Analgesic effectiveness of quadratus lumborum block for patients after abdominal surgery: a systematic review and meta-analysis
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Abstract

**Background:** A series of studies have reported that quadratus lumborum block (QLB) can have a great postoperative analgesia for lower abdominal surgery. However, a meta-analysis of the analgesic effect of QLB in patients undergoing lower abdominal surgery has not been published.

**Methods** We searched the databases of Pubmed, Embase, Cochrane Library, and Web of Science (updated to October 15, 2019). We cumulative opioid consumption at 6, 12, 24 and 48h after surgery; pain score (rest and dynamic) at 6, 12, 24 and 48h after surgery; occurrence of common opioid-related complications at 24h after surgery. Opioid consumption as the main outcome.

**Results** Thirteen randomized controlled trials (RCTs) including 751 patients were analysed. Compared with control group, QLB group can effectively reduce 24 and 48h cumulative opioid consumption 10.1mg (95%CI: -13,-7.2; p<0.00001) and 16.22mg (95%CI: -19.39,13.03; p<0.00001) in patients with cesarean section, but can reduce effectively cumulative opioid consumption in patients undergoing laparoscopic surgery at 6, 12 and 24h. Posterior QLB group and transmuscular QLB group reduced 24h cumulative opioid consumption 4.03mg (95%CI: -7.89, -0.19; p=0.04) and 12.44mg (95%CI: -20.2, -4.68; p=0.002), respectively. QLB group reduced rest visual analogue scale (VAS) score at 12, 24 and 48 h, however, the effective reduction of rest VAS score in patients undergoing cesarean section only occurs at 24h after surgery.

**Conclusion** QLB seems to provide better analgesia for patients undergoing laparoscopic surgery than patients undergoing cesarean section. Transmuscular QLB appears to have reduced postoperative opioid consumption compared to posterior QLB. More future RCTs are needed to support our conclusions.
Background

Postoperative acute pain occurs in more than 80% of operation patients, and approximately 75% of operation patients experience the moderate or higher pain[1, 2]. Evidence shows that less than half of operation patients claim that postoperative pain is effectively relieved. Inadequate negative control of pain affects the quality of life, function and function recovery, risk of postoperative complications, and risk of long-term postoperative pain [3]. Proper postoperative analgesia can reduce pain, encourage patients to cough and get out of bed, reduce the occurrence of lower extremity thrombosis and pulmonary complications and improve postoperative satisfaction [4-6]. Postoperative analgesia using traditional opioids often causes constipation, nausea, vomiting and other adverse reactions, thus limiting its clinical application. Regional analgesia techniques combined with intravenous self-controlled analgesia can effectively reduce the dosage and adverse effects of opioids, which is conducive to rapid recovery after surgery [4]. The quadratus lumborum block (QLB) was first proposed by Blanco [7] in 2007, which is suitable for perioperative analgesia in abdominal, hip and lower extremity surgery. Studies[8, 9] have shown that compared with the transverse subabdominisplane block (TAPB), QLB can block both body and visceral pain, with better analgesic effect and longer duration. A number of studies [8-22] have also reported that the QLB can be an effective postoperative analgesia both for laparoscopic surgery[14, 23-28] and cesarean section[10, 16, 18, 29-31], and the choices about the different approaches of QLB were also diverse. However, a meta-analysis of the QLB has not been published. The purpose of this article is to report on the improvement in the analgesic effect of the QLB compared to placebo and control groups in patients undergoing lower abdominal surgery. Subgroup analyses were intended to be used to find differences in the approach of different QLB and between patients with different surgical procedures. Provide guidance for anesthesiologists to
choose postoperative analgesia.

Methods

The work has been reported in line with PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) and AMSTAR (Assessing the methodological quality of systematic reviews) Guidelines.

The meta-analysis was registered on PROSPERO (CRD42019120858), RegistryURL:http://www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO/display_record.php?ID=CRD42019120858.

2.1 Eligibility criteria

We included randomized controlled trials (RCTs) that measured the postoperative analgesia of QLB in patients undergoing lower abdominal surgery. There were no restrictions on the language of the full text. In order to ensure that the outcome indicators would not be interfered by too many factors, the trials we included must compared QLB group with control group with sham block or without block.

