

# Laparoendoscopic single-site surgery versus conventional multi-port laparoscopy in ovarian drilling: A Randomized Controlled Trial

#### **Thesis**

Submitted for partial fulfillment of the MD degree in Obstetrics and Gynecology

By

#### Maya Mahmoud Mahmoud Abd El-Razek

M.B.BCH. 2012 M.Sc. 2016

Assistant lecturer of Obstetrics and Gynecology Faculty of Medicine – Ain Shams University

Under supervision of

### Dr. Hesham Mohamed Fathy

Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology Faculty of Medicine- Ain Shams University

#### Dr. Ahmed Mohamed Bahaa El-Din

Assistant Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology Faculty of Medicine-Ain Shams University

## Dr. Haitham Fathy Mohamed Gad

Lecturer of Obstetrics and Gynecology Faculty of Medicine-Ain Shams University

> Faculty of Medicine Ain Shams University 2019

# **List of Contents**

	Pag
Acknowledgment	
List of Abbreviations.	i
List of Figures	11
List of Diagram	iv
List of Picture	V
List of Tables	V
Abstract	V
Protocol	V
Introduction	1
Aim of the Work	5
Review of literature:	
Chapter 1:	
Abdominal wall anatomy	6
Midline abdomen	7
Umbilicus	8
Medial costal margin	9
Lateral abdomen/flank	9
Ninth left intercostal	1
Hypogastrium	1
Chapter 2:	
Abdominal access techniques	1
• Open (Hasson)	1
Closed (Veress needle)	1
Advanced access techniques	2
Chapter 3:	
Single incision surgery (SIS)	2
• Single incision port versus multiple ports	2
• Single incision port versus multiple ports	3
• Instruments	3
monuments	-

# List of Contents (Cont.)

	Page
Chapter 4:	
Complications of laparoscopy	41
<ul><li>Related to abdominal access</li><li>Related to pneumoperitoneum</li></ul>	41 51
<ul> <li>Related to tissue dissection and hemostasis.</li> </ul>	52
• Other complications	54
Polycystic ovary syndrome (PCOS)	55
Defining PCOS	56
<ul> <li>Overview of ovulation induction in PCOS</li> </ul>	65
<ul><li>Ovarian drilling versus gonadotropins</li><li>Mechanism of laparoscopic ovulation</li></ul>	67
induction	70
Patients and Methods	77
Results	88
Discussion	103
Summery	114
Conclusion	118
Recommendations	119
References Appendix	120 158
Arabic Summery	



# Acknowledgement

First of all, all gratitude is due to Allah almighty for blessing this work, until it has reached its end, as a part of his generous help, throughout my life.

I would like to express my deep gratitude to **Dr**. Hesham Mohamed Fathy, Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Ain Shams University, and **Dr**. Ahmed Mohamed Bahaa El-Din, Assistant Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Ain Shams University, for their supervision, guidance, enthusiastic encouragement and useful critiques of this research work. It is a great honor to work under their supervision.

I would like to express my special appreciation and thanks to **Dr. Haitham Fathy Mohamed Gad**, Lecturer of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Ain Shams University. You have been a tremendous mentor for me. I would like to thank you for encouraging this work. Your advice and support on both research as well as on my career have been invaluable.

I would also like to thank My Colleagues, and Nurses of Laparoscopy Unit of Ain Shams Maternity University Hospital who contributed to this research. My grateful thanks are also extended to My Friends for their support and motivation to give my best.

Last but not least, I owe more than thanks to My Family for providing me unfailing support and continuous encouragement throughout my years of study and through the process of researching and writing this thesis. This

accomplishment would not have been possible without you. My heartfelt thanks.

