DOI: 10.21088/ijaa.2349.8471.12325.1

Indian Journal of Anesthesia and Analgesia
Volume 12 Number 3 July - September 2025

EDITORIAL

Targeting the Ventral Ramus: Many Roads, One Destination?

Pallavi Ahluwalia

HOW TO CITE THIS ARTICLE:

Pallavi Ahluwalia. Targeting the ventral ramus: Many roads, one destination? Ind J Anesth Analg. 2025; 12(3): 167-169.

Advances in ultrasound technology, anatomical knowledge, and the search for safer, more effective pain management methods have all contributed to a remarkable transformation in regional anesthesia in recent decades. One of the many innovations that have developed into useful instruments for targeting neural structures with minimal invasiveness is the Interfascial plane blocks. However, a critical question is raised by the proliferation of techniques that target similar anatomical structures. For example, the erector spinae plane (ESP) block, the midpoint transverse process to pleura (MTP) block, and the retrolaminar block (RLB) all target the ventral rami of spinal nerves to provide multi-dermatomal analgesia. So, the question arises- do we need so many different approaches to accomplish the same clinical goal?

Interfascial plane blocks have gained popularity due to their many benefits, including their ease of use, improved functionality, and capacity to provide analgesia over a large anatomical area. Unlike traditional nerve blocks that target specific peripheral nerves, these blocks involve injecting a local anesthetic (LA) into the fascial planes, where it spreads to block the neighbouring neural structures. These techniques usually focus on the spinal nerve's ventral ramus, which is an essential component of abdominal and thoracic surgeries. In 2016, the ESP block was first used.[2] Local anesthetic is administered between the erector spinae muscles and the transverse processes at the segmental levels supplying the area of interest. A possible explanation is that LA spreads into the paravertebral space to block the ventral and dorsal rami of the spinal nerve.[3] The MTP block, a more recent addition, aims for comparable paravertebral spread by focusing on the area between the midpoint of the transverse process and the pleura. It is hypothesised that LA spreads through spreads through septations and fenestrations in the superior costotransverse ligament to reach the paravertebral space. In contrast, in the retrolaminar block, LA is injected into the musculofascial plane between the vertebral lamina and deep paraspinal muscles. LA spreads by diffusion to deliver an anesthetic posterior to the lamina to the ventral ramus.

Each method has been praised for its special benefits. The ESP block is commended for being simple to use and having a minimal chance of puncturing the pleura. The MTP block is said to target the paravertebral space with greater precision, which could increase the effectiveness of thoracic procedures. Because it is more superficial, the retrolaminar block is thought to be safer for patients who have coagulopathy or anatomical variations. Notwithstanding these variations, the objective of all three blocks is the same: to stop the ventral ramus from transmitting pain. This overlap raises questions about whether the variations are purely academic exercises in technique differentiation or have clinical significance.

AUTHOR'S AFFILIATION:

Professor, Department of Anaesthesia, Teerthanker Mahaveer Medical College, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh-244001, India.

E-mail: drpallaviahluwalia@yahoo.com

The variation in patient anatomy and clinical context is a strong justification for preserving multiple approaches. Not every patient has predictable local anesthetic spread or the same fascial planes. Obesity or prior spinal surgery, for instance, may make it difficult to see ESP block landmarks, which makes the retrolaminar approach more practical. Similarly, the superficial nature of the retrolaminar block may be better for patients with chronic lung disease, where pleural proximity carries a higher risk. With its emphasis on precise paravertebral spread, the MTP block may be beneficial in situations where targeted analgesia is needed for particular dermatomes, like the treatment of rib fractures.

Different levels of operator experience and resource availability are also accommodated by the variety of techniques. Practitioners with little ultrasound experience can use the ESP block because it is relatively simple to learn and has obvious ultrasound landmarks (the erector spinae muscle and the transverse process). On the other hand, MTP block necessitates exact needle placement nearer the pleura, requiring more expertise and assurance in ultrasound-guided procedures. In situations where ultrasonography capabilities are limited, the retrolaminar block[4] may be more useful because it is less reliant on deep anatomical visualization. Because of the options of multiple approaches, the clinicians can select a technique aligned with their skill set and equipment, potentially improving safety and success rates.

Advocates of multiple techniques argue that subtle differences in the diffusion of local anaesthesia and clinical outcomes justify the existence of multiple techniques. For example, clinical trials indicate that ESP block can achieve a wider craniocaudal spread than retrolaminar block, and may cover multiple derms with a single injection. Conversely, the proximity of the MTP block to the paravertebral space may increase sympathetic chain blockade, offering additional benefits in visceral pain. These differences, although not always clinically relevant, provide fertile ground for research. Comparative studies examining time to onset, duration, and analgesic efficacy may improve our understanding of the optimal indications of each block, ultimately improving patient care.

