

Laparoscopic Cholecystectomy Versus Small Incision Cholecystectomy in Symptomatic Gallstones Disease

Shaban Mehrvarz¹, Hassan Ali Mohebi¹ and Mohammad Hosein Kalantar Motamedi²

ABSTRACT

Objective: To compare the results and outcomes of the laparoscopic cholecystectomy (LC) with the small incision cholecystectomy (SIC).

Study Design: Observational study.

Place and Duration of Study: Baqiyatallah Hospital, Tehran, Iran, from February 2008 to March 2009.

Methodology: Patients with symptomatic gallstones that were referred and enrolled in the study for LC or SIC. Operation, anaesthesia, analgesics and postoperative care were standardized. The patients were assessed for operation time, postoperative pain, nausea, vomiting, hospital stay, return to work time and complications in the postoperative period on day 1, 1 week, 1 month and 6 months, postoperatively.

Results: Of 144 patients, 81 underwent LC and 63 underwent SIC. Both groups were matched for age, gender, BMI, clinical findings and ASA grading. The mean duration of operation was 74 and 62 minutes in the LC and SIC groups, respectively ($p = 0.0059$). Duration of hospital stay and return to regular activities were shorter after LC compared to SIC. Pain scores, nausea and vomiting were the same in both groups, although the frequency of intra-operative complications were greater in LC compared to SIC.

Conclusion: Outcome and complications of SIC were comparable with those of LC.

Key words: Gallstone. Laparoscopic cholecystectomy. Small incision cholecystectomy. Complications.

INTRODUCTION

Cholecystectomy is a commonly performed surgical procedure for patients suffering from symptomatic gallstones. Open cholecystectomy (OC) was the method of choice for gallbladder surgery for almost a century.^{1,2} Gradually, surgeons opted to perform this operation through smaller incisions and in early 1980's small incision cholecystectomy (SIC), also known as mini-laparotomy, was debuted. Patients undergoing SIC had a quicker recovery and less complications compared to those undergoing conventional OC.^{1,3}

Cholecystectomy, using a laparoscope or laparoscopic cholecystectomy (LC), in late 1980's was greatly accepted by patients and employed by surgeons because it left a much smaller scar but further investigation and comparison of the results with those of SIC was not done at the onset.^{4,5} Most studies focused on the comparison of LC and OC and emphasized the better outcome of LC. At present, it is well understood that patients undergoing LC have a better and shorter recovery time compared to those undergoing OC.^{3,4}

Some consider LC the method of choice for surgical removal of the gallbladder with stones. However, there is no definite evidence supporting the preference of this method over SIC.^{5,6}

Several studies have compared the results of SIC and LC and reported less cost and shorter duration of operation in the SIC procedure compared to LC but the complications, morbidity and mortality were the same in both methods and sometimes even less complications were seen in the SIC group.⁴⁻⁷

Patients' quality of life 3 months after surgery was also evaluated in a study done on 257 patients administered with questionnaires. The study showed no significant difference between the two groups.¹

In a review study in 2008, 59 randomized clinical trials and 5,556 patients were evaluated. It was shown that SIC had a shorter duration of operation compared to LC. However, no significant difference was detected between the two groups in terms of hospital stay, rate of switching to open surgery, complications, morbidity, mortality and postoperative outcome. In a study evaluating the data in Cochrane Library, 56 randomized clinical trials and 5,246 patients were evaluated in three groups OC, SIC and LC which showed similar results and stated that SIC and LC were almost similar in terms of complications and mortality. SICs had significantly lower cost.^{5,8} There is a consensus that the surgical cost of LC is significantly greater than OC and SIC. The reason is that LC requires expensive equipment and it is

Department of Surgery¹ / Trauma², Baqiyatallah University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran.

Correspondence: Prof. Dr. Mohammad Hosein Kalantar Motamedi, Trauma Research Center, Baqiyatallah University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran.

E-mail: motamedical@lycos.com

Received July 25, 2011; accepted August 07, 2012.

harder to provide such equipment and devices in less developed countries with major obstacles in their healthcare system; this is an important issue requiring attention.^{8,9}

The aim of the present study was to compare the methods of LC and SIC and evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of each of these procedures.

