, paravertebral block; NRS, Numeric Rating Scale; INB, intercostal nerve block.

thoracotomy. Future studies should focus on the efficacy of PVB and ESPB for postoperative pain management for esophagectomy.

Acknowledgments

Funding: None.

Footnote

Reporting Checklist: The authors have completed the Narrative Review reporting checklist. Available at https://jtd.amegroups.com/article/view/10.21037/jtd-23-241/rc

Peer Review File: Available at https://jtd.amegroups.com/

article/view/10.21037/jtd-23-241/prf

Conflicts of Interest: All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form (available at https://jtd.amegroups.com/article/view/10.21037/jtd-23-241/coif). MLF, JH and WJE report funding from ZonMW for the PEPMEN trial. MIvBH is consultant for Viatris, Johnson & Johnson, Alesi Surgical, Bbraun and Medtronic, and received unrestricted research grants from Stryker. He also received a research grant from ZonMWfor the PEPMEN trial. All fees paid to institution. MWH has no conflicts of interest to declare.

Ethical Statement: The authors are accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

References

1. Sung H, Ferlay J, Siegel RL, et al. Global Cancer Statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN Estimates of Incidence and Mortality Worldwide for 36 Cancers in 185 Countries. CA Cancer J Clin 2021;71:209-49.
2. Visser E, Marsman M, van Rossum PSN, et al. Postoperative pain management after esophagectomy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Dis Esophagus 2017;30:1-11.
3. van Boekel RLM, Warlé MC, Nielen RGC, et al. Relationship Between Postoperative Pain and Overall 30-Day Complications in a Broad Surgical Population: An Observational Study. Ann Surg 2019;269:856-65.
4. Orringer MB, Forastiere AA, Perez-Tamayo C, et al. Chemotherapy and radiation therapy before transhiatal esophagectomy for esophageal carcinoma. Ann Thorac Surg 1990;49:348-54; discussion 354-5.
5. Orringer MB, Marshall B, Stirling MC. Transhiatal esophagectomy for benign and malignant disease. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg 1993;105:265-76; discussion 276-7.
6. Kalff MC, van Berge Henegouwen MI, Baas PC, et al. Trends in Distal Esophageal and Gastroesophageal Junction Cancer Care: The Dutch Nationwide Ivory Study. Ann Surg 2023;277:619-28.
7. Slaman AE, Pirozzolo G, Eshuis WJ, et al. Improved Clinical and Survival Outcomes After Esophagectomy for Cancer Over 25 Years. Ann Thorac Surg 2022;114:1118-26.
8. Mann C, Berlth F, Hadzijusufovic E, et al. Minimally invasive esophagectomy: clinical evidence and surgical techniques. Langenbecks Arch Surg 2020;405:1061-7.
9. van der Sluis PC, van der Horst S, May AM, et al. Robot-assisted Minimally Invasive Thoracolaparoscopic Esophagectomy Versus Open Transthoracic Esophagectomy for Resectable Esophageal Cancer: A Randomized Controlled Trial. Ann Surg 2019;269:621-30.
10. Biere SS, van Berge Henegouwen MI, Maas KW, et al. Minimally invasive versus open oesophagectomy for patients with oesophageal cancer: a multicentre, open-label, randomised controlled trial. Lancet 2012;379:1887-92.
11. Olsén MF, Grell M, Linde L, et al. Procedure-related chronic pain after thoracoabdominal resection of the esophagus. Physiother Theory Pract 2009;25:489-94.
12. Flisberg P, Törnebrandt K, Walther B, et al. Pain relief after esophagectomy: Thoracic epidural analgesia is better than parenteral opioids. J Cardiothorac Vasc Anesth 2001;15:282-7.
13. van den Berg JW, Tabrett K, Cheong E. Paravertebral catheter analgesia for minimally invasive Ivor Lewis oesophagectomy. J Thorac Dis 2019;11:S786-93.
14. Elsabeeny WY, Ibrahim MA, Shehab NN, et al. Serratus Anterior Plane Block and Erector Spinae Plane Block Versus Thoracic Epidural Analgesia for Perioperative Thoracotomy Pain Control: A Randomized Controlled Study. J Cardiothorac Vasc Anesth 2021;35:2928-36.
15. Zhu M, Gu Y, Sun X, et al. Ultrasound-Guided Intercostal Nerve Block Following Esophagectomy for Acute Postoperative Pain Relief in the Postanesthesia Care Unit. Pain Pract 2018;18:879-83.
16. Barbera C, Milito P, Punturieri M, et al. Serratus anterior plane block for hybrid transthoracic esophagectomy: a pilot study. J Pain Res 2017;10:73-7.
17. Tubog TD. Overview of multimodal analgesia initiated in the perioperative setting. J Perioper Pract 2021;31:191-8.
18. Fjederholt KT, Okholm C, Svendsen LB, et al. Ketorolac and Other NSAIDs Increase the Risk of Anastomotic Leakage After Surgery for GEJ Cancers: a Cohort Study of 557 Patients. J Gastrointest Surg 2018;22:587-94.

