

## CLINICAL STUDY

# Complicated appendectomy in children in relation to laparoscopic vs open procedures

Faruquzzaman<sup>1</sup>, Saroj Kumar Mazumder<sup>2</sup>

Chittagong Medical College Hospital Chittagong, Bangladesh. drfaruquzzaman@yahoo.com

**Abstract:** The role of laparoscopic appendectomy in the management of complicated appendicitis remains unsettled with reports of a higher incidence of postoperative intraperitoneal abscess. Most studies on laparoscopic appendectomy in children have been done in the Western population. This retrospective review has been done to compare laparoscopic appendectomy with open appendectomy in children with complicated appendicitis in Chittagong Medical Hospital, Bangladesh.

Based on intention-to-treat analysis, there were 51 and 61 children in the laparoscopic and open appendectomy groups, respectively. Conversion from laparoscopy to open technique was done in six children. Distribution of age, gender and pathology of appendicitis was similar for the two groups. With laparoscopic appendectomy, the mean operative time was longer (112 vs 72 minutes, p-value is less than 0.005), while severe wound infection (2.1 vs 21 percent, p-value is less than 0.05) and mean postoperative hospital stay (5.7 vs 7.4 days, p-value is less than 0.005) were significantly lower. The incidence of postoperative intraperitoneal abscess (12 vs 11.5 percent) and postoperative fever (20 vs 11.5 percent) were not significantly different (p-value is greater than 0.05).

This review has confirmed that the longer the operating time, the lower the incidence of wound infection and shorter the postoperative stay for laparoscopic appendectomy. There was no increased risk of postoperative intraperitoneal abscess (*Tab. 1, Fig. 15, Ref. 35*). Full Text (Free, PDF) [www.bmj.sk](http://www.bmj.sk).

Key words: laparoscopic appendectomy, appendicitis, intraperitoneal abscess.

Appendicitis is the commonest surgical emergency in the Western world. Rare under 2 years, common in second and third decades, but can occur at any age (1). About 7 % of people in Western countries have appendicitis at some time in their lives; 200,000 appendectomies for acute appendicitis are performed each year in the United States (2). The fatal complication may be (1):

- Wound infection.
- Intra-abdominal abscess (pelvic, RIF, subphrenic).
- Adhesions.
- Abdominal actinomycosis (rare!).
- Portal pyaemia (R).

Laparoscopic appendectomy (LA) has the advantage of providing better access and good visualisation of the peritoneal cavity with relatively smaller incisions, as compared to open appendectomy (OA). Logically, LA should be beneficial in the management of complicated appendicitis, which is often associated with inflammatory masses, omental adhesions, and intraperitoneal abscesses (3, 4). Laparoscopy also helps to correct the preoperative diagnosis in clinically doubtful cases of appendicitis.

However, despite these advantages, the role of laparoscopy in complicated appendicitis in children still remains a matter of debate (4, 5). The issue has also been complicated by some reports that LA may be associated with a higher risk of postoperative intraperitoneal abscess (3, 4). Most studies that have compared LA with OA on complicated appendicitis in children have been in the Western population and the regional literature on the subject is limited.

Minimal adhesions can be released by gentle traction on the appendix using a 5- or 3-mm suprapubic forceps. In the presence of severe inflammation, use of a metallic suction cannula enables quick dissection of inflammatory tissue, especially in the case of abscess. Peritoneal lavage may be helped with the insertion of a sponge, enabling respiration of fluids more easily. While removing the appendix through the umbilicus, pressure on the abdominal wall may help in extracting the caecum for better control and ligation. Surgeon's placement between the patient's legs facilitates intraperitoneal lavage of both upper quadrants. If no 5-mm endoscope is available, a 10-mm suprapubic port is needed at the time of umbilical extraction. The use of an endoscope with an operating channel can be an option (6–10).