2.2 Literature search

We searched the databases of Pubmed, Embase, Cochrane Library and Web of Science (updated to October 15, 2019). A total of 843 literatures about QLB were retrieved. The search was done independently by two authors Chao Xu and He Zhu using (quadratus lumborum) and (nerve block or block, Nerve or Blocks, Nerve or Nerve Blocks or Nerve Blockade or Blockade, Nerve or Blockades, Nerve or Nerve Blockades or Chemical Neurolysis or Chemical Neurolyses Or Neurolyses, Chemical or Neurolysis, Chemical) as the search terms.

2.3 Data collection and presentation

The characteristics and results data of the included trials were extracted independently by two authors Chao Xu and He Zhu, and the work of quality assessment was also completed
independently by two authors (Chao Xu and He Zhu) using the Cochrane risk bias tool and Review Manager 5.3 software (Cochrane, London, UK) according to the Cochrane handbook [32]. If the two authors disagree about the quality of the article, it will be decided by the third author (Tianyu Liu) to join the discussion.

To assess the effect of QLB on postoperative analgesia in patients after abdominal surgery, we extracted the following data: cumulative opioid consumption (transformed to morphine equivalent) [33, 34] at 6, 12, 24 and 48h after surgery; time interval from the end of the surgery to the first use of additional analgesic; the number of patients who used additional analgesic after surgery; pain score (rest and dynamic) at 6, 12, 24 and 48h after surgery; nausea and vomiting, itching, sedation, muscle weakness, and postoperative patient satisfaction at 24h after surgery; We contacted the author to ask about the results and got some responses to complete the meta-analysis[16, 18].

2.4 Meta-analysis

Two authors collaborated on data processing using the Review Manager 5.3 software (Cochrane, London, UK) for data synthesis. Considering the heterogeneity among different trials, we chose random effect modeling for the synthesis of dichotomous and continuous data. The synthesized dichotomous variables were represented by the odds ratios (OR) and their 95% confidence intervals (CI). The synthesized continuous variables were represented by the mean differences and their 95% CIs. The findings were considered statistically significant when the 95% CI of the OR excluded 1 and the 95% CI of the mean difference excluded 0.

The heterogeneity between trials was determined using an $I^2$ test [35, 36]. If the $I^2$ value was less than 25%, low heterogeneity was considered to exist; If $I^2$ value was greater than 25% and less than 50%, moderate heterogeneity was considered to exist; and if $I^2$ value
was greater than 50%, high heterogeneity was considered to exist. If there was high heterogeneity ($I^2$ value ≥50%), a sensitivity analysis was performed to determine the source of heterogeneity. If the included variables were excluded one by one and the $I^2$ value was still greater than 50%, the result was considered to be reliable. If the characteristics of the included trials varied widely, subgroup analysis was performed to reduce heterogeneity.

Results

3.1 Study selection

The two authors (Chao Xu and He Zhu) retrieved a total of 843 articles, 32 of which were viewed in full text. 13 articles that met the inclusion criteria and were analyzed for data[10, 14, 16, 18, 23-31]. Fig. 1 details the search, inclusion and exclusion of the literature. A total of 751 patients (372 patients underwent caesarean section[10, 16, 18, 29-31] and 379 patients underwent laparoscopic surgery[14, 23-28] in the lower abdomen) were finally included in the data analysis, 373 in the QLB group (215 patients were performed with posterior QLB[10, 14, 16, 23, 26, 30, 31] and 130 patients were performed with transmuscular QLB[24, 25, 27-29], and 28 patients were performed lateral QLB[18]) and 380 in the control group. All QLB were guided by ultrasound and all included patients undergoing lower abdominal surgery were adults. Most trials had demonstrated random sequence generation and 1 trial did not demonstrate this, but there is no evidence to prove the low quality of it[14]. Strict Blinding was performed on all evaluators, ensuring minimal performance bias. However, patients in 4 trials were not blinded and may result in a detection bias of pain scores[10, 17, 18, 22].