19. Hirano Y, Konishi T, Kaneko H, et al. Early postoperative non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and anastomotic leakage after oesophagectomy. Br J Surg 2023;110:260-6.
20. Corsini EM, Hofstetter WL; MD Anderson Esophageal Cancer Working Group. Ketorolac use and anastomotic leak in patients with esophageal cancer. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg 2021;161:448-54.
21. Pierre SC, Schmidt R, Brenneis C, et al. Inhibition of cyclooxygenases by dipyrone. Br J Pharmacol 2007;151:494-503.
22. Hinz B, Cheremina O, Bachmakov J, et al. Dipyrone elicits substantial inhibition of peripheral cyclooxygenases in humans: new insights into the pharmacology of an old analgesic. FASEB J 2007;21:2343-51.
23. Koster HT, Avis HJ, Stevens MF, et al. Metamizole in postoperative pain management. Ned Tijdschr Geneeskd 2012;156:A4323.
24. Konijnenbelt-Peters J, van der Heijden C, Ekhart C, et al. Metamizole (Dipyrone) as an Alternative Agent in Postoperative Analgesia in Patients with Contraindications for Nonsteroidal Anti-Inflammatory Drugs. Pain Pract 2017;17:402-8.
25. Fares KM, Mohamed SA, Hamza HM, et al. Effect of thoracic epidural analgesia on pro-inflammatory cytokines in patients subjected to protective lung ventilation during Ivor Lewis esophagectomy. Pain Physician 2014;17:305-15.
26. Wylie JA, Kong L, Barth RJ Jr. Opioid Dependence and Overdose After Surgery: Rate, Risk Factors, and Reasons. Ann Surg 2022;276:e192-8.
27. Nguyen V, Tiemann D, Park E, et al. Alpha-2 Agonists. Anesthesiol Clin 2017;35:233-45.
28. Wang X, Lin C, Lan L, et al. Perioperative intravenous S-ketamine for acute postoperative pain in adults: A systematic review and meta-analysis. J Clin Anesth 2021;68:110071.
29. Shin HJ, Na HS, Do SH. Magnesium and Pain. Nutrients 2020;12:2184.
30. Todorov L, VadeBoncouer T. Etiology and Use of the “Hanging Drop” Technique: A Review. Pain Res Treat 2014;2014:1-10.
31. Tran DQ, González AP, Bernucci F, et al. Confirmation of loss-of-resistance for epidural analgesia. Reg Anesth Pain Med 2015;40:166-73.
32. Holladay J, Sage K. Epidural Catheter. StatPearls 2022. Available online: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK559115/
33. van Zuylen ML, Ten Hoope W, Bos E, et al. Safety of epidural drugs: a narrative review. Expert Opin Drug Saf 2019;18:591-601.
34. Hermanides J, Hollmann MW, Stevens MF, et al. Failed epidural: causes and management. Br J Anaesth 2012;109:144-54.
35. Feray S, Lubach J, Joshi GP, et al. PROSPECT guidelines for video-assisted thoracoscopic surgery: a systematic review and procedure-specific postoperative pain management recommendations. Anaesthesia 2022;77:311-25.
36. Myles PS, Myles DB, Galagher W, et al. Measuring acute postoperative pain using the visual analog scale: the minimal clinically important difference and patient acceptable symptom state. Br J Anaesth 2017;118:424-9.
37. Rosero EB, Joshi GP. Nationwide incidence of serious complications of epidural analgesia in the United States. Acta Anaesthesiol Scand 2016;60:810-20.
38. Bos EME, Hollmann MW, Lirk P. Safety and efficacy of epidural analgesia. urrO pin Anaesthesiol 2017;30:736-42.
39. Bos EME, Haumann J, de Quelerij M, et al. Haematoma and abscess after neuraxial anaesthesia: a review of 647 cases. Br J Anaesth 2018;120:693-704.
40. Holte K, Foss NB, Svensén C, et al. Epidural anesthesia, hypotension, and changes in intravascular volume. Anesthesiology 2004;100:281-6.
41. Yeung JH, Gates S, Naidu BV, et al. Paravertebral block versus thoracic epidural for patients undergoing thoracotomy. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2016;2:CD009121.
42. Liu S, Carpenter RL, Neal JM. Epidural anesthesia and analgesia. Their role in postoperative outcome. Anesthesiology 1995;82:1474-506.
43. Baldini G, Bagry H, Aprikian A, et al. Postoperative urinary retention: anesthetic and perioperative considerations. Anesthesiology 2009;110:1139-57.
44. Hu Y, Craig SJ, Rowlingson JC, et al. Early removal of urinary catheter after surgery requiring thoracic epidural: a prospective trial. J Cardiothorac Vasc Anesth 2014;28:1302-6.
45. Kietaibl S, Ferrandis R, Godier A, et al. Regional anaesthesia in patients on antithrombotic drugs: Joint ESAIC/ESRA guidelines. Eur J Anaesthesiol 2022;39:100-32.
46. Chekol WB, Melesse DY, Denu ZA, et al. Evidence-based thoracic epidural nerve block: A systematic review. Int J Surg Open 2020;24:151-5.
47. Cho TH, Kim SH, O J, et al. Anatomy of the thoracic paravertebral space: 3D micro-CT findings and their clinical implications for nerve blockade. Reg Anesth Pain Med 2021;46:699-703.

