

Comparison of Pericapsular Nerve Group and Lateral Quadratus Lumborum Blocks for Analgesia after Primary Total Hip Arthroplasty: A Randomized Controlled Trial

Ellen L. H. Johnson, MD,¹ Tara L. Kelly, MD,¹ Bethany J. Wolf, PhD,²
Erik Hansen, MD³, Andrew Brown⁴, Carla Lautenschlager⁴, Sylvia H.
Wilson, MD¹

From the

¹Department of Anesthesiology and Perioperative Medicine, Medical University of South Carolina, Charleston, SC, USA

²Department of Public Health Sciences, Medical University of South Carolina, Charleston, SC, USA

³Department of Orthopaedics & Physical Medicine, Medical University of South Carolina, Charleston, SC, USA

⁴College of Medicine, Medical University of South Carolina, Charleston, SC, USA

Contributor statements:

1. Ellen L. H. Johnson. Conflicts of interest: none. This author helped with study design, data collection, interpretation of the results, and manuscript writing and editing. ORCID 0000-0002-8697-226X
2. Tara L. Kelly. Conflicts of interest: none. This author helped with data collection, interpretation of the results, and manuscript writing and editing.

3. Bethany J. Wolf. Conflicts of interest: none. This author helped with study design, data interpretation, statistical analysis, and manuscript writing and editing. ORCID 0000-0002-7124-5158
4. Erik Hansen. Conflicts of interest: This author helped with study design, interpretation of the results, and manuscript writing and editing.
5. Andrew Brown. Conflicts of interest: none. This author helped with data collection and manuscript writing and editing.
6. Carla Lautenschlager. Conflicts of interest: none. This author helped with data collection and manuscript writing and editing.
7. Sylvia H. Wilson. Conflicts of interest: none. This author helped with study conception, study procedures, interpretation of the results, and manuscript writing and editing. ORCID 0000-0003-4747-6009.

Address Correspondence to:

Ellen H. Johnson, MD, Department of Anesthesia and Perioperative Medicine, Medical University of South Carolina, 167 Ashley Ave, Suite 301, MSC 912, Charleston, SC 29425, USA (phone: 843-792-2322; fax: 843-792-2726; email: hayell@musc.edu)

Conflict of Interests/Financial Disclosures:

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Funding: This work was supported by internal departmental support (Department of Anesthesia and Perioperative Medicine, Medical University of South Carolina). This project was also supported by the South Carolina Clinical & Translational Research Institute, Medical University

of South Carolina's CTSA, NIH/NCRR Grant Number 1UL1TR001450. The contents are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of the NIH or NCRR.

Running Head: Pericapsular Nerve Group vs Quadratus Lumborum for Hip Arthroplasty

Prior Presentation: This work was presented at The Society for Ambulatory Anesthesia 2024 Annual Meeting (Savannah, GA)

Abbreviations: BMI, body mass index; CI, confidence intervals; EOM, external oblique muscle; FICB, facia iliaca compartment block; HOOS JR, Hip disability and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score for Joint Replacement; IOM, internal oblique muscle; IQR, interquartile range; IV MME, intravenous morphine mg equivalents; LDM, latissimus dorsi muscle; LOS, length of stay; PACU, postoperative anesthesia care unit; PROMIS-10, Patient-Reported Outcome Measures Information System; QL, quadratus lumborum; QLB, quadratus lumborum block; SD, standard deviation; THA, total hip arthroplasty; TAM, transversus abdominus muscle; VAS, visual analog scale.

KEYWORDS: Nerve Block; Arthroplasty, Replacement, Hip; Anesthesia and Analgesia; Analgesia

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 **Introduction:** The quadratus lumborum block (QLB) and the pericapsular nerve group (PENG)
3 block both provide effective postoperative analgesia after hip surgery while minimizing impact
4 on motor function. This study aimed to compare QLB and PENG in patients undergoing primary
5 total hip arthroplasty.

6 **Methods:** This superiority trial randomized patients scheduled for elective total hip arthroplasty
7 to receive a lateral QLB or PENG with lateral femoral cutaneous nerve blocks for postoperative
8 analgesia. Perioperative analgesic protocols were standardized. The primary outcome was
9 postoperative cumulative opioid consumption at 72 hours. Secondary outcome was postoperative
10 pain scores. Additional outcomes of interest included time to first ambulation, length of stay,
11 patient reported outcome measures, and opioid- related side effects.