Additional file 1 presents the outcomes of included articles, Additional file 2 presents the results of the meta-analysis and Fig. 2 presents the results of quality assessment
completed by two authors; the characteristics of the included articles were presented in Additional file 3. Sensitivity analysis was performed on all data synthesis, and no trials were found to reduce $I^2$ to 50%. Since less than 10 articles were included, the Begg’s test was not performed.

3.2 Interval opioid consumption

We synthesized the total consumption of opioids at 12h, 24h and 48h after surgery to quantitatively evaluate whether QLB could reduce the need for opioids in patients after surgery. Cumulative opioid consumption was transformed to intravenous morphine equivalents (morphine 10 mg i.v. = morphine 30mg p.o. = tramadol 100 mg i.v. = ketobemidone 8 mg i.v. = fentanyl 1mg i.v. = sufentanil 0.01mg i.v.). Compared with control group, QLB group can effectively reduce 6, 12 and 24h cumulative opioid consumption, but the data are highly heterogeneous ($I^2=92\%, \ 93\%\ and \ 93\%, respectively$), after the subgroup analysis, we found: QLB group can effectively reduce 24 and 48h cumulative opioid consumption 10.1mg ($95\%\text{CI: } -13,-7.2; P<0.00001$) and 16.22mg ($95\%\text{CI: } -19.39,13.03; P<0.00001$) in patients with cesarean section, For patients underwent laparoscopic surgery , QLB group can reduce effectively cumulative opioid consumption at 6, 12 and 24h with 4.91mg ($95\%\text{CI: } -9.68,-0.14; P=0.04$), 3.19mg ($95\%\text{CI: } -6.23,-0.16; P=0.04$) and 7.95mg ($95\%\text{CI: } -15.88,-0.01; P=0.05$), respectively. Posterior QLB group and transmuscular QLB group reduced 24h cumulative opioid consumption 4.03mg ($95\%\text{CI: } -7.89, -0.19; p=0.04$) and 12.44mg ($95\%\text{CI: } -20.2, -4.68; p=0.002$), respectively (Additional file 2 and Fig. 3).

The cumulative morphine consumption in the laparoscopic subgroup at 12h and in the cesarean section subgroup at 24 and 48h showed low heterogeneity ($I^2=41\%, \ 18\%\ and \ 0\%,\ respectively$). The rest of the morphine consumption data showed high heterogeneity,
and the sensitivity analysis still could not effectively reduce the $I^2$ value.

3.3 Rest pain

Because the included articles used visual analogue scale (VAS)[10, 23, 26, 27, 30, 31] or numerical rating scale scoring (NRS)[14, 16, 18, 29] to assess postoperative rest pain, we synthesized the data using the same scoring method at the same time. Because only one trial[18] evaluated the resti NRS score at 36h after surgery, we calculated pain scores at 6, 12, 24, and 48h postoperatively.

At 6h postoperatively, there was no statistically significant between QLB group and control group in rest VAS score.

At 12h postoperatively, QLB can reduce rest VAS score and NRS score 1.66cm (95%CI: -2.07, -1.26, $P<0.00001$; $I^2=61%$) and 1.1cm (95%CI: -1.65, 0.55, $P<0.0001$; $I^2=20%$), respectively. The laparoscopic subgroup($I^2=64%$), cesarean section subgroup($I^2=20%$) and posterior QLB subgroup ($I^2=61%$) all showed statistical differences compared with control group.

At 24h postoperatively, QLB can reduce rest VAS score and NRS score 2.05cm (95%CI: -3.39, -0.7, $P=0.003$; $I^2=97%$) and 2.34cm (95%CI: -3.22, -1.45, $P<0.00001$; $I^2=94%$), respectively. Compared with control group, QLB subgroup can reduce NRS score 1.07cm (95%CI: -1.51, -0.62, $P<0.00001$; $I^2=0%$) in patients underwent cesarean section (Additional file 2 and Additional Fig. 4).

At 48h after operation, QLB can only reduce rest VAS score 0.81cm (95%CI: -1.56, -0.03, $P=0.04$; $I^2=0%$) but can not statistically reduce NRS score.

