

A COMPARATIVE STUDY BETWEEN KETAMINE AND LIDOCAINE TO DECREASE PROPOFOL INJECTION PAIN DURING INDUCTION OF ANESTHESIA

Bikash Khadka^{1*}, Nil Raj Sharma²

Affiliation

1. Lecturer, Department of Anesthesia and Critical Care, Lumbini, Medical College and Teaching Hospital, Palpa, Nepal.
2. Professor, Department of Anesthesia and critical care, Lumbini Medical College and Teaching Hospital, Palpa, Nepal.

ARTICLE INFO

Received : 10 November, 2020

Accepted : 09 February, 2021

Published : 15 June, 2021

© Authors retain copyright and grant the journal right of first publication with the work simultaneously licensed under Creative Commons Attribution License CC - BY 4.0 that allows others to share the work with an acknowledgment of the work's authorship and initial publication in this journal.



ORA 224

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3126/bjhs.v6i1.37564>

* Corresponding Author

Dr Bikash Khadka

Lecturer

Department of Anesthesia and critical care

Lumbini Medical College and Teaching Hospital, Palpa, Nepal

Email: khadka.vkas@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4114-8285>

Citation

Bikash Khadka, Nil Raj Sharma. A Comparative Study Between Ketamine and Lidocaine to Decrease Propofol Injection Pain During Induction of Anesthesia. BJHS 2021;6(1)14. 1304 - 1309.

ABSTRACT

Introduction

Pain during the injection of anesthetic agents may be distressing and can reduce the acceptability of an otherwise useful agent such as propofol during daycare surgeries. Lidocaine and ketamine both are used as pre-treatment to decrease propofol induced pain. This study aims to compare the effectiveness of ketamine injection to decrease propofol-induced pain in comparison to lidocaine injection.

Methodology

This is a prospective cross-sectional comparative study. Eighty-nine cases were divided into two groups where group K received ketamine 2 ml (0.2 mg/kg) whereas group L received lidocaine 2% 2ml (0.5 mg/kg) after venous occlusion with rubber tourniquet. One-fourth dose of propofol was injected 1 min after release of tourniquet and pain accessed at 0, 1, and 2 minutes of propofol injection with a verbal response and behavioral signs. Chi-square test and paired T-test were used and a p-value less than 0.05 was considered significant.

Result

Regarding hemodynamic, oxygenation, and adverse effects there was no significant difference. Immediately after propofol injection, only 1 patient of the ketamine group had mild pain (2.22%) while 12 patients from the lignocaine group had mild pain (27.27%) with a p-value of 0.009. Also after 2 minutes of propofol injection, only 12 cases had mild pain i.e. 13.48% (1 from ketamine group i.e. 2.22% and 11 from lidocaine group i.e. 25%) with p-value of 0.002.

Conclusion

Our study helps prove low-dose ketamine is more effective in reducing the incidence and severity of pain on injection of propofol in comparison to Lidocaine with better hemodynamic stability.

KEY WORDS

Ketamine; Lidocaine; Pain; Pretreatment; Propofol



INTRODUCTION

Pain during the injection of anesthetic agents may be distressing to the patients and it can be a limiting factor for use of common anesthetic drugs such as propofol.

Propofol (2, 6-diisopropyl phenol) is a popular induction agent, especially for short cases and daycare surgeries. It produces a good quality of anesthesia and rapid recovery. It belongs to the group of phenols, and so propofol can irritate the skin, mucous membrane, and venous intima.¹

Many factors appear to affect the incidence of pain, which include the site of injection, size of vein, speed of injection, buffering effect of blood, temperature of propofol, and concomitant use of drugs such as local anesthetics and opiates.²

The formulation for the preparation of propofol also plays a role regarding pain during injection. Propofol (a 10% emulsion of fat formulated with medium-chain and long-chain triglycerides) might be associated with lesser pain upon injection whereas microemulsion of propofol produces more severe and frequent pain during injection.³

Lidocaine pre-treatment is most commonly used to decrease injection-related pain.^{4,5} It has a local anesthetic effect. However, it has a failure rate between 13% to 32%.^{4,6}

Ketamine which is N-methyl-D-aspartate (NMDA) receptor antagonist has also been recognized to reduce pain induced by propofol. Also, it acts peripherally to reduce pain. It has both anesthetic and analgesic effects. It is considered that ketamine when mixed with propofol can decrease the pH of the mixed solution and reduce propofol injection pain.⁷ In the sub-anesthetic dose, it also has a local anesthetic effect which may also alleviate propofol-induced pain. There may be undesired effects with the use of ketamine such as sympathetic stimulation, increased secretion, and a rise in intracranial and intraocular pressure.