METHODOLOGY

All patients presenting to the outpatient clinic of the study centre suffering from symptomatic gallstones and being candidates for surgery were included in a prospective study. This trial was not randomized because the type of surgeries were done based on the patients' request. An informed written consent was obtained from all patients. This study was approved by the institute ethics committee. The study was conducted from February 2008 to March 2009. Patients younger than 18 years of age, association with the common bile duct (choledochal) stone, cholangitis, jaundice, pregnancy, moderate to severe systemic disease with ASA (American Society of Anaesthesiology) grading > 2, history of upper abdominal surgery, mental illness, obesity with BMI > 45 kg/m² and acute cholecystitis were excluded from the study.

Both surgeries were performed by expert surgeons with more than 5 years experience with the assistance of senior residents of surgery. During the operation, a nasogastric tube was inserted if required and then extracted postoperatively. All patients underwent general anaesthesia. Fascia and skin were sutured similarly in all patients.

SIC was performed through an oblique right sub-costal incision. At first, a 5-6 cm incision was made on the skin and after entering the abdominal cavity, the incision was expanded upto 8 cm, if necessary. At the end of surgery and after applying the sutures, the length of incision was measured again using a ruler. If the incision was longer than 8 cm or another procedure had been performed other than the cholecystectomy i.e. common bile duct exploration, the patient was excluded from the study. Duration of operation was calculated from the moment of surgery until the completion of skin suturing.

Level of pain was determined using the visual analogue scale (VAS) which was performed 24 hours after surgery. Patients had to be NPO for upto 12 hours postoperatively and after that if the patients had no vomiting, a liquid diet was started for them. Pethidine was injected for pain control 0.5 mg/kg immediately after transferring the patient to the ward every 6 hours for a total of 2 doses. After that, pain relievers were administered according to the VAS pain scale (a tablet of acetaminophen for 0-3, acetaminophen and codeine for 4 – 7 and intravenous pethidine for 8 – 10 on this scale).

At the time of discharge from the hospital, patients had oral nutrition, no vomiting and a pain scale of below 4 at rest. Antibiotic was administered 30 minutes prior to surgery with 1 g of intravenous cephalosporin. After the operation, antibiotic administration continued only if advised by the surgeon. Hospital stay was defined as days of hospitalization due to the cholecystectomy surgery during the 30-day postoperative period.

Patients were followed-up one week, 1 month and 6 months after discharge. They visited in the clinic or were followed via phone call. If patients had any complaints, another visit would be arranged for them.

In order to make quantitative comparisons, statistical t-test was invoked, moreover, to compare qualitative data, a chi-square test was applied using $p < 0.05$ as the level of significance. We used Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 11.5 software for statistical analysis.

RESULTS

A total of 144 patients were enrolled in this study, out of which 81 (56.25%) underwent LC and 63 (43.75%) underwent SIC. Patients were matched in terms of age and gender. The mean age of all patients was 48.8 ± 15.3 years. This variable was 49.3 ± 14.1 years for the SIC and 48.4 ± 16.2 years for the LC group. There were 115 females (79.87%) and 29 males (20.13%). In the SIC group of 63 patients, 49 (77.78%) were females and 14 (22.22%) were males. In the LC group of 81 patients, 66 (81.49%) were females and 15 (18.51%) were males. The mean BMI was 28.8 ± 5.4 kg/m² in patients. This rate was 27.7 ± 4.3 kg/m² in the SIC and 29.98 ± 6.8 kg/m² in the LC group. No statistically significant difference was detected in this respect ($p = 0.28$). Details of the demographic data are presented in Table I.

Patients in both groups were in ASA grades of 1 and 2. Both groups were similar in the normal range in terms of blood cell count and liver enzymes. Ultrasound was performed for all patients and indicated gallstones. No significant difference was detected between the two groups in terms of ultrasound report. The mean duration of operation was 60.6 ± 16.5 minutes in the SIC and 70.3 ± 23.4 minutes in the LC group. Difference between

Table I: Demographic data in both groups.