12 **Results:** This trial consented and randomized 106 subjects and 101 were included in analysis:
13 PENG (n=50), QLB (n=51). Mean (95% CI) opioid consumption (IV MME) in the first 72 hours
14 did not differ between PENG [109.6 (93.6, 125.6)] and QL [92.3 (76.6, 107.9)] groups (p=0.129)
15 There were no significant differences between treatment arms in average pain score, time to
16 ambulation, distance ambulated, rate of same day discharge, or hospital length of stay. There
17 were also no differences in patient reported outcomes using HOOS-JR and PROMIS-10 scores.

18 **Conclusion:** Patients undergoing primary THA receiving preoperative PENG vs QLB had
19 similar opioid consumption, pain scores, time to ambulation, and hospital length of stay. Both
20 QL and PENG blocks are analgesic options in patients undergoing primary THA.

21 **Clinical Trials Registration:** NCT05710107; www.ClinicalTrial.gov

22 IRB Protocol ID: Pro00124880

23 **Key message:**

- 24 • Pericapsular nerve group (PENG) block may provide analgesia after hip arthroplasty and
25 improve early functional recovery. This study evaluated postoperative opioid
26 consumption in patients randomized to PENG or lateral quadratus lumborum block
27 (QLB).
- 28 • Opioid consumption, pain scores, motor recovery, and functional outcome measures did
29 not differ in patients randomized to PENG vs lateral QLB.
- 30 • PENG and lateral QLBs are analgesic options following total hip arthroplasty with
31 similar rates of same day discharge.

32

33

34

35 INTRODUCTION

36 Total hip arthroplasty is a common orthopedic procedure and demand is expected to increase by
37 176% by 2040 and 659% by 2060(1). With this growth, interest in decreasing hospital length of
38 stay has resulted in the development of rapid recovery protocols, including analgesia with
39 regional anesthetic techniques promoting early ambulation(2, 3). The lateral quadratus lumborum
40 block (QLB) has shown to be effective in controlling pain, increasing time to first request of
41 analgesia, and decreasing opioid consumption after THA(4, 5), but few studies have compared
42 the lateral QLB with other motor sparing blocks including the more recently described
43 pericapsular nerve group (PENG) block.

44 The PENG block targets the articular branches of the obturator, accessory obturator, and femoral
45 nerves, thus inhibiting sensory innervation to the anterior capsule while retaining motor
46 innervation(6, 7). It can be combined with a lateral femoral cutaneous (LFC) nerve block to
47 improve its analgesic effect on the lateral thigh. When compared to no block, PENG blocks have
48 been shown to reduce pain scores, opioid use, and time to first ambulation while increasing hip
49 range of motion(8). PENG blocks may also provide analgesia similar to fascia iliaca
50 compartment blocks (FICB)(9) and improved analgesia compared to femoral nerve blocks(9),
51 while maintaining quadriceps strength. However, the analgesic properties of PENG and lateral
52 QLB have not been compared.

53 The purpose of this study was to compare postoperative opioid consumption in patients
54 undergoing primary THA and randomized PENG and LFC blocks or a lateral QLB. We
55 hypothesized that the combined PENG + LFC nerve block would provide superior analgesia, as
56 measured by opioid consumption at 72 hours after surgery and pain scores, while promoting
57 functional recovery.

58 **METHODS**

59 This randomized trial was approved by the institutional review board (Pro00124880;
60 04/21/2020) and registered on www.ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT05710107; 1/12/2023) before
61 patient enrollment. This trial was conducted in accordance with the original protocol, and written
62 informed consent was obtained from all subjects. This manuscript adheres to the applicable
63 Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials guidelines.

64 On the day of surgery, subjects were invited to participate, provided with informed consent, and
65 enrolled if eligible by study staff if determined to be eligible. Inclusion criteria included age \geq 18
66 years of age and ambulatory patients undergoing elective hip arthroplasty with planned same day
67 discharge or observation of 23 hours or less. Exclusion criteria included local anesthetic allergy,
68 weight <40 kg, unable or unwilling to provide informed consent, and substance abuse.

69 Enrollment and initial data collection took place at the Medical University of South Carolina
70 University Hospital in Charleston, SC. Subsequent data was collected via a paper diary or secure
71 text messaging system and in the orthopedic clinic.