<sup>1</sup>Chittagong Medical College Hospital Chittagong, Bangladesh, and <sup>2</sup>Department Community Medicine, Chittagong Medical College, Bangladesh

**Address for correspondence:** Faruquzzaman Dr, C/O: Md. Moazzem Hossain (Engineer), House No. 7, Islambag Road (Paulpara), Railygate, Daulatpur (Postal code 9202), Bangladesh  
Phone: +8801713312349

## Methods and materials

*Type of study:* a retrospective study.

*Place of study:* Paediatric Surgery Department of Chittagong Medical College Hospital.

*Period of study:* From 13.01.07 to 11.12.08.

*Sample size:* A total of 189 children underwent appendectomy for acute appendicitis during the study period, of which 112 had complicated appendicitis.

*Type of sampling:* Convenient type of purposive sampling.

*Surgical procedure:* The laparoscopic appendectomies were done by a single surgeon, while the open appendectomies were performed by surgical trainees with at least three years of surgical experience. There was no selection of cases for laparoscopic appendectomy. Both procedures were done by standard techniques. The operative time, duration of postoperative stay, wound infection rate, incidence of intraperitoneal abscess and postoperative fever were compared.

A retrospective review was done to compare LA with OA in children (aged 12 years or less) who had undergone emergency appendectomy for complicated appendicitis over a period of five years from January 2007 to December 2008. Complicated appendicitis in this study has been defined as the presence of one or more of the following pathological changes involving the appendix and the peritoneum, namely perforation, gangrene, mass formation or intra-abdominal abscess. LA was performed by the same consultant surgeon, while OA was performed by surgical trainees with general surgical experience of not less than three years. There was no selection of patients for LA and all patients scheduled for appendectomy under the consultant surgeon primarily underwent LA. The surgical trainees were involved in assisting the LA. Both, LA and OA were done under general anaesthesia and all patients received perioperative antibiotics with intravenous third generation cephalosporin and metronidazole. LA was performed using a 10-mm trocar at the umbilicus as a camera port, a 5-mm trocar in the right flank about the level of the umbilicus and 3-mm trocars just above the pubic symphysis. The mesoappendix was dissected using ultrasonic dissector and the appendix stump was ligated using either an endoloop or intracorporeal knot. The position of the two working ports slightly varied as per the operative findings after visualisation through the camera port. The appendix was extracted either within the umbilical trocar or by use of a bag, when required. After the removal of ports, the fascia was sutured at the umbilicus and intracutaneous sutures were used to close the 10-mm and 5-mm trocar sites. OA was performed through a muscle-splitting incision in the right iliac fossa. The appendectomy was done by standard technique. Peritoneal lavage was done in both techniques using sufficient normal saline until all the collections have been visibly cleared and the effluent was clear in appearance. Volumes ranging 1–1.5 L were required in our cases. In both, LA and OA techniques, the distal ileal loops were traced for about 15–20 cm. All visible interloop adhesions and exudates were cleared. Intraperitoneal drains were not used for both, LA and OA in view of the good peritoneal lavage used in all cases and unreliability of such drains. The demographical features such as age, gender and race, as well as the pathological changes in the appendix were recorded. The pathology in the appendix was classified as perforation, gangrene or appendicular mass/abscess. Patients with appendicular mass or abscess formation were

grouped under this category even though the appendix also showed either perforation or gangrenous change. After surgery, all patients received antibiotics either for a minimum period of five days or for at least 48 hours after the patient remained febrile, whichever was longer. The antibiotics were initially given intravenously and changed to oral route when oral feeds were commenced. The operative time, postoperative inpatient days, postoperative adverse events such as wound infection, significant postoperative fever, and intraperitoneal abscess, were compared between the LA and OA groups. The operating time for LA was taken as the interval from the time of umbilical incision to closure of the port sites, and that for OA from the time of right iliac fossa incision to completion of wound closure. Wound infection for the purpose of the study was grouped into mild and severe, using a modification of the National Nosocomial Infection Surveillance (NNIS) system of classification<sup>6</sup>. Mild infection was defined as the presence of minimal seropurulent or purulent discharge, which was settled with either oral antibiotics or dressings for three days or less, and did not delay the patient's recovery from surgery. Severe wound infection was defined as the presence of moderate seropurulent or frank purulent discharge with or without systemic symptoms, which required dressing for more than three days or required surgical intervention. Postoperative fever was defined as the presence of fever of  $>38^{\circ}\text{C}$  beyond the second postoperative day. Postoperative intra-abdominal abscess was defined as the presence of intraperitoneal collection demonstrable by ultrasonography or surgical drainage. Statistical analysis was done using unpaired *t*-test for continuous variables and chi-square test for discrete variables with Yates' correction where applicable. A *p*-value of  $<0.05$  was taken as significant.

