MEDS Clinical Medicine (2024)
Clausius Scientific Press, Canada

DOI: 10.23977/medsc.2024.050402
ISSN 2616-1907 Vol. 5 Num. 4

Laparoscopic Management of Intestinal Obstruction: Clinical Effectiveness

Zheng Liu[1], Xiaocheng Mei[1], Lin Yang[2,*]

[1]*Department of General Surgery, People's Hospital of Pu'er City, Yunnan, 653304, China*
[2]*Universiti Teknologi MARA, Shah Alam, 40450, Malaysia*
[*]*Corresponding author: ljyanglin@126.com*

Keywords: Bowel Obstruction; Abdominal Surgery; Postoperative Complications

Abstract: Our study scrutinizes the prowess of laparoscopic methods in tackling intestinal obstructions, gauging their scope for widespread application. It engaged 90 patients diagnosed from April 2020 to April 2021, randomly allocated into two factions. Forty-five patients encountered the rigors of traditional open surgery, while an equal number embraced the gentler touch of minimally invasive laparoscopic intervention. An examination of surgical metrics like operation span, blood loss, expense, and incision breadth was executed. The findings revealed that the laparoscopic faction outperformed on every front. They savored brisker surgeries, scantier blood loss, thriftier expenses, and trimmer incisions. Moreover, they boasted a substantially slimmer tally of postoperative complications and a robust enhancement in treatment efficacy ($P<0.05$). These revelations advocate that laparoscopic surgery not only sharpens surgical precision but also curtails hospital durations and trims down complication rates, endorsing it as a superior strategy for the surgical untangling of intestinal obstructions and advocating for its broader adoption in clinical practice.

1. Introduction

Bowel blockage, a severe acute abdominal condition, arises from a variety of sources including adhesions, tumors, and inflammatory intestinal conditions. It presents with symptoms like sharp abdominal pain, constipation, and vomiting. In extreme cases, this ailment can halt blood flow through the mesenteric arteries, leading to intestinal necrosis and life-threatening complications. Research indicates that it strikes across all ages, from the young to the old. Notably, about 10% of cases reoccur within three years post-colectomy, especially following colorectal, gynecological, and pediatric surgeries [1]. In adults, it's often linked to colorectal cancer, demanding swift and effective intervention.

Surgical intervention serves as the primary remedy for bowel blockage, incorporating both traditional open and modern minimally invasive laparoscopic methods. Laparoscopic surgery, celebrated for hastening the return to normal intestinal functions, shortens hospital stays and cuts down the incidence of postoperative complications, making it an advantageous choice for addressing this intricate health issue [2]. Constant advancements in surgical techniques significantly boost patient outcomes, emphasizing the critical role of progressive enhancements in surgical approaches and

patient management strategies.

2. Research Framework

2.1 Gathering Data

This investigation included 90 patients diagnosed with bowel blockage, all meeting defined eligibility criteria. The group included 50 males and 40 females, ranging in age from 30 to 70 years, with an average age of 45.56 ± 4.51 years. Statistical analysis showed no significant variations in terms of disease duration, socioeconomic status, medical background, or drug allergies ($P > 0.05$).

Eligibility for inclusion required that patients be hospitalized at our facility with a confirmed diagnosis of bowel blockage, possessing comprehensive medical records, clear cognitive function, and the capability to communicate and actively contribute to the research. The exclusion criteria ruled out individuals with significant cardiac, liver, or kidney disorders, serious psychiatric conditions, allergies to anesthesia, or any surgical contraindications. Additionally, patients who did not comply, withdrew consent, or were transferred to another facility were also excluded.

2.2 Methodology

(1) Surgical Group Allocation

After verifying the data, participants were randomly divided into two groups. The first group (n=45) underwent laparoscopic surgery, with meticulous documentation of each procedural step to ensure data accuracy and reliability. The second group underwent traditional open surgery, preceded by a detailed explanation of the procedure and the need for patient cooperation. This procedure involved general anesthesia followed by a midline abdominal incision for direct access to the obstruction. Adhesions were cleared through either blunt or sharp dissection, with repairs made to any discontinuities in the seromuscular layer. During the operation, sodium hyaluronate was applied to the open surgery group to help reduce the likelihood of adhesion recurrence. Vital signs were closely monitored throughout the perioperative period.