72 Enrollment occurred from February 7, 2023 to November 9, 2023, with data collection
73 continuing until December 16, 2023. Consenting subjects were consecutively assigned a study
74 ID (1-106) and randomized to either lateral QLB, or PENG block with LFC block using a
75 computer-generated list created by a statistician before study initiation using simple
76 randomization. Randomization assignments were kept in sealed envelopes which were opened
77 prior to block placement. Other than the regional anesthesia team, all patients, care team
78 members, and research staff were blinded to randomization.

79 **Protocol**

80 In preoperative holding, subjects were placed in the supine position and administered
81 intravenous sedation (midazolam (0-2mg), dexmedetomidine (0-20µg)). To maintain blindness,
82 all participants regardless of group assignment had sonographic scans of all block sites with
83 aseptic skin prep and subcutaneous lidocaine placement at the appropriate insertion site. For both
84 block groups, a 10 cm, 21-gauge, echogenic needle was inserted and ropivacaine (30mL, 0.25%)
85 injected in 3-5 mL aliquots with intermittent aspiration.

86 **Lateral quadratus lumborum block (QL) Block**

87 A high-frequency (13–6 MHz), linear or low-frequency (5–2 MHz), curvilinear ultrasound probe
88 was used to visualize the external oblique, internal oblique, and transversus abdominus muscles
89 before scanning laterally to identify the lateral aponeurosis of the transversus abdominus muscle
90 and the lateral aspect of the QL muscle. An echogenic needle was then advanced (anterior to
91 posterior) until the needle tip was deep to the aponeurosis to the transversalis abdominus muscle
92 and lateral to the QL muscle, as previously described(10). Ropivacaine was injected
93 incrementally with frequent aspiration and spread observed on ultrasound imaging.

94 **Pericapsular Nerve Group Block (PENG) Block with Lateral Femoral Cutaneous (LFC)** 95 **Block**

96 For PENG block placement, a low-frequency (5–2 MHz), curvilinear ultrasound probe
97 was used to visualize the anterior inferior iliac spine, iliopsoas tendon, and iliopubic
98 eminence. An echogenic needle was then advanced (lateral to medial) under ultrasound
99 guidance until the tip reached the lateral and inferior margin of the iliopsoas tendon
100 between the anterior inferior iliac spine (lateral) and iliopubic eminence (deep), as
101 previously described. Ropivacaine (20ml; 0.25%) was injected lateral and inferior to the

102 psoas tendon with spread observed on ultrasound along the lateral superior pubic
103 ramus(7).
104 A high- frequency (13–6 MHz), linear probe was used to visualize the lateral femoral cutaneous
105 (LFC) nerve superficial to the sartorius muscles and medial to the anterior superior iliac spine.
106 An echogenic needle was then advanced (lateral to medial) under ultrasound guidance until the
107 needle tip was visualized in plane with the nerve(11). Ropivacaine (10ml; 0.25%) was injected
108 and spread observed around the nerve.

109 **Anesthetic Care**

110 Anesthetic care was standardized. Unless contraindicated, multimodal analgesia included
111 preoperative oral acetaminophen (1000mg) and intraoperative ketorolac (15–30 mg intravenous,
112 IV, based on renal function) during surgical closure. Intraoperatively, spinal anesthesia
113 (bupivacaine 10mg) was supplemented with intravenous sedation. General anesthesia was
114 utilized in the event of the inability to place or inadequate spinal anesthesia. Surgeons performed
115 periarticular injection immediately before closure (ropivacaine 0.2% with ketorolac 30 mg and
116 clonidine 100mcg) for all patients. Postoperative anesthetic care unit (PACU) orders were
117 standardized and included hydromorphone (0.2mg IV every 10min for severe pain).
118 Postoperative surgical orders were standardized: oral acetaminophen (1000mg every 8hours),
119 methocarbamol (750–1000mg every 8hours), celecoxib (200mg two times per day), and
120 oxycodone as needed for moderate and severe pain (5–10 mg).

