International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)
ISSN: 2319-7064
Impact Factor 2024: 7.101

Lumbar Cerebrospinal Fluid Drainage in Aneurysmal Subarachnoid Hemorrhage: A Comprehensive Review

Dr. Ranjith HK

Sr. Resident, Department of Neuroanesthesia, Medanta, The Medicity, Gurgaon
Email: *hkranjith1993[at]gmail.com*

Abstract: ***Aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage (aSAH) remains a neurosurgical emergency associated with high morbidity and mortality despite advances in management. The EARLYDRAIN trial by Wolf et al. (2023) introduced prophylactic lumbar cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) drainage as an adjunct to standard care, reporting a reduction in unfavourable outcomes at 6 months and a lower incidence of secondary infarctions. This review critically evaluates the trial's methodology, clinical implications, and underlying physiologic rationale from a Neuroanaesthesiology and neurocritical care perspective, comparing the findings with similar studies such as the LUMAS trial and retrospective analyses, while considering current standards and potential future directions***

Keywords: aneurysm, csf, vasospasm, dci, lumbar drain, sah

1. Introduction

aSAH is notorious for its devastating neurological sequelae, with delayed cerebral ischemia (DCI) and secondary infarctions contributing significantly to poor outcomes [1]. Traditional interventions such as aneurysm clipping or coiling are time - sensitive, yet the post - procedural management of blood breakdown products within the subarachnoid space remains controversial. Historically, strategies like external ventricular drainage have been employed; however, these do not consistently clear the blood from the basal cisterns where erythrocyte sedimentation is prominent [2]. Several studies, including the prospective LUMAS trial [3] and several retrospective analyses [4, 5], have investigated CSF diversion with mixed outcomes. The EARLYDRAIN trial [6], by contrast, provides robust evidence that early lumbar CSF drainage, set at a fixed rate of 5 mL per hour initiated within 72 hours of hemorrhage, may enhance blood clearance, reduce intracranial pressure (ICP), and ultimately improve neurological outcomes.

2. Methods and Trial Design

The multicenter, pragmatic, randomized clinical trial enrolled 287 patients across 19 centres in Germany, Switzerland, and Canada. Patients were randomized to either standard care or additional lumbar drainage following aneurysm occlusion. The primary endpoint was the dichotomized modified Rankin Scale (mRS) score (3 - 6 indicating an unfavourable outcome) at 6 months. Secondary outcomes included the rate of secondary infarctions at discharge and complications such as infections and shunt dependency. The lumbar drain was standardized to 5 mL/hour for a minimum of 4 days, and simultaneous ICP monitoring from both lumbar and ventricular drains was implemented to ensure safety.

3. Results and Outcomes

The EARLYDRAIN trial demonstrated that 32.6% of patients in the lumbar drain group had an unfavourable outcome at 6 months compared to 44.8% in the standard care group (risk ratio 0.73; P =.04). Secondary infarctions were significantly reduced in the lumbar drain group (28.5% vs 39.9%; risk ratio 0.71; P =.04).

Comparative Analysis with Similar Studies:
Comparisons with other studies highlight both similarities and differences in methodology and outcomes:

1) LUMAS Trial:
   The prospective LUMAS trial [3], which randomized 210 patients, did not show a statistically significant benefit for lumbar drainage, likely due to under powering and recruitment of patients with less severe aSAH. In contrast, the EARLYDRAIN trial included a broader spectrum of hemorrhage severity, allowing the detection of a significant outcome benefit [6].
2) Retrospective Studies:
   Several retrospective studies have suggested favourable outcomes with lumbar drainage in aSAH (Kasuya et al [4], Roelz et al [5]). However, these studies often had inherent biases related to patient selection and non - standardized drainage protocols. EARLYDRAIN's randomized design and standardized drainage protocol lend more weight to its findings.
3) External Ventricular Drainage (EVD) vs. Lumbar Drainage:
   While EVD is common for managing acute hydrocephalus and high ICP, its ability to clear subarachnoid blood is limited by the natural sedimentation of erythrocytes. EARLYDRAIN's lumbar drainage appears to overcome this limitation by leveraging gravitational forces to enhance blood clearance. This physiological advantage is supported by imaging findings showing a distinct colour difference between ventricular and lumbar CSF samples.