Groups	LC	SIC	p-value
Total (%)	81 (56.25%)	63 (43.75%)	0.327
Female, n (%)	66 (81.5%)	49 (77.78%)	0.740
Male, n (%)	15 (18.5%)	14 (22.22)	0.340
Age (year) mean \pm SD	48.4 ± 16.2	49.3 ± 14.1	0.727
BMI mean \pm SD	29.98 ± 6.8	27.7 ± 4.3	0.280
ASA-I (%)	76 (93.83)	60 (95.24)	0.190
ASA-II (%)	05 (6.17)	03 (4.76)	0.180

LC = Laparoscopic cholecystectomy
SIC = Small incision cholecystectomy
ASA = American Society of Anesthesiology
BMI = Body Mass Index

Table II: Operative and postoperative variables evaluated in both groups.

Groups	LC (81)	SIC (63)	p-value
Operation time, mean \pm SD	70.3 \pm 23.4	60.6 \pm 16.5	0.0059
Pain (VAS), mean \pm SD	4.6 \pm 1.6	4.6 \pm 1.9	1.000
Nausea, n (%)	14 (17.3%)	14 (22.2%)	0.840
Vomiting, n (%)	03 (3.7%)	02 (3.3%)	0.090
Hospital stay (day), mean \pm SD	2.4 \pm 1.1	2.9 \pm 0.5	0.001
Return to activity, mean \pm SD	3.39 \pm 1.8	9.54 \pm 2.6	0.0001
Surgical site infection, n (%)	01 (1.23%)	01 (1.59%)	1.000

the two groups was statistically significant ($p = 0.0059$, Table II). Excessive bleeding requiring blood transfusion during the operation did not occur in any patient and none of the cases required re-operation in the first 48 hours after surgery.

Damage to the bile ducts during surgery was not reported in any group. But a case of trauma to the common bile duct was detected in the follow-up of one case of LC. One case of trauma to the small intestine occurred in a patient during laparoscopic surgery which was repaired during the operation with no need to switch over to open surgery. The mean score of postoperative pain 24 hours after surgery, according to VAS was 5.18. This score was 4.6 ± 1.6 in the SIC and 4.6 ± 1.9 in the LC group ($p = 1.00$). Incidence of nausea 24 hours after surgery was 22.2% in the SIC and 17.3% in the LC group ($p = 0.84$). A total of 2 (3.3%) of patients in the SIC and 3 (3.7%) of patients in the LC had vomiting ($p = 0.09$). The mean duration of hospital stay was 2.9 ± 0.5 days in the SIC and 2.4 ± 1.1 days in the LC group ($p = 0.001$). Time to return to regular daily activity was 3.39 ± 1.8 days in the LC and 9.54 ± 2.6 days in the SIC group ($p = 0.0001$). In the follow-ups, 2 patients after LC presented with abdominal pain, nausea, vomiting and jaundice in the first week and had a history of some other operations as well (hysterectomy and surgery on the lower extremity). Laboratory examinations showed high levels of liver enzymes. Drug-induced jaundice was diagnosed for them. These patients had no complication in their 6 months follow-up. One patient in the LC and one patient in the SIC group developed wound infection. Cardiovascular complications or morbidity and mortality did not occur in any patient.

DISCUSSION

This study shares many similarities with other studies. However, some differences were observed which are described as follows: Gallstone disease is more prevalent among women and obese individuals. In this study, the mean BMI of patients was 28.8 kg/m^2 . This rate was reported to be 27.3 kg/m^2 by Ros, 27.5 kg/m^2 by Keus and 23.4 kg/m^2 by Watanapa.^{2,4,10} These show patients suffering from gallstones are usually overweight. Another point noticed in this study is the duration of operation. This duration was shorter in SIC group compared to LC. The results obtained by Ros and Keus

are also in accordance with this very finding indicating that the duration of operation in SIC is 12 – 14 minutes shorter than that of LC (SIC = 94 minutes and LC = 108 minutes, SIC = 60 minutes and LC = 72 minutes, respectively.⁴ In all studies, SIC had a shorter duration compared to LC and this is a definite advantage of SIC over LC.^{2,11,12}

In some areas, the LC technique seems advantageous and its plus points carry more weight than those of SIC. In this study, patients in LC group had a shorter hospital stay which was in agreement with Ros.² In general, most studies reported shorter hospitalizations in LC group.^{11,16} Some studies reported similar hospitalizations in both groups of LC and SIC.^{4,9} Although Keus and McGine stated hospital stay was shorter in SIC group (3.7 versus 4.1 days), this difference was not statistically significant.^{4,13}