Critics claim that the similarities between these units outweigh their differences and that this leads to unnecessary redundancies. From an anatomical point of view, all three methods target the same neural structure, the ventral ramus, by diffusion through adjacent fascia. Clinical studies have not yet demonstrated a consistent and significant difference in outcome rates. A randomized controlled study comparing ESP and retrolaminar blocks in laparoscopic surgery conducted in 2022, for example, did not show a difference in post-operative pain scores or opioid consumption.[5] Similarly, the preliminary data on MTP block suggest comparable efficacy to ESP block in the treatment of rib fractures. If these blocks produce equivalent results, the case for retaining multiple techniques becomes questionable, especially when the cognitive burden on the clinician is considered.

Both clinical practice and medical education are becoming more complex as a result of the proliferation of techniques. Multiple blocks, each with unique anatomical landmarks, ultrasound imaging needs, and potential complications, must be learned, practiced, and maintained by anesthesiologists. For trainees and non-specialists, who might find it difficult to grasp the subtleties of each strategy, this is especially difficult. Given its broad use and strong body of research, standardizing a single, well-validated method, for example, the ESP block, could expedite training, lower errors, and enhance patient care consistency.

In a busy clinical setting, having multiple alternatives to the same procedure may lead to decision fatigue. Clinicians have to balance the theoretical benefits of each block against the individual needs of the patient, often under time pressure. This complexity may lead to suboptimal decision-making or reliance on known techniques, even when alternatives may be more appropriate. Simplification of the block repertoire may increase efficacy and reduce the risk of procedural errors such as inadvertent pleural puncture during MTP blocking or inadequate analgesia due to improper retrolaminar injection. The argument over various strategies highlights a larger conflict in medicine: how to strike a balance between standardization and innovation. Although the variety of approaches encourages adaptability and research, it also runs the risk of overwhelming practitioners

and fragmenting clinical practice. There are various steps involved in a practical strategy to address this tension.

To elucidate the clinical distinctions between these blocks, high-quality, multicentre trials are required. Instead of using surrogate endpoints like local anesthetic spread in cadavers, studies should concentrate on patient-centred outcomes like pain management, opioid sparing, and functional recovery. To outline the indications, benefits, and drawbacks of each block, professional associations like the American Society of Regional Anesthesia and Pain Medicine should create evidence-based guidelines. These recommendations can minimize needless variation by assisting clinicians in choosing the best method for particular situations. Training programmes should give priority to the teaching of a core set of broad and well-validated blocks, with additional techniques introduced as advanced competencies. For example, the ESP block could serve as a basic technique, while the MTP and retrolaminar blocks would be reserved for specific indications or challenging cases. Improvements in ultrasound technology, such as automatic recognition of landmarks, could alleviate the difficulty of learning several techniques. By improving visualization and needle guidance, these tools can reduce the need for a highly specialised approach.

A proliferation of ventral ramus-focused interstitial blocks exemplifies the dynamic nature of regional anaesthesia, where innovation drives progress but also calls for scrutiny. Although the ESP, MTP, and retrolaminar block have theoretical advantages, their clinical equivalence and overlapping indications give rise to a valid concern of exclusion. Investing in benchmarking research, standardisation of training, and technology deployment, the sector can reap the benefits of these techniques while minimising complexity. Ultimately, the aim is not to remove the options, but to ensure that each approach has a place in the inventory through evidence, utility, and meaningful contribution to patient care. For this area, where accuracy and efficiency are of paramount importance, the clarity of our approach to blocking the same structure is both a challenge and an opportunity.

REFERENCES

1. Costache I, De Neumann L, Ramnanan CJ, Goodwin SL, Pawa A, Abdallah FW, McCartney CJ. The mid-point transverse process to pleura (MTP) block: a new end-point for thoracic paravertebral block. Anaesthesia. 2017 Oct;72(10):1230-6.
2. Chin KJ, Adhikary SD, Forero M. Erector spinae plane (ESP) block: a new paradigm in regional anesthesia and analgesia. Current Anesthesiology Reports. 2019 Sep 15;9:2
3. Jinn CK, Kariem EB. Mechanisms of action of the erector spinae plane (ESP) block: a narrative review. Canadian Journal of Anesthesia. 2021 Mar 1;68(3):387-408.71-80.
4. Peker K, Aydın G, Gençay I, Saraçoğlu AG, Şahin AT, Öğden M, Peker SA. The effect of preemptive retrolaminar block on lumbar spinal decompression surgery. European Spine Journal. 2024 Nov;33(11):4253-61.
5. Liu D, Zhang G, Zhu Y, Liu X, Xu S, He M, Chen S, An K, Liang G, Zhu Z. Effectiveness of Ultrasound-Guided Retrolaminar Block and Erector Spinae Plane Block in Retroperitoneal Laparoscopic Surgery: A Randomized Controlled Trial. J Pain Res. 2022 Mar 28;15:815-826