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Abstract

Background: Perforation is a common and serious complication of peptic ulcer disease that requires urgent surgical interference. Our aim is to evaluate the effectiveness and postoperative outcome of laparoscopic procedure in repairing perforated duodenal ulcers by comparing this modality with the conventional open surgical repair.

Patients and Methods: A retrospective study of 58 consecutive cases were included and subjected to simple closure of the perforated duodenal ulcers from May 2009 to January 2012 at Sohag University Hospital. Twenty two patients were managed laparoscopically and 36 patients underwent open surgical repair. Demographic data and surgical outcome were compared in both groups.

Results: The operative time in laparoscopic group is more than open group, but without significant statistical difference (p=0.126). Laparoscopic group showed an earlier tolerance to oral feeding (4.26 ± 0.42 vs 5.12 ± 2.38 days, p=0.04). Additionally, laparoscopic group showed an earlier hospital discharge and return to work than open one (6.63 ± 1.92 vs. 8.24±2.32 days, p=0.026, 20.28 ± 0.16 vs 28.23 ± 0.87 days, p=0.041, respectively). The mean consumed postoperative analgesics per day was less among laparoscopic group (1.7 ±0.26 vs 3.1 ±0.34 ampoule/ day, p=0.013). The incidence of wound infection, wound dehiscence, prolonged ileus and postoperative pneumonia were more in open group. There were no mortalities in laparoscopic group, but two cases died in open one. Intra-operative conversion to open surgery in laparoscopic group was performed to four cases.

Conclusions: Laparoscopic primary repair of perforated peptic ulcer can be done safely in early cases. It offers less postoperative pain, low incidence of postoperative wound complications, early hospital discharge and return to work, in addition to the cosmetically better outcome. Further training in laparoscopic skills is needed to propose it as a standard method for repair of perforated duodenal ulcers.

Keywords: Laparoscopy, duodenal ulcer, perforation.

INTRODUCTION

The incidence of peptic ulcer disease has declined over the past few years following a more streamlined pharmacological intervention. This can be attributed to the efficiency of histamine H2 blockers and proton...
Perforated peptic ulcer can be treated by a wide range of options that varies from conservative non-operative treatment to immediate definitive ulcer surgery. Three prognostic factors (preoperative shock, perforation for more than 24 hours, and associated medical disease) have been identified in patients with perforated peptic ulcer. Mouret, et al. first described laparoscopic intervention for perforated duodenal ulcer in 1990. Subsequently, this approach has found wide acceptance and has been successfully incorporated into the surgical armamentarium at many hospitals. Several larger comparative studies have been published confirming the technical feasibility and demonstrating some of the established advantages of the laparoscopic approach.

In our locality, this is the first clinical trial to employ the use of laparoscopy in simple closure of perforated duodenal ulcer. Our aim in this study is to evaluate the effectiveness and surgical outcome of laparoscopic approach in repairing perforated duodenal ulcers by comparing this procedure with the traditional open repair.

**PATIENTS AND METHODS**

This retrospective nonrandomized study was carried out at Sohag University Hospital from May 2009 to January 2012. Only 58 patients confirmed to the selection criteria and informed about pros and cons of each technique. All eligible cases were consented. The study included cases with perforated duodenal ulcers that were submitted to whether laparoscopic or open repair over omental patch. Comparative study was done between laparoscopic and open groups by assessing; operative time, mean consumed postoperative analgesics per day during the first three days after surgery, early postoperative complications, mortality rate, time to tolerate normal diet and time to return to work.

Preoperative clinical and radiological diagnosis was done to all patients via: full history taking, complete clinical evaluation, routine investigations, plain X-ray chest and abdomen in erect position, and abdominal ultrasound.

Exclusion criteria in both groups included: complicated ulcers with gastric outlet obstruction, patients with previous upper abdominal incision, and patients with serious associated cardiopulmonary disease.

Follow up was limited to the early postoperative period during the first month after surgery in regular outpatient visits every week after hospital discharge for monitoring of postoperative complications. The patients were evaluated clinically and by abdominal ultrasound for suspected cases with an intraperitoneal collection.

Preoperative preparation and resuscitative measures were done to all patients by intravenous fluids, correction of electrolyte imbalance (if present), nasogastric tube decompression, self-retaining urinary catheter to calculate urinary output, intravenous broad spectrum antibiotics and proton pump inhibitor, and urgent surgical interference was performed as soon as the clinical decision to operate.

