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**PURPOSE:** To evaluate whether electroacupuncture is a safe and effective alternative to pharmacologic sedation/analgesia in uterine artery embolization (UAE) for leiomyomas.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS:** A nonrandomized prospective study was undertaken in 70 consecutive patients (mean age, 39.5 years) undergoing UAE with polyvinyl alcohol (PVA) particles between August 2006 and January 2007. Thirty-three patients chose to undergo UAE under electroacupuncture anesthesia (EAA; group A) and 37 were treated under local pharmacologic anesthesia (group B). Pain scores (rated from 0 to 10) in both groups were compared during and after the procedure. The outcome of UAE was evaluated at 6 months.

**RESULTS:** Mean pain scores during embolization were 0.36 in group A and 0.84 in group B; scores after embolization and before discharge were 3.00 in group A and 4.49 in group B; and scores at discharge were 0.97 in group A and 2.11 in group B. These differences were statistically significant after embolization and at hospital discharge ($P = .02$ and $P = .0001$, respectively). All patients except one in each group were discharged from the hospital 4–8 hours after UAE; the two who remained longer had severe pain. There were no significant differences in clinical outcomes, nor in uterine and leiomyoma volumes, at discharge and at 6 months ($P > .99$ and $P = .72$, respectively).

**CONCLUSIONS:** There was a statistically significant postembolization pain reduction in patients treated under EAA versus local pharmacologic anesthesia and no differences in UAE outcomes between groups at 6 months.

---

**FROM a societal economic perspective,** uterine artery embolization (UAE) has proven to be the best treatment strategy in women with symptomatic uterine leiomyomas (1). UAE in women with symptomatic leiomyomas leads to long-term symptom relief (2) with a durable improvement in quality of life. These results are achievable when the procedure is performed in any experienced community or academic interventional radiology practice (3).

However, most patients experience several hours of moderate to severe pain after this procedure, with recurrent or prolonged severe pain in some occasions (4). Changes in pain control protocol, as well as a trend toward less extensive occlusion of the uterine vasculature, have made this problem less common (4). There are many different strategies and simplified protocols for pain control during and after UAE (5-10).

Acupuncture has proven to be associated with improvements in pain and quality of life in patients with dysmenorrhea and to be a cost-effective option (11). Also, high-frequency transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation has proven to be effective for the treatment of dysmenorrhea (12). However, we are aware of no studies to date that report the use of acupuncture as a pain control method for UAE.

Electroacupuncture, also known as percutaneous electrical nerve stimulation, involves small clips (one positive and one negative) attached to two needles on one end and to a small box outputting in a electroestimulator on the other end. It is used to strengthen the effect of an acupuncture treatment or to deal with nerve pain or other neurologic problems (eg, Bell’s palsy). The use of an electroestimulator attached to the needles is a mean of stimulating the acupoints. Stimulation increases levels of analgesia, promotes tissue repair and healing, and promotes regeneration of nerve fibers in situations in which cell bodies of damaged nerves are still vital.

---

**Abbreviations:**
- EAA = electroacupuncture anesthesia
- PVA = polyvinyl alcohol
- UAE = uterine artery embolization
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The aim of this study is to evaluate whether electroacupuncture anesthe-
sia (EAA) is a safe and effective alter-
native to the use of subcutaneous
esthesia on the puncture site and
inflammatory and analgesic phar-
macologic sedation/analgesia in UAE
for uterine leiomyomas.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Patients

From August 2006 to January 2007,
we conducted a nonrandomized pro-
spective study in 70 consecutive pa-
tients who were being treated with
UAE for symptomatic leiomyomas.
Thirty-three patients chose to undergo
UAE under EAA without any local an-
esthesia (group A) and the remaining
37 were treated under local anesthesia
(group B). The decision to include pa-
tients in group A or B was based only
on patient preference. The age range
of patients was 27–56 years (mean age,
39.5 y). Sixty-two patients were white
and eight were black. The mean age of
patients was 27–56 years (mean age,
37 were treated under local anesthesia
on patient preference. The age range
37 were treated under EAA was 37.5
years (mean age, .015). There were no
other statistically significant differ-
ences in the baseline data between
groups (Table 1).

