decubitus position for 15 minutes. In the GA group general anesthesia was inducted and maintained with target-controlled infusion propofol 1% combined with fentanyl 1.5 µg/kg. Intraoperative and recovery times, postanesthesia recovery scores, and postoperative outcomes were recorded.

The continuous variables were analyzed according to the Student t test if parametric, or according to the Mann Whitney test if not parametric. Categorical variable were analyzed with χ² test or the Fisher’s test. The level of significance was set as p < 0.05.

### Times (min)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spinal Group</th>
<th>General Group</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surgery duration</td>
<td>45.5(35.0-50.0)</td>
<td>40.0(35.0-45.0)</td>
<td>0.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anesthesia duration</td>
<td>27.0(35.0-30.0)</td>
<td>30.0(25.0-30.0)</td>
<td>0.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to ambulation</td>
<td>60.0(60.0-65.0)</td>
<td>60.0(60.0-75.0)</td>
<td>0.892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to urinary voiding</td>
<td>72.5(63.0-102.0)</td>
<td>80.0(65.0-135.0)</td>
<td>0.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to discharge</td>
<td>132.5(120.0-150.0)</td>
<td>150.0(140.0-160.0)</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Results and Discussion:

#### Intra-operative and recovery times

The two groups were comparable with respect to patients characteristics and duration of surgery and anesthesia. Only one patient in the GA group was converted to general anesthesia due to inadequate level of sensory block. The times to achieve ambulation and to urinary voiding were similar between groups. The time for home readiness was shorter in the SA group (132.5 min CI95% 120.0-150.0) versus GA group (150.0 min CI95% 140.0-160.0) (p = 0.010).

The incidence of post-operative complications were rare in both groups.

**Conclusion(s):** Unilateral spinal anesthesia with low-dose hyperbaric 5% prilocaine provides recovery profiles and discharge times comparable to general anesthesia with propofol. Patients receiving SA were able to go home earlier than GA patients without added complications.

### 2AP2-11

#### Perioperative negative pressure pulmonary edema: case scenario

**Calixto L., Sá J.**

Centro Hospitalar do Porto, Dept of Anaesthesiology, Porto, Portugal

**Background:** The Negative Pressure Pulmonary Edema (NPPE) is a multifactorial condition reported in patients after general anesthesia. Despite being uncommon (0.05-0.1%), it is a potentially life-threatening emergency that can be fatal in 11-40%. It characteristically occurs after endotracheal intubation, but has already been described after Laryngeal Mask Airway (LMA) use[1]. As its occurrence is under-reported, our aim is to point out the importance of an expeditious diagnosis.

**Case report:** 24-yr-old woman (50kg, 1.60m), presented to the ambulatory surgery center for an axillary ganglia excisional biopsy. Patient’s medical history was relevant only for a recurrent spontaneous pneumotorax. Unknown allergies. Normal pre-operative study.

**Inhalatory anesthesia, atraumatic LMA place. Anesthesia and surgical procedure were uneventful.** Transferred to Postanesthesia Care Unit (PACU), spontaneously ventilating (SV).

Ten minutes later, marked respiratory distress, tachypnea, cyanosis, accesso-

### Learning points:

- Transferred to Intermediate Care Unit, conscious, hemodynamically stable, SV with supplemental oxygen, SpO2 > 90%. An echocardiograph (normal) and angiographic evaluation (acute pulmonary edema in resolution, no signs of thromboembolism) were performed. Progressive recovery without non-invasive pressure support, discharged from hospital on the 4th postoperative day. Follow-up in 8 weeks.

**Discussion:** When considering differential diagnosis of acute-onset perioperative pulmonary edema, NPPE was considered despite the absence of evident high airway obstruction. However, the clinical presentation and its rapid improvement are consistent with the diagnosis. Given the increasing use of LMA, similar episodes can become recurrent, being crucial its prompt recognition.

**References:**


#### Learning points:

- We should be alert for the possibility of NPPE occurrence.

### Monitoring: Equipment and Computers

#### 3AP1-1

**The effect of hand dominance on neuromuscular monitoring at the adductor pollicis muscle**

**Kim K.S., Kim D.W., Jeong J.S.**

Hanyang University, Dept of Anaesthesiology & Pain Medicine, Seoul, Korea, Republic of

**Background and Goal of Study:** Neuromuscular blockade at the adductor pollicis muscle may be influenced by hand dominance resulting in conflicting results of several studies. The primary purpose of this study was to determine if hand dominance influences measurements of neuromuscular blockade at the adductor pollicis using acceleromyography.

**Materials and Methods:** After induction of anesthesia, both ulnar nerves were stimulated supramaximally using a train-of-four (TOF) stimulation every 15 seconds in 31 patients. Acceleromyographic responses were monitored in both hands and 0.6 mg/kg of rocuronium was administered. Onset, maximum effect, and offset of rocuronium were measured and compared in both hands. Signals were recorded until TOF ratios were more than 0.9 in all patients.

**Results and Discussion:** In total, 27 patients were right-handed and 4 patients were left-handed. There were no differences in the mean supramaximal threshold or mean initial TOF ratio between dominant and non-dominant hands. No statistically significant differences were found between 716 paired TOF ratios in the dominant or non-dominant hand.

A correlation was seen between the dominant and nondominant hand [Nondominant = 0.931-Dominant + 1.714, R = 0.929]. Agreement from a Bland-Altman analysis was excellent with a bias of 1.6% and limits of agreement of -21.2% to 24.5% for all signals.

**Conclusion(s):** Dominant and non-dominant hands can be used interchangeably for neuromuscular monitoring at the adductor pollicis muscle.
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