

Abdominal Wall Closure in Emergency Laparotomy: Management and Outcome in Omdurman Teaching Hospital

Lodu S Kuju¹

¹ Sudan Medical Specialization Board

Received: 13 April 2013 Accepted: 3 May 2013 Published: 15 May 2013

Abstract

Background : The incisions those applied in approaching those operations, were vertical anterior abdominal incisions (midline or paramedian), and the way these incisions were closed, it was either mass or layered abdominal wall closure and types of suture materials used in the closure, non-absorbable/absorbable, monofilament (Nylon)/ polyfilament (Vicryl). Objectives : To study a series of patients those who underwent vertical incisions, either midline or paramedian and how they were closed, mass or layered closure and suture materials used inclosing the abdomen and the outcome.

Index terms— laparotomy incision closure, suture material, closure technique.

1 Introduction

losure of the abdominal wall is a common denominator of all abdominal surgery. The methods of closure are often based on local traditions and preference of the teacher and the surgeon is often reluctant to change these methods later on in his or her career. Abdominal closure is performed in multitude of fashions and an abundance of differently tailored studies on this matter. The goal to wound closure is to restore function of abdominal after a surgical procedure. The optimal method should be so technically simple that its results are as good for the hands of the trainee as they are for the experienced surgeon. It should leave the patient with a reasonably aesthetic scar and most importantly, it should minimize the frequency of wound rupture, incisional hernia (IH) wound infection and sinus formation. Mass closure involves a single layer closure of all musculofascial layers and may or may not include the peritoneum. Numerous clinical trials have compared layered to mass abdominal closure. Some studies have shown an increased incidence of burst abdomen and incisional hernia with layered closure and some studies show no difference in these complications, but no studies demonstrate advantage of layered over mass closure (1) . Closure of the midline abdominal incision have varied over time with better understanding of the physiology and engineering of closure of the abdominal wall and improvement in the materials of surgical sutures (2) .

When this surgical procedure is conducted in an emergency setting and depending on the type of surgery (clean and/or contaminated), the incidence of complications may be particularly high, especially when acute dehiscence of the wall occurs. Furthermore, the rate of herniation related to midline laparotomy is still high approximately 16% of cases. Despite efforts to evaluate different suture techniques, suture threads (reabsorbable or non-absorbable) and general factors that may interfere with the repair process, the incidence

2 Conclusion: Mass abdominal wall closure technique

is the preferable technique by the surgeons than layered closure technique, for it is less time consuming and it has got a disadvantage of forming an incisional hernia, when it got dispted by any assault to area of suture line. of complications associated with this approach has been reduced (3) .

Access to the abdominal cavity must be performed in such a way that surgical treatment procedures can be performed safely. For skin incision, scalpel and electrocautery are equivalent. Subcutaneous tissues and fascias

must be divided by electrocautery to minimize blood loss. The best way to close abdominal cavity is by an all layer, slowly absorbable, running suture with suture: wound length ratio 4:1. Closing the peritoneal layer is not necessary. Subcutaneous suture and drains do not reduce the risk of wound complications. Staples should be used for skin (4)(5)(6)(7)(8)(9) .

A similar technique is used for closure of the paramedian incision (PMI). The anterior and the posterior rectus sheaths are packed up in one bite. A transrectus incision will incorporate the medial sliver of the rectus muscle into the suture loops. Mass closure of the lateral (PMI) is not possible. For this incision, the anterior and posterior rectus sheaths are closed separately (1) .

Mass closure techniques (MCT) with the one loop suture technique allow give of suture with coughing, respiration and movement. It basically holds the wound together and allows the properties of wound healing, the strongest of the all wound healing techniques, to take place without necrosis and closure by second intention (2) .

The choice of suture material is more complex. They prefer to use absorbable sutures with delayed degradation, such as polydioxanone (PDS). Among nonabsorbable sutures, monofilament suture is recommended. Whether the incision is vertical or transverse, the steps for closure are more or less the same (1,(10)(11)(12)(13)(14)(15)(16)(17)(18)(19)(20)(21) .