48. Kingma BF, Eshuis WJ, de Groot EM, et al. Paravertebral catheter versus Epidural analgesia in Minimally invasive Esophageal esection: a randomized controlled multicenter trial (PEPMEN trial). BMC Cancer 2020;20:142.
49. Alimian M, Imani F, Rahimzadeh P, et al. Adding Dexmedetomidine to Bupivacaine in Ultrasound-guided Thoracic Paravertebral Block for Pain Management after Upper Abdominal Surgery: A Double-blind Randomized Controlled Trial. Anesth Pain Med 2021;11:e120787.
50. Okoye NU, Majekodunmi AA, Ilori IU. Analgesic and opioid sparing effects of preoperative thoracic paravertebral block: A double blind evaluation of 0.5% bupivacaine with adrenaline in patients scheduled for simple mastectomy. Niger Postgrad Med J 2021;28:102-7.
51. Choi YJ, Kwon HJ, O J, et al. Influence of injectate volume on paravertebral spread in erector spinae plane block: An endoscopic and anatomical evaluation. PloS One 2019;14:e0224487.
52. Zhang WQ, Li JB, Huang Y, et al. The median effective volume of ultrasound-guided thoracic paravertebral nerve block with 0.3% ropivacaine in radical thoracoscopic surgery for lung cancer. Technol Health Care 2022;30:1343-50.
53. El-Boghdadly K, Pawa A, Chin KJ. Local anesthetic systemic toxicity: current perspectives. Local Reg Anesth 2018;11:35-44.
54. Priya S, Bamba C. Comparison of Morphine and Clonidine as Adjuvants in Paravertebral Block. Anesth Essays Res 2018;12:459-63.
55. Mayur N, Das A, Biswas H, et al. Effect of Clonidine as Adjuvant in Thoracic Paravertebral Block for Patients Undergoing Breast Cancer Surgery: A Prospective, Randomized, Placebo-controlled, Double-blind Study. Anesth Essays Res 2017;11:864-70.
56. Bhatnagar S, Mishra S, Madhurima S, et al. Clonidine as an analgesic adjuvant to continuous paravertebral bupivacaine for post-thoracotomy pain. Anaesth Intensive Care 2006;34:586-91.
57. Kamble TS, Deshpande CM. Evaluation of the Efficacy of Bupivacaine (0.5%) alone or with Clonidine (1μg/kg) Versus Control in a Single Level Paravertebral Blockin Patients Undergoing PCNL Procedure. J Clin Diagn Res 2016;10:UC13-UC17.
58. Naja ZM, Ziade FM, El-Rajab MA, et al. Guided paravertebral blocks with versus without clonidine for women undergoing breast surgery: a prospective double-blinded randomized study. Anesth Analg 2013;117:252-8.
59. Karmakar MK, Ho AM, Law BK, et al. Arterial and venous pharmacokinetics of ropivacaine with and without epinephrine after thoracic paravertebral block. Anesthesiology 2005;103:704-11.
60. Zhang S, Liu H, Cai H. Efficacy and Safety of Continuous Paravertebral Block after Minimally Invasive Radical Esophagectomy for Esophageal Cancer. Pain Res Manag 2020;2020:3105874.
61. Feenstra ML, Ten Hoope W, Hermanides J, et al. Optimal Perioperative Pain Management in Esophageal Surgery: An Evaluation of Paravertebral Analgesia. Ann Surg Oncol 2021;28:6321-8.
62. Saran JS, Hoefnagel AL, Skinner KA, et al. Comparison of single-injection ultrasound-guided approach versus multilevel landmark-based approach for thoracic paravertebral blockade for breast tumor resection: a retrospective analysis at a tertiary care teaching institution. J Pain Res 2017;10:1487-92.
63. Casati A, Alessandrini P, Nuzzi M, et al. A prospective, randomized, blinded comparison between continuous thoracic paravertebral and epidural infusion of 0.2% ropivacaine after lung resection surgery. Eur J Anaesthesiol 2006;23:999-1004.
64. Richardson J, Sabanathan S, Jones J, et al. A prospective, randomized comparison of preoperative and continuous balanced epidural or paravertebral bupivacaine on post-thoracotomy pain, pulmonary function and stress responses. Br J Anaesth 1999;83:387-92.
65. Messina M, Boroli F, Landoni G, et al. A comparison of epidural vs. paravertebral blockade in thoracic surgery. Minerva Anestesiol 2009;75:616-21.
66. Eason MJ, Wyatt R. Paravertebral thoracic block-a reappraisal. Anaesthesia 1979;34:638-42.
67. Lönnqvist PA, MacKenzie J, Soni AK, et al. Paravertebral blockade. Failure rate and complications. Anaesthesia 1995;50:813-5.
68. Fujii T, Shibata Y, Shinya S, et al. Transverse vs. parasagittal in-plane approaches in ultrasound-guided paravertebral block using a microconvex probe: A randomised controlled trial. Eur J Anaesthesiol 2020;37:752-7.
69. Krediet AC, Moayeri N, van Geffen GJ, et al. Different Approaches to Ultrasound-guided Thoracic Paravertebral Block: An Illustrated Review. Anesthesiology 2015;123:459-74.
70. Luyet C, Eichenberger U, Greif R, et al. Ultrasound-guided paravertebral puncture and placement of catheters in human cadavers: an imaging study. Br J Anaesth 2009;102:534-9.