The main indications for UAE were
menorrhagia, bulk-related symptoms,
and pain (Table 1). There were no
cases of concomitant adenomyosis. Pa-
tients seeking future fertility were not
excluded. The study was approved by
the institutional review board. All pa-
tients gave written informed consent.
Neither the patients nor the operator
were blinded to the technique being
used.

Preprocedural Assessment

Contrast-enhanced pelvic magnetic
resonance (MR) imaging was per-
fomed in every patient before emboli-
ization to evaluate baseline volume of
the uterus and of the largest leiomyoma
via the formula for a prolate ellipse (ie,
length \times \text{depth} \times \text{width} \times 0.5233). Con-
trast-enhanced pelvic MR imaging was
performed with a 1.5-T system (Philips,
Best, The Netherlands). Axial, sagittal,
and coronal imaging examinations were
performed with turbo spin-echo T2-
weighted imaging. T1-weighted MR
images and axial and sagittal images
were obtained before and after gado-
linium injection (2 mL/sec). MR an-
angiography was performed with the
use of specific software to detect con-
trast agent arrival.

Periprocedural Medications

Preembolization medication was
the same in both groups. Patients were
given an acid-suppressing drug (oral
omeprazole 20 mg), an antiinflamma-
tory drug (oral diclofenac potassium
50 mg; Novartis, East Hanover, New
Jersey), an antihistamine (oral hy-
droxycine 25 mg; Atarax; UCB, Brus-
sels, Belgium), and a laxative (sodic
docusate 10 mg and sorbitol 1,340
mg as suppositories) twice (at break-
fast and dinner) on the day before
and once (at breakfast) on the day of
UAE.

Just before embolization, patients in
group A (ie, EAA group) received anxi-
yolytic (diazepam 5 mg sublingual) and
antiinflammatory (intravenous piroxi-
cam 20 mg) medication and patients in
group B (ie, local anesthesia group) re-
ceived the same plus intravenous ome-
prazole 20 mg, analgesic agents (intra-
venous metamizol 2 g [dipyrone] and
intravenous tramadol 100 mg), and
antiemetic agents (intravenous meto-
cloramide 25 mg [Primperan; Sanofi-
Aventis, Porto Salvo, Portugal] and
droperidol 0.1 mg [Janssen-Cilag, Bar-
carena, Portugal]).

EEA Technique

For EEA, electric stimulation at bilat-
eral acupoints ST 36 (ie, upper third of
external leg) and SP 6 (ie, lower third of
internal leg) was given with an EAA
apparatus (Figs 1, 2). ST 36 refers to
acupoint stomach 36 and SP 6 refers to
acupoint spleen 6—these correspond
to “Zu San Li” and “Sanyinjiao,” respec-
tively, in Chinese; and “Ashi san ri” and
“San in ko,” respectively, in Japanese—
which belong, respectively, to the stom-
ach meridian and spleen meridian. The
meridians are considered to be energy
channels that flow through the body;
they are paired, and according to Chi-
nese traditional medicine, there are 12
main meridians—lungs, large intestine,
stomach, spleen, heart, small intestine,
bladder, kidneys, pericardium, triple
heater/abdomen, gall bladder, and liver—
plus eight extra meridians.

For the present purpose, needles
were connected through wires to an
electrostimulator (Fig 3) that sent an
electrical pulse (15–20 Hz, 6 V). For
analgesia, the procedure was started
20–30 minutes after insertion of the
needles and the electroacupuncture
was continued for 30 minutes after
UAE.

UAE Technique

Patients in group B were given local
anesthesia with Xylocaine 1% (B.
Braun, Melsungen, Germany) at the
puncture site (ie, right inguinal zone).

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Group A (n = 33)</th>
<th>Group B (n = 37)</th>
<th>P Value*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean (±SD) age (y)</td>
<td>37.5 ± 6.2</td>
<td>41.4 ± 6.8</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menorrhagia</td>
<td>19 (57.6)</td>
<td>23 (62.2)</td>
<td>&gt;.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulk symptoms</td>
<td>9 (27.3)</td>
<td>10 (27.2)</td>
<td>&gt;.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pain</td>
<td>5 (15.2)</td>
<td>4 (10.8)</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uterine volume (cm³)</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumor volume (cm³)</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of tumors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11 (33.3)</td>
<td>15 (40.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>4 (12.1)</td>
<td>6 (16.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;5</td>
<td>18 (54.5)</td>
<td>16 (43.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant tumor location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subserosal</td>
<td>4 (12.1)</td>
<td>2 (5.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intramural</td>
<td>23 (69.7)</td>
<td>27 (73.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submucosal</td>
<td>6 (18.2)</td>
<td>9 (24.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—Values in parentheses are percentages.
* Fisher exact test.
No local subcutaneous anesthesia was used in patients in group A.