3 II.

4 Patients and Methods

This is an observational prospective analytical study hospital based study, conducted at Omdurman Teaching Hospital. The study population was composed of male and female patients who underwent vertical abdominal wall closure during the period Nov.2012 Oct.2013. A total number of 124patients were the use of predesigned and pretested structured questionnaire.

Non probability sampling including all patients operated in the emergency theatre during the allocated period of study. Data analysis by using SPSS version 20.The percentage was calculated and chi-square test was used for the analysis. Test of significance was analytically accepted and P value0.000. Ethical clearance and approval for conducting this study was obtained from the ethical committee of Omdurman Teaching Hospital. Informed verbal consent was obtained from the patients participating in this study after full explanation of the study objectives.

5 III.

6 Results

A total of 124 patients were included in the study of emergency laparotomy. The surgical access in all these laparotomies was through vertical incisions, either midline or paramedian. The mean age range was 37.5 (SD_+19.4) years, ranged from 13to 90 years. Seventy seven (62.1%) were forty or younger and only one patient above 80 years (Table1). Male patients constituted 104(83.9%) and female 20 (16.1%) ratio of male: female was 5.2: 1. P value 0.000

Mass closure technique was used in 111(89.5%) while layered closure in 13 (10.5%). The later technique was used in all cases of paramedian incision and only three cases of midline incision. 97.4% of midline was closed in mass closure, which was found to be statistically significant P value 0.000(Table3). The continuous mode of closure was adopted in all cases (100%). This was used in mass closure of midline and layered closure of paramedian incisions. Interrupted fasial closure was not practiced in this study.

Vicryl was applied in 21 (16.9%). The most commonly used size of suture material was size 2# in106 (85.5%), size 1# 17 (13.7%) and 0# is only one suture. Of Nylon type of suture size 2# was commonly used 90 (87.4%) of Vicryl variety, size2# was 16 (76.2%) of patients (Table 4). In all ten patients of paramedian incisions and three midline incision, layered closure was applied. Vicryl was used in closing both fascial layers. The first layer was of peritoneum and posterior rectus sheath and second layer of the anterior rectus sheath) P value 0.000. Closure of the abdominal incisions took between 5-10minutes 76 (61.3%) of patients, however, those who took >10mkinutes 48 (38.7%) of patients. Regarding type of incision incisions, out of 114 midline incisions 68 (59.6%) < 10 minutes. In the paramedian incision the great majority 10 (80%) took less than10 minutes though this was statistically not significant P value 0.205.

In all cases, conventional interrupted skin closure was practice. Suture size 0# was used in 66 (53.2%), 2/0 # in 48 (38.7%) and size 1# or2 # were used in 5 (4%) each. Regarding type, the majority 120 (96.8%) Nylon was used and 4 (3.2%) other types were employed (Silk in one and Vicryl in three patients. Most of abdominal wall closure 118 (95.2%) wre by done by the registrars; remaining six patients (4.8%) were completed by either surgeons' two patients or house officers' four patients.

Length of hospital stay varies 55 (44.4%) were discharge in less than five days, 52 (41.0%) discharged between5-10 days and 16 (13.7%) discharged in more than 10 days.

Ninety seven of patients (78.2%) discharged home without any complications. The morbidity 12 (9.7%) and mortality was seen in 15 (12.1%). The morbidity and mortality were seen in 10.9% and14.1% respectively in patients with acute abdomen, where as in 3.7% and7.4% of patients with abdominal trauma.

Wound infection 7 (5.6%), burst abdomen 4 (3.2%) and (IH) 1(0.8%) were complications encountered. All seven cases of wound infection and single case that developed (IH) in the study had mass closure of their anterior abdominal wall. Out of four patients who developed burst abdomen, three followed mass closure. Out of 15 mortality 14 (93.3%) followed mass closure whereas one patient (6.7%) from layered closure.