3.4 Dynamic pain

Six trials[10, 14, 16, 29-31] evaluated postoperative dynamic pain scores, 3 trials[10, 30, 31] used VAS, and 3 trials[14, 16, 29] used NRS. [10, 30, 31]. Because few trials could be
included, we analysed pain scores at 6, 12 and 24h after operation. Only at 24h postoperatively, QLB can effectively reduce dynamic NRS scores 1.76cm (95%CI: -2.29, -1.22, P<0.00001; \(I^2=83\%\)), the dynamic NRS of patients after cesarean section was reduced by 0.89cm (95%CI: -1.67, -0.12, \(P=0.02; I^2=0\%\)) (Additional file 2).

### 3.5 Opioid-related adverse effects

Seven articles [10, 15-19, 22] reported the incidence of nausea and vomiting 24 hours after surgery, and only three of these articles reported nausea and vomiting [15, 17, 19]. Two articles [14, 16] used NRS scores to measure the degree of nausea and vomiting. We synthesized the incidence of nausea and vomiting 24 hours after surgery. There was no significant difference in the incidence of nausea and vomiting between the QLB group and the control group.

Few observations were reported about the incidence of itching and sedation [10, 18, 22], therefore statistical synthesis was not performed. Only one article [10] observed the incidence of itching and sedation (one case of itching and one case of sedation), and it was not possible to determine whether a significant difference exists between the QLB group and the control group.

### 3.6 Additional analgesic

Three articles [14, 18, 29] reported the time interval to the first additional analgesic, and 5 articles [14, 18, 23, 26, 28] reported the numbers of patients who used additional analgesic. No statistical differences were found after subgroup analysis (Additional file 2).

### 3.7 Opioid-related adverse effects

Eight articles [10, 14, 16, 18, 26, 28, 29, 31] reported the incidence of postoperative nausea and vomiting (PONV) within 24 hours. We found that statistical differences only exist in the transmuscular QLB subgroup with an odds ratio of 0.29 (95%CI:0.12
$0.70 \times P=0.005 \times I^2=0\%$ (Additional file 2).

Four articles [10, 18, 26, 31] reported the incidence of pruritus within 24 hours after surgery, and no statistical differences were found after analysis (Additional file 2 and Fig. 5).

### 3.8 Patient satisfaction

Three trials [23, 28, 29] performed patient satisfaction surveys, but different scales were used (Bruggemann comfort scale (BCS) scores, Quality of Recovery 40 (QoR-40) questionnaire score and obstetric quality-of-recovery scoring tool (ObsQoR-11)). We did not perform data synthesis.

Zhu et al. [28] reported that the recovery quality of patients in the QLB group was significantly higher than that of the control group. No statistical difference was found in the other two articles [23, 31].

## Discussion

### 4.1 Postoperative analgesia

The results of the statistical synthesis show that the QLB can effectively reduce the cumulative opioid consumption within 24 hours after surgery, even the pain score of 48h after surgery. The blocking range of the QLB may explain this result; a cadaver study [37] showed that the QLB can stably block the T12-L3 nerve roots, and another cadaver study [38] claimed that the coloring agent of the QLB can reach the thoracic sympathetic trunk, which can effectively reduce visceral pain.

Interestingly, for patients underwent laparoscopic surgery, statistically significant analgesic effect began to appear from 6h after operation; for patients with cesarean section, the analgesic effect often showed statistical difference from 24h after operation. Compared with the control group, the QLB group had a lower reduction in dynamic pain...
score than the rest pain score. There is no statistical difference in time to the first additional analgesic and numbers of patients who used additional analgesic. These seem to indicate that the postoperative analgesic effect of QLB is more pronounced when the pain is relatively mild.

QLB showed limited analgesic efficacy in patients undergoing cesarean section within 12 hours of surgery. However it's undeniable that QLB reduced the cumulative consumption of opioids, rest pain scores and dynamic pain scores in patients underwent cesarean section at 24h postoperatively, and the heterogeneity of these data was low, indicating that QLB can provide good analgesia for parturients. All QLB were performed at the end of cesarean section, which would not affect the operation. Blanco et al [8] have shown that QLB has a better postoperative analgesia after cesarean section than TAPB. QLB may be a good choice for parturients who are prone to postoperative pain.