There are illustrated the Figures of laparoscopic appendectomy (Figs 1–11).

#### Data processing and analysis

Using computer-based statistical package statistical analysis of the data was done. The data were analyzed with SPSS computer package programme. The survey data were usually analyzed using descriptive statistical measures such as mean value, SD, percentage, co-efficient of variation etc. All parameters were expressed as mean  $\pm$  standard error of the mean (SEM).



Fig. 1. Exploration of peritoneal cavity.




Fig. 2. Exposure.




Fig. 6. Clamping of appendix.




Fig. 3. Appendiceal dissection.




Fig. 7. Resection of appendix.



Fig. 4. The appendix is inflammatory, but narrow and entirely free.




Fig. 8. Dissection: appendiceal abscess.




Fig. 5. Ligature of mesentery.




Fig. 9. Stapling in case of abscess.

The report was produced by computer-based programmes, namely Microsoft Word, Power point, Adobe and other accessories. A p value of less than 0.05 was considered significant.

## Results

A total of 189 children underwent appendectomy for acute appendicitis during the study period, of which 112 had compli-



Fig. 10. Stapling a gangrenous appendix.



Fig. 11. Suction drain.




Fig. 12. Laparoscopic appendectomy, open appendectomy and a conversion from LA to OA.




Fig. 13. Variation in races.

cated appendicitis. Of these, 45 had the appendectomy completed by laparoscopy, 61 had OA, and six required a conversion from LA to OA (Figs 12, 13 and 14) (Tab. 1).

The intention-to-treat principle was used to analyze the results. The age of patients ranged 5–12 years for the LA group




Fig. 14. Appendicular pathology.




Fig. 15. The percentages of males in the LA group and in the OA group.

and 4–12 years for the OA group. The males constituted 50.9 % of the LA group and 54.1 % of the OA group (Fig. 15) (Tab. 1).

There was no statistically significant difference between the LA and OA groups with regard to demographical features such as age, gender and race as well as the pathological changes involving the appendix (Tab. 1). The mean operative time for the LA group was 112 (range 50–163, with 5 % trimmed mean of 114, standard deviation [SD] 36.3 and 95% confidence interval [CI] of 104–124) min and that for the OA group was 72 (range 40–137, with 5% trimmed mean of 72, SD 30.3 and 95% CI 64–79) min. The operative time was significantly longer for the LA group ( $p < 0.005$ ). One or more of the three postoperative adverse events noted above occurred in 18 of the 51 patients (35 %) in the LA group and 42 of 61 (69 %) in the OA group. Postoperative complications as a whole were more frequent after OA ( $p$  with Yates' correction  $< 0.005$ ). Severe wound infection occurred in 13 of 61 (21 %) of the OA patients and in two of the 51 (4 %) patients of LA group. Severe infection occurred significantly less frequently with the LA group ( $p$  with Yates correction  $< 0.05$ , odds-ratio [OR] 0.23, 95% CI 0.07–0.67). Mild wound infection occurred in one of the 51 (2 %) patients of the LA group and in 21 of 61 (34 %) of the OA patients. Postoperative intraperitoneal abscess developed in six of 51 patients (12 %) in the LA group and seven of 61 children (11.5 %) in the OA group (Yates'  $p > 0.05$ ). The locations of the collections in the LA group were interileal in three and pelvic in three patients. The locations in the OA group were interileal in two, pelvic in three and two in the right iliac fossa. Except for one patient in each of the LA and

