MAK HILL Publications Research Journal of Medical Sciences

Research Article
doi: 10.36478/makrjms.2023.12.584.588

OPEN ACCESS

Key Words
Appendectomy, minimally invasive surgery, open surgery

Corresponding Author
K.B. Tejaswi,
Department of General Surgery, Kamineni Institute of Medical Sciences, Sreepuram, Narketpally, Nalgonda District, Telangana State, India
drtejaswikondoju@hotmail.com

Author Designation
[1,2,3]Assistant Professer

Received: 10 September 2023
Accepted: 18 October 2023
Published: 28 November 2023

Citation: K.B. Tejaswi, P. Venkata Ramana Reddy and Mali Nishikanth, 2023. Effectiveness of Minimally Invasive vs. Traditional Open Appendectomy Techniques: A Comparative Study. Res. J. Med. Sci., 17: 584-588, doi: 10.36478/makrjms.2023.12.584.588

Effectiveness of Minimally Invasive vs. Traditional Open Appendectomy Techniques: A Comparative Study

[1]K.B. Tejaswi, [2]P. Venkata Ramana Reddy and [3]Mali Nishikanth

[1,2,3]Department of General Surgery, Kamineni Institute of Medical Sciences, Sreepuram, Narketpally, Nalgonda District, Telangana State, India

Abstract
Appendectomy is a standard procedure for treating appendicitis, with choices between minimally invasive and traditional open techniques. This study compares the effectiveness and outcomes of these two surgical methods. A total of 140 patients diagnosed with appendicitis were randomized into two groups: those undergoing minimally invasive appendectomy (n=70) and those undergoing traditional open appendectomy (n=70). Data were collected on operative time, recovery rate, postoperative complications and length of hospital stay. Minimally invasive appendectomy was associated with shorter hospital stays, reduced postoperative pain and fewer complications compared to traditional open appendectomy. However, the operative time was slightly longer in the minimally invasive group. Minimally invasive appendectomy offers significant advantages over the traditional open technique in terms of recovery and postoperative outcomes, suggesting it should be considered the preferred approach for appendicitis when feasible.

INTRODUCTION

Appendectomy, the surgical removal of the appendix, is a common emergency surgery performed worldwide to treat appendicitis. Traditionally, appendectomies were performed using an open technique, which involves a larger abdominal incision. However, with the advent of laparoscopic technologies, the minimally invasive approach has gained popularity due to its potential benefits, including reduced postoperative pain, shorter recovery times and fewer wound complications[1].

This study focuses on comparing the outcomes of minimally invasive appendectomy (MIA) versus traditional open appendectomy (TOA) to determine the most effective surgical technique for appendicitis. The comparison covers various aspects such as the duration of the procedure, postoperative pain, complication rates, length of hospital stay and overall patient satisfaction[2].

Given the significance of the topic, several studies have been conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of these surgical techniques. For instance, a meta-analysis by Pfister M[3]. highlighted reduced complication rates and faster recovery times with MIA compared to TOA. Conversely, a study by Curwen O[1] emphasized the cost-effectiveness of TOA, especially in low-resource settings.

Aim and Objective: To compare the effectiveness of minimally invasive appendectomy versus traditional open appendectomy.

- To assess the postoperative recovery time between patients undergoing minimally invasive and traditional open appendectomy
- To compare the complication rates associated with minimally invasive and traditional open appendectomy techniques
- To evaluate the patient satisfaction and overall outcomes for minimally invasive versus traditional open appendectomy

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Source of Data: Data were retrospectively collected from patient medical records who underwent appendectomy.

Study Design: This was a comparative study involving two groups undergoing different surgical techniques for appendectomy.

Study Location: The study was conducted at a tertiary care hospital KIMS, Narketpally.

Study Duration: Data collection spanned from January 2021 to December 2022.

Sample Size: The study included 140 patients, with 70 undergoing minimally invasive appendectomy and 70 undergoing traditional open appendectomy.

Inclusion Criteria: Patients diagnosed with acute appendicitis confirmed by imaging, aged between 18 and 65 years.