This study aimed to compare the effectiveness of ketamine injection to decrease propofol-induced pain in comparison to lidocaine injection experienced during the administration of the pretreatment solution and after the release of the tourniquet during propofol injection for the induction of general anesthesia. This study will also help to determine the local anesthetic effect of ketamine and find an alternative drug to lidocaine injection to decrease propofol-induced pain.

METHODOLOGY

This study was carried out at a tertiary center in the Department of Anesthesiology and critical care of Lumbini Medical College and Teaching Hospital (LMCTH), Palpa. Ethical clearance was taken and approved by the Institutional Review Committee (IRC—LMC 09-G/019). Informed and written consent was taken. After approval from the institutional review board, the study was carried out among 89 cases that underwent surgical procedures under general anesthesia (age group 15 to 60 years of age with American Society of Anesthesiologists (ASA) physical status classification system grades of 1 or 2) at LMCTH. This is

a prospective comparative randomized study starting from 1st June 2019 to 28th February 2020. Allocation to groups was done based on a random lottery basis and double-blinding was done. Exclusion criteria included unwilling participants, participants with ASA physical status grades 3 and 4, history of allergy to any of the study drugs, hemodynamically unstable, Pregnant women, morbidly obese, psychological disorders, patients with acute or chronic pain syndromes, and patients who had received any sedatives and analgesics medications before surgery.

Sample size calculation:

In unknown population group:

$N = Z^2 pq / d^2$ where N= population (sample size), Z= confidence level of 95 % (standard value = 1.96), P = estimated decrease of propofol induced pain by ketamine, q = 1-p and d= margin of error (0.05).

N Kad, P Malik, J Dureja, A Thakur. Ketamine pretreatment to alleviate the pain of propofol injection: A randomized, double blind study. The Internet Journal of Anesthesiology. 2008 Volume 20 Number 2

Based on the above study, incidence of pain was reduced from 94% to 26%. Thus p is taken as 26%.

Thus N=295.64

Revised sample in known population group as from above study:

$N' = n / (1 + n/N)$ where N'= new population group(sample size), n = sample size of previous study = 100 and N= total population= 295.64

Thus N' = 74.72

Thus minimum sample size of 75 patients was taken and divided into two groups.

Anesthetic techniques and the study protocol

The pre-anesthetic evaluation was done a day before surgery and informed/written consent was taken. All patients fasted for 8 hrs. On arrival to the operating room, an 18-G cannula was inserted into a vein on the dorsum of the patient's non-dominant hand without local anesthetics. Routine monitoring (Electrocardiogram, Non-invasive blood pressure, and pulse oximeter) were applied. An isotonic saline infusion was started at a rate of 5–6 ml/kg/h before the induction of anesthesia.

Baseline parameters were recorded. Oxygen saturation (SpO₂) was monitored continuously whereas noninvasive BP was recorded at baseline and every 3 min thereafter. De-saturation was defined as SpO₂ below 92%.

Patients were informed that they would be given intravenous anesthetics that might cause pain in the forearm. After this information, the intravenous solution was stopped, and the arm with the intravenous line was raised for 20 seconds for gravity drainage of the venous blood. A rubber tourniquet was placed on the forearm for 60 seconds to occlude the venous blood.



The operating room anesthesia assistant who did not participate in the study had prepared the drugs according to the table of randomization. Anesthesia was given under the supervision of the author and/or Co-author who are also blinded about the patient group. Data collection was done by the anesthesia provider.

Group K patients received ketamine 0.2 mg/kg (Aneket, Neon Laboratories).

Group L received lidocaine 0.5 mg/kg (Loxicard 2%, Neon Laboratories)

All patients received pretreatment medication diluted in 10-ml syringes with isotonic saline 0.9%. All patients received one fourth dose of Propofol (Neorof 1% w/v, Neon Laboratories)

Occlusion was released and one-fourth of the total calculated dose of propofol was administered over 5 seconds. The level of pain was assessed at 0, 1, and 2 min after administration of propofol by the second observer who was unaware of the group to which the patient had been allocated.