71. Luyet C, Herrmann G, Ross S, et al. Ultrasound-guided thoracic paravertebral puncture and placement of catheters in human cadavers: where do catheters go? Br J Anaesth 2011;106:246-54.
72. Horlocker TT, Vandermeulen E, Kopp SL, Gogarten W, Leffert LR, Benzon HT. Regional Anesthesia in the Patient Receiving Antithrombotic or Thrombolytic Therapy: American Society of Regional Anesthesia and Pain Medicine Evidence-Based Guidelines (Fourth Edition). Reg Anesth Pain Med 2018;43:263-309.
73. Krishnan S, Cascella M. Erector Spinae Plane Block. StatPearls 2022. Available online: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK545305/
74. Sobhy MG, Abd El-Hamid AM, Elbarbary DH, et al. Ultrasound-guided erector spinae block for postoperative analgesia in thoracotomy patients: a prospective, randomized, observer-blind, controlled clinical trial. Ain-Shams J Anesthesiol 2020;12:33.
75. Forero M, Rajarathinam M, Adhikary S, et al. Erector spinae plane (ESP) block in the management of post thoracotomy pain syndrome: A case series. Scand J Pain 2017;17:325-9.
76. Toscano A, Capuano P, Costamagna A, et al. Is continuous Erector Spinae Plane Block (ESPB) better than continuous Serratus Anterior Plane Block (SAPB) for mitral valve surgery via mini-thoracotomy? Results from a prospective observational study. Ann Card Anaesth 2022;25:286-92.
77. Leong RW, Tan ESJ, Wong SN, et al. Efficacy of erector spinae plane block for analgesia in breast surgery: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Anaesthesia 2021;76:404-13.
78. Chen N, Qiao Q, Chen R, et al. The effect of ultrasound-guided intercostal nerve block, single-injection erector spinae plane block and multiple-injection paravertebral block on postoperative analgesia in thoracoscopic surgery: A randomized, double-blinded, clinical trial. J Clin Anesth 2020;59:106-11.
79. Turhan Ö, Sivrikoz N, Sungur Z, et al. Thoracic Paravertebral Block Achieves Better Pain Control Than Erector Spinae Plane Block and Intercostal Nerve Block in Thoracoscopic Surgery: A Randomized Study. J Cardiothorac Vasc Anesth 2021;35:2920-7.
80. Vig S, Bhan S, Ahuja D, et al. Serratus Anterior Plane Block for Post-Thoracotomy Analgesia: a Novel Technique for the Surgeon and Anaesthetist. Indian J Surg Oncol 2019;10:535-9.
81. Xie C, Ran G, Chen D, et al. A narrative review of ultrasound-guided serratus anterior plane block. Ann Palliat Med 2021;10:700-6.
82. Chen JQ, Yang XL, Gu H, et al. The Role of Serratus Anterior Plane Block During in Video-Assisted Thoracoscopic Surgery. Pain Ther 2021;10:1051-66.
83. Huang L, Zheng L, Wu B, et al. Effects of Ropivacaine Concentration on Analgesia After Ultrasound-Guided Serratus Anterior Plane Block: A Randomized Double-Blind Trial. J Pain Res 2020;13:57-64.
84. Abdallah NM, Bakeer AH, Youssef RB, et al. Ultrasound-guided continuous serratus anterior plane block: dexmedetomidine as an adjunctive analgesic with levobupivacaine for post-thoracotomy pain. A prospective randomized controlled study. J Pain Res 2019;12:1425-31.
85. El Sherif FA, Abd El-Rahman AM, Othman AH, et al. Analgesic Effect of Morphine Added to Bupivacaine in Serratus Anterior Plane Block Following Modified Radical Mastectomy. Only a Local Effect? Randomized Clinical Trial. J Pain Res 2020;13:661-8.
86. Toscano A, Capuano P, Galatà M, et al. Safety of Ultrasound-Guided Serratus Anterior and Erector Spinae Fascial Plane Blocks: A Retrospective Analysis in Patients Undergoing Cardiac Surgery While Receiving Anticoagulant and Antiplatelet Drugs. J Cardiothorac Vasc Anesth 2022;36:483-8.
87. Zhan Y, Chen G, Huang J, et al. Effect of intercostal nerve block combined with general anesthesia on the stress response in patients undergoing minimally invasive mitral valve surgery. Exp Ther Med 2017;14:3259-64.
88. Ahmed Z, Samad K, Ullah H. Role of intercostal nerve block in reducing postoperative pain following video-assisted thoracoscopy: A randomized controlled trial. Saudi J Anaesth 2017;11:54-7.
89. Wang Y, Cheng J, Yang L, et al. Ropivacaine for Intercostal Nerve Block Improves Early Postoperative Cognitive Dysfunction in Patients Following Thoracotomy for Esophageal Cancer. Med Sci Monit 2019;25:460-5.
90. Mogahed MM, Elkahwagy MS. Paravertebral Block Versus Intercostal Nerve Block in Non-Intubated Uniportal Video-Assisted Thoracoscopic Surgery: A Randomised Controlled Trial. Heart Lung Circ 2020;29:800-7.
91. Guerra-Londono CE, Privorotskiy A, Cozowicz C, et al. Assessment of Intercostal Nerve Block Analgesia for Thoracic Surgery: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. JAMA Netw Open 2021;4:e2133394.
92. Momenzadeh S, Elyasi H, Valaie N, et al. Effect of cryoanalgesia on post-thoracotomy pain. Acta Med Iran 2011;49:241-5.
93. Gwak MS, Yang M, Hahm TS, et al. Effect of

