Result and safety of orchiectomy under spermatic cord block
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**Result**

Of the 19 patients, 18 had successful operation under spermatic cord block. One patient needed to be converted to general anesthesia because of severe pain during the operation; 1 patient had transient bradycardia but no hypotension; 2 patients had tachycardia (one of the two who were converted to general anesthesia; another had no symptom). 7 patients (36.84%) had mild pain, 10 patients (52.63%) had moderate pain and 2 patients (10.53%) had severe pain.

None of the patients had any complication related to local anesthetic drugs; and there was no major complication detected in the series.

**Conclusion**

Spermatic cord block is successful in most patients, safe for orchietomy and not suitable for anxiety disorder and obese patient. It can be the alternative method of anesthesia for the selected patient.
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ผลการศึกษา: ผู้ป่วยจำนวน 19 ราย ผ่าตัดส่งต่อโดยวิธีการซีคลอราเซาะทางที่สpermatic cord 18 ราย, 1 ราย ผ่าการปอดมาก จึงต้องเปลี่ยนวิธีระบายความรู้สึกด้วยการยาสลบ ผู้ป่วย 1 ราย ซึ่งพาร์คด้านหลัง (<60 ครั้ง/นาที), 2 ราย ซึ่งพาร์คด้านหน้า (>100 ครั้ง/นาที) (1 ใน 2 รายนั้นต้องสลบแบบผ่าตัด) ไม่มีผู้ป่วยรายใดเลยที่มีอาการ วิงเวียนศีรษะ, คลื่นไส้อาเจียน

ผู้ป่วย 7 นาย (36.84%) ปวดหลังน้อย (pain score อยู่ในช่วง 0-3/10), ผู้ป่วย 10 นาย (52.63%) ปวด bụngกลาง (pain score อยู่ในช่วง 4-6/10), ผู้ป่วย 2 นาย (10.53%) ปวดครัว (pain score อยู่ในช่วง 7-10/10)

ไม่มีผู้ป่วยรายใดเลยที่มีภาวะแทรกซ้อนจากการซีคลอราซ่าทางที่สpermatic cord

สรุป:
การซีคลอราซ่าทางที่สpermatic cord เพื่อผ่าตัดอันพาะ (orchietomy) นั้นปลอดภัย สามารถผ่าตัดได้สำเร็จเกือบทุกราย ไม่แม้กระทั่งก่อปัญหาที่มีความวิตกกังวลสูง และสรุปเกี่ยวกับนั้นเป็นทางเลือกหนึ่งของแพทย์จากการระบายความรู้สึกชั่วคราว

คำสำคัญ: การผ่าตัดอันพาะ, การซีคลอราซ่าทางที่สpermatic cord
Orchiectomy is a minor procedure, either done under spinal block or general anesthesia. Some surgeons, however, prefer to do it with spermatic cord block; so far there are no data available on its safety, efficacy or technique description have been reported. Spermatic cord block is not widely recognized a technique for anesthesia in patient receiving scrotal operation.

Keiting W Kaye\(^1\), in 1982 reported 35 patients who received local anesthesia sufficient for vasectomy, hydrocelectomy, spermatocytectomy or orchiectomy: 10-12 ml 0.5% bupivacaine hydrochloride injected through the spermatic cord, approximately 1 cm below and medial to the pubic tubercle and infiltrated anesthesia at the overlying skin.

Eugene F. Fuchs\(^2\), in 1982 reported 344 cases of scrotal procedure with excellent result, achieved with spermatic cord block by injection of 0.5% bupivacaine hydrochloride just superior to the tubercle.

Materials and Methods

Of 19 patients from December 2002 – October 2004 who were diagnosed prostatic cancer. They were nonlocalized prostatic cancer or physical status not suitable for radical prostatectomy surgery.

All subjects were operated and evaluated postoperative by one surgeon.

After the procedure has been described, the patients were offered the choice of having the operation done under spermatic cord anesthesia as an alternative either to general or spinal anesthesia.

We excluded patients who were allergic to bupivacaine hydrochloride, or having severe hypertension, recent MI, unstable angina, uncorrected bleeding disorder, paraplegia and neuro-sensory deficit.

During the pre-operation we explained the patient the procedure and provided anesthesia only on the scrotal content and scrotal skin at the incision site; he would feel some pain initially during the injection of anesthetic agent, and he might have some abdominal discomfort during the cord manipulation, and postoperatively he could ambulate or immediately take some food.

The patient was not allowed to take anything by mouth after midnight before the procedure.

Oral administration of lorazepam 1 mg at night and 1/2 -1 hr before the operation is used as the only preoperative sedation.

Every patient was given an intravenous line (heparin lock medicut) and an anesthetist was on stand-by to give anesthesia if spermatic cord block did not work.

The anesthetic agent is 0.25 % bupivacaine hydrochloride was selected, as it has long pharmaceutical action.

The patient\(^\text{1-3}\) was in supine position. The pubic tubercle is palpated; the cord was trapped between the index and middle fingers of the surgeon; 1 cm below and medial to the tubercle was the injected point, infiltrate at skin and pass the needle vertically down to the anterior aspect of the pubic bone. In it course the needle, thus passes through the spermatic cord, 8 -10 ml bupivacaine hydrochloride is injected through the cord at slightly different angle and the needle entering the blood vessel be aware of.

