



Original article

Is non-operative approach applicable for penetrating injuries of the left thoraco-abdominal region?

Osman Kones^a, Cevher Akarsu^a, Halil Dogan^{b, *}, Yildiz Okuturlar^c, Ahmet Cem Dural^a, Mehmet Karabulut^a, Eyup Gemici^a, Halil Alis^a^a Bakirkoy Dr. Sadi Konuk Training and Research Hospital, Department of General Surgery, Istanbul, Turkey^b Bakirkoy Dr. Sadi Konuk Training and Research Hospital, Department of Emergency Medicine, Istanbul, Turkey^c Bakirkoy Dr. Sadi Konuk Training and Research Hospital, Department of Internal Medicine, Istanbul, Turkey

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 15 May 2015

Received in revised form

14 October 2015

Accepted 6 November 2015

Available online 10 March 2016

Keywords:

Wounds penetrating

Physical examination

Diagnostic imaging

Treatment outcome

ABSTRACT

Objectives: Currently, diagnostic laparoscopy (DL) is recommended for the left thoraco-abdominal region penetrating injuries (LTARP). However, organ and diaphragmatic injury may not be detected in all of these patients. Our aim is to focus on this LTARP patient group without any operative findings and to highlight the evaluation of diagnostic tools in the high-tech era for a possible selected conservative treatment.

Material and methods: The patients who were admitted to ED due to LTARP, and who underwent routine DL were evaluated retrospectively in terms of demographic, clinical, radiological, and operative findings of the patients.

Results: The current study included 79 patients with LTARP. In 44 of 79 patients, abdominal injury was not detected. In 30 patients an isolated diaphragmatic injury was revealed and in 4 patients a visceral injury was accompanying to diaphragmatic injury. Surgical findings revealed that the diaphragm was the organ most likely to sustain injury. In patients with more than one positive diagnostic findings need for surgery rate was 61.5%, however; in patients with one positive diagnostic finding (n = 53), positive surgical finding rate was only 35.8%, (p = 0.03). Regarding the combined use of all diagnostic tools in these patients; such as physical examination, plain chest X-ray, and computed tomography, when this method was used for pre-operative diagnosis, sensitivity was measured as 82.7%, specificity 84.1%, PPV 77.4% and NPV 88.1%.

Conclusion: Although DL is reliable for diagnosis of diaphragmatic and visceral injury in patients with LTARP. However, individual decision making for laparoscopic intervention is needed to prevent morbidity of an unnecessary operation under emergent setting due to high rates of negative intraabdominal findings.

Copyright © 2016 The Emergency Medicine Association of Turkey. Production and hosting by Elsevier B.V. on behalf of the Owner. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

Left thoraco-abdominal region penetrating injuries (LTARP) may lead to diaphragmatic damage as well as damage to intra-abdominal and thoracic organs, and therefore they are different from other penetrating abdominal and thoracic injuries. The results of the LTARP may vary from a life-threatening cardiac injury which

requires an emergency department thoracotomy to negative or delayed surgical findings.^{1–3} While abdominal and thoracic injuries are often treated conservatively with the aid of physical examination, laboratory tests, and radiological examination, diagnostic laparoscopy is usually recommended for LTARP. Studies have suggested that delayed diagnosis increases the risk of visceral herniation and strangulation, leading to a mortality rate up to 60% which can be easily missed in acute period due to the lack of specific clinical findings.^{2,3} It is crucial to diagnose diaphragm injury using radiological techniques together with clinical evaluation to avoid unnecessary surgical interventions. Diagnostic laparoscopy (DL), thoracoscopy, or laparotomy may then be necessary to reach a diagnosis in these patients.

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +90 5057067282.

E-mail address: drhalildogan@gmail.com (H. Dogan).

Peer review under responsibility of The Emergency Medicine Association of Turkey.

Implementation of routine laparotomy for every abdominal stab wound increases the rate of negative laparotomies (5%–40%), leading to longer hospital stays, more complications and increased costs.⁴ Therefore, the conservative approach has gained favor for penetrating injuries. However, many physicians still prefer to perform diagnostic laparoscopy rather than using the conservative approach for LTARP. Today, laparoscopic surgery is increasingly used for diagnosis and treatment of penetrating abdominal injuries.⁵

Although DL diminishes the negative laparotomy rate, there are still some complications such as vascular or organ injuries, hemorrhage, embolus, adhesions, infection or those related to anesthesia.^{6–8}

Clinical studies have shown that approximately 50% of stab wounds penetrating into the anterior wall of the abdomen, and approximately 85% of stab wounds penetrating into the posterior wall can be treated non-operatively. Therefore, non-operative approach is increasingly being used in these patients.^{9–12}

In our department, all patients with left thoraco-abdominal injuries undergo routine diagnostic laparoscopy without wound exploration. We aimed to analyze the pre-operative diagnostic tools of LTARP patients who underwent diagnostic laparoscopy, and compare them with operative findings in order to prevent unnecessary DL's.