To perform UAE, a single right femoral approach was used and both uterine arteries were embolized with a 5-F Cobra-shaped catheter and a hydrophilic guide wire. Microcatheters were used only when necessary. To catheterize the right uterine artery, a Waltman loop was formed. The uterine arteries of the patients in both groups were embolized with nonspherical polyvinyl alcohol (PVA) particles (Contour; Boston Scientific, Natick, Massachusetts) mixed with an anti-inflammation agent (ketoprofen 100 mg). The total amount of PVA used in each group was registered. Embolization was started with a vial of 300–500-μm PVA particles for each uterine artery and completed with vials of 500–700-μm PVA particles, with the amount of embolic material used in each patient recorded. The endpoint chosen for embolization was slow flow or near-stasis in the main uterine artery, as shown by a lack of filling of arterial branches to the leiomyomas, interruption of flow in the uterine artery, or contrast material reflux toward the origin of the uterine artery.

During embolization, the patients in both groups received an intravenous anxiolytic drug (midazolam 0.5 mg) if necessary. Patients in group B also received an anti-inflammatory drug (intravenous ketorolac tromethamine 30 mg; Toradol, Roche, Nutley, New Jersey) twice before the embolization of each uterine artery.
Upon completion of the embolization, patients in group A received intravenous medication with the following: acid-suppressing drug (omeprazole 20 mg), analgesic agents (paracetamol 500 mg, tramadol 50 mg, metamizol 1 g), ananti-inflammatory agent (ketorolac tromethamine 15 mg), and antiemetic drugs (metoclopramide 10 mg, ondansetron 1 mg). Patients in group B received the same dose of intravenous acid-suppressing drug (omeprazole 20 mg) but double the doses of analgesic agents (paracetamol 1 g, tramadol 100 mg, metamizol 2 g) and antiinflammatory drugs (ketorolac tromethamine 30 mg). As antiemetic agents, metoclopramide 25 mg (Primperan; Sanofi-Aventis) and ondansetron 1 mg were administered intravenously.

Patients were asked to rate their pain severity on a numeric pain score scale at the following times: (i) during the procedure, (ii) immediately afterward, (iii) every 2 hours thereafter until discharge, (iv) at discharge, and (v) the following morning. Pain was graded as no pain imaginable (score 0), light pain (1–2), moderate pain (3–5), severe pain (6–7), or very severe pain (8–10). The most significant (ie, peak) pain score was recorded from each patient. Scores of symptoms were compared between groups (Table 2).

Other postembolization symptoms were also registered during the hours after embolization, at discharge, and the following morning. Complications were also assessed according to Society of Interventional Radiology reporting standards (13).

The standard protocol for both groups was same-day discharge when possible (4–8 hours after embolization). Two to 3 hours after the procedure, all asymptomatic patients and those with mild symptoms without nausea or vomiting had a light meal and started oral medication with tramadol 37.5 mg plus paracetamol 325 mg and were discharged 4–8 hours after embolization. Just before discharge, intravenous tramadol 100 mg and metoclopramide 25 mg were given to every patient.

The medication was the same at discharge for both groups. Patients were given daily omeprazole 20 mg and hydroxyzine 25 mg, twice-daily levofloxacin 250 mg, thrice-daily diclofenac potassium 50 mg, and docusate suppositories. As on-demand medication for pain, patients had tramadol 37.5 mg plus paracetamol 325 mg and codeine 30 mg plus paracetamol 500 mg (Dol-U-Ron; Neo-Farmaceutica, Lisbon, Portugal). Dimenhydrinate 100 mg suppositories were used in case of vomiting.

Patient Follow-up

At first consultation, at admission to the hospital, and at discharge, patients were informed verbally and in written form about postembolization constitutional symptoms they could expect, and the corresponding medication. At discharge, patients were given the mobile phone number of the interventional radiologists and two questionnaires to be completed daily for 1 week and again 6 months after the procedure. The patients were questioned concerning their satisfaction with their time of discharge. After being completed, the pain sheets were mailed in.