#### List of Abbreviations

AES : Androgen Excess Society

ALVH : Assisted Laparoscopic Vaginal Hysterectomy

AMH : Anti-Mullerian Hormone

ART : Assisted Reproductive Technology

ASRM: American Society of Reproductive Medicine

AUB : Abnormal Uterine Bleeding

BMI : Body Mass Index

DHEAS: Dihydroepiandrosterone Sulfate

ESHRE: European Society of Human Reproduction and

**Embryology** 

FAI : Free Androgen Index

FSH : Follicle-Stimulating Hormone

GTT : Glucose Tolerance Test

Hb : Hemoglobin

IVF : In Vitro Fertilization

LESS : Laparoendoscopic Single Site Surgery

LESSCAR: Laparoscopic Single-Site Surgery Consortium for

Assessment and Research

LH : Lutienizing Hormone

LOD : Laparoscopic Ovarian Drilling

MRCOG: Member/Fellow of the Royal College of

Obstetricians and Gynecologists

NCCAH: Non Classic Congenital Adrenal Hyperplasia

NIH : National Institute of Health

NOTES: Natural Orifice Transluminal Endoscopic Surgery

NOTUS: Natural Orifice Transumbilical Surgery

OHSS : Ovarian Hyperstimulation Syndrome

OPUS : One-Port Umbilical Surgery PCOS : Polycystic Ovary Syndrome

POD : Post Operative Day

#### List of Abbreviations (Cont.)

POSAS: Patient and Observer Scar Assessment Scale

SHBG : Sex Hormone Binding Globulin

SILS : Single Incision Laparoscopic Surgery

SIMPL : Single-Instrument Port Laparoscopic Surgery

SLAPP: Single Laparoscopic Port Procedure

SLIT : Single Laparoscopic Incision Transabdominal

Surgery

SPA : Single Port Access Surgery

SPL : Single Port Laparoscopy

TLH : Total Laparoscopic Hysterectomy

TSH : Thyroid Stimulating Hormone

TUES : Transumbilical Endoscopic Surgery

UTI : Urinary Tract InfectionVAS : Visual Analogue Scale

WHO : World Health Organization

# **List of Figures**

Fig.	Title	Page
1	Sectional view of the abdominal wall	7
	musculature.	
2	Anomalies of Urachus.	8
3	Muscles of the lateral abdominal wall.	10
4	Nerves of the abdominal wall.	10
5	Blood vessels of the anterior abdominal wall.	11
6	Port sites for laparoscopy in gynecology	22
7	Azimuth angle, manipulation angle, elevation angle.	24
8	Ergonomics for laparoscopic surgeon.	24
9	Laparoendoscopic single-site surgery ports	32
	and instruments.	
10	TriPort.	34
11	QuadPort.	34
12	TriPort 15.	34
13	GelPOINT.	35
14	SILS Port.	35
15	SILS Kit.	36
16	Single-site laparoscopy access system.	36
17	The Real Hand Instruments.	37
18	Autonomy Laparo-Angle Instruments.	38
19	SILS Hand Instruments.	38
20	EndoEYE.	40
21	Deflectable-tip EndoEYE.	40
22	Grading of severity of hirsutism.	58
23	Ultrasound criteria of polycystic ovaries.	61
24	Success of the procedure was assessed by the	94
	need for additional ports insertion.	
25	Mean operative time in both study groups.	95
26	Mean operative blood loss in both study	96
	groups.	
27	Pre and post-operative Hb levels in the	98

Fig.	Title			
	studied groups			
28	Postoperative pain score in both study groups	99		
29	Incidence of intra-operative and post- operative complications in both study groups.	101		
30	Hospital length of stay in both study groups	102		
31	POSAS score in both study groups	103		

# **List of Diagram**

Diagram		Title			Page
1	Diagram follow-up.	patient	allocation	and	88

# **List of Pictures**

Picture	Title	Page
1	Umbilical hernia	8
2	Veress needle for isufflation	15
3	Straight laparoscope with zero angle	
	degree lens	
4	Single incision laparoscopic surgery	32
5	Additional port insertion scars with	91
	insertion of intraperitoneal drain	
6	Superficial wound infection	91
7	Post operative wound follow up	91
8	LESS group day 1 scar	92
9	Multiport group day 1 scar	92
10	Port and instruments position	106