**Tab. 1. Demographic features and distribution of appendicular pathology in the laparoscopic and open surgery groups.**

Demographics	No (%) LA (n = 51)	No (%) OA (n = 61)	p-value
Age (years)			
Range	5–12	4–12	
Mean (median)	8.7 (9)	9 (9)	> 0.05 (NS)
Gender			
Male	26 (50.9)	28 (54.1)	
Female	25 (49.1)	33 (45.9)	> 0.05 (NS)
Race			
Chittagong	14	30	
Comilla	12	22	
Others	13	21	> 0.05 (NS)
Appendicular pathology			
Perforated	22	29	
Gangrenous	10	26	
Abscess/mass	7	18	> 0.05 (NS)

OA groups requiring surgical drainage of the pelvic abscess, all other patients responded to conservative treatment with antibiotics. Postoperative fever occurred in ten of the 51 (20 %) patients in the LA group and seven of the 61 (11.5%) children in the OA group. There was no statistically significant difference between the two groups (Yates'  $p > 0.05$ ). The mean periods of postoperative hospital stay were 5.7 (range 2–14, SD 1.93, 95% CI 4.9–6) days for the LA group, and 7.4 (range 5–13, SD 1.86 and 95% CI 6.8–7.8) days for the OA group, respectively. The postoperative stay for the LA group was significantly shorter ( $p < 0.005$ ).

### Discussion and comparison with other studies

Most existing studies on LA in children have compared this group with those undergoing OA with regard to operative time, duration of postoperative stay and postoperative complications such as postoperative fever, postoperative ileus, wound infection and postoperative intraperitoneal abscess formation (4, 5, 7, 35). A longer operative time is often quoted as a disadvantage of LA compared to OA. A report on children treated for perforated appendicitis from another centre in the region showed a statistically significant difference in mean operative time of 106.5 min (95% CI 100.2–112.8) in the LA group and 92.8 min (95% CI 82.9–102.7) in the OA group (32). The longer mean operative time of 112 minutes for the LA group in our cases of complicated appendicitis is thus similar. The time taken for laparoscopic dissection in complicated appendicitis depends on the severity of the pathological changes in the abdomen and the optimal positioning of the working ports. The presence of ileus, inflammatory oedema and interloop adhesions together with the varied position of the appendix may make the initial identification of the position of the appendix through the camera port difficult, resulting in a less than optimal position of the working ports. Most studies have shown a significantly reduced incidence of

wound infection with LA compared with that of OA (4). Our study that is confined to cases of complicated appendicitis has also shown a lower incidence of both, mild and severe wound infections with LA. The reduction in the number of wound infections is possibly due to the small size of the individual port-site wounds compared with the longer wounds in OA (4, 5). The multiple abdominal layers opened up in OA allow infected material to collect, thus promoting wound infection. In LA, the appendix is taken out via a bag or through the laparoscopic cannula, in contrast to open delivery through the wound in OA. The suction and irrigation of the intraperitoneal collections are done via a suction device passed through the laparoscopic port in LA, whereas such manoeuvres easily contaminate the wound of OA despite protection with packs. The incidence of intraperitoneal abscesses following LA for complicated appendicitis in children has been variably reported, with some studies showing no difference compared to OA, while others have shown a higher incidence<sup>4</sup>. The reason for the increase in the incidence of intraperitoneal abscesses following LA is perplexing as laparoscopy provides better access to all parts of the peritoneal cavity, enabling easier detection, effective drainage and irrigation of localised collections during appendectomy (3–32). The general bias of selecting LA for bigger-sized children with a fat-laden peritoneum may contribute to this higher incidence (33–35). Our review, which is confined to cases of complicated appendicitis and matched for severity of appendicitis between the LA and OA groups, has not shown any significant difference in intraperitoneal infections following LA. Most reports have shown that the length of postoperative hospital stay is significantly less following LA compared with OA (4). This has also been shown in our patients. Factors, such as early ambulation following surgery, reduction in wound pain, decreased use of postoperative analgesics, reduced incidence of ileus and wound infection may collectively lead to reduction in postoperative inpatient days. However, it needs to be mentioned that our retrospective analysis has the limitation of variability in the experience of surgeons between the LA and OA groups. This variability was to some extent minimised by adopting a standard protocol for both, LA and OA and by ensuring a minimum of three years of surgical experience for the surgical trainees. It is inevitable that any new procedure that is adopted in clinical practice tends to be done by senior members. Such a bias has been noted in many of the published reports comparing LA with OA (4). In conclusion, the present report happens to be the first detailed analysis comparing LA with OA in Malaysian children, and the results show that LA can be safely recommended for complicated appendicitis in children in the local setting. Although the operating time was a little longer for LA than OA, both wound infection incidence and postoperative hospital stay were significantly less for LA. There was no evidence of any increase in the intraperitoneal infective complications following LA, as suggested in some of the previous reports. Further prospective, randomized studies are required to assess the role of LA in children. The patients need to be matched for variables such as severity of appendicular pathology, surgeon's experience and related factors such as size of patient.