Table 1: Comparison between EARLY DRAIN and LUMAS trial

Feature	EARLYDRAIN Trial	LUMAS Trial
Publication Year	2023	2012
Study Design	Pragmatic, multicenter, parallel - group, open - label randomized controlled trial with blinded endpoint evaluation	Single - centre, prospective, randomized controlled trial
Number of Participants	287 (analyzed)	210 (recruited and randomized)
Inclusion Criteria	Adult patients with acute aSAH of all clinical grades, aneurysm treated within 48 hours	WFNS Grade 1 - 3, modified Fisher Grade 2 - 4 or 3+4 on initial CT, recruitment before 96 hours post - hemorrhage
Intervention Group	Early LD (started within 72 hours of aSAH) + standard of care (SOC)	LD (inserted after randomization) + SOC
Control Group	Standard of care alone	Standard of care alone
Duration of Drainage	Median of 7 days (up to 8 days)	Planned for 10 days (stopped at angiography)
Drainage Rate	5 mL per hour	Not explicitly stated as a fixed rate
Primary Outcome	Unfavourable neurological outcome at 6 months (mRS 3 - 6)	Prevalence of delayed ischemic neurological deficit (DIND)
Key Findings	Significantly lower rate of unfavourable outcome at 6 months in the LD group; fewer secondary infarctions	No significant reduction in the prevalence of DIND; no improvement in outcome at 6 months
Secondary Outcomes (Significant)	Lower rate of secondary infarction at discharge; GOS - E 1 - 4 at 6 months; Barthel Index < 80 at 6 months	Improved early clinical outcome (mRS at Day 10)
Limitations	Open - label design (potential for bias); not all centres had equal experience with LD; other potential treatments not explored	Single - centre; potential for selection bias (excluded poor grades and delayed presentations)
Conclusion	Prophylactic early LD after aSAH lessened secondary infarction and decreased unfavourable outcome at 6 months	LD reduced the prevalence of DIND and improved early outcome but did not improve outcome at 6 months

Mechanistic Insights and Clinical Rationale:
From a Neuro - intensivist's perspective, optimizing cerebral perfusion while mitigating intracranial hypertension is paramount. In aSAH, blood and its degradation products irritate cerebral vessels, leading to vasospasm and microcirculatory disturbances [7, 8]. Lumbar drainage appears more effective in removing blood products from the basal cisterns through gravitational forces, reducing the irritative load on cerebral vessels. The lower ICP observed with lumbar drainage not only preserves autoregulation but also reduces the risk of secondary ischemic events. These benefits align with modern neurocritical care practices that emphasize multimodal monitoring and targeted ICP management.

4. Discussion

The EARLYDRAIN trial reinforces the concept that prophylactic lumbar drainage is both feasible and beneficial [6]. For the neuroanesthesiologist, the technique offers an alternative means to manage ICP without resorting to more aggressive therapies such as hyperventilation or osmotherapy. Neurocritical care practitioners may find that lumbar drainage stabilizes ICP fluctuations and reduces the burden of secondary infarction, which in turn can lead to shorter intensive care durations and improved rehabilitation trajectories.

In comparison, the LUMAS trial's underpowered design and selective recruitment may have masked potential benefits, whereas retrospective analyses, despite inherent biases, corroborate the potential advantages of lumbar drainage [3]. Lumbar drainage technique was associated with lower ICP levels, suggesting that lumbar drainage may more effectively attenuate ICP spikes - critical triggers of cortical spreading depolarisations and subsequent infarction [9, 10]. The data suggest that lumbar drainage should be considered, especially in patients with significant subarachnoid blood burden where the gravitational removal of blood is physiologically advantageous.