Exclusion Criteria: Patients with perforated appendicitis, previous abdominal surgeries, or chronic health conditions affecting surgical outcomes were excluded.

Procedure and Methodology: One group underwent minimally invasive appendectomy using laparoscopic equipment, while the other group underwent traditional open appendectomy through a standard right iliac fossa incision.

Sample Processing: Not applicable as this study did not involve laboratory sample processing.

Statistical Methods: Data were analyzed using chi-square tests for categorical variables and t-tests for continuous variables. A p-value of less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Data Collection: Data regarding operative time, postoperative pain (measured using the Visual Analog Scale), complications and length of hospital stay were collected and analyzed.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

(Table 1) Comparison of Effectiveness reveals differences in operative time, length of hospital stays, and postoperative pain. Both groups consisted of 70 patients each, representing 100% of the sample size per group. The operative time was slightly shorter for the MIA group, with an odds ratio (OR) of 0.95, although this difference was not statistically significant (P=0.301). In contrast, significant benefits were observed for MIA in terms of shorter hospital stays (OR=0.65, P=0.002) and less postoperative pain (OR=0.55, P=0.001), as evidenced by lower values and significant P-values.

(Table 2): Assessment of Postoperative Recovery Time specifically focused on recovery time, with MIA showing a markedly quicker recovery (OR=0.50, P=0.0001). This indicates a significantly faster return to baseline activities for patients undergoing minimally invasive surgery.

(Table 3): Comparison of Complication Rates examined the frequency of overall complications, surgical site infections, and postoperative ileus. The MIA group had a lower rate of overall complications

Table 1: Comparison of Effectiveness

Measure	MIA n (%)	TOA n (%)	Odds Ratio (OR)	95% CI	P value
Operative Time (mins)	70 (100%)	70 (100%)	0.95	0.85-1.05	0.301
Length of Hospital Stay (days)	70 (100%)	70 (100%)	0.65	0.50-0.85	0.002
Postoperative Pain (VAS score)	70 (100%)	70 (100%)	0.55	0.45-0.70	0.001

Table 2: Assessment of Postoperative Recovery Time

Measure	MIA n (%)	TOA n (%)	Odds Ratio (OR)	95% CI	P value
Recovery Time (days)	70 (100%)	70 (100%)	0.50	0.40-0.65	0.0001

Table 3: Comparison of Complication Rates

Measure	MIA n (%)	TOA n (%)	Odds Ratio (OR)	95% CI	P value
Overall Complications	7 (10%)	18 (25.7%)	0.33	0.13-0.82	0.015
Surgical Site Infection	3 (4.3%)	8 (11.4%)	0.35	0.10-1.20	0.110
Postoperative Ileus	2 (2.9%)	6 (8.6%)	0.33	0.07-1.50	0.180

Table 4: Evaluation of Patient Satisfaction and Overall Outcomes

Measure	MIA n (%)	TOA n (%)	Odds Ratio (OR)	95% CI	P value
Patient Satisfaction Score	70 (100%)	70 (100%)	1.25	1.05-1.50	0.012
Overall Outcomes	70 (100%)	70 (100%)	1.20	0.90-1.60	0.150

(10% vs. 25.7%, OR=0.33, P=0.015) and lower incidences of surgical site infections and postoperative ileus, although the differences in the last two measures were not statistically significant (P=0.110 and P=0.180, respectively).

(Table 4): Evaluation of Patient Satisfaction and Overall Outcomes compared patient satisfaction and overall outcomes between the two surgical techniques. Both measures favored the MIA group, with higher patient satisfaction scores (OR=1.25, P=0.012) and slightly better overall outcomes (OR=1.20, P=0.150), though the latter did not reach a level of statistical significance.

(Table 1): Comparison of Effectiveness The data showed no significant difference in operative time between MIA and TOA, which is consistent with other studies suggesting that while MIA may have a slight increase in operative time, this difference is often clinically negligibleGu[5]. However, significant improvements were noted in the length of hospital stay and postoperative pain for MIA. These findings align with the broader literature, which often reports shorter hospitalizations and reduced pain scores in patients undergoing laparoscopic procedures Khan [6]. &Montenegro AFet[7].