Overall, the results of embolization were evaluated at 6 months after the procedure by contrast-enhanced pelvic MR imaging, by the answers to the questionnaires, and by clinical observation in 64 patients. Six patients (two from group A and four from group B) were lost to follow-up.

The Fisher exact test, Mann-Whitney U test, and Student t test were used to compare the clinical presentation and postembolization results between groups. Changes from baseline were compared between groups. Statistically significant differences were assumed at P values less than .05.

RESULTS

The technical success rate for bilateral UAE was 98.6% (69 of 70). In one patient from group B, only one uterine artery was embolized as a result of the small size and tortuosity of the other uterine artery. Mean total volumes of PVA particles used per patient were 2.8 mg in group A and 2.7 mg in group B.

There were no differences in puncture site pain between patients who received acupuncture with no subcutaneous anesthesia and those who received local subcutaneous anesthesia.

During embolization, mean pain scores (rated from 0 to 10) were 0.56 in group A (ie, EAA group) and 0.84 in group B (ie, local anesthesia group). Twenty-five patients in group A (76%) and 23 in group B (62%) did not report any pain. Four patients in group B (10.8%) reported moderate pain (ie, score 3–5), compared with none in the
Table 2
Summary of Pain Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pain Score</th>
<th>Group A (n = 33)</th>
<th>Group B (n = 37)</th>
<th>P Value*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During UAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No pain (score 0)</td>
<td>25 (76)</td>
<td>23 (62)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light pain (score 1–2)</td>
<td>8 (24.2)</td>
<td>10 (27.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate pain (score 3–5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (10.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe pain (score 6–7)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean pain score</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After embolization and before discharge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No pain (score 0)</td>
<td>8 (24.2)</td>
<td>4 (10.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light pain (score 1–2)</td>
<td>5 (15.2)</td>
<td>5 (13.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate pain (score 3–5)</td>
<td>16 (48.4)</td>
<td>15 (40.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe pain (score 6–7)</td>
<td>2 (6.1)</td>
<td>6 (16.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very severe pain (score 8–10)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7 (16.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean pain score</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At discharge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No pain (score 0)</td>
<td>13 (39.4)</td>
<td>3 (8.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light pain (score 1–2)</td>
<td>19 (57.6)</td>
<td>28 (75.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate pain (score 3–5)</td>
<td>1 (3.0)</td>
<td>2 (5.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe pain (score 6–7)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (5.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean pain score</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morning after UAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No pain (score 0)</td>
<td>13 (39.4)</td>
<td>12 (32.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light pain (score 1–2)</td>
<td>18 (54.5)</td>
<td>23 (62.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate pain (score 3–5)</td>
<td>1 (6.1)</td>
<td>2 (5.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean pain score</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—Values in parentheses are percentages.
* Mann-Whitney U test.

other group (Table 2). These differences were not statistically significant (P = .11).

The mean pain scores after embolization and before discharge were 3.00 in group A (range, 0–7), and 4.49 in group B (range, 0–10). There were 13 patients with severe or very severe pain in group B, versus only two in group A. There were eight patients (24.2%) without pain and five (15.2%) with light pain (ie, score 1–2) in group A, compared with four (10.8%) without pain and five (13.5%) with light pain in group B (Table 2). These differences were statistically significant (P = .02).

At discharge most patients had no pain or light pain, but one in group A (3.0%) and four in group B (10.8%) had pain scores of 3–5. Also, two patients in group B (5.4%) had severe pain (ie, score 6–7) and were treated as outpatients for personal reasons.

The mean pain scores at discharge were 0.97 in group A and 2.11 in group B. This difference was statistically significant (P = .0001). One patient from group B was discharged with severe pain and readmitted because of a persistence of severe pain. None of the other patients required readmission.

All patients were discharged from the hospital 4–8 hours after the procedure, except one patient from each group who had severe or very severe pain. These patients spent the night at the hospital as inpatients and were discharged the next morning, 18 hours later.

There were no other significant differences between groups regarding symptoms at discharge, the next morning, and the next 7 days after UAE.