### Limitations of this study

In our opinion, the sample size of 112 complicated cases analysed in this study were not adequate to calculate the exact figure. Moreover, we found no national research paper that would enable a satisfactory comparison and provide proper contrast. Indeed, right now we badly need some more of practical basic clinical researches in a very large scale to depict the original image in full scale to combat against such a crucial threat in surgical management.

### References

1. Pierce AG, Neil RB. Surgery at a glance. Acute appendicitis. INBN-0-632-059885; 1999–2000: 98.
2. Thambidorai CR, Aman FY. Laparoscopic appendectomy for complicated appendicitis in children. Singapore Med J 2008; 49 (12): 994.
3. Golub R, Siddiqui F, Pohl D. Laparoscopic versus open appendectomy: a metaanalysis. J Am Coll Surg 1998; 186: 545–553.
4. Aziz O, Athanasiou T, Tekkis PP et al. Laparoscopic versus open appendectomy in children: A metaanalysis. Ann Surg 2006; 243: 17–27.
5. Meguerditchian AN, Prasil P, Cloutier R et al. Laparoscopic appendectomy in children: A favorable alternative in simple and complicated appendicitis. J Pediatr Surg 2002; 37: 695–698.
6. Jean LD. Tips and technique in laparoscopic surgery; ISBN 2-287-59749, 203: 115.
7. Adamek HE, Maier M, Benz C, Huber T, Schilling D, Riemann JF. Schwerwiegende komplikationen der diagnostischen laparoskopie. Med Klein 1996; 91: 694–697.
8. Addiss GD, Shaffer N, Fowler S, Tauxe RV. The epidemiology of appendicitis and appendectomy in the United States. Am J Epidemiol 1990; 132: 910–925.
9. Andersson RE, Hugander A, Thulin AJG. Diagnostic accuracy and perforation rate in appendicitis: association with age and sex of patient and with appendectomy rate. Eur J Surg 1992; 158: 37–41.
10. Arnbjörnsson E. Small intestinal obstruction after appendectomy: an avoidable complication? Curr Surg 1984; 354–355.
11. Arnbjörnsson E, Andrén-Sandberg A, Bengmark S. Appendectomy in the elderly, incidence and operative findings. Ann Chir Gyn 1983; 72: 223–228.
12. Attwood SEA, Hill ADK, Murphy PG, Thornton J, Stephens RB. A prospective randomized trial of laparoscopic vs. open appendectomy. Surgery 1992; 112: 497–501.
13. Birkenfeld A, Brzezinski A, Schenker JG. Post mechanical sterility. Acta Eur Fertil 1982; 13: 173–176.
14. Blind PJ, Dahlgren ST. The continuing challenge of the negative appendix. Acta Chir Scand 1986; 152: 623–627.
15. Bonjer HJ, Hazebroek EJ, Kazemier G, Giuffrida MC, Meijer WS, Lange JF. Open vs. closed establishment of pneumoperitoneum in laparoscopic surgery. Br J Surg 1997; 84: 599–602.
16. Borgstein PJ, Gordijn RV, Eijsbouts QAJ, Cuesta MA. Acute appendicitis: a clear-cut case in men, a guessing game in women. Surg Endosc 1997; 11: 923–927.