In this study, patients in LC group resumed their regular daily activities significantly sooner than those in SIC group. This finding was in accordance with those of Ros and Keus.^{2,4}

Most studies found similar results although LC is more costly.^{6,7,9} It should be mentioned that most cholecystectomy patients are housewives, retired or unemployed individuals; therefore, getting back to work as soon as possible is not an issue for them but spending more money on their operation can cause financial problems for them. This issue has been discussed in western countries as well.^{7,9,12}

Trauma to the bile duct is the most important complication of cholecystectomy. Based on most studies, this complication is less probable to happen in open SIC surgery. As for other complications, statistically significant differences between these two methods were not observed. There is always a higher risk of trauma to the bile ducts during the operation in LC technique.^{3,15} In this study, there was one case of trauma to the bile ducts in LC group. Ros reported higher incidence of trauma and complications during the operation in LC group.² Keus reported 5 cases of surgical complication in LC and 3 cases in SIC group.⁴ Therefore, a higher frequency of complications is more likely to occur in LC.^{7,12,16}

Postoperation pain, 24 hours after the surgery, was not significantly different in the two groups. However, the highest frequency and the mean pain score were greater in SIC group. In Ros study, level of pain 24 and 48 hours after the operation was greater in the SIC group.² In this study, two groups had no difference in terms of nausea and vomiting postoperatively; though, Squirrel reported higher prevalence of vomiting in LC group.³ No mortality occurred in either group. Similar studies did not report any mortalities either; however, mortality has been reported to be 0.1% in LC.^{2,4,15}

Performing cholecystectomy through laparoscopic surgery is costly and requires expensive equipment; whereas, open surgery does not require special equipment. In a study, the price difference between these two methods was USD1,165.¹² This rate was reported to be 980 Euros in another study.^{12,7} University and teaching hospitals are potentially affiliated to the governmental sector and are on a budget. Therefore, cost-effectiveness of a procedure is an important issue for them.^{12,9,18} In another study, Niell reported SIC was 29% less expensive than LC but they suggest that costs to patients and society as well as time lost away from work may be lower for mini-cholecystectomy.¹⁹

Most clinical trials show that SIC and LC is not significantly different in terms of postoperative complications, mortality and recovery period.^{8,10,12} Mc Mohan found that LC was more costly but after 3 months there were no significant differences between the SIC and LC.²⁰ Therefore, we can recommend SIC to patients who do not need to return to work sooner.⁹

SIC can be regarded as a proper alternative for LC; it is an easy operation and it also imposes less injuries to the bile duct. It also decreases the financial costs of treatment.

Nowadays laparoscopic cholecystectomy uses new single- port devices instead of four-port ones. The goal of laparoscopic surgery is using smaller incision for surgeries. This has better cosmetic results and patient satisfaction, but must offer safety. Some conditions obligate the surgeons to convert the surgery to open cholecystectomy.^{21,22}

In university hospitals, teaching open cholecystectomy to residents is an essential part of surgical training. Consequently, surgical residents should learn open cholecystectomy completely before starting to learn laparoscopic cholecystectomy.

CONCLUSION

Final outcome and surgical complications of SIC are comparable with those of LC. It can be recommended to use SIC in the educational hospitals as the method of choice for most of the patients. LC may be confined to those who need to return to work more quickly or young patients for whom aesthetics is an important concern.