# **List of Tables**

Table	Title	Page
1	Proposed diagnostic criteria for polycystic	56-
	ovary syndrome.	57
2	Types of abnormal uterine bleeding (AUB)	60
	suggestive of abnormal degree of	
	anovulation in PCOS.	
3	Investigations for PCOS.	62-
		63
4	Gonadotropins and estradiol profiles in	63
	different clinical scenarios.	
5	Multistep approach to treatment of an-	64
	ovulatory infertility associated with	
	polycystic ovary syndrome.	
6	Comparison between laparoscopic ovulation	68
	induction and gonadotropin ovulation	
	induction.	
7	Demographic characteristics of both study	93
	groups.	
8	Past surgical history of both study groups.	93
9	Need for additional ports.	94
10	Operative data in both study groups.	95
11	Pre- and post- operative Hb levels in the	97
	studied groups.	
12	Postoperative pain score in both study	98
	groups.	
13	Incidence of intraoperative and postopeative	99
	complications in both study groups.	
14	Hospital length of stay in both study groups.	101
15	POSAS score in both study groups.	102

#### **Abstract**

**Study objective:** To compare the efficacy and safety of Laparoendoscopic single site surgery (LESS) to conventional multiport laparoscopy (CML) for laparoscopic ovarian drilling (LOD) in polycystic ovary syndrome patients (PCOS).

**Design:** A randomized controlled trial.

**Setting:** University hospital.

Patients: Women with PCOS scheduled for LOD.

**Interventions:** 70 women were randomly assigned to either LESS or CML group (35 in each group) underwent LOD using straight laparoscopic instruments. Successful procedure was evaluated by the need of an additional port.

**Measurements and Main Results:** There was no significance difference in demographic characteristics between the groups. In addition, there were no differences in postoperative outcomes regarding operative time, estimated blood loss, postoperative pain, and length of hospital stay, between the two groups. LOD was successful in 94.3% of patients (33/35) in LESS group without the need of an additional port. Port insertion related morbidity were reported in the CML group in the form of extraperitoneal insufflation (2.9%), and wound hematoma (2.9%). While, surgical site infection was reported in the lESS group (5.7%). The mean score of the patient and Observer Scar Assessment Scale (POSAS) was significantly decrease from day 1 to 7 in both groups with LESS having lower score on day 7 compared to CML (12.6 vs 14, P= .001).

**Conclusion:** LESS is feasible, safe, and equally effective to CML with a better cosmetic satisfaction, and less port site related morbidity. However, it is associated with superficial wound infection.

**Keywords**: cosmetic outcome; Laparoendoscopic single site surgery; Laparoscopic ovarian drilling; Single port laparoscopy

# PROTOCOL OF A THESIS FOR PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF M.D. DEGREE IN OBSTETRICS AND GYNECOLOGY

Title of the Protocol: Laparoendoscopic single-site surgery versus conventional multi-port laparoscopy in ovarian drilling: A Randomized Controlled Trial.

Postgraduate Student: Maya Mahmoud Mahmoud Abd El-Razek.

Degree: M.B.BCH.2012, M.Sc.2016.

**DIRECTOR: Dr. Hesham Mohamed Fathy.** 

Academic Position: Professor of Obstetrics and Gynaecology.

**Department:** Obstetrics and Gynaecology.

Co-DIRECTOR: Dr. Ahmed Mohamed Bahaa El-Din.

Academic Position: Assistant professor of Obstetrics and

Gynaecology.

**Department:** Obstetrics and Gynaecology.

Co-DIRECTOR: Dr. Haitham Fathy Mohamed Gad.

Academic Position: Lecturer of Obstetrics and Gynaecology.