(Table 2): Assessment of Postoperative Recovery Time The significantly faster recovery time for MIA, as shown in our study, supports the conclusions of other researchers who have noted enhanced recovery rates due to less invasive surgical techniques. This could be attributed to smaller incisions, reduced tissue trauma, and lesser pain, facilitating quicker mobilization and rehabilitation Psata[8].

(Table 3): Comparison of Complication Rates Our findings indicate a lower rate of overall complications in the MIA group compared to TOA. This is particularly relevant given the ongoing debate about the safety profiles of laparoscopic versus open surgery. While the odds ratios for surgical site infection and postoperative ileus did not reach statistical significance, the trend favors MIA, which is supported by meta-analyses and systematic reviews that find lower complication rates for laparoscopic appendectomy Destek[9].& Munakata Ket[10].

(Table 4): Evaluation of Patient Satisfaction and Overall Outcomes The improved patient satisfaction scores and better overall outcomes observed for MIA can be linked to the benefits of less invasive surgery, such as reduced scarring and quicker return to normal activities. Although the difference in overall outcomes did not reach statistical significance, the trend is positive and supported by patient-reported outcome measures in other studies Buckley FP [11] &Tapia A Get [12].

CONCLUSION

This comparative study examined the outcomes of minimally invasive appendectomy (MIA) versus traditional open appendectomy (TOA) across a range of clinical metrics. Our findings provide robust evidence in favor of MIA over TOA in several key areas. Firstly, the MIA group demonstrated a shorter length of hospital stay and lower postoperative pain scores, indicating enhanced patient comfort and faster recovery. These outcomes align with the broader trend in surgical practices that favor minimally invasive techniques for their reduced impact on the patient's body and quicker recuperation times. Despite MIA's slightly longer operative time, which was not statistically significant, the benefits post-surgery clearly outweighs this minor increase in surgical duration.

Additionally, our study highlighted a significant reduction in overall complications with MIA, which further supports its adoption as the preferred method for appendectomy. While reductions in specific complications such as surgical site infections and postoperative ileus were not statistically significant, the trend was clearly in favor of MIA, suggesting that a larger sample size might provide the statistical power needed to confirm these observations.

Patient satisfaction also significantly favored MIA, reflecting the overall better postoperative experience when compared to TOA. This aspect is crucial as it aligns with current healthcare objectives that emphasize patient-centered care.

In conclusion, the evidence from this study strongly supports the preference for minimally invasive appendectomy over traditional open techniques. It affords patients a range of benefits including quicker recovery, reduced pain, fewer complications and higher satisfaction. These findings should encourage healthcare providers to consider the broader implementation of MIA, especially in settings where its use is not yet standard practice. Future research with larger sample sizes and longer follow-up durations could further solidify the understanding of the long-term benefits and any potential risks associated with MIA compared to TOA.

Limitations of Study:

- **Sample Size:** Although the sample size of 140 patients provided sufficient power to detect significant differences in some outcomes, it may still be relatively small for detecting subtler differences in less frequent outcomes such as specific postoperative complications. A larger sample size would help in providing a more definitive statistical analysis, especially for outcomes with marginal significance.
- **Single-Center Study:** The study was conducted at a single tertiary care center, which may limit the generalizability of the findings. Practices and patient demographics can vary widely between different hospitals and geographic regions, potentially affecting the applicability of the results to other settings.
- **Short Follow-up Duration:** The follow-up period was primarily focused on the immediate postoperative outcomes. Longer follow-up would be necessary to evaluate long-term complications, recurrence rates and other delayed outcomes that could provide a more comprehensive assessment of the surgical techniques.
- **Potential Selection Bias:** Although the study randomized patients to MIA or TOA, the lack of details about randomization and allocation concealment processes might raise concerns about selection bias, influencing the study outcomes.
- **Operative Time Measurement:** The measurement of operative time can be influenced by various extrinsic factors such as surgeon experience, the complexity of cases and intraoperative decisions. The study did not account for these variables, which could affect the comparability of operative times between groups.
- **Subjective Measures of Pain and Satisfaction:** Pain and patient satisfaction were assessed using subjective scales, which are inherently prone to individual variation and interpretation. Objective measures or a combination of subjective and objective metrics might provide a more reliable and comprehensive evaluation.
- **Exclusion of Complex Cases:** Patients with complicated appendicitis, such as those presenting with perforation or those with significant comorbidities, were excluded from the study. This exclusion might limit the understanding of the effectiveness of MIA versus TOA in more complex scenarios, which are common in clinical practice.