Without direct comparison, we only found differences in 24h postoperatively cumulative opioid consumption between posterior QLB and transmuscular QLB (4.03g (95%CI:-7.86,-0.19), $I^2=71\%$ vs 12.44g (95%CI:-20.2,-4.68), $I^2=84\%$), limited by heterogeneity, no certain assertion can be made. One trial[39] directly compared posterior QLB and transmuscular QLB, and found that the mixed effect of the two approaches was better, but the analgesic effect of the two approaches was not statistically different.

4.2 PONV

The occurrence of nausea and vomiting after lower abdominal surgery is one of the most common side effects, mainly related to the traction of the intestine and the application of postoperative opioids. As a part of postoperative analgesia, QLB may have the potential to reduce the use of opioids. Although the cumulative opioid consumption in each subgroup decreased significantly within 24 h after surgery, only the transmuscular QLB group[28,
had statistically preventive effects on PONV and showed low heterogeneity. This may be related to the more reduction on postoperative opioid consumption of transmuscular QLB compared to posterior QLB (Additional file 2 and Fig. 3). Because few articles were included, this conclusion is restrictive. In the future, more research is needed to study the effect of transmuscular on the incidence of postoperative nausea and vomiting.

4.3 Performance of QLB

Seven of included RCTs [10, 14, 16, 23, 26, 30, 31] performed posterior QLB, 5 RCTs [24, 25, 27-29] performed transmuscular QLB, and 1 RCT [18] performed lateral QLB. Although QLB is an invasive procedure, local anesthetics and ultrasound can be used to minimize damage to the patient. Because the structure of the abdominal wall muscles involved in the QLB is difficult to locate, the QLB procedures in all of the included articles were performed under ultrasound guidance. Under ultrasound guidance, transversus abdominis, the external oblique and the internal oblique can be clearly identified [10], which reduces the difficulty of executing QLB.

4.4 Complications of QLB

Because there is no great vessel and loose connective tissue around the optimal point of injection, this reduces the possibility of tissue damage, and complications of local hematoma and abdominal organ damage have not been reported. However, because local anesthetics can spread to the lumbar plexus, there is a potential risk of quadriceps weakness and accidental falls[40, 41]. SaM et al[42] reported that after 30-40 minutes of QLB in two patients, severe hypotension and tachycardia occurred, possibly due to the spread of local anesthetic to the paravertebral space and epidural space, leading to sympathetic blockade.

4.5 Limitations

Our meta-analysis had some limitations. First, the number of articles included was small,
and the amount of data that could be synthesized was limited. Because the articles obtained during the search were limited, only the amount of literature for the lower abdominal surgery\([10, 14, 16, 18, 23-31]\) was met and no analysis of upper abdomen\([19, 43]\), hip\([44-47]\) and lower limb surgery was performed. Some outcomes could not be analyzed because of insufficient documentation. The incidence of postoperative opioid-related complications was too small, which may mask the significant difference between the QLB group and the control group. Furthermore, prospective studies of patients with long-term follow-up were not retrieved, making it impossible to judge the impact of the QLB on long-term prognosis in patients. Finally, the heterogeneity within the literature is large and cannot be eliminated by subgroup analysis and sensitivity analysis, which affects the reliability of the results.

**Conclusion**

QLB showed effective postoperative analgesia at 6-24h after laparoscopic surgery and 24-48h after cesarean section. Transmuscular QLB appears to have more reduction on postoperative opioid consumption compared to posterior QLB. Transmuscular QLB had statistically preventive effects on PONV. In future, more RCTs are needed to support our conclusions.
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Figures
The search, inclusion and exclusion of the literature.
| Ishio 2017 | Irwin 2019 | Hansen 2019 | Fujimoto 2019 | Dam 2019 | Blanco 2015 |
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- Random sequence generation (selection bias)
- Allocation concealment (selection bias)
- Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)
- Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)
- Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)
- Selective reporting (reporting bias)
- Other bias
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Figure 2