For the laparoscopic group, preoperative discussions emphasized the procedure's benefits and expected outcomes, fostering patient confidence. Strict aseptic measures were followed during surgical preparation, and a combination of sedative and anesthetic agents was administered. Pneumoperitoneum was established using carbon dioxide, maintaining intraperitoneal pressure between 12-20 mmHg. Trocar placement was strategic, optimizing access while avoiding scars from previous surgeries. The main trocar served as the observation port. Once the laparoscope was positioned, the surgeon identified and treated obstruction sites using laparoscopic adhesiolysis. Ultrasonic scalpels were employed for effective excision of band adhesions. Both blunt and sharp dissection techniques were utilized as needed, with hemorrhaging managed promptly through sutures and compression to maintain hemostasis.

(2) Laparoscopic Technique Implementation

During laparoscopic procedures, patients were positioned supine. Surgeons, guided by detailed preoperative obstruction assessments, selected aggressive therapeutic tactics appropriate for laparoscopic management. Trocar entry points, typically two to four 12mm punctures, were carefully chosen to provide optimal surgical access and avoid interference with previous surgical scars. Laparoscopic adhesiolysis was performed at obstruction sites using a 5mm ultrasonic scalpel for precise dissection. Bleeding was controlled through suturing and hemostatic techniques, including electrocoagulation for larger vessels or tissues.

(3) Postoperative Care and Management

Meticulous postoperative management was crucial following laparoscopic surgery. Sodium

hyaluronate, chitosan, and biological fibrin sealants were applied to exposed fibrous tissue to prevent obstruction recurrence. Incision site discharge was closely monitored, with immediate drainage system implementation if serous or sanguineous exudate was observed. Postoperative care included strict dietary monitoring, anti-inflammatory medications, and gastrointestinal decompression to support recovery. Meticulous management of medications, commitment to rehabilitation exercises, and careful monitoring of vital signs were essential for achieving the best therapeutic results.

2.3 Measurement Variables

To comprehensively evaluate the outcomes of both surgical approaches, healthcare providers meticulously documented a range of observational metrics for each study group. These metrics encompassed surgical parameters, including operative duration, intraoperative blood loss, and incision length, as well as clinical outcomes such as bowel peristalsis recovery time, regular diet resumption time, hospital discharge time, treatment effectiveness, and complication frequency. The incidence of postoperative complications, such as wound infections, bleeding, ileus, and anastomotic leaks, was carefully monitored and recorded. All collected data, including the volume of blood loss measured in milliliters, incision length measured in centimeters, and recovery times measured in hours or days, was meticulously managed using an Excel spreadsheet to ensure accuracy and precision in subsequent statistical analysis.

2.4 Statistical Analysis

Data integrity was maintained through a rigorous collection and verification process. Statistical analysis was performed using IBM SPSS Statistics software (version 26.0). Descriptive statistics, including means, standard deviations, ranges for continuous variables, and frequencies and percentages for categorical variables, were calculated.

Comparisons between the two groups were made using appropriate statistical tests. Independent t-tests were used for normally distributed continuous variables, while the Mann-Whitney U test was applied to non-normally distributed variables. Chi-square tests were used for categorical variables, with Fisher's exact test employed when expected frequencies were less than five. Statistical significance was set at a P-value of less than 0.05.

3. Results

3.1 Comparison of Preoperative and Postoperative Clinical Indicators

Table 1: Comparison of Preoperative and Postoperative Clinical Indicators (n=90)

Index	Surgical Duration (minutes)	Blood Loss During Surgery (ml)	Hospital Stay After Surgery (days)	Length of Surgical Incision (cm)	Duration of Postoperative Swelling (days)	Duration of Postoperative Pain (days)
Control Group (45 cases)	83.44 ± 22.34	25.11 ± 8.03	10.54 ± 2.93	3.14 ± 0.41	5.11 ± 1.23	7.39 ± 2.01
Experimental Group (45 cases)	90.33 ± 10.46	22.46 ± 6.11	4.11 ± 1.03	2.34 ± 0.56	3.94 ± 0.96	5.22 ± 1.67
t	2.342	2.373	13.454	6.033	5.460	4.240
P	< 0.05	< 0.05	< 0.05	< 0.05	< 0.05	< 0.05

The study demonstrated that clinical outcomes for patients who underwent laparoscopic surgery significantly improved compared to those who received traditional open surgery. An analysis of various operative metrics showed marked improvements in the laparoscopic group, with significant differences in all measured indicators ($P < 0.05$). (Table 1)

3.2 Comparison of therapeutic efficacy between two groups

The analysis comparing therapeutic efficacy between the two patient groups revealed a significantly better response in the treatment group. Statistical analysis confirmed a profound difference, $p < 0.05$. (Table 2.)