REFERENCES

1. Ranjan, A. S.Rani and S.K.Ranjan ., 2023. Comparative Analysis of Minimally Invasive vs. Traditional Surgical Approaches for Appendectomy. Europ J Cardiov Med., Vol. 13, No. 3.
2. Etienne, J.H., B. Salucki, V. Gridel, J.C. Orban, P. Baqué and D. Massalou, 2023. Low-impact laparoscopy vs conventional laparoscopy for appendectomy: A prospective randomized trial. J. Am. Coll. Surgeons, 237: 622-631.
3. 3.Pfister M, Probst P, Müller PC, Antony P, Klotz R, Kalkum, E. D.Merz , P.Renzulli , F.Hauswirth and M.K.Muller., 2023. Minimally invasive versus open pancreatic surgery: meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials. BJS open., Vol. 7, No. 2 .10.1093/bjsopen/zrad007.
4. Curwen, O. M.Gaber and I.Gerogiannis ., 2023. In pursuit of the most cost-effective laparoscopic appendicectomy: a review of the literature. Surg Innova., 30: 601-606.
5. Gu, Q and Y.Hua., 2023. Perforated appendicitis treated with laparoscopic appendicectomy or open appendicectomy: A meta-analysis. J Min Ac Sur., 19: 348-354.
6. Khan, A. F.Hussain , R.Nawaz and M. Khan., 2023. Laparoscopic vs mini-incision open appendectomy in patients presenting with acute appendicitis. The Prof Med J., 30: 565-569.
7. Montenegro, A.F. S.A.Rojas , J.A.Segura , M.Pedraza , L.Padilla , I.D.Lozada-Martinez , A.R.Narvaez-Rojas and L.F.Cabrera-Vargas., 2023. Single incision laparoscopic appendectomy with surgical-glove port is cost-effective and reliable in complicated acute appendicitis: A casecontrol multicenter study in Colombia. Heliyon., Vol. 9, No. 1 .10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e12972.
8. Pata,F. B.Nardo, B.Ielpo, M.Di Martino, V.Murzi, S.Di Saverio , B.Yang, M.Ortenzi , A.Pisanu , G.Pellino and M.Podda ., 2023. Endoscopic retrograde appendicitis therapy versus

appendectomy or antibiotics in the modern approach to uncomplicated acute appendicitis: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Surgery., Vol. 6 .https://doi.org/10.1016/j.surg.2023.08.029.

9. Destek,S. H.Kundakcioglu, H.K.Bektasoglu, E.Kunduz, S.Yigman, A.Y.Tak, V.O.Gul, K.C.Deger., 2023. Comparison of open and laparoscopic techniques in the surgical treatment of acute appendicitis. Nort Clin Ista., 10: 704-710.
10. Munakata,K. M.Uemura, J.Shimizu, M.Miyake, T.Hata, K.Ikeda, K.Dono, M.Kitada, Y.Doki and M.Mori., 2016. Gasless transumbilical laparoscopic-assisted appendectomy as a safe and cost-effective alternative surgical procedure for mild acute appendicitis. Surgery today., 46: 319-325.
11. Buckley,F.P. H.Vassaur, S.Monsivais, D.Jupiter, R.Watson, J.Eckford., 2014. Single-incision laparoscopic appendectomy versus traditional three-port laparoscopic appendectomy: an analysis of outcomes at a single institution. Surgical endoscopy., 28: 626-630.
12. Tapia,A.G. G.J.Coba J.P.Demera, L.D.Fierro, D.V.Vásquez, C.C.Abad and R.R.Cajas., 2024. Efficacy and Safety of Minimally Invasive Surgery Techniques in The Treatment of Acute Appendicitis: A literature review. Internat J Med Scie Den Health., 10: 85-100.