121 **Outcomes**

122 Collected data included demographics, opioid consumption, pain rating using the Visual
123 Analog Scale (VAS), time to first ambulation (time 0 with operative spinal placement),
124 distance at first ambulation, post anesthesia care unit (PACU) duration, hospital length of

125 stay (LOS), same day discharge rates, patient reported outcome measures [Hip disability
126 and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score for Joint Replacement (HOOS JR) and Patient-
127 Reported Outcome Measures Information System (PROMIS-10) surveys], and opioid
128 related side effects. Demographic data collected included patient age, sex, and race, and
129 body mass index (BMI, cm^2/kg). Intraoperative and postoperative opioids were converted
130 to intravenous morphine mg equivalents (IV MME) for comparison. VAS measurements
131 were taken by having patients mark on a 100mm line (0mm: no pain to 100mm: worst
132 pain). VAS measurements were taken before placing the block in holding and
133 approximately one hour after PACU arrival. Starting on postoperative day (POD) 1, data
134 was collected by paper pain diary or by secure text message (Twilio(12)) based on the
135 patient's preference. Specifically, the name, dose, and frequency of any pain medications,
136 VAS measurements, patient satisfaction, and any side effects were collected. For
137 subjects preferring paper diaries, a member of the research staff would call and speak to
138 patients for data collection. For subjects preferring texts, paper diaries were also given,
139 and messages were sent at 9 am (to collect overnight data) and 3 pm (to collect day data)
140 through POD 3. PACU duration, hospital length of stay, and same day discharge rates
141 were collected by research staff. Time to first ambulation and distance ambulated were
142 collected by physical exam by trained research staff in PACU and by physical therapy
143 assessments. On POD 7, 2 weeks postoperative, and 6 weeks postoperative, participants
144 completed the HOOS Jr and PROMIS-10 Global Health questionnaires by text message
145 or phone interview from the research team. HOOS JR provides information on patient-
146 reported hip pain and function in patients undergoing THA(13). PROMIS-10 provides

147 information on patient-reported general health quality of life, including physical, mental,
148 and social health. Opioid related side effects were collected throughout the study.

149 **Power**

150 Postoperative cumulative opioid consumption (IV MME) at 72 hours was the primary outcome.
151 A prior study(10) found mean IV MME at 12 hours postoperative in subjects undergoing THA
152 with a QL block was 16 ± 12 MME. Therefore, a sample size of 48 subjects per group with 9
153 repeated measures of opioid consumption provides 80% power to detect a difference in
154 cumulative MMEs consumed postoperatively of 4 MMEs at significance level $\alpha = 0.006$
155 (Bonferroni adjusted for 9 pairwise comparisons between group) assuming a standard deviation
156 of ± 12 MMEs, a first-order autoregressive correlation structure and correlation between
157 observations on the same subject of $\rho = 0.33$. Thus, enrollment planned for 53 subjects/group
158 (106 total) to allow for 10% attrition.

159 **Statistics**

160 Differences in patient characteristics between treatment arms were assessed using chi-square or
161 Fisher's exact test for categorical variables and t-tests or Wilcoxon rank sum tests for continuous
162 variables to assess balance between treatment arms.
163 The primary outcome of interest was cumulative postoperative opioid consumption in the first 72
164 hours. Differences in cumulative opioid consumption between block groups was assessed using
165 a linear mixed model approach. The model included fixed effects for treatment group,
166 postoperative time, and the interaction between block group and postoperative time and a
167 random subject effect to account for correlation between measures collected on the same patient
168 over time. Model assumptions were checked graphically, and transformations were considered if

169 needed. Differences between block types at each postoperative time were evaluated using linear
170 contrasts from the model.

171 Secondary and additional outcomes of interest included postoperative worst and average VAS
172 pain scores in the first 72 hours, time to first ambulation, PACU duration, hospital length of stay,
173 same day discharge rates, patient reported outcome measures (HOOS JR and PROMIS-10), and
174 opioid related side effects. VAS pain score, patient reported outcomes (HOOS JR and PROMIS-
175 10) were measured at multiple timepoints. Differences in these outcomes over time between
176 block groups were assessed using a linear mixed model approach described previously.

177 Difference between treatment groups in time to first ambulation, time to return of motor
178 function, PACU duration, and hospital length of stay were evaluated using Wilcoxon rank sum
179 tests. Associations between block type and opioid side effects were evaluated using Fisher's
180 exact test. The association between block type and rate of same day discharge was evaluated
181 using a logistic regression approach. The model included block type and anesthesia stop time to
182 account for the fact that later surgeries were less likely to go home the same day.

183 Approximately 0-21% of observations for primary and secondary outcomes were missing.

184 Multiple imputation with 10 imputations was used to impute missing outcome values prior to all
185 analyses and results are reported based on the pooled estimates across imputations. As a
186 sensitivity analysis, we also conducted a complete case analysis and compared the results with
187 those from the imputed data. All analyses were conducted in SAS v. 9.4 (SAS Institute, Cary,
188 NC, USA).

