Is there a role for celiac plexus block for chronic pancreatitis?

Pietro Fusaroli, Giancarlo Caletti

Department of Gastroenterology, University of Bologna, Imola, Italy

Endoscopic ultrasound–celiac plexus block (EUS-CPB) and endoscopic ultrasound–celiac plexus neurolysis (EUS-CPN) have been reported to provide pain relief and reduce narcotics use in patients with chronic pancreatitis [1]. The techniques of EUS-CPB and EUS-CPN are identical; the differences are in the substances injected and in the indications. Neurolysis, in which bupivacaine and ethanol are injected, has been used in patients who have pancreatic cancer or chronic pancreatitis. On the other hand, block, in which bupivacaine with or without triamcinolone is injected, has been used mainly in patients who have chronic pancreatitis [2].

The injection of ethanol, bupivacaine, and triamcinolone into the celiac plexus disrupts signal transmission to the spinal cord and central nervous system, theoretically interfering with the perception of pain. The effects of ethanol are much less reversible than the effects of bupivacaine and triamcinolone, and albeit rare, more severe adverse effects have been reported with ethanol than with bupivacaine and triamcinolone, no significant difference in pain control was found between the two groups (14% vs. 16% for controls) [14].

Sey et al. have offered an original perspective on the topic of EUS-CPB, addressing the problem of the short duration of its effects [16]. From a huge EUS-CPB database of 1108 patients treated at the Indiana University Medical Center, Indianapolis, Indiana, USA, they extrapolated data for 248 patients with chronic pancreatitis who underwent two or more procedures and investigated the incremental effects of repeated EUS-CPB procedures.

Either a standard 22-gauge needle or a dedicated 20-gauge needle with sideholes at the end was used for EUS-CPB. When visible, the celiac ganglia were targeted; otherwise, 20 mL of 0.75% bupivacaine followed by 40 to 80 mg of triamcinolone, according to the endosonographer’s preference, was injected at the level of the celiac trunk. The majority of the patients underwent 2 to 4 procedures, but some had 5 to 6 and a few of them even had up to 10 EUS-CPB procedures. After the first session, 76% of the patients reported pain relief, a value in line with the upper limit of the range of effectiveness reported in the literature. The median duration of pain relief was 10...
weeks. Subsequent EUS-CPB procedures produced fairly longer intervals of pain relief (12–20 weeks). Failure to obtain pain relief after the first EUS-CPB was associated with failure after subsequent EUS-CPB procedures. On the other hand, older age ($P = 0.026$) and pain relief after the first block ($P = 0.0024$) were associated with pain relief after subsequent EUS-CPB procedures. Finally, the number of EUS criteria for chronic pancreatitis was not associated with pain relief.

Given the nearly complete absence of complications (only 3 minor transient events occurred), the study of Sey et al. is a unique and interesting demonstration of the feasibility and efficacy of repeated EUS-CPB procedures to control pain in patients with chronic pancreatitis. Given the benign but chronic nature of chronic pancreatitis, these patients are natural candidates to undergo a treatment that is reasonably effective, safe, and repeatable.

The good results of the study from the Indiana University Medical Center agree with those of an ongoing randomized, multicenter trial comparing EUS-CPB (bupivacaine + triamcinolone) with a sham procedure, in which patients are blinded to the procedure, and should revive interest in EUS-CPB. In preliminary results, the rate of pain reduction was significantly higher in the treated arm than in the sham arm; morphine use was also reduced in the treatment group, although the difference between the treatment group and the sham group was not significant. Crossover to the active treatment was requested by 100% of the patients in the sham group after a median of 46 days [17].

In summary, according to this new evidence, EUS-CPB appears to be a safe, moderately effective, and repeatable treatment for patients with pain caused by chronic pancreatitis. Of course, recourse to EUS-CPB should be weighed against the alternative options that are available. These include lifestyle changes (e.g., cessation of alcohol and tobacco use), supplementation of pancreatic enzymes, and psychosocial support to reduce opiate dependence. For patients who have severe disease with main pancreatic duct dilatation, endoscopic or surgical duct decompression and total pancreatectomy with islet auto-transplantation are also options. Gastroenterologists must use their clinical judgment in order to select the patients who may benefit from EUS-CPB (e.g., those who experienced relief after a previous EUS-CPB procedure and those who are elderly). On the other hand, precious time should not be wasted on EUS-CPB when it is ineffective; in these cases, other treatments should be readily adopted before the disease becomes too advanced (with the development of excessive organ fibrosis and nociceptive pathway remodeling) to respond even to surgical treatment [18].

**Competing interests:** None

**References**

4. **Loeve US, Mortensen MB.** Lethal necrosis and perforation of the stomach and the aorta after multiple EUS-guided celiac plexus neurolysis procedures in a patient with chronic pancreatitis. Gastrointest Endosc 2013; 77: 151–152
12 O’Toole TM, Schmulewitz N. Complication rates of EUS-guided celiac plexus blockade and neurolysis: results of a large case series. Endoscopy 2009; 41: 593–597