The results of quality assessment of the included articles.
2.3.2 caesarean section

| Study or Subgroup | Experimental | Control |
|-------------------|--------------|---------|
|                   | Mean | SD | Total | Mean | SD | Total | Weight | Mean Difference | IV, Random, 95% CI |
| Blanco 2015       | 11   | 11.0057 | 25    | 22.2263 | 19.7543 | 23    | 5.1% | -11.23 [−20.38,−0.07] |
| Hansen 2019       | 21.8 | 16   | 34    | 31.4 | 20    | 34    | 5.3% | -9.60 [−18.21,−0.98] |
| Irwin 2019        | 18.4759 | 15.7959 | 44    | 22.0398 | 20.1689 | 42    | 5.7% | -3.59 [−11.24, 4.12] |
| Mieszkowski 2018  | 9.3817 | 3.7281 | 28    | 20.5946 | 3.676 | 30    | 7.9% | -11.21 [−13.12,−9.31] |
| Subtotal (95% CI) | 131  | 129 | 24.1% | -10.10 [−13.00,−7.20] |

Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 22.55; Ch^{2} = 3.67; df = 3 (P = 0.30); I^2 = 18\%$

Test for overall effect: $Z = 6.63 (P = 0.00001)$

1.3.3 laparoscopic

| Study or Subgroup | Experimental | Control |
|-------------------|--------------|---------|
|                   | Mean | SD | Total | Mean | SD | Total | Weight | Mean Difference | IV, Random, 95% CI |
| Fujimoto 2019     | 30.1 | 5   | 27    | 30.4 | 5.8 | 29    | 7.7% | -0.30 [−3.13, 2.53] |
| Kılıç 2018        | 10.22 | 2.79 | 22    | 28.5 | 5.74 | 22    | 7.7% | -18.28 [−20.95,−15.61] |
| Okmen 2019        | 6.7   | 3.47 | 30    | 11.92 | 4.1 | 30    | 7.9% | -5.22 [−7.14,−3.30] |
| Zhu 2019          | 34.1 | 9.9 | 29    | 42.1 | 11.6 | 29    | 6.7% | -8.00 [−13.55,−2.45] |
| Subtotal (95% CI) | 108  | 110 | 29.9% | -7.95 [−15.88,−0.91] |

Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 60.40; Ch^{2} = 93.05; df = 3 (P < 0.00001); I^2 = 97\%$

Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.96 (P = 0.05)$

1.3.4 Posterior QLB

| Study or Subgroup | Experimental | Control |
|-------------------|--------------|---------|
|                   | Mean | SD | Total | Mean | SD | Total | Weight | Mean Difference | IV, Random, 95% CI |
| Blanco 2015       | 11   | 11.0057 | 25    | 22.2263 | 19.7543 | 23    | 5.1% | -11.23 [−20.38,−0.07] |
| Fujimoto 2019     | 30.1 | 5   | 27    | 30.4 | 5.8 | 29    | 7.7% | -0.30 [−3.13, 2.53] |
| Irwin 2019        | 18.4759 | 15.7959 | 44    | 22.0398 | 20.1689 | 42    | 5.7% | -3.59 [−11.24, 4.12] |
| Okmen 2019        | 6.7   | 3.47 | 30    | 11.92 | 4.1 | 30    | 7.9% | -5.22 [−7.14,−3.30] |
| Subtotal (95% CI) | 126  | 124 | 26.4% | -4.03 [−7.86,−0.19] |

Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 9.11; Ch^{2} = 10.49; df = 3 (P = 0.01); I^2 = 71\%$

Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.06 (P = 0.04)$

1.3.5 Transmuscular QLB

| Study or Subgroup | Experimental | Control |
|-------------------|--------------|---------|
|                   | Mean | SD | Total | Mean | SD | Total | Weight | Mean Difference | IV, Random, 95% CI |
| Hansen 2019       | 21.8 | 16 | 34    | 31.4 | 20 | 34    | 5.3% | -0.60 [−18.21,−0.09] |
| Kılıç 2018        | 10.22 | 2.79 | 22    | 28.5 | 5.74 | 22    | 7.7% | -18.28 [−20.95,−15.61] |
| Zhu 2019          | 34.1 | 9.9 | 29    | 42.1 | 11.6 | 29    | 6.7% | -8.00 [−13.55,−2.45] |
| Subtotal (95% CI) | 85   | 85 | 19.7% | -12.44 [−20.20,−4.68] |

Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 38.36; Ch^{2} = 12.90; df = 2 (P = 0.002); I^2 = 84\%$

Test for overall effect: $Z = 3.14 (P = 0.002)$

Total (95% CI) | 450 | 448 | 100.0% | -8.21 [−11.63,−4.80] |

Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 37.58; Ch^{2} = 201.51; df = 14 (P < 0.00001); I^2 = 93\%$

Test for overall effect: $Z = 4.71 (P = 0.00001)$

Test for submaximal differences: $Ch^{2} = 7.36; df = 3 (P = 0.06); I^2 = 59.3\%$

---

**Figure 3**

Cumulative opioid consumption 24 hours after surgery.

**Figure 4**

Rest pain score at 24 hours after surgery. Visual analogue scale (VAS) score at rest 24 hours after surgery. Numerical rating scale (NRS) score at rest 24 hours after surgery.
Table 1

| Study or Subgroup | Experimental | Control | Odds Ratio | M-H, Random, 95% CI |
|-------------------|--------------|---------|------------|---------------------|
|                   | Events       | Total   | M-H, Random, 95% CI |
| Cesarean section  | 0 25         | 0 23    | Not estimable |
|                   | 3 34         | 9 34    | 0.27 [0.07, 1.10] |
|                   | 9 44         | 7 42    | 1.29 [0.43, 3.84] |
|                   | 0 20         | 0 20    | Not estimable |
|                   | 0 28         | 0 30    | Not estimable |
| Subtotal (95% CI) | 151          | 149     | 0.63 [0.14, 2.96] |
| Total events      | 12           | 16      |             |
| Heterogeneity:    | Tau² = 0.81; | Chi² = 2.97, df = 1 (P = 0.06); I² = 66% |
| Test for overall effect: Z = 0.60 (P = 0.55) |
| Laparoscopic       | 1 30         | 0 30    | 3.10 [0.12, 79.23] |
|                   | 8 29         | 16 29   | 0.31 [0.10, 0.93] |
|                   | 59           | 59      | 0.58 [0.08, 4.41] |
| Total events      | 9            | 16      |             |
| Heterogeneity:    | Tau² = 1.16; | Chi² = 1.76, df = 1 (P = 0.18); I² = 43% |
| Test for overall effect: Z = 0.52 (P = 0.60) |
| Posterior QLB     | 0 25         | 0 23    | Not estimable |
|                   | 9 44         | 7 42    | 1.29 [0.43, 3.84] |
|                   | 0 20         | 0 20    | Not estimable |
|                   | 1 30         | 0 30    | 3.10 [0.12, 79.23] |
|                   | 119          | 115     | 1.41 [0.50, 3.96] |
| Total events      | 10           | 7       |             |
| Heterogeneity:    | Tau² = 0.00; | Chi² = 0.26, df = 1 (P = 0.61); I² = 0% |
| Test for overall effect: Z = 0.65 (P = 0.52) |
| Transmuscular QLB | 3 34         | 9 34    | 0.27 [0.07, 1.10] |
|                   | 8 29         | 16 29   | 0.31 [0.10, 0.93] |
|                   | 63           | 63      | 0.29 [0.12, 0.78] |
| Total events      | 11           | 25      |             |
| Heterogeneity:    | Tau² = 0.00; | Chi² = 0.02, df = 1 (P = 0.88); I² = 0% |
| Test for overall effect: Z = 2.78 (P = 0.005) |
| Total (95% CI)    | 392          | 386     | 100.0%      |
| Total events      | 42           | 64      |             |
| Heterogeneity:    | Tau² = 0.27; | Chi² = 10.92, df = 7 (P = 0.14); I² = 36% |
| Test for overall effect: Z = 1.81 (P = 0.07) |
| Test for subgroups differences: Chi² = 5.20, df = 3 (P = 0.16). I² = 42.3% |

Figure 5

The incidence of postoperative nausea and vomiting (PONV) within 24 hours after surgery.
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