189 **RESULTS**

190 This trial consented and randomized 106 subjects (February 7, 2023-November 12, 2023). Five
191 patients were excluded from analysis due to withdrawal of participation (n=3, 2 in QLB group, 1
192 in PENG group) and inability to perform block (n=2, both in PENG group). The final study
193 population included 50 subject who received a PENG block and 51 subjects who received a QL
194 block (Figure 1). Participant characteristics by treatment group are shown in Table 1. There were
195 no notable differences between demographic and baseline characteristics of the two groups.

196 **Table 1. Patient Characteristics**

	PENG	QLB	P
	(n = 50)	(n = 51)	
Age (years), mean±SD	62.8±12.7	65.8±9.77	0.198
Gender (male), n (%)	28 (56.0)	22 (44.0)	0.196
Race (white), n (%)	34 (68.0)	42 (55.3)	0.095
Average VAS pain in last week (mm), mean±SD			
Movement	67.1±23.7	66.7±18.9	0.923
Rest	43.9±30.3	44.3±25.4	0.941
Total OR time (mins); median (IQR)	160 (62)	153 (32)	0.007

197 Abbreviations: IQR, interquartile range; PENG, pericapsular nerve group; QLB, quadratus

198 lumborum block; SD, standard deviation; VAS, visual analogue scale

199 **Postoperative Opioid Consumption**

200 Cumulative opioid consumption is presented in Figure 2. Mean (95% CI) opioid consumption
201 (IV MME) in the first 72 hours did not differ between patients randomized to PENG [112.9
202 (93.4, 132.4)] and QLB [89.3 (71.1, 107.9); $p=0.065$]. A complete case analysis was conducted
203 to serve as a sensitivity analysis to examine the impact of imputation to address missing data and
204 results were similar.

205 **Additional Outcomes**

206 Additional outcomes of interest are summarized in Table 2. There was no significant difference
207 in average VAS pain scores between treatment arms. Worst pain reported on a VAS scale was an
208 average of 7mm higher in the PENG group compared to the QLB group ($p=0.032$); however,
209 when using imputed data, this difference was no longer significant when considering the
210 complete case ($p=0.061$). There was no difference between treatment arms in time to first
211 ambulation or distance ambulated. There was also no difference in patient centered outcome
212 measures using HOOS and PROMIS scores at 1, 2, and 6 weeks postoperative.

213 Hospital LOS is presented in Figure 3. Mean differences (95% CI) in PENG versus QLB groups
214 for PACU LOS [-19 min (-74.0, 37.0); $P=0.486$] and hospital LOS [0.15 hours (-1.3, 2.05),
215 $P=0.821$] and rates of same day discharge (48% versus 52%, respectively; $P=0.561$) did not
216 differ between groups. Opioid side effects did not differ between groups in the first 72 hours
217 including any ($P=0.366$), itching ($P=0.352$), and nausea ($P=0.145$). There was no documented
218 harm or unintended effect in either group.

219 **Table 2.** Additional Outcomes of Interest

	PENG	QLB	P
	(n = 50)	(n = 51)	
Average VAS Pain Scores (mm), mean (95% CI)			0.362
PACU	33.2 (26.5, 39.9)	29.5 (22.9, 36.1)	
12 hours	47.2 (39.2, 55.1)	43.5 (36.5, 50.6)	
24 hours	48.7 (40.5, 60.0)	45.1 (38.7, 51.5)	
36 hours	46.0 (38.3, 53.8)	42.4 (35.7, 49.1)	
48 hours	40.4 (32.4, 48.4)	36.8 (29.8, 43.8)	
60 hours	38.3 (29.5, 47.2)	34.7 (27.9, 41.5)	
72 hours	35.3 (27.1, 43.5)	31.7 (24.8, 38.6)	
Worst VAS Pain Scores (mm), mean (95% CI)			0.032
PACU	34.9 (28.8, 41.0)	27.8 (21.8, 33.9)	
12 hours PO	61.5 (54.0, 69.1)	54.5 (47.2, 61.8)	
24 hours PO	63.7 (54.3, 70.0)	56.6 (50.2, 63.0)	
36 hours PO	60.4 (53.5, 67.4)	53.4 (46.8, 60.0)	
48 hours PO	55.7 (48.4, 63.0)	48.6 (41.6, 55.6)	
60 hours PO	54.9 (48.3, 61.4)	47.8 (41.0, 54.6)	