5. Limitations

Despite its strengths, the EARLYDRAIN trial is not without limitations. The modest sample size and pragmatic design introduced inter - centre variability in standard care. Detailed imaging analyses quantifying clot burden were not performed, which limits the ability to correlate clot clearance with clinical outcomes. Additionally, the absence of advanced Neuromonitoring techniques (e. g., cerebral micro - dialysis) limits the mechanistic understanding of microcirculatory improvements achieved with lumbar drainage.

6. Future Directions

Future research should aim to optimize lumbar drainage parameters, including rate and duration, and incorporate multimodal Neuromonitoring to elucidate the mechanisms of neuroprotection. The combination of lumbar drainage with pharmacologic agents (e. g., intrathecal thrombolytics) could potentially further enhance outcomes by promoting clot dissolution. Moreover, large - scale, multicenter trials with stratified randomization based on hemorrhage severity and clot burden will help refine patient selection and optimize the risk - benefit profile of lumbar drainage.

7. Conclusion

The EARLYDRAIN trial provides robust evidence supporting prophylactic lumbar CSF drainage as an adjunct to standard care in aSAH. By facilitating the clearance of blood products and reducing ICP, lumbar drainage lowers the incidence of secondary infarctions and unfavourable neurological outcomes. Although further research is needed to optimize protocols and patient selection, these findings

represent a significant advancement in the neurocritical care management of aSAH.

References

[1] Nieuwkamp DJ, Setz LE, Algra A: Changes in case fatality of aneurysmal subarachnoid haemorrhage over time, according to age, sex, and region: a meta - analysis. Lancet Neurol.2009, 8: 635 - 642. 10.1016/S1474 - 4422 (09) 70126 - 7

[2] Macdonald RL, Higashida RT, Keller E: Clazosentan, an endothelin receptor antagonist, in patients with aneurysmal subarachnoid haemorrhage undergoing surgical clipping: a randomized, double - blind, placebo - controlled phase 3 trial (CONSCIOUS - 2). Lancet Neurol.2011, 10: 618 - 625. 10.1016/S1474 - 4422 (11) 70108 - 9

[3] Al - Tamimi YZ, Bhargava D, Feltbower RG: Lumbar drainage of cerebrospinal fluid after aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage: a prospective, randomized, controlled trial (LUMAS). Stroke.2012, 43: 677 - 682. 10.1161/STROKEAHA.111.625731

[4] Kasuya H, Shimizu T, Kagawa M: The effect of continuous drainage of cerebrospinal fluid in patients with subarachnoid hemorrhage: a retrospective analysis of 108 patients. Neurosurgery.1991, 28: 56 - 59. 10.1227/00006123 - 199101000 - 00009

[5] Roelz R, Schaefer JH, Scheiwe C: Impact of stereotactic ventriculo - cisternostomy on delayed cerebral infarction and outcome after subarachnoid hemorrhage. Stroke.2020, 51: 431 - 439. 10.1161/STROKEAHA.119.027424

[6] Wolf S, Mielke D, Barner C: Effectiveness of Lumbar Cerebrospinal Fluid Drain Among Patients With Aneurysmal Subarachnoid Hemorrhage: A Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA Neurol.2023, 80: 833 - 842. 10.1001/jamaneurol.2023.1792

[7] Macdonald RL: Origins of the concept of vasospasm. Stroke.2016, 47: 11 - 15. 10.1161/STROKEAHA.114.006498

[8] Dorhout Mees SM, Rinkel GJE, Feigin VL: Calcium antagonists for aneurysmal subarachnoid haemorrhage. Cochrane Database Syst Rev.2007, 277: 10.1002/14651858. CD000277. pub3

[9] Dreier JP: The role of spreading depression, spreading depolarization and spreading ischemia in neurological disease. Nat Med.2011, 17: 439 - 447. 10.1038/nm.2307

[10] Hartings JA, Strong AJ, Fabricius M: Cortical spreading depolarizations and outcome after traumatic brain injury: a prospective observational study. Lancet Neurol.2011, 10: 1058 - 1064. 10.1016/S1474 - 4422 (11) 70171 - 9