Comparative Study between Mass Closure and Hughes Repair in Emergency Laparotomy

Thesis

Submitted for Partial Fulfillment of Master Degree in General Surgery

By Abdallah Mohamed Soliman M.B.B.Ch

Faculty of Medicine - Ain Shams University

Under supervision of

Prof. Dr. Essam Fakhry Ebied

Assistant Professor of General Surgery Faculty of Medicine - Ain Shams University

Dr. Ahmed Aly Khalil

Lecturer of General Surgery Faculty of Medicine - Ain Shams University

> Faculty of Medicine Ain Shams University 2018



سورة البقرة الآية: ٣٢

Acknowledgment

First and foremost, I feel always indebted to AUAH, the Most Kind and Most Merciful.

I'd like to express my respectful thanks and profound gratitude to **Prof. Dr. Essam Takhry Ebied,** Assistant Professor of General Surgery - Faculty of Medicine- Ain Shams University for his keen guidance, kind supervision, valuable advice and continuous encouragement, which made possible the completion of this work.

I am also delighted to express my deepest gratitude and thanks to **Dr. Ahmed Ally Khalil**, Lecturer of General Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, for his kind care, continuous supervision, valuable instructions, constant help and great assistance throughout this work.

I would like to express my hearty thanks to all my family for their support till this work was completed.

Last but not least my sincere thanks and appreciation to all patients participated in this study.

Aldallah Mohamed Soliman

List of Contents

Title	Page No.
List of Tables	i
List of Figures	ii
List of Abbreviations	vi
Introduction	1
Aim of the Work	4
Review of Literature	
Anatomy and Physiology	5
 Pathophysiology of Wound Healing 	28
Techniques of Abdominal Wall Closure	47
Patients and Methods	68
Results	77
Discussion	97
Summary and Conclusion	103
References	105
Arabic Summary	

List of Tables

Table No.	Title	Page No.
Table (1):	Data of mass closure group	77
Table (2):	Data of Hughes abdominal repair grou	ıp 82
Table (3):	Comparison between mass closure and huge repair group regardemographic data	rding
Table (4):	Comparison between mass closure and huge repair group regarding the of the technique and the intraoperative.	time cost
Table (5):	Comparison between mass closure and huge repair group regarding Icis hernia formation, wound infection, abdomen and cases with bad condition and diabetic patients	sional burst chest
Table (6):	r	

List of Figures

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure (1):	Layers of the anterolateral abdomized wall, including the trilaminar muscles	flat
Figure (2):	Arrangement of the Camper's Scarpa's fascia in the lower part of anterior abdominal wall	and the
Figure (3):	Superficial fascia (Gray's Anatomy)	
Figure (4):	Muscles of anterior abdominal v	
	(teachmeanatomty)	12
Figure (5):	The transversusabdominis is innerval by the lower intercostal ner	ited ves
	(thoracoabdominal, nerve root T7-T1	1)15
Figure (6):	The rectus sheath above the arcu	
	line	
Figure (7):	The rectus sheath below the arcu	
	line	
Figure (8):	The blood supply to the abdomen	
Figure (9):	The venous and lymphatic drainage	
	anterolateral abdominal wall	
Figure (10):	Dermatomes and nerves of	
	abdominal wall	26
Figure (11):	Major cells and their effects on nor	
	wound healing	
Figure (12):	The potential effects of diabetes	
	wound healing	
Figure (13):	The mathematical model of wor	
	closure	
Figure (14):	(A) Facial closure. (B) looping of	
	polydioxanone (PDS) at vertex.	
	continuous suture. (D) two PDS e	
	meeting in middle of incision,	
	together, and cut	
Figure (15):	Continuous mass closure technique	58

List of Figures (Cont...)

Fig. No.	Title	Page	No.
Figure (16):	Far-and-near double horizon	ntal	
	mattress suture developed by Prof. I		
	Hughes at Cardiff		
Figure (17):	Interrupted X-suture		61
Figure (18):	VAC device		
Figure (19):	Wound covered with VAC		64
Figure (20):	Subcutaneous 3-cm-wide access tuni	nels	
	are created over the anterior re-		
	sheath laterally to just beyond	the	
	semilunar line		65
Figure (21):	The external oblique aponeurosis	is	
	incised		66
Figure (22):	One Kocher clamp was clamped to	the	
	angle of the wound then two Koo		
	clamps were clamped to the fascial la	ayer	
	midway through the incision and t		
	retracted by the assistant		$\dots 72$
Figure (23):	Diagram showing the Hughes clos		
	method, using a combination		
	standard mass closure with a serie		
	horizontal and two vertical matt		
	sutures within a single suture		73
Figure (24):	This was done by a far bite starting		
	cm on the edge of linea from outsid		
	and then taking a near bite of 0.5 cm		
	the other side inside-out—a near bit		
	the same side outside-in and then a		
	bite on the other side inside-out		
Figure (25):	0 0		78
Figure (26):	Mass closure as regarding incision		
T. (0=)	hernia after 6 months		78
Figure (27):	Mass closure ar regarding wo	und	70
	101001100		'/11

List of Figures (Cont...)