2. Material and methods

The patients with LTARP who were consecutively admitted to the emergency department of Bakirkoy Dr. Sadi Konuk Training and Research Hospital between 2009 and 2013 were included in this study. Physical examination findings, plain chest X-rays, thoracic and abdominal computed tomography (CT) (Siemens Sensation 64 system, 6 mm sections) of the patients were evaluated retrospectively by radiologists. Furthermore, demographic data of the patients such as age, gender, and clinical variables such as type of injury, diagnostic method, injured organs (isolated diaphragm, hollow viscus, solid organ or combination of them), operation durations, type of surgery, conversion rate to open surgery and length of hospital stay were also evaluated.

In the study, the left thoraco-abdominal region was described as the area within the middle axillary line laterally, the 4th intercostal space superiorly, and the costal edge inferiorly. All patients underwent routine diagnostic laparoscopy without exploration of the wound. Hemodynamically unstable patients and patients with stab wounds of other abdominal regions or dorsal side were excluded from the study. The rate of accurate preoperative diagnosis of diaphragmatic injury was calculated.

2.1. Operative technique

Pneumoperitoneum was created using Veress needle open technique. The optical port in umbilicus and one 5 mm working port was inserted to right or left iliac fossa under laparoscopic vision. A 30° telescope was used to facilitate the inspection of peritoneal cavity and abdominal organs. Non-traumatic hand devices were used for the inspection. Also an additional trocar was inserted if the manipulation was difficult. In all cases, isolated diaphragmatic injuries were repaired with conventional laparoscopic suturing and knotting device.

2.2. Statistical analysis

Statistical analysis was carried out using JMP® software version 10.0.0 (SAS®, Cary, NC). Patient characteristics were analyzed via descriptive statistics. For continuous variables, the median and

range was calculated. For categorical variables, the numbers and percentages in each category were recorded. Differences between normally distributed parameters were compared with Student's *t*-test. Frequency distributions were compared with the chi-square test. Physical examination, plain chest X-ray, thoracic CT, and abdominal CT results were separately analyzed and compared to the surgical findings. Isolated diaphragm, any hollow or solid organ injury and combined injuries were accepted as positive surgical finding for statistical analysis. Also the combination of pre-operative diagnostic tools was analyzed and compared to these surgical findings. Univariate odds ratios (OR) with 95% confidence intervals (CI) were calculated to assess the relationships between diagnostic tools and surgical outcomes.

The numbers of true-positives (TP), true-negatives (TN), false-positives (FP), and false-negatives (FN) for these clinical and radiological modalities were determined using 2×2 tables. Likelihood ratio, odds ratio with 95% confidence interval was calculated for combined use of diagnostic findings. The diagnostic value of these modalities was also assessed in terms of sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), negative predictive value (NPV), and diagnostic accuracy using relevant formulas. All *p* values less than 0.05 were considered statistically significant, and all of the performed tests were two-sided.

3. Results

The current study included 79 patients with LTARP. All of the patients were male. The median age was 28 (17–63) years. Thoraco abdominal CT was taken after physical examination and chest X-ray in seventy seven of 79 patients.

The median length of hospital stay was 1 (1–8) days and the median operation time was 58 (30–87) minutes. Diaphragmatic and organ injury were not detected in 44 (56%) patients (Table 1), which constituted a negative laparoscopy result. Isolated or combined diaphragmatic injury was detected in 34 (43%) patients. Thirty patients (38%) had isolated diaphragmatic injury. Among the patients with isolated diaphragmatic injury, 28 patients underwent laparoscopic repair, and 2 patients underwent open surgery and primary diaphragm repair was performed using non-absorbable sutures. Moreover, four patients (5%) had combined injuries: two patients had diaphragmatic and colonic injuries, one patient had diaphragmatic and gastric injuries, and one patient had diaphragmatic, small intestinal and colonic injuries. Patients with colonic or gastric injuries in addition to diaphragmatic injury underwent laparoscopic repair, whereas the patient with diaphragmatic, small intestinal and colonic injuries and the patient with isolated colonic injury were converted to open surgical repair. Therapeutic intervention was applied to total number of 35 patients (44%) who were applied laparoscopy.

The rate of conversion to open surgery procedure in these patients with positive surgical findings ($n = 35$) was 11.4% ($n = 4$). Seven patients (9%) received a chest tube and underwent closed underwater drainage preoperatively due to concomitant pneumothorax.

Table 1
Distribution of injured intraabdominal organs.

Injured intraabdominal organ	n	%
None any intraabdominal injury	44	55.70
Isolated diaphragmatic injury	30	38
Colonic injury	1	1.25
Diaphragmatic and colonic injury	2	2.55
Diaphragmatic and gastric injury	1	1.25
Diaphragmatic, colonic and intestinal injury	1	1.25

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/2604071>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/2604071>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)