72 hours PO	50.4 (43.8, 57.0)	43.4 (36.8, 49.9)	
Ambulation, median (IQR)			
Time to first ambulation (mins)	500.5 (89)	502 (69)	0.792
Distance ambulated (feet)	200 (150)	180 (200)	0.304
Patient centered outcomes, mean (95% CI)			
HOOS JR			0.282
1 week	54.3 (49.2, 59.4)	57.2 (53.0, 61.4)	
2 weeks	62.3 (58.1, 66.6)	65.3 (60.8, 69.8)	
6 weeks	68.9 (64.9, 72.9)	71.8 (67.3, 76.3)	
Physical Health, PROMIS			0.785
1 week	42.6 (40.4, 44.9)	43.0 (40.7, 45.2)	
2 weeks	46.0 (43.8, 48.3)	46.4 (44.1, 48.7)	
6 weeks	48.0 (45.7, 50.2)	48.3 (46.1, 50.5)	
Mental Health, PROMIS			0.801
1 week	45.9 (43.9, 47.9)	46.2 (44.2, 48.3)	
2 weeks	49.0 (47.0, 60.0)	49.3 (47.3, 51.3)	
6 weeks	50.7 (48.7, 52.8)	51.0 (49.1, 52.9)	

- 220 CI, confidence intervals; HOOS JR, Hip disability and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score for Joint
221 Replacement; LOS, length of stay; PACU, postoperative anesthesia care unit; PROMIS-10,
222 Patient-Reported Outcome Measures Information System; QLB, quadratus lumborum block;
223 VAS, visual analog scale

224 **DISCUSSION**

225 This randomized, prospective study did not find a PENG block with LFC block to be superior to
226 a lateral QLB for reducing postoperative opioid consumption or pain scores after THA. Our
227 results contrast with two prior studies which found patients randomized to PENG for THA (14)
228 or surgery for hip fracture (15) to have decreased opioid consumption compared to those
229 receiving a fascia iliaca compartment block (FICB). Alternatively, our results support prior
230 retrospective and smaller studies finding no difference in opioid consumption after PENG
231 compared to other peripheral nerve blocks. (9, 16-19) In a retrospective study of 160 patient
232 receiving a PENG (n=45), anterior QLB (n=38), or no block (n=77) for analgesia after THA,
233 both peripheral nerve blocks were associated with decreased opioid consumption compared to
234 controls, but opioid consumption did not differ between patient who received PENG or QLB
235 (16). Similarly, in a prospective study of 89 patients for THA randomized to PENG (n=30),
236 anterior QLB (n=30), or intraarticular injection (n=29), opioid consumption at 48 hours differed
237 between the QLB and intraarticular but not between the PENG and other groups (18). Opioid
238 consumption after THA also did not differ in a third trial of 90 patients randomized to PENG or
239 anterior QLB(19) or in two recent prospective studies of 40 (9) and 58 (17) patients randomized
240 to PENG or FICB. Our study also did not find a difference in pain score between block groups.
241 While prior publications noted no differences in pain scores when comparing PENG to anterior
242 QLB (18) or FICB (20), other studies have noted improved pain scores with PENG compared
243 with anterior QLB (19), FICB (14, 15, 17), and femoral neve block (21). While our findings
244 support that both PENG and latera QLB offer analgesia following THA, they also support the
245 use of the lateral QLB to promote early functional recovery including ambulation and same day
246 discharge.

247 As joint arthroplasty increasingly moves to an outpatient procedure, earlier ambulation coupled
248 with analgesia promotes same day discharge and peripheral nerve block selection may impact
249 this goal. In a prospective study, patients randomized to PENG had similar quadriceps strength
250 compared to patient with a sham block, but demonstrated earlier postoperative mobility with
251 longer distances ambulated and earlier discharge home (22). Other publications have found
252 patients randomized to PENG to have less quadriceps weakness compared with FICB (9),
253 femoral nerve block (21), and anterior QLB (18). However, this improved strength and
254 mobilization has not always correlated with a decreased LOS(8, 9, 19, 20). Our results support
255 prior publications demonstrating that PENG blocks do not create quadriceps weakness and
256 should promote the ability of patients to achieve same day discharge goals after THA but that
257 LOS is likely multifactorial.