Table 2: Comparison of therapeutic efficacy between two groups (n, %)

Category	Partial Response	Stable Condition	Disease Progression	Treatment Success Rate
Control Group (45 cases)	21	10	35	77.78%
Treatment Group (45 cases)	25	2	43	95.56%
t	6.18			
p	0.045			

3.3 Comparison of side effects between two groups

A comparison of postoperative side effects showed a lower incidence rate in the treatment group compared to the control group, with a statistically significant difference, $p < 0.05$. The specifics of the side effects encountered by each group, table 3.

Table 3: Comparison of side effects between two groups (n, %)

Category	Bone Marrow Depression	Queasiness	Hepatic Function Irregularities	Additional Adverse Effects	Rate of Side Effects
Control Group (45 cases)	2	2	0	2	11 (24.44%)
Treatment Group (45 cases)	1	0	1	0	3 (6.67%)
p	0.042				

Note: Due to the small sample size, Fisher's Exact Test was utilized for more precise probability estimation.

4. Discussion

Intestinal obstruction, characterized by the disruption of normal intestinal flow due to mechanical blockages from adhesions, hernias, tumors, or functional issues like ileus, presents a significant clinical challenge [3]. Clinically, this condition manifests as colicky abdominal pain, vomiting, and constipation, which can escalate into severe complications if left untreated [4].

The pathophysiology of intestinal obstruction involves a cascade of events. Initial gas and fluid buildup above the blockage leads to distension, triggering increased peristalsis and intensifying symptoms. Continued distension disrupts venous return, leading to edema, raised intraluminal pressure, and the risk of arterial compromise [5]. This situation may escalate to ischemia, tissue death, perforation, and potentially fatal infections such as peritonitis and sepsis, underlining the critical need for prompt medical action [6].

Systemically, a bowel blockage can trigger dehydration and significant electrolyte imbalances [7]. As the intestines retain water and electrolytes, combined with vomiting and diminished intake, this can lead to severe hypovolemia and shock. Managing these imbalances is vital for the effective acute treatment of these patients [8].

There has been a notable shift in surgical approaches towards less invasive methods, with laparoscopic surgery becoming increasingly favored [9]. This technique offers multiple benefits over traditional open surgery, such as less trauma from surgery, lower postoperative discomfort, fewer needs for painkillers, faster recovery, and shorter durations of hospital stays [10]. These benefits translate to lower healthcare costs and improved resource utilization.

Laparoscopic surgery also minimizes postoperative complications like wound infections [11] and reduces the risk of adhesions, a frequent cause of recurrent bowel obstructions [12]. The lower inflammatory response associated with laparoscopy is particularly beneficial for patients at risk of systemic complications.

Comparative studies demonstrate that laparoscopic procedures not only minimize surgical impact but also improve overall patient outcomes, including shorter hospital stays, fewer complications, and enhanced postoperative recovery [13]. However, laparoscopic surgery may not be suitable for all patients, depending on factors like obstruction cause and location, patient health, surgical history, and surgeon expertise [14].

The success of laparoscopic surgery hinges on several factors. A thorough preoperative assessment is crucial to identify patients who are suitable candidates for this approach. Surgeons must possess specialized training and experience in laparoscopic techniques to ensure safe and effective procedures. Additionally, access to advanced laparoscopic equipment and a dedicated surgical team is essential for optimal outcomes. While laparoscopic surgery offers numerous advantages, it is important to acknowledge its limitations. Complex cases involving extensive adhesions, severe inflammation, or anatomical variations may pose challenges for laparoscopic intervention. In such instances, open surgery may be necessary to ensure complete resolution of the obstruction and minimize the risk of complications.