Patients were asked a standard question about the pain on injection of propofol, the verbal response, and the behavioral signs, such as facial grimacing, arm withdrawal, or tears were noted by the anesthesia provider. A score of 0-3 which corresponds to no pain, mild, moderate, and severe pain was recorded at zero, one, and two minutes. Adverse effects if any, were noted.

Scoring system⁸:

0 = No pain

1 = Mild pain (pain reported only in response to a question)

2 = Moderate pain (pain reported in response to a question and accompanied by behavioral signs reported spontaneously)

3 = Severe pain (strong vocal response or facial grimace, tears, arm withdrawal)

After a complete assessment, general anesthesia was completed by variable doses of propofol till the loss of eyelash reflex. The dose of propofol used per kilogram was assessed until the loss of eyelash reflex. After that, fentanyl 2 mcg/kg was given intravenously. The tracheal intubation was facilitated with 0.1 mg/kg vecuronium, and anesthesia was maintained with Isoflurane 1.2% and oxygen with controlled mechanical ventilation. Any post operative emergence agitation will be noted.

Statistical analysis

Data were analyzed using SPSS version 20.0 computer software. Numerical variables were presented as mean and SD, whereas categorical variables were presented as the frequency and percentage (%). The Chi-Square (χ^2) test was used for comparisons of categorical variables. A paired t-test was used to assess the variance between preoperative and intraoperative values in the respective groups. An unpaired t-test was used to assess the difference between the two groups. A p-value of <0.05 was considered statistically significant.

RESULTS

Eighty nine patients completed the study. 45 patients were in the Ketamine group while 44 patients in the lidocaine group and demographic data are demonstrated as below in table 1.

Table 1: Demography table

Demography	Ketamine Group	Lidocaine Group
Age (years)*	41±16.72	36±12.35
Sex(Male/Female)**	29/16	25/19
ASA(I/II)**	34/11	34/10

*Mean ± Standard deviation **Number/frequency

Regarding hemodynamic, there was no significant difference between baseline measurements in mean arterial pressure in both groups. No de-saturation was observed among any group. Only 2 cases; 4% of the ketamine group experienced emergence agitation which was statistically insignificant. There was no finding of increased secretions with ketamine injection.

Immediate after propofol injection, 53 cases had No pain (59.5%) while 36 patients experienced pain (40.44%) of which only 13 cases from the ketamine group had some sort of pain while 23 cases from the lidocaine group had pain. Only 1 patient of the ketamine group had mild pain (2.22%) while 12 patients from the lidocaine group had mild pain (27.27%) which was statistically significant with a p-value of 0.009.




Figure 1: Bar chart showing pain scoring immediately after the injection of study drug

After 1 minute of propofol injection, 51 cases had no pain, while 38 cases (42.69%) experienced pain. 17 cases from the ketamine group and 21 from the lidocaine group had mild pain and 3 had moderate pain which was statistically insignificant.

Table 2: Pain score after 1 minute of propofol injection

	Score 0	Score 1	Score 2	Score 3	Total
Ketamine group	28	15	2	0	45
Lidocaine group	23	20	1	0	44
Total	51	35	3	0	89



After 2 minutes of propofol injection, only 12 cases (13.48%) had mild pain (1 from ketamine group, 2.22% and 11 from lidocaine group, 25%) which was statistically significant. (P value 0.002).




Figure 2: Bar chart showing pain scoring 2 min after injection of study drug.

DISCUSSION

This study was conducted to know the efficacy of ketamine in comparison to lidocaine to alleviate Propofol-induced pain.