258 Fewer studies have evaluated functional outcomes measures after PENG. In 90 patients
259 randomized the PENG or sham for THA, PENG subjects had improved quality of recovery
260 (QoR)-15 scores on postoperative day 1 and 2 but this difference was lost on postoperative day 3
261 (22). Similar to our findings, QoR-40 scores did not differ in patients randomized to PENG,
262 anterior QL, and intraarticular injection after THA, despite decreased pain and opioid
263 consumption in both peripheral block groups(18).

264 Finally, our results are generalizable to most patients undergoing elective THA. We had few
265 exclusion criteria and included most of our patient population presenting for primary THA.

266 **Limitations**

267 Our study does have some potential limitations. While our group performs both PENG and QLB
268 daily, PENG is a new technique. Notably, we were unable to perform the randomized block only
269 in two patients, both randomized to the PENG group, which may suggest a more difficult block

270 technique. Despite substantial institutional progress to increase patient ambulation after surgery,
271 our physical therapists frequently do not start postoperative day zero ambulation until after noon,
272 regardless of patient strength and readiness, in an effort to expedite discharge of any patients that
273 stayed overnight for 23-hour observation. Thus, patient strength/readiness and pain control may
274 not have been the primary factor impacting time or first ambulation. Similarly, while 88.15% of
275 our total joint arthroplasty cases were outpatient in our institution in 2024, only 51.53%
276 completed same day discharge with the patient/family preference being the primary reason for
277 not going home on the day of surgery. Thus, patient/family choice and preparedness like
278 remains a key factor in the ability to achieve same day discharge.

279 **Conclusion**

280 Although we were unable to demonstrate superiority for opioid consumption at 72 hours
281 postoperative, there was no significant difference in opioid consumption between groups.
282 Additionally, mobility and functional outcome measures were similar between groups. We
283 propose that both a lateral QLB and PENG block + LFC block are effective analgesic methods
284 for patients undergoing THA.

REFERENCES

1. Pabinger C, Lothaller H, Portner N, Geissler A. Projections of hip arthroplasty in OECD countries up to 2050. *Hip Int.* 2018;28(5):498-506.
2. Guerra ML, Singh PJ, Taylor NF. Early mobilization of patients who have had a hip or knee joint replacement reduces length of stay in hospital: a systematic review. *Clin Rehabil.* 2015;29(9):844-54.
3. Tasso F, Simili V, Di Matteo B, Monteleone G, Martorelli F, De Angelis A, et al. A rapid recovery protocol for hip and knee replacement surgery: a report of the outcomes in a referral center. *Eur Rev Med Pharmacol Sci.* 2022;26(10):3648-55.
4. Huda AU, Minhas R. Quadratus Lumborum Block Reduces Postoperative Pain Scores and Opioids Consumption in Total Hip Arthroplasty: A Meta-Analysis. *Cureus.* 2022;14(2):e22287.
5. Kim YJ, Kim HT, Kim HJ, Yoon PW, Park JI, Lee SH, et al. Ultrasound-Guided Anterior Quadratus Lumborum Block Reduces Postoperative Opioid Consumption and Related Side Effects in Patients Undergoing Total Hip Replacement Arthroplasty: A Propensity Score-Matched Cohort Study. *J Clin Med.* 2021;10(20).
6. Del Buono R, Padua E, Pascarella G, Costa F, Tognu A, Terranova G, et al. Pericapsular hip radiofrequency: future approaches to treat hip chronic pain. *Minerva Anesthesiol.* 2021;87(12):1393-4.
7. Giron-Arango L, Peng PWH, Chin KJ, Brull R, Perlas A. Pericapsular Nerve Group (PENG) Block for Hip Fracture. *Reg Anesth Pain Med.* 2018;43(8):859-63.