**Surgical procedure:** All patients were scheduled to receive endotracheal anesthesia with muscle relaxation. The open repair was performed through upper midline incision. After dissection and division of the inflammatory adhesions, the site of perforation was identified and closed by full thickness suturing using polygalactin No1 suture over a healthy omental patch. Peritoneal toilet was achieved by warm saline solution. Closure of the abdominal incision with two intraperitoneal tube drains, one adjacent to the repair and the other in the pelvis.

Laparoscopic repair was performed as follows: The patient was placed in supine position with head up and the surgeon stood between the legs of the patient. Pneumoperitoneum (below 12 mmHg) was started through an umbilical incision using Hasson open technique to avoid injury of any possible adherent intraperitoneal structures. The umbilical port was used for application of the camera, two working ports were placed on each sides of the camera in triangular fashion at the level of transpyloric plane at the midclavicular line in both sides, and the last port was introduced in the epigastrium for liver and gall bladder retraction as well as irrigation and suction of saline. The assistant retracted the gall bladder and liver upward, blunt and sharp dissection to divide the inflammatory adhesion that was facilitated by using the ultrasonic dissecting.
device. Visualization of the site of perforation was supported by irrigation of saline or insufflations of air through the nasogastric tube that showed as escape of saline or air bubbles from perforation site. Meticulous peritoneal lavage was achieved by irrigation and suction of warm saline. Irrigation and suction was performed to all intraperitoneal spaces and pelvic cavity in a dependent position. The perforation was closed by 2-3 stitches with polygalactin No1 suture using healthy omental patch that was inserted beneath the stitches. Drain was put in the subhepatic space at the end of the procedure and the fascia was closed in all ports.

Postoperative management included, intravenous fluids, parenteral broad spectrum antibiotics (Cefepime, 1 gm/12hours and metronidazol, 500 mg/8 hours), nasogastric aspiration and parenteral proton pump inhibitor were used. All patients received an intramuscular ampoule of nalbuphine (20mg) after they regain consciousness as a standard method of postoperative analgesia; additional analgesic ampoules of nalbuphine were given to the patients according to their needs for postoperative pain relief. The mean consumed postoperative analgesic ampoules during the first 3 days after operation were calculated in both groups. Tolerance to oral intake and length of hospital stay were recorded to all patients. We used student’s t-test to verify the comparative study between both groups and p < 0.05 was considered to be statistically significant.

RESULTS

Laparoscopic omental patch repair was done to 22 patients; during the same period, open repair was performed to 36 patients. Demographic data was recorded in both open and laparoscopic groups as shown in Table 1.

The operative findings and postoperative care were compared in both groups as shown in Table 2. There was significant statistical difference between laparoscopic and open groups as regards; start to oral feeding, duration of nasogastric tube use, mean consumed analgesic during the first three postoperative days, hospital stay and duration of return to work.

Intraoperative conversion to open surgery in laparoscopic group was conducted to four cases as two of them were due to failure of simple closure of extremely friable edge ulcers and the remaining two patients were due to presence of massive adhesions that interfered with visualization of the ulcer site. All cases of conversion to open surgery were presented by abdominal pain more than 24 hours on admission.

The postoperative surgical outcome was recorded and compared in both groups in Table 3. The incidence of wound infection, wound dehiscence, prolonged ileus and postoperative pneumonia were more in open group.

There were no mortalities in laparoscopic group, but two cases died in open group, one of them was due to postoperative pneumonia and the other due to severe postoperative sepsis and pulmonary edema.

Reperforation occurred in 2 and 3 patients of laparoscopic and open group respectively, all of them were reopened surgically and subjected to good drainage with revision of the perforation with omental patch repair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Demographic data of both laparoscopic and open group.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographic data</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of patients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age in years (mean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (M/ F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of ulcer symptoms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of NSAIDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdominal pain &gt;24 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBCs count on admission (median)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Operative findings and postoperative care.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operative findings</th>
<th>Laparoscopic</th>
<th>Open</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of patients</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operative time (min)</td>
<td>112.6±22.43</td>
<td>102.1±42.67</td>
<td>0.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion to open surgery</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of naso-gastric tube use (days)</td>
<td>2.6±2.63</td>
<td>3.7±1.75</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start to oral feeding (mean by days)</td>
<td>4.26±0.42</td>
<td>5.1±2.38</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean consumed analgesic during the first 3 postop. days (ampoules/day)</td>
<td>1.7±0.26</td>
<td>3.1±0.34</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital stay (days)</td>
<td>6.63±1.92</td>
<td>8.2±2.32</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return to work (mean/days)</td>
<td>20.28±0.16</td>
<td>28.2±0.87</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Postoperative complications and mortality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surgical outcome</th>
<th>Laparoscopic</th>
<th>Open</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wound infections</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wound dehiscence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reperforations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prolonged ileus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ataelectasis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumonia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortality</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION

With the recent advances of curative medical treatment for H. pylori, the prevalence and recurrence of peptic ulcer have been significantly declined.\(^{(23,24)}\)

Consequently, major acid-reduction surgical procedures are not required for perforated peptic ulcer. As a result, simple closure of the perforation with an omental patch has become the favored option of treatment.\(^{(12,13)}\)

The presence of septic peritonitis and associated bad general condition of these patients with perforated duodenal ulcers make us hesitating to employ the use of laparoscopic simple repair. So, this is the first clinical trial to manage these patients laparoscopically in a retrospective study and with a potential patient selection.

In this literature, the demographic data of both laparoscopic and open groups showed that 50% and 53% of patients respectively had a history of NSAIDs use and this was inconsistent with current study that reported a smaller number of NSAIDs intake in patients with perforated peptic ulcers.\(^{8}\) This variability may be due to the abuse of NSAIDs in our locality. We used four port sites to perform the laparoscopic...
repair for closure of perforated duodenal ulcers, this is in agreement with many other studies.\textsuperscript{1,8,16,17,21,25,26} On the other hand, Lee et al.\textsuperscript{22} in a recent study reported that three port sites are sufficient to do the same procedure.

This variability may be related to the long run of training and technical experience.

In our study, it was found that the operative time in laparoscopic group is more than open group, but without significant statistical difference (P. value 0.126).

This is consistent with many studies,\textsuperscript{1,9,17,21} and inconsistent with other studies.\textsuperscript{19,22,25}

However, laparoscopic group of our series showed significant statistical difference in comparison with the open group as regards: start of oral feeding, duration of nasogastric tube use, hospital stay and return to work. These results agree with many related comparative studies.\textsuperscript{2,8,15–19,25,26} Conversion to open surgery varies from 0% up to 60%.\textsuperscript{27–29} The reported reasons for conversion are: inadequate ulcer localization and large sized ulcer, cardiovascular instability, prolonged perforation more than 24 hours, inadequate instruments, abscess and adhesions.\textsuperscript{1,27–30}

In our study, intraoperative conversion to open surgery occurred in four cases (18%) among the laparoscopic group series, all of them presented preoperatively by abdominal pain more than 24 hours on admission, two of them were due to failure of simple closure of the extremely friable edge ulcers and the other two cases due to failure of identification of perforation sites from massive adhesions. It was noticed in our study that laparoscopic repair was achieved safely without surgical conversion in cases that were presented early during the first 24 hours from the onset of perforation. This is consistent with many current comparable studies.\textsuperscript{1,29–31}

Our results showed that the reported incidence of wound infections, wound dehiscence and prolonged ileus, were less among the laparoscopic group series in comparison with open group. Many other current studies have similar reported outcomes.\textsuperscript{16,17,21,22,25,26,31}

However the incidence of atelectasis was less in the open group. The incidence of postoperative ulcer reperforation was found in 9% and 8.3% of both laparoscopic and open groups respectively. Tissues friability and technical errors were the underlying responsible factors. These recorded incidences were close to the reported results in other parallel studies.\textsuperscript{6,18,21,25}

No mortalities were detected in the laparoscopic group, but two cases died among the open group, one of them due to postoperative pneumonia and the other was due to severe sepsis.

In conclusions laparoscopic primary repair of perforated peptic ulcer can be done safely in early cases that presented within 24 hours from the onset of perforation. It offers less postoperative pain, lower incidence of tissue trauma and postoperative wound complications, early hospital discharge and return to work, in addition to the cosmetically better outcome. Further training in laparoscopic skills is needed to propose it as a standard method for repair of perforated duodenal ulcers.
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