The exact mechanism of how propofol causes pain is unknown. Scott et al. Suggested two mechanisms for pain: the first is direct irritation and the second is an indirect effect through the kinin cascade.⁴ Release of kininogen from the vein wall with triggering of local kinin cascade may lead to pain. Several factors affect the propofol injection pain including the site of injection, vein size, speed of the injection of the drug, concentration in an aqueous phase, temperature.⁴

The incidence of propofol pain on injection has been reported to be up to 90% if a vein on the dorsum of the hand is used.⁶ Multiple pharmacological and physical approaches have been used to decrease propofol injection pain including pre mixture or pretreatment of propofol with a variable degree of success to alleviate pain completely. Lidocaine, amide local anesthetic agent, has been used more frequently either as premixture or pre-treatment. The dose of lidocaine may be a limiting factor. Pang et al. administered 60 mg intravenous lidocaine and the pain incidence was 11% whereas we used a low dose of 0.5mg/kg thus the incidence of pain was 27.27%, 45.45%, and 25% immediately after, 1 min after, and 2 min after propofol injection respectively.⁹ Turan et al, who administered 0.5 mg/kg intravenous lidocaine had also a higher incidence of pain of 33.3% which is similar to our study finding.¹⁰ Picard and Tramèr study also had a higher incidence of pain i.e 40% following 0.5mg/kg of lignocaine similar to our study.⁵

Ketamine has also been used as pre-treatment for propofol-induced pain with variable success. Low cost, ease of administration, effectiveness, ease of availability, and relatively better side effect profile makes ketamine an attractive option. It also has a local anesthetic effect thus can be used to attenuate propofol-induced pain. In our study, only 4 cases had severe pain immediately after propofol injection

whereas only 2 patients experienced severe pain after 1 minute whereas none had severe pain after 2 minutes.

The incidence of pain after propofol injection was about 26–46% after pretreatment with ketamine at a dose of 0.1–0.2 mg/kg.¹¹ In a study done by Ayman A. Elsayed, 16% had pain even after ketamine pre-treatment.⁸ In our study only 2.22% of patients had mild pain immediately after propofol injection, 33.33% after 1 minute and only 2.22% experienced pain 2 minutes later which shows efficacy in comparison to the lidocaine group. Only 8 patients had moderate pain and 4 had severe pain immediately after propofol injection whereas only 2 cases had moderate pain and none with severe pain 1 minute after propofol injection. This also shows the intensity of pain was very low during ketamine pre-treatment.

A study reported that the frequency of propofol injection pain was 14.9% after pretreatment with ketamine at a dose of 0.5 mg/kg but we had used a low dose of ketamine (0.2mg/kg).¹² Usage of a larger dose of ketamine 1 mg/kg could eliminate the pain but as shown in our study incidence of pain is very low even at the low dose we had used (0.2mg/kg).¹³ Wang et al found that ketamine at ~0.3 mg/kg was effective in the elimination of propofol pain which is dose only slightly higher than what we had used.¹⁴ CH Tan et al found ketamine pretreatment reduced the incidence of pain from 84% to 26% which is a similar finding to that of our study where 33.33% had pain after 1 minute of propofol injection.¹⁵ A low dose of ketamine also helps eliminate its potential adverse effects such as increased secretion and emergence reaction which was statistically insignificant in our study.

Polat et al. proved that lidocaine 40 mg, metoclopramide, ketamine (100 mcg per kg), and remifentanyl are equally effective but our study showed superior results with Ketamine rather than lidocaine as incidence and intensity of pain was significantly low in the ketamine group.¹⁶

Hemodynamic stability was observed and no significant changes were recorded. Though a transient rise in heart rate and blood pressure was noted, it wasn't clinically or statistically significant. MAP was well maintained which may be due to the sympathetic stimulating effect of ketamine.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Tourniquet application may itself cause pain which should be taken into consideration while application. Only one-fourth dose of the required dose of propofol is given. Calculation and delivery of dosage may be difficult thus figure was round up.

CONCLUSION

Our study proved that low-dose ketamine was more effective in reducing the incidence and severity of pain on injection of propofol in comparison to Lidocaine.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

None

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

Self-funded, Support was provided solely from institutional and/or departmental sources

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge my Head of Department

Professor Dr. Nil Raj Sharma for his support and guidance, resident student of the department of anesthesia, and the OT Department of LMCTH, Palpa for their continuous support and best regards.