After the spermatic cord was blocked the skin at the incision site was infiltrated with 3-5 ml
bupivacaine hydrochloride, 3 - 5 minutes before the start of the operation so that drug became effective.

Orchiectomy was performed in the midline raphe incision with epididymis - sparing fashion to create a round structure mimic a small testis for cosmetic result. The wound was closed with 3-0 CCG and no drain was given.

During the operation, the patient was monitored and blood pressure, pulse rate and abnormal symptom were recorded; when surgery finished the patient's pain score of the procedure (including pain of anesthetic injection) was assessed immediately by using visual analog pain scale (0 = no pain, 5 = moderate pain and 10 = worst possible pain)

At 1-week follow-up, the patient's symptom and wound were evaluated again.

Result

Of the 19 patients age 59 - 93 yr (mean = 72.11 yr), operative time 25 - 70 min (mean 41.84 min), amount of bupivacaine hydrochloride 12 - 34 ml (mean = 23.63 ml) orchiectomy under spermatic cord block were successful in 18 - 19 (94.74 %). One patient failed because he had so severe pain that needed to be converted to general anesthesia.

One patient had bradycardia (pulse rate = 54/min, 5 min in duration); 2 patients had tachycardia (pulse rate = 124/min, 102/min). None of patients had hypotension, nausea or vomiting. No complication related to the anesthesia nor the procedure was seen. Most of the patients felt little pain especially when monopolar electrocautery was used to cut the tissue or stop bleeding.

Figure 1. A) trapping spermatic cord with 2 fingers; injection at the site 1 cm below and medial to the pubic tubercle. B) transverse section of spermatic cord at injection site; C) scrotal skin infiltration at incision site.
Post-operatively, all of the patients ambulated immediately; 17 patients (89.47 %) rated their visual analog pain scale between 0 – 6; 2 patients (10.53 %) numbered their visual analog pain 10 (1 of them converted from local to general anesthesia).

When classify to mild (pain score 0-3/10), moderate (pain score 4-6/10), and severe pain (pain score 7-10/10).

7 patients (36.84 %) was in mild pain group, 10 patients (52.63 %) had moderate pain, and severe pain in 2 patients (10.53 %).

At 1-week follow-up, 1 patient suffer from surgical wound infection which later he improved by wound dressing and oral antibiotic treatment; 1 patient had scrotal hematoma which improved with time and conservative treatment.

Table 1. The number of pain scale assessed at the end of the procedure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visual analog pain score</th>
<th>Number of patient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (21.05 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 (10.53 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 (5.26 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 (21.05 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 (26.32 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 (5.26 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2 (10.53 %)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 = no pain; 5 = moderate pain; and 10 = worst possible pain.

Discussion

The technique of spermatic cord block is base on the anatomy:4 as the cord emerges from the external ring, it passes over the pubic tubercle and the shifted medially to the scrotum. In this region it is closely associated with the ilioinguinal nerve and the genital branch of genitofemoral nerve, which supply the testis and its covering, the epididymis and the vas deferens but not the scrotal skin. The scrotal skin receives sensory supply from the pudendal nerve and the perineal branch of the posterior cutaneous nerve of the thigh, therefore it needs to be infiltrated with the anesthetic agent separately from spermatic cord block.

Good result of spermatic cord block facilitates a successful orchiectomy. No complication related to anesthesia was detected in the series. The advantage of spermatic cord block is its short time of recover, low cost and may be performed in patient who has high risk of anesthesia.

2 patients numbered their visual analog pain scale 10. One he had underlying anxiety disorder, while the other had severe pain that needed to be converted to general anesthesia which might have caused by his obesity (BW 79.5 kg, HT 165 cm, BMI 29.20 kg/m²; mean BW = 52.46 kg; patients who had success operation whose BW was in the range of 39 – 64 kg). Obesity made it difficult to palpate the cord and inject anesthetic agent to the correct point, so the spermatic cord block did not work well.

One patient had bradycardia (pulse rate = 54/min) which might due to his vagovagal reflex when the cord was under traction; however he developed no other symptom or hypotension.
Several patients still felt pain after spermatic cord block was done, and when the monopolar electrocautery was used, but during the sharp dissection they felt not pain. This might be caused by the current of monopolar electrocautery that dispersed to the remote grounding site, which out of the area that the ilioinguinal nerve and genitofemoral nerve supply.

Experience from the study allows us to recommend limited use of low-voltage electrocautery to stop bleeding. Bipolar electrocautery may reduce cautery effect associated with pain.

**Conclusion**

In summary, spermatic cord block is successful in most patients and safe for orchietomy. It can be the alternative method of anesthesia in selected patient.

The surgeon should have a good knowledge of the anatomy of the spermatic cord, its nerves supplies and relation ship between them. For preoperation, the patient needs to be explained the procedure and some symptoms that he may experience during the operation.

Spermatic cord block is not suitable in patient with anxiety or obesity. They should receive general or spinal anesthesia.
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