Laparoscopic surgery is becoming the preferred approach for managing intestinal obstruction. Studies indicate that, when appropriately applied, laparoscopic techniques offer a safer and more effective alternative to open surgery, leading to improved patient outcomes [15]. Integrating these minimally invasive methods is essential for modern, patient-centered surgical care.

Further research is needed to refine patient selection criteria for laparoscopic surgery, optimize surgical techniques, and explore the long-term outcomes of this approach. Continued advancements in laparoscopic technology and surgical expertise will likely further enhance the safety and efficacy of this minimally invasive approach to treating intestinal obstruction. [16]

References

[1] Krielen P, Di Saverio S, Ten Broek R, et al. Laparoscopic versus open approach for adhesive small bowel obstruction, a systematic review and meta-analysis of short term outcomes[J]. Journal of Trauma and Acute Care Surgery, 2020, 88(6): 866-874.

[2] Quah G S, Eslick G D, Cox M R. Laparoscopic versus open surgery for adhesional small bowel obstruction: a systematic review and meta-analysis of case–control studies[J]. Surgical endoscopy, 2019, 33: 3209-3217.

[3] Sallinen V, Di Saverio S, Haukijärvi E, et al. Laparoscopic versus open adhesiolysis for adhesive small bowel obstruction (LASSO): an international, multicentre, randomised, open-label trial[J]. The Lancet gastroenterology & hepatology, 2019, 4(4): 278-286.

[4] Cui N, Liu J, Tan H. Comparison of laparoscopic surgery versus traditional laparotomy for the treatment of emergency patients [J]. Journal of International Medical Research, 2020, 48(3): 0300060519889191.

[5] Håkanson C A, Fredriksson F, Lilja H E. Adhesive small bowel obstruction after appendectomy in children–Laparoscopic versus open approach[J]. Journal of pediatric surgery, 2020, 55(11): 2419-2424.

[6] Lima M, Di Salvo N, Cordola C, et al. Laparoscopy-assisted versus open surgery in treating intestinal atresia: single

center experience[J]. Journal of Investigative Surgery, 2021, 34(8): 842-847.
[7] Podda M, Khan M, Di Saverio S. Adhesive small bowel obstruction and the six w's: who, how, why, when, what, and where to diagnose and operate? [J]. Scandinavian Journal of Surgery, 2021, 110(2): 159-169.
[8] Rondelli F, Gemini A, Cerasari S, et al. Laparoscopic vs. open loop ileostomy reversal: a meta-analysis of randomized and non-randomized studies[J]. Langenbeck's Archives of Surgery, 2023, 408(1): 329.
[9] Stenberg E, Ottosson J, Szabo E, et al. Comparing techniques for mesenteric defects closure in laparoscopic gastric bypass surgery—a register-based cohort study[J]. Obesity Surgery, 2019, 29: 1229-1235.
[10] Assali S, Mourany J, Jones B, et al. Technical approach to laparoscopic examination of the small bowel in gallstone ileus[J]. Case Reports in Surgery, 2020, 2020.
[11] Krielen P, Stommel M W J, Pargmae P, et al. Adhesion-related readmissions after open and laparoscopic surgery: a retrospective cohort study (SCAR update)[J]. The Lancet, 2020, 395(10217): 33-41.
[12] Zhang J, Xu X, Wang X, et al. Laparoscopic versus open repair of congenital duodenal obstruction: a systematic review and meta-analysis[J]. Pediatric Surgery International, 2022, 38(11): 1507-1515.
[13] Moghadamyeghaneh Z, Talus H, Ballantyne G, et al. Short-term outcomes of laparoscopic approach to colonic obstruction for colon cancer[J]. Surgical endoscopy, 2021, 35: 2986-2996.
[14] Foss N B, Kehlet H. Challenges in optimising recovery after emergency laparotomy [J]. Anaesthesia, 2020, 75: e83-e89.
[15] Detz D J, Podrat J L, Castro J C M, et al. Small bowel obstruction[J]. Current problems in surgery, 2021, 58(7): 100893.
[16] Sebastian-Valverde E, Poves I, Membrilla-Fernández E, et al. The role of the laparoscopic approach in the surgical management of acute adhesive small bowel obstruction [J]. BMC surgery, 2019, 19(1): 1-7.