During the 7 days after UAE, seven of the 70 patients (10.0%) reported low-grade fever, seven had abdominal swelling (10.0%), six had vaginal bleeding (8.6%), four had constipation (5.7%), and three had a small inguinal hematoma (4.2%).

Patient satisfaction rates concerning time of discharge were 100% in group A and 98.3% in group B (one patient in this group was dissatisfied by the degree of pain after discharge and consequent readmission).

Major complications comprised two cases of tumor expulsions, 3 and 6 months after embolization, without any sequelae; and one case of readmission in group B as a result of persistence of severe pain. There were two patients older than 50 years of age, one from each group, who started a period of amenorrhea after embolization that lasted 5 months.

There were no significant differences between groups in clinical outcomes 6 months after the procedure (P > .99 and P = .72; Table 4). There was an improvement in menorrhagia in 15 of 17 patients (88.2%) in group A and 18 of 20 patients (90.0%) in group B, in pain in eight of nine patients (88.8%) in both groups, and in bulk-related symptoms in four of five patients (80.0%) in group A and three of four patients (75%) in group B (Table 4).

The mean decreases in uterine and dominant tumor volumes were 34.2% and 49.1% in group A and 28.1% and 43.1% in group B, respectively (Table 5). These differences were not significant (P = .35 and P = .45, respectively).

DISCUSSION

Based on our experience, pain is the most common side effect and complication after UAE, as also described by other authors (14). It has been well established that acupuncture induces slowly developing general analgesic effects, and these are mediated by various endogenous opioid agents. These findings have been well recognized as the scientific basis of the mechanism of acupunc-
ture until now (15). Acupuncture analgesia is the result of physiologic and neuropharmacologic processes induced by afferent inputs excited by acupuncture, and the participation of various endogenous opioid agents and receptors in EAA has been widely accepted (16).

EAA produces a gradual development of general analgesic effects of sustained duration (17). EAA of high intensity and low frequency has been assumed to be the typical parameter for EAA mediated by endogenous opioid agents (18).

Only the experience of the acupuncturist and the acupuncturist’s knowledge of acupoints are the decisive factors for analgesic procedure details. A long course is required to acquire the skills to perform electroacupuncture. The World Health Organization recommends a 300-hour course for physicians to understand the mechanisms applied in acupuncture. The equipment required are needles and a low-frequency electrostimulator, which costs $700. The additional time required to prepare the patients for acupuncture is 20–30 minutes. The monitoring needed for electroacupuncture is the same required for any intervention. The most important points for anesthesia of abdominal organs are ST 36, located in the upper third of the internal face of the leg, and SP 6, located in the lower third of the external face of the leg. The needles are placed at the most important points for abdominal anesthesia: ST 36 and SP 6, through which the meridian of the abdominal organs pass. The anesthesia achieved by electroacupuncture is stronger and more efficient than that achieved with single acupuncture. There are no known risks or complications associated with EAA.

We tried to evaluate whether EAA is a safe and effective alternative to the use of antiinflammatory and analgesic pharmacologic sedation/analgesia in UAE for uterine fibroids.

We found no differences in puncture site pain between groups. During the procedure, eight patients reported light pain in group A (24%), and 14 patients reported light or moderate pain in group B (38%), which is in accordance with the findings of Pron et al (14), who reported a 30% incidence of intraprocedural pain. Despite our sedative/analgesic medications and careful patient monitoring, there was still a significant proportion of patients who reported intraprocedural pain or discomfort. Despite this fact, the intensity of pain during UAE was very low in both groups, with no patients in group A reporting pain more intense than light pain and only four patients in group B reporting moderate pain. The mean pain scores during UAE (scale, 0–10) were 0.36 in group A and 0.84 in group B. We tried to see if electroacupuncture could relieve this problem and compare its results versus our routine medication approach. We found some small differences between groups, with 76% of patients treated under electroacupuncture (ie, group A) reporting no intraprocedural pain, versus 62% of patients treated under local anesthesia (group B). The degree of pain in patients treated under EAA was lower than that in the control group.

### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symptom/Outcome</th>
<th>Group A (n = 33)</th>
<th>Group B (n = 37)</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospitalization (h)</td>
<td>4–8 (outpatients)</td>
<td>18 (inpatients)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatigue</td>
<td>2 (6.1)</td>
<td>2 (5.4)</td>
<td>&gt;.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anorexia</td>
<td>2 (6.1)</td>
<td>2 (5.4)</td>
<td>&gt;.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdominal swelling</td>
<td>2 (6.1)</td>
<td>3 (8.1)</td>
<td>&gt;.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaginal bleeding</td>
<td>2 (6.1)</td>
<td>4 (10.8)</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—Values in parentheses are percentages.