REFERENCES

1. Kay B, Rolly G. I.C.I. 35868, a new intravenous induction agent. *Acta Anaesthesiol Belg.* 1977;28(4):303-16.
2. Jalota L, Kalira V, George E, Shi YY, Hornuss C, Radke O, et al. Prevention of pain on injection of propofol: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ.* 2011;342:d1110.
3. Larsen B, Beerhalter U, Biedler A, Brandt A, Doege F, Brun K, et al. [Less pain on injection by a new formulation of propofol? A comparison with propofol LCT]. *Anaesthesist.* 2001;50(11):842-5.
4. Scott RP, Saunders DA, Norman J. Propofol: clinical strategies for preventing the pain of injection. *Anesthesia.* 1988;43(6):492-4.
5. Picard P, Tramer MR. Prevention of pain on injection with propofol: a quantitative systematic review. *Anesth Analg.* 2000;90(4):963-9.
6. King SY, Davis FM, Wells JE, Murchison DJ, Pryor PJ. Lidocaine for the prevention of pain due to injection of propofol. *Anesth Analg.* 1992;74(2):246-9.
7. Eriksson M, Engleson S, Niklasson F, Hartvig P. Effect of lignocaine and pH on propofol-induced pain. *Br J Anaesth.* 1997;78(5):502-6.
8. Elsayed A, Rayan A. A comparative study between a small dose of ketamine, lidocaine 1%, and acetaminophen infusion to decrease propofol injection pain. *Ain-Shams Journal of Anaesthesiology.* 2015;8(3):437-42.
9. Pang WW, Mok MS, Huang S, Hwang MH. The analgesic effect of fentanyl, morphine, meperidine, and lidocaine in the peripheral veins: a comparative study. *Anesth Analg.* 1998;86(2):382-6.
10. Turan A, Memis D, Kaya G, Karamanlioglu B. The prevention of pain from injection of propofol by dexmedetomidine and comparison with lidocaine. *Can J Anaesth.* 2005;52(5):548-9.
11. Barbi E, Marchetti F, Gerarduzzi T, Neri E, Gagliardo A, Sarti A, et al. Pretreatment with intravenous ketamine reduces propofol injection pain. *Paediatr Anaesth.* 2003;13(9):764-8.
12. Borazan H, Sahin O, Kececioğlu A, Uluer MS, Et T, Otelcioglu S. Prevention of propofol injection pain in children: a comparison of pretreatment with tramadol and propofol-lidocaine mixture. *Int J Med Sci.* 2012;9(6):492-7.
13. Furuya A, Matsukawa T, Ozaki M, Nishiyama T, Kume M, Kumazawa T. Intravenous ketamine attenuates arterial pressure changes during the induction of anaesthesia with propofol. *Eur J Anaesthesiol.* 2001;18(2):88-92.
14. Wang M, Wang Q, Yu YY, Wang WS. An effective dose of ketamine for eliminating pain during injection of propofol: a dose response study. *Ann Fr Anesth Reanim.* 2013;32(9):e103-6.
15. Tan CH, Onsiong MK, Kua SW. The effect of ketamine pretreatment on propofol injection pain in 100 women. *Anaesthesia.* 1998;53(3):302-5.
16. Polat R, Aktay M, Ozlu O. The effects of remifentanyl, lidocaine, metoclopramide, or ketamine pretreatment on propofol injection pain. *Middle East J Anaesthesiol.* 2012;21(5):673-7.