IV.

Discussion

Midline incision is still the most frequently used to access the abdominal cavity in emergency surgery. In our study midline incisions are the most which constitutes about 97.4% and this comply the previous international studies (5,6,7) .

Mass closure where all layers of the abdominal wall were closed as one structure (except skin), 89.5% whereas layered closure was less utilized 10.5% (5) .

Most suture materials used Nylon 103 (83%) and Vicryl 21(17%). The most commonly used size of suture materials was 2# and 1# Nylon and Vicryl 2#. Surgical-site infection remains the important early postoperative complications as within the first 30 days postoperatively 5.6%, burst abdomen 3.2% and incisional hernia 11.2% (18) , V.

Volume XIII Issue IV Version I

Conclusion

Mass closure technique is most preferred by the surgeons than the layered closure for it is less time consuming, it has got disadvantage of forming incisional hernia when it gets disrupted by any assault to the area of suture line.



Figure 1:

1

Of the emergency wall closure, 92(74.2%) were (84.6%) of abdominal trauma and stab wounds acute abdomen, 28 (22.4%) abdominal trauma and 4 (21.4%) (Table2). (3.2%) other abdominal conditions. Gunshot account 22

Figure 2: Table 1 :

2

Abdominal Wall Closure in Emergency Laparotomy: Management and Outcome in Omdurman Teaching Hospital

013

2

Year

Volume XIII Issue IV Version I

() I

Age	Frequency	Percentage	
00-20	27	21.8%	
21-40	50	40.3%	
41-60	29	23.4%	
61-80	17	13.7%	
81-100	01	0.8%	
Total	124	100%	
Causes	Midline	Para median	Total%
Acute abdomen	83	9	92(74.2%)
Stab wound	21	1	22(17.7%)
Gunshot	6	0	6(4.8%)
Others	4	0	4(3.2%)
Total	114	10	124(100.0%)

Midline was 114 (91.9%) and paramedian abdominal trauma and 4 (3.5%) patients other incision was 10 (8.1%) of vertical in the study. Out of 114 abdominal emergencies. Whereas those of paramedian patients operated through midline incision 83 (72.8%) incision nine were acute abdomen and one patient were cases of acute abdomen, 27 (23.8%) were stab wound (Table3).

Figure 3: Table 2 :

3

Closure type	Midline Incision	Paramedian incision	Total
Mass	111(97.4%)	00 (0.00%)	111(89.5%)
Layered	03 (2.6%)	10 (100%)	013(10.5%)
Total	114 (100%)	10 (100%)	124(100%)

Figure 4: Table 3 :

4

Suture type	Suture 2#	Suture1#	Suture0#	Total%
Nylon	90 (87.4%)	12 (11.7%)	01 (0.9%)	103(100%)
Vicryl	16 (76.2)	05 (23.8%)	00 (0.00%)	21(100%)
Total	106(185.5%)	17 (13.7%)	01 (0.8%)	124(100%)

Figure 5: Table 4 :