cryoanalgesia combined with intravenous continuous analgesia in thoracotomy patients. J Korean Med Sci 2004;19:74-8.
94. Moorjani N, Zhao F, Tian Y, et al. Effects of cryoanalgesia on post-thoracotomy pain and on the structure of intercostal nerves: a human prospective randomized trial and a histological study. Eur J Cardiothorac Surg 2001;20:502-7.
95. Lu Q, Han Y, Cao W, et al. Comparison of non-divided intercostal muscle flap and intercostal nerve cryoanalgesia treatments for post-oesophagectomy neuropathic pain control. Eur J Cardiothorac Surg 2013;43:e64-70.
96. Mustola ST, Lempinen J, Saimanen E, et al. Efficacy of thoracic epidural analgesia with or without intercostal nerve cryoanalgesia for postthoracotomy pain. Ann Thorac Surg 2011;91:869-73.
97. Yang MK, Cho CH, Kim YC. The effects of cryoanalgesia combined with thoracic epidural analgesia in patients undergoing thoracotomy. Anaesthesia 2004;59:1073-7.
98. Ju H, Feng Y, Yang BX, et al. Comparison of epidural analgesia and intercostal nerve cryoanalgesia for post-thoracotomy pain control. Eur J Pain 2008;12:378-84.
99. Low DE, Allum W, De Manzoni G, et al. Guidelines for Perioperative Care in Esophagectomy: Enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS(®)) Society Recommendations. World J Surg 2019;43:299-330.

Cite this article as: Feenstra ML, van Berge Henegouwen MI, Hollmann MW, Hermanides J, Eshuis WJ. Analgesia in esophagectomy: a narrative review. J Thorac Dis 2023;15(9):5099-5111. doi: 10.21037/jtd-23-241