1. Hydera AA, Wunderlich CA, Puvanachandra P, et al. The impact of traumatic brain injuries: A global perspective. *Neuro Rehabilitation* 22 (2007): 341-353.
2. Khadka B, Deka PK, Karki A. Role of CT (Computed Tomography) in head injury. *JMMIHS* 2 (2016): 4552.
3. Mebrahtu-Ghebrehiwet M, Quan LH, Andebirhan T. The profile of CT scan findings in acute head trauma in Orotta Hospital, Asmara, Eritrea. *J Eritrean Med Assoc* 4 (2009): 5-8.
4. Mutch CA, Talbott JF, Gean A. Imaging evaluation of acute traumatic brain injury. *Neurosurg Clin N Am* 27 (2016): 409-439.
5. Saul TG. Joint Section on Neurotrauma and Critical Care of the American Association of Neurological Surgeons and Congress of Neurological Surgeons. Management of Head Injury April. 1998 Apr.
6. Vicky C Chang. Epidemiology of work –related Traumatic Brain injury: A systematic Review. *Am J Ind Med* 2015;58:353-77.
7. Dewan MC, Rattani A, Gupta S, Batculon RE, Hung YC, Punchak M et al. Estimating the global incidence of traumatic brain injury. *J Neurosurg* 130:1080–1097, 2019
8. GBD 2016 Traumatic Brain Injury and Spinal Cord Injury Collaborators. Global, regional, and national burden of traumatic brain injury and spinal cord injury, 1990–2016: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016. *Lancet Neurol* 2019; 18: 56–87
9. Tabish SA, Syed N. Recent advances and future trends in traumatic brain injury. *Emerg. Med.* 2015;5(229):104172.
10. Puvanachandra P, Hyder AA. The burden of traumatic brain injury in Asia: a call for research. *Pak J Neurol Sci* 4 (2009): 27-32.
11. Waxman K, Sundine MJ, Young RF. Is early prediction of outcome in severe head injury possible? *Archives of surgery.* 1991;126(10):1237-42.
12. Teasdale G, Jenne B. Assessment of coma and impaired consciousness. A practical scale. *Lancet* 1974; 2: 81–84.
13. Kafle P, Khanal B, Yadav DK, Poudel D, Karki T, Cherian I. Head Injury in Nepal: An Instuonal Based Prospectve Study on Clinical Profile, Management and Early Outcome of Traumac Brain Injury in Eastern Part of Nepal *BJHS* 2019;4(2)9: 750 - 754.
14. Coxa M, Beckerb TD, Motsumic M. Head injury burden in a major referral hospital emergency centre in Botswana. *Afr J Emerg Med* 8 (2018): 100-105.
15. National Clinical Guidance Centre. Head Injury: Triage, assessment, investigation and early management of head injury in children, young people and adults. NICE: London (2014).
16. I Imtiaz AM. Trauma Radiology: Importance of Computed Tomography Scans In Acute Traumatic Brain Injury. *International Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences and Business Management.* 2016;4(4):7-15.
17. Jude-Kennedy EC, Ofodile EC, Timothy N. The burden of motorcycle-related neurotrauma in South-East Nigeria. *Journal of Clinical Medicine and Research.* 2009 Oct 31;1(1):013-7.
18. Mebrahtu-Ghebrehiwet M, Quan L, Andebirhan T. The profile of CT scan findings in acute head trauma in Orotta Hospital, Asmara, Eritrea. *Journal of the Eritrean Medical Association.* 2009;4(1):5-8.
19. Ohaegbulam SC, Mezue WC, Ndubuisi CA, Erechukwu UA, Ani CO. Cranial computed tomography scan findings in head trauma patients in Enugu, Nigeria. *SurgNeurol Int.* 2011;2.
20. Coronado VG, McGuire LC, Sarmiento K, Bell J, Lionbarger MR, Jones CD, et al. Trends in traumatic brain injury in the US and the public health response: 1995–2009. *J Safety Res.* 2012;43(4):299-307.
21. Adeolu AA, Malomo AO, Shokunbi MT, Komolafe EO, Abiona TC. Etiology of head injuries in Southwestern Nigeria: a public health perspective. *The Internet Journal of Epidemiology [serial on the Internet].* 2005;2(2).
22. Bordignon KC, Arruda WO. CT scan findings in mild head trauma: a series of 2,000 patients. *Arqneuropsiquiatr.* 2002;60(2A):204-10.
23. Adhikari K, Gupta MK, Pant AR, Rauniyar RK. Clinical patterns and computed tomography findings in patients with cranio-cerebral trauma in tertiary hospital in eastern Nepal. *JNHRC Vol.17 no.1 issue 42 Jan-March 2019*
24. Asare HK, Abdulai AB, Akorli E, Aweligiba S, Akorli P. Computed Tomography Findings of Traumatic Brain Injury in Patients with Head Trauma Presenting at the Tamale Teaching Hospital, Ghana. *Journal of Radiology and Clinical Imaging* 2 (2019): 024-032.
25. Obajimi MO, Jumah KB, Brakohuapa WO, Iddrisu W. Computed tomography features of head injury in Ghanaian children. *Nigerian Journal of Surgical Research.* 2002;4(3):84-8
26. Chalya PL, Kanumba ES, Mabula JB, Giiti G, Gilyoma JM. Aetiological spectrum, injury characteristics and treatment outcome of head injury patients at Bugando Medical Centre in north-western Tanzania. *Tanzania journal of healthresearch.* 2011;13(1):74-81.
27. Chieregato A, Fainardi E, Morselli-Labate AM, Antonelli V, Compagnone C, Targa L, Kraus J, Servadei F. Factors associated with