-
- [Singh and Ahluwalia (2012)] ‘A comparison between mass closure and layered Closure of midline abdominal incisions’. G Singh , R Ahluwalia . *Med J DY Patil Univ* 2012 Jun. 5 p. .
- [Joris and Harold (2011)] ‘A multicentre randomized controlled trial evaluating the effect of small stitches on incidence incisional hernia in midline incisions’. J H Joris , E L Harold , WillemR . *BMC Surg* 2011 Aug. 11 p. 20.
- [Bellon-Caneiro (2005)] ‘Abdominal wall closure in laparotomy’. J M Bellon-Caneiro . *Cir Esp* 2005 Mar. 77 (3) p. .
- [Leaper et al. ()] ‘Abdominal wound closure: A controlled Trial of polyamide (Nylon) and polydioxanone suture (PDS)’. D J Leaper , A Allan , R H Kennedy . *Ann R Coll Surg Engl* 1985. 67 (5) p. . (Sept)
- [Gaikwad et al. (2009)] ‘An ideal suture for midline abdominal closure’. V Gaikwad , R Kapoor , R Thambudorai . *Indian J Surg* 2009 March-April. 71 p. .
- [Annual Meeting] *Annual Meeting*,
- [Michael et al.] *Ashley Maingot’s Abdominal Operations*, J Michael , Zinner , W Stanley . (11th edition)
- [Altaf et al. ()] ‘Closure of elective abdominal Incisions with monofilament, non-absorbable suture material versus poly-filament absorbable suture material’. A T Altaf , S A Mohammad , Abdul Rasheed , S . *J Ayub Med Coll Abbottabad* 2011. 23 (2) .
- [Chawia (2012)] ‘Comparison between mass closure and layered closure of midline abdominal incision’. S A Chawia . *Med J DY Patil Univ* 2012 Jun. 5 p. .
- [Rahbari et al. (2009)] ‘Current practice of abdominal wall closure in elective surgery: Is there any consensus?’. N N Rahbari , P Knebel , M K Diener . *BMC Surg* 2009 May. 9 (8) .
- [Millbourn et al. (2009)] ‘Effect of stitches length on wound complications after closure of midline incisions: A randomized controlled trials’. D Millbourn , Y Cengiz , L A Israelsson . *Arch Surg* 2009 Nov. 144 (11) p. .
- [Albertsmeier et al. (2012)] ‘Evaluation of the safety and efficacy of MonoMax® suture material for abdominal closure after Primary midline laparotomy a controlled prospective multicentre trial: ISSAAC [NCT005725079]’. M Albertsmeier , C M Seiler , L Fischer . *Langenbecks Arch Surg* 2012 March. 397 (3) p. .
- [Ceydeli et al. ()] ‘Finding the best abdominal closure: An evidence-base review of the literature’. A Ceydeli , J Rucinski , L Wise . *Curr Surg* 2005. 62 p. .
- [Bolli and Schilling (2006)] ‘Incision and closure of the abdominal wall’. M Bolli , M Schilling . *Chirurg* 2006 May. 77 (5) p. .
- [Justinger et al. ()] ‘Incisional hernia after abdominal wall closure with slowly absorbable versus fast absorbable antibacterial coated sutures’. C Justinger , J E Slotta , M K Schilling . *Surgery* 2012. 151 (3) p. .
- [Bellon et al. ()] ‘Midline abdominal wall closure: A new prophylactic mesh concept’. J M Bellon , P Lopez-Hervas , M Rodriguez . *J Am Coll Surg* 2006 Oct. 203. (4) p. .
- [Scheidel and Hohl ()] ‘Modern synthetic suture materials and abdominal wound closure techniques in gynecological surgery’. P Scheidel , M K Hohl . *Baillieres Clin Obstet Gynecol* 1987Jun. 1 (2) p. .
- [Alcides et al.] ‘Needle for abdominal wall closure’. J B Alcides , T K Nelton , A Joao Jr . Society of American Gastrointestinal and endoscopic Surgeons (SAGES) p. 2012.
- [Carlson (2000)] ‘New developments in abdominal wall closure’. M A Carlson . *Chirurg* 2000 Jul. 71 (7) p. .
- [Bloemen et al. (2011)] ‘Randomized clinical trial comparing polypropylene or polydioxanone for midline abdominal wall closure’. A Bloemen , P Van Dooren , B F Huizinga . *Br J Surg* 2011 May. 98 (5) p. .
- [Schahtrupp et al. (2002)] *Temporary closure of the abdominal wall (laparotomy) hernia*, A Schahtrupp , V Fackleday , U Klinge . 2002 Dec. 2002 Sep 20. 6 p. .
- [Nicole and Richard (2000)] ‘The search for an ideal method of abdominal fascial closure’. C F Nicole , A Richard . *Ann Surg* 2000 March. 231 (3) p. .