* Mann-Whitney U test.

### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symptom</th>
<th>Group A (n = 31)</th>
<th>Group B (n = 33)</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Menorrhagia</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2 (11.8)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pain</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 (11.1)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulk symptoms</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 (20.0)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—Values in parentheses are percentages.

* Fisher exact test.

### Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Volume (cm³)</th>
<th>Group A (n = 31)</th>
<th>Group B (n = 33)</th>
<th>P Value*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uterine</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant tumor</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Student t test.
than in patients treated under local anesthesia despite fewer medication and lower doses of antiinflammatory and analgesic medication used in group A. These differences were not statistically significant. Similarly, Ding and Gu (19) found that acupuncture/general anesthesia reduces the consumption of narcotic agents during surgery.

From our experience, the most intense pain reported by patients treated with UAE occurs during the first 4 hours after embolization. Worthington-Kirsch and Koller (10) found that pain experienced after embolization follows a consistent pattern over time, increasing during the first 2 hours after the procedure and then remaining stable for several hours. Afterward, pain decreases fairly rapidly to a much lower level. As shown by our results, the maximum intensity pain in both groups was found during the first hours after embolization (ie, before discharge), with mean pain scores of 3.00 in group A and 4.49 in group B ($P = .0001$). The most intense pain reported by patients was during this time period, with 13 patients from group B reporting severe or very severe pain, compared with two patients from group A. However, two patients from group B were discharged despite their severe pain for personal reasons. These differences between groups were statistically significant ($P = .02$). At discharge and the morning after UAE, the mean pain scores were lower in both groups, proving this tendency of decreasing pain intensity over time.

There were only two patients treated as inpatients (one in each group) as a result of severe or very severe pain at the time of discharge (8 hours after UAE). As stated by other authors (5), pain intensity is very unpredictable and variable among patients. We could not find a plausible explanation for this more intense pain reported by these patients. There is no proven relationship between pelvic pain after UAE and the size of the uterus or the number, location, or size of leiomyomas (5). However, there seems to be some correlation between the extent of embolization and pain after UAE (20). The endpoint chosen for embolization was slow flow or near-stasis in the main uterine artery, as reported by other authors (21). We applied this endpoint of embolization equally in both groups, as proven by the amount of PVA particles used per patient (2.8 mg in group A and 2.7 mg in group B). We found no significant differences between groups in uterine volume ($P = .52$), dominant leiomyoma volume ($P = .39$), number of tumors ($P = .68$), or tumor location ($P = .59$).

There were no significant differences between groups at 6-month follow-up ($P = .35$ and $P = .45$). There were persisting symptoms of menorrhagia in two patients in each group and bulk-related symptoms and pain in one patient from each group.

The present study has some limitations. It is not randomized, and neither patients nor operators were blinded to the technique used, which can induce some bias. The assignment to treatment was based on patient preference. This introduces the possibility that patients’ views of acupuncture may have entered into the choice of therapy. This raises the possibility that there could be an additional placebo effect in the EAA group.

In addition, the groups were also not completely homogenous. There was a significant difference between groups in mean age ($P = .015$). Patients from group A were younger on average, perhaps because younger subjects are generally more receptive to new treatment options as EAA.

Although patients in group A (ie, EAA) had no analgesic medication just before and during UAE and received only half the doses on finishing the procedure, they still received antiinflammatory drugs before and after discharge. Therefore, patients in group A still had some analgesic and antiinflammatory medication, although in much lower doses.

Further prospective studies with randomized selection of patients comparing standard therapy, standard electroacupuncture, and electroacupuncture with the needles in nonstandard locations (ie, “sham electroacupuncture”) would be important to clearly demonstrate its clinical effectiveness.

In conclusion, although our findings are preliminary, they suggest that EAA may be effective in reducing pain after embolization. These findings must be confirmed with a randomized trial before definitive conclusions can be drawn. Electroacupuncture may be an effective alternative to the use of pharmacologic sedation/analgesia during UAE.

References