Fig. No.	Title	Page	No.
Figure (28):	Mass closure as regarding		50
T' (20)	abdomen		79
Figure (29):	Mass closure as regarding infection		80
Figure (30):	Mass closure as regarding dia	abetis	
	mellitus		
Figure (31):	Mass closure as regarding malignar	•	
Figure (32):	Hughes repair as regarding gender		83
Figure (33):	Hughes repair as regarding incis		09
Figure (24).	hernia		രാ
Figure (34):	Hughes repair as regarding winfection		84
Figure (35):	Hughes repair as regarding	burst	
•	abdomen		84
Figure (36):	Hughes repair as regarding	chest	
	infection		85
Figure (37):	Hughes repair as regarding dia		
J	mellitus		85
Figure (38):	Hughes repair as regarding malign	ancy	86
Figure (39):	Bar chart between groups accordi		
	age (years)	_	87
Figure (40):	Bar chart between groups accordi	ng to	
	Gender		88
Figure (41):	Bar chart between groups accordi		
	Body mass index		88
Figure (42):	Bar chart between groups accordi	ng to	
	time of the technique		90
Figure (43):	Bar chart between groups accordi	ng to	
	the cost intraoperative		90
Figure (44):	Bar chart between groups accordi	ng to	
	wound length		93

List of Figures (Cont...)

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure (45):	Bar chart between groups according incisional hernia, wound infection, abdomen, chest infection and dia	burst
	mellitus	
Figure (46):	Bar chart between groups according serum albumin	O
Figure (47):	Bar chart between groups according cases with malignancy	ng to
Figure (48):	Bar chart between groups according cases with anemia	ng to

List of Abbreviations

Abb.	Full term
4.5.5	A 7
ADP	$ A denosine\ diphosphate$
AGEs	Advanced glycaton end-products
<i>DFUs</i>	Diabetic foot ulcers
DHEA	De hydroepi and roster one
DHT	Dihydrotes to sterone
DIEA	Deep inferior epigastric artery
DPC	Delayed primary closure
DSEA	Deep superior epigastric artery
<i>IL</i>	Interleukin
MCL	Midclavicular line
<i>MMPs</i>	$ Matrix\ metalloprote as es$
<i>NPWT</i>	Negative pressure wound therapy
<i>NPWT</i>	Negative pressure wound therapy
PDS	Polydioxan one
<i>PMNs</i>	Olymorphonuclear leukocytes
ROS	Reactive oxygen species
SD	Standard deviation
TNF	Tumor necrosis factor
<i>VAC</i>	Vacuum assisted closure





INTRODUCTION

n emergency laparotomy is a major operation that involves opening the abdomen. This allows the surgeon to view the organs inside and repair any emergency problems that have occurred, it is called "emergency" because it must be done very soon or even immediate (Caroline, 2018).

Since 19th century when surgeons started performing surgery, they had to inflict wound on their patients and it is their duty to endeavor constantly to get these wounds to heal as quickly as possible, uncomplicated wound is the only accepted outcome. Peritoneal adhesions and chronic discharging sinuses develop in some surgical wounds and even though it is due to circumstances beyond his control. It is a tragedy for the patient leading to high morbidity and mortality (*Schwartz*, 1988).

Multiple factors can lead to impaired wound healing. In general terms, the factors that influence repair can be categorized into local and systemic. Local factors are those that directly influence the characteristics of the wound itself, while systemic factors are the overall health or disease state of the individual that affect his or her ability to heal. Any of these factors are related, and the systemic factors act through the local effects affecting wound healing (*Gogia*, 1995).

There are several factors that affect the outcome of abdominal closure, these factors are pre-operative like age and



comorbidities and intra operative like the duration of the operation and Post-operative like the use of antibiotics and follow up wound dressing (*Hofman et al.*, 2007).

Common complications are Wound infection, Wound failure, Incisional hernia and sinus formation. The most complications following frequent midline emergency abdominal laparotomy include incisional hernias, which develop in 10-15 % of patients and surgical site infections in 15-25 % of cases (*Leaper*, 1998).

Incisional hernia forms the most common delayed morbidity following midline laparotomy surgeries causing mental trauma to the patient impairing their quality of life and also scars the name and fame of the surgeon. Also, this morbidity impairs the patient-doctor relationship though the incisional hernia may occur both due to surgeon's or patient's variables.

So, the need for possible attributes on surgeon's aspect to prevent the incisional hernia is the need of the hour (Harvath, 2003)

We commonly use the conventional method of closure according to Jenkins's rule. Which includes continuous fascial closure with a single suture. This method allows even distribution of tension across the entire length of the suture, resulting in minimization of tissue strangulation. The goal is



approximation of tissue edges to allow scar formation. Excessive tension leads to tissue necrosis and eventual failure of the closure (Millbourn, 2009).

There is a relatively new technique called Hughes repair. The Hughes abdominal closure technique constitutes a series of two horizontal and two vertical mattresses within single suture whereby, the tension load of suture is distributed both along and across the suture line. Hughes method of abdominal wall closure is named after an eminent professor Hughes BR, who has initially proved this technique to be efficacious than mesh repair in treating Incisional hernias (Rajasekaran, 2017).

AIM OF THE WORK

To compare mass closure & Hughes repair in emergency laparotomy as regard intraoperative technique, operation time, incidence of complication as wound infection, dehiscence, burst abdomen and incisional hernia.