REFERENCES

- Keus F, Vries DJ, Gooszen GH. Laparoscopic versus small incision cholecystectomy: health status in a blind randomized trial. *Surg Endosc* 2008; **22**:1648-59.
- Ros A, Gustafsson L, Krook H, Nordgren C, Thorell A, Wallin G, et al. Laparoscopic cholecystectomy versus mini-laparotomy cholecystectomy. *Ann Surg* 2001; **234**:741- 9.
- Squirrell DM, Majeed AW, Troy G, Peacock JE, Nicholl JP, Johnson AG. A randomized prospective, blinded comparison of postoperative pain metabolic response and perceived health after laparoscopic and small incision cholecystectomy. *Surgery* 1998; **123**:485-95.
- Keus F, de Jong J, Gooszen HG, van Laarhoven CH. Laparoscopic versus small incision cholecystectomy for patient with symptomatic cholecystolithiasis. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2006; (18):CD006229.
- Keus F, Gooszen HG, Van Laarhoven CJ. Systematic review: open, small-incision or laparoscopic cholecystectomy for symptomatic cholecystolithiasis. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2009; **29**:359-78.
- Leo J, Filipovic G, Krementsova J, Norblad R, Söderholm M, Nilsson E. Open cholecystectomy for all patients in the era of laparoscopic surgery: a prospective cohort study. *BMC Surg* 2006; **6**:5.
- Seale AK, Ledet WP Jr. Mini-cholecystectomy: a safe, cost-effective day surgery procedure. *Arch Surg* 1999; **134**:308-10.
- Keus F, Gooszen HG, van Laarhoven CH. Open, small-incision, or laparoscopic cholecystectomy for patients with symptomatic cholecystolithiasis. An overview of cochrane hepato-biliary group reviews. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2010; (1):CD008318.
- Secco GB, Cataletti M, Bonfante P, Baldi E, Davini MD, Biasotti B, et al. Laparoscopic versus mini-cholecystectomy: analysis of hospital costs and social costs in a prospective randomized study. *Chir Ital* 2002; **54**:685-92.
- Watanapa P. Mini-cholecystectomy: a personal series in acute and chronic cholecystitis. *HPB (Oxford)* 2003; **5**:231-4.
- Majeed AW, Troy G, Nicholl JP, Smythe A, Reed MW, Stoddard CJ, et al. Randomized, prospective, single- blind comparison of laparoscopic versus small-incision cholecystectomy. *Lancet* 1996; **347**:989-94.
- Syrakos T, Antonitsis P, Zacharakis E, Takis A, Manousari A, Bakogiannis K, et al. Small-incision (mini-laparotomy) versus laparoscopic cholecystectomy: a retrospective study in a university hospital. *Langenbecks Arch Surg* 2004; **389**:172-7.
- McGinn FP, Miles AJG, Uglow M, Ozmen M, Terzi C, Humby M. Randomized trial of laparoscopic cholecystectomy and mini-cholecystectomy. *Br J Surg* 1995; **82**:1374-7.
- Richards C, Edwards J, Culver D, Emori TG, Tolson J, Gaynes R. Does using a laparoscopic approach to cholecystectomy decrease the risk of surgical site infection? *Ann Surg* 2003; **237**:358-62.
- Lillemoie KD, Melton GB, Cameron JL, Pitt HA, Campbell KA, Talamini MA, et al. Postoperative bile duct strictures: management and outcome in the 1990s. *Ann Surg* 2000; **232**:430-41.
- Barkun JS, Barkun AN, Sampalis JS, Fried G, Taylor B, Wexler MJ, et al. Randomized controlled trial of laparoscopic versus mini-cholecystectomy. The Mc Gill gallstone treatment group. *Lancet* 1992; **340**:1116-9.
- Weber DM. Laparoscopic surgery: an excellent approach in elderly patients. *Arch Surg* 2003; **138**:1083-8.
- Glavic Z, Begic L, Simlesa D, Rukavina A. Treatment of acute cholecystitis: a comparison of open vs. laparoscopic cholecystectomy. *Surg Endosc* 2001; **15**:398-401.
- Calvert NW, Troy GP, Johnson AG. Laparoscopic cholecystec-

- tomy: a good buy? A cost comparison with small-incision mini-cholecystectomy. *Eur J Surg* 2000; **166**:782-6.
20. McMahon AJ, Baxter JN, Anderson JR, Ramsay G, O'Dwyer PJ, Russell IT, *et al.* Laparoscopic versus mini-laparotomy cholecystectomy: a randomised trial. *Lancet* 1994; **343**:135-8.
21. Roberts KE, Solomon D, Duffy AJ, Bell RL. Single-incision laparoscopic cholecystectomy: a surgeon's initial experience with 56 consecutive cases and a review of the literature. *J Gastrointest Surg* 2010; **14**:506-10.
22. Cziupka K, Partecke LI, Nass C, Mirow L. [Single-port access cholecystectomy is a safe alternative to conventional laparoscopic cholecystectomy: a retrospective comparison of single-port access versus standard laparoscopic cholecystectomy]. *Zentralbl Chir* 2012 Mar 16. [Epub ahead of print]. German.