17. Champault G, Cazacu F, Taffinder N. Serious trocar accidents in laparoscopic surgery: a French survey of 103,852 operations. Surg Laprosc Endosc 1996; 6: 367–370.
18. Cox MR, McCall JL, Padbury RTA, Wilson TG, Wattchow DA, Toouli J. Laparoscopic surgery in women with a clinical diagnosis of acute appendicitis. Med J Aust 1995; 162: 130–132.
19. Deutsch AA, Zelikovsky A, Reiss R. Laparoscopy in the prevention of unnecessary appendectomies: a prospective study. Br J Surg 1982; 69: 336–337.
20. Cang FC, Hogle HH, Welling DR. The fate of the negative appendix. Am J Surg 1973; 126: 752–754.
21. Frazee RC, Roberts JW, Symmonds RE, Snyder SK, Hendricks JC, Smith RW, Custer MD, Harrison JB. A prospective randomized study comparing open vs. laparoscopy appendectomy. Ann Surg 1994; 219: 725–731.
22. Fritts LL, Orlando R. Laparoscopic appendectomy: a safety and cost analysis. Arch Surg 1993; 128: 521–525.
23. Graham A, Henley C, Mobley J. Laparoscopic evaluation of acute abdominal pain. J Laparosc Surg 1991; 1: 165–168.
24. Hansen JB, Smithers BM, Schache D, Wall DR, Miller BJ, Menzies BL. World J Surg 1996; 20: 17–21.
25. Heinzelmann M, Simmen HP, Cummins AS, Largiader F. Is laparoscopic appendectomy the new »gold standard«? Arch Surg 1995; 130: 782–784.
26. Hellberg A. Prospective randomized multicenter study of laparoscopy vs. open appendectomy. Br J Surg 1999; 86: 48–53.
27. Henle K, Beller S, Rechner J, Zerz A. Laparoskopische vs. konventionelle appendektomie: eine prospektive, randomisierte studie. Chirurg 1996; 67: 526.
28. Jansen FW, Kapiteyn K, Trimbos-Kemper T, Hermans J, Trimbör JB. Br J Obstet Gynecol 1997; 104: 595–600.
29. Kok HJM. Laparoscopic appendectomy: a new opportunity for curing appendicopathy. Surg Lap End 1992; 2: 297–302.
30. Krähenbühl L, Frei E, Klaiber Ch, Büchler MW. Acute appendicitis standard treatment or laparoscopic surgery. In: Büchler MW, Farthmann EH (Eds). Progress in surgery. Karger, Basel, 1998, pp 1–191.
31. De Wilde RL. Goodbye bowel obstruction after appendectomy. Lancet 1991; 338: 1012.
32. Bhatia JY, Pandey K, Rodrigues C, Mehta A, Joshi VR. Postoperative wound infection in patients undergoing coronary artery bypass graft surgery: A prospective study with evaluation of risk factors. Ind J Microbiol 2003; 21: 246–251.
33. Baniaghbal B, Al-Hindi S, Davies MRQ. Laparoscopic appendectomy with appendix mass in Children. Pediatr Endosurg Innovative Tech 2004; 8: 25–30.
34. Rai R, Chui CH, Sai Prasad TR et al. Perforated appendicitis in children: benefits of early laparoscopic surgery. Ann Acad Med Singapore 2007; 36: 277–279.
35. Moberg AC, Berndsen F, Palmquist I et al. Randomized clinical trial of laparoscopic versus open appendectomy for confirmed appendicitis. Br J Surg 2005; 92: 298–304.

Received January 9, 2009.  
Accepted September 20, 2010.