**Department:** Obstetrics and Gynaecology.

Faculty of Medicine Ain Shams University 2017

# What is already known on this subject? AND What does this study add?

Laparoscopic surgery is a better alternative to traditional open abdominal surgery because it involves a shorter operative time with less morbidity and faster recovery. However, the superiority of LESS surgery over conventional laparoscopy is the lower incidences of port infection, bleeding, and subcutaneous emphysema, resulting in faster recovery, lower morbidity, less postoperative pain, and a nearly completely hidden scar than those achieved with conventional laparoscopy.

#### 1. INTRODUCTION/ REVIEW

Laparoscopic surgery has become the standard of care for many abdominal and pelvic surgeries. Several studies have proved that the laparoscopic approach to various benign and malignant conditions has resulted in decreased morbidity, shorter hospital stay, improved surgical outcomes, and improved quality of life when compared with conventional surgeries (Walker et al., 2009).

Although laparoscopy has decreased the morbidity directly related to a surgical approach, each working port carries an inherent risk of bleeding, infection, concomitant organ damage, hernia formation, and decreased cosmetic outcome. Advances in surgical instrumentation and design have allowed minimal access surgery to become even more minimal (Rao, 2004).

One of the more recent advances in the field of minimally invasive surgery is the increasing use of single incision laparoscopic surgery (SILS) in various gynecologic procedures. SILS allows laparoscopic surgery through a single incision in the umbilicus (Romanelli and Roshek, 2010).

SILS has been described in the literature using many acronyms such as SPA (single port access surgery), LESS (laparoendoscopic single site surgery), SLIT (single laparoscopic incision transabdominal surgery), and SPL (single port laparoscopy). In 2008, an international consortium of minimally invasive experts (the Laparoscopic Single-Site Surgery Consortium for Assessment and Research—LESSCAR) made a consensus to use the term laparoendoscopic single site surgery (LESS) to include all procedures performed in a minimally invasive manner through a single incision (Gill et al., 2010).

The potential drawbacks of the single-port approach are a

larger umbilical incision and the proximity of the instruments resulting in a technical challenge; the extracorporeal interaction of the instruments and camera (known as sword fighting) especially for advanced surgery (*Fanfani et al., 2012*).

Initially, during the 1960s and 1970s, the application of laparoscopic surgery in gynecology was restricted to diagnostic cases and tubal procedures such as sterilization *(Yoon et al., 2010)*.

**Pelosi** first described utilizing this technique for more complex gynecological surgery; who performed a single incision laparoscopic hysterectomy with bilateral salpingo-oophorectomy in 1991. This method, however, was not popularized for another 15 years due to numerous procedural obstacles *(Pelosi, 1991)*.

The interest in this surgical approach has grown exponentially. Several publications in the gynecology literature have demonstrated preliminary feasibility, safety and reproducibility of LESS in the treatment of both benign and gynecological oncology conditions (Fader and Escobar, 2009).

The SILS  $^{\text{m}}$  Port Multiple Instrument Access Port (Covidien®) is a multi-instrument access port that allows up to three laparoscopic instruments (three 5-mm cannulas or two 5-mm and one 12-mm cannula) to be used simultaneously through separate flexible channels. This port allows for adjustment of the cannula positions within the flexible port, and there is a separate channel for CO  $_2$  insufflation with out leak. The port must be inserted through an open access technique (*Rettenmaier*, 2009).

LESS performed using conventional laparoscopic instruments for appendectomy and cholecystectomy has been reported (*Akgür et al., 2010; Colon et al., 2011*). However, the combined use of the SILS port (Covidien®) and the conventional laparoscopic instruments has only been reported in the gynecology literature in a report describing the use of conventional straight laparoscopic instruments with SILS port on 14 patients with adnexal masses (*Dursun et al., 2013*).

The hypothesis is that single incision technique might offer advantages over the standard multi-port laparoscopy as potentially leading to less postoperative pain and improved cosmoses from a relatively hidden umbilical scar, as well as risk reduction of postoperative wound infection, hernia formation and elimination of multiple trocar site closures. *(Mencaglia et al., 2013).*