8. Pascarella G, Costa F, Del Buono R, Pulitano R, Strumia A, Piliago C, et al. Impact of the pericapsular nerve group (PENG) block on postoperative analgesia and functional recovery following total hip arthroplasty: a randomised, observer-masked, controlled trial. *Anaesthesia*. 2021;76(11):1492-8.
9. Aliste J, Layera S, Bravo D, Jara A, Munoz G, Barrientos C, et al. Randomized comparison between pericapsular nerve group (PENG) block and suprainguinal fascia iliaca block for total hip arthroplasty. *Reg Anesth Pain Med*. 2021;46(10):874-8.
10. Kelly T, Wolla CD, Wolf BJ, Hay E, Babb S, Wilson SH. Comparison of lateral quadratus lumborum and lumbar plexus blocks for postoperative analgesia following total hip arthroplasty: a randomized clinical trial. *Reg Anesth Pain Med*. 2022;47(9):541-6.
11. Davies A, Crossley A, Harper M, O'Loughlin E. Lateral cutaneous femoral nerve blockade-limited skin incision coverage in hip arthroplasty. *Anaesth Intensive Care*. 2014;42(5):625-30.
12. Twilio. n.d. "What is Twilio, and how does it work? An introduction to the leader in customer engagement" <https://www.twilio.com/en-us/resource-center/what-is-twilio-an-introduction-to-the-leading-customer-engagement-platform>
13. Jacobs CA, Peabody MR, Duncan ST, Muchow RD, Nunley RM, Group A, et al. Development of the HOOS(global) to Assess Patient-Reported Outcomes in Patients Undergoing Hip Preservation Procedures. *Am J Sports Med*. 2018;46(4):940-6.
14. Vamshi C, Sinha C, Kumar A, Kumar A, Kumari P, Kumar A, et al. Comparison of the efficacy of pericapsular nerve group block (PENG) block versus suprainguinal fascia iliaca block (SFIB) in total hip arthroplasty: A randomized control trial. *Indian J Anaesth*. 2023;67(4):364-9.

15. Mosaffa F, Taheri M, Manafi Rasi A, Samadpour H, Memary E, Mirkheshti A. Comparison of pericapsular nerve group (PENG) block with fascia iliaca compartment block (FICB) for pain control in hip fractures: A double-blind prospective randomized controlled clinical trial. *Orthop Traumatol Surg Res.* 2022;108(1):103135.
16. Braun AS, Peabody Lever JE, Kalagara H, Piennette PD, Arumugam S, Mabry S, et al. Comparison of Pericapsular Nerve Group (PENG) Block Versus Quadratus Lumborum (QL) Block for Analgesia After Primary Total Hip Arthroplasty Under Spinal Anesthesia: A Retrospective Study. *Cureus.* 2023;15(12):e50119.
17. Choi YS, Park KK, Lee B, Nam WS, Kim DH. Pericapsular Nerve Group (PENG) Block versus Supra-Inguinal Fascia Iliaca Compartment Block for Total Hip Arthroplasty: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *J Pers Med.* 2022;12(3).
18. Et T, Korkusuz M. Comparison of the pericapsular nerve group block with the intra-articular and quadratus lumborum blocks in primary total hip arthroplasty: a randomized controlled trial. *Korean J Anesthesiol.* 2023;76(6):575-85.
19. Wang QR, Ma T, Hu J, Yang J, Kang PD. Comparison between ultrasound-guided pericapsular nerve group block and anterio quadratus lumborum block for total hip arthroplasty: a double-blind, randomized controlled trial. *Eur Rev Med Pharmacol Sci.* 2023;27(16):7523-32.
20. Bravo D, Aliste J, Layera S, Fernandez D, Erpel H, Aguilera G, et al. Randomized clinical trial comparing pericapsular nerve group (PENG) block and periarticular local anesthetic infiltration for total hip arthroplasty. *Reg Anesth Pain Med.* 2023;48(10):489-94.
21. Lin DY, Morrison C, Brown B, Saies AA, Pawar R, Vermeulen M, et al. Pericapsular nerve group (PENG) block provides improved short-term analgesia compared with the femoral

nerve block in hip fracture surgery: a single-center double-blinded randomized comparative trial.

Reg Anesth Pain Med. 2021;46(5):398-403.


22. Hu J, Wang Q, Hu J, Kang P, Yang J. Efficacy of Ultrasound-Guided Pericapsular Nerve Group (PENG) Block Combined With Local Infiltration Analgesia on Postoperative Pain After Total Hip Arthroplasty: A Prospective, Double-Blind, Randomized Controlled Trial. J Arthroplasty. 2023;38(6):1096-103.

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials flow diagram. LFC, lateral femoral cutaneous nerve; PENG, pericapsular nerve group; QLB, quadratus lumborum block.

Figure 2. Cumulative Opioid Consumption

Figure 3. Patients Discharged Over Time






Figure 2. Cumulative Opioid Consumption




Figure 3. Patients Discharged Over Time