

**A Retrospective Cross-Sectional Evaluation of the Predictors of Difficulty in Laparoscopic Cholecystectomy**Aditya Veer Vikram<sup>1</sup>, Amit Kumar Bimal<sup>2</sup>, Pratibha Kumari<sup>3</sup><sup>1</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of General Surgery, Lord Buddha Kosi Medical College & Hospital, Saharsa, Bihar, India<sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of General Surgery, Lord Buddha Kosi Medical College & Hospital, Saharsa, Bihar, India<sup>3</sup>Junior Resident, Department of General Surgery, Lord Buddha Kosi Medical College & Hospital, Saharsa, Bihar, India

Received: 11-01-2024 Revised: 15-02-2024 / Accepted: 11-03-2024

Corresponding author: Dr. Amit Kumar Bimal

Conflict of interest: Nil

**Abstract****Aim:** The aim of the present study was to identify predictors for difficult Laparoscopic cholecystectomy.**Methods:** A retrospective cross-sectional review of surgical records was done for all patients who underwent laparoscopic cholecystectomy on an elective basis at Department of General surgery, Lord Buddha Kosi Medical College & Hospital, Saharsa, Bihar, India for the period of 2 years. A total of 250 patients who underwent laparoscopic cholecystectomy (50 patients with difficult and 200 patients without difficult LC) were studied during the study period.**Results:** The majority of patients were female. The median age was 48 years. When we assessed different preoperative and intraoperative variables in two groups (difficult LC and non-difficult LC), we found differences based upon age, gender, past history of acute cholecystitis, gallbladder wall thickness, fibrotic gallbladder, and adhesion at the triangle of Calot ( $P < 0.05$ ). However, We did not observe significant differences in other variables ( $P > 0.005$ ). We had also evaluated different factors associated with difficult LC. In logistic regression analysis, on multivariate analysis gender (male), past history of acute cholecystitis, gallbladder wall thickness ( $\geq 4-5$  mm), fibrotic gallbladder, and adhesion at the triangle of Calot were significantly associated with an increased risk of difficult laparoscopic cholecystectomy ( $P < 0.05$ ).**Conclusion:** Gender (male), past history of acute cholecystitis, gallbladder wall thickness (4-5 mm), fibrotic gallbladder, and adhesion at Calot's triangle are significant predictors for difficult LC. Moreover, an awareness about reliable predictors for difficult LC would be helpful for an appropriate treatment plan and application of the resources to anticipate difficult LC.**Keywords:** Cholelithiasis, Predictors, Difficult laparoscopic cholecystectomy.This is an Open Access article that uses a funding model which does not charge readers or their institutions for access and distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>) and the Budapest Open Access Initiative (<http://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/read>), which permit unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided original work is properly credited.**Introduction**

Cholecystectomy is a surgical procedure to remove the gallbladder due to stone or inflammation, and its the most standard procedure performed in the biliary tract. [1] Laparoscopic cholecystectomy has become the preferred method and has been accepted as the gold standard for definitive management of symptomatic cholelithiasis or gallstones. [1,2] This surgical procedure has many advantages over the standard open cholecystectomy, such as minimal trauma, decreased pain, shorter hospital stay, better cosmetic outcome, and faster recovery. [3,4] However, some studies have shown that laparoscopic cholecystectomy has a higher

frequency of complications than the standard open cholecystectomy.

The complication includes injury of the common bile duct, bile leakage, gallbladder perforation, injury to the vascular and visceral structure during the application of Veress needle and a trocar, and other complications such as external biliary fistula, perihepatic collection, wound sepsis, hematoma, foreign body inclusions, adhesions, metastatic port-site deposits, and cholelithoptysis. [1,3] In the early years of the laparoscopic cholecystectomy era, the conversion rate to open procedure was 2-15%. After years of learning and understanding the laparoscopic technique and increasing surgeons' experience, the conversion rate dropped to

approximately 1–6%. This conversion was an attempt to avoid complications due to various difficulties encountered during the procedure. [5]

A few factors that play a role in the decision for conversion from laparoscopic to open surgery are, the patient condition, level of surgeon expertise and technical factors, amongst others. One of the leading reasons for conversion is inability to define anatomy and difficult dissection, followed by other complications like bleeding. The conversion rate for elective laparoscopic cholecystectomy is around 5%, whereas the conversion rate in the setting of acute cholecystitis may be as high as 30%. In 1985, the first endoscopic cholecystectomy was performed by Mühe of Böblingen, Germany. Despite skeptical remarks from the academic surgical community, laparoscopic cholecystectomy (LC) was adopted rapidly around the world and has subsequently been recognized as the new "gold standard" for the treatment of gallstone disease. [6] In 1992, the national institutes of health (NIH) consensus development conference stated that laparoscopic cholecystectomy provides a safe and effective treatment for most patients with symptomatic gallstones. [7]

The aim of the present study was to identify predictors for difficult Laparoscopic cholecystectomy.

### Materials and Methods

A retrospective cross-sectional review of surgical records was done for all patients who underwent laparoscopic cholecystectomy on an elective basis at department of General Surgery, Lord Buddha Kosi Medical College & Hospital, Saharsa, Bihar, India for the period of 2 years. A total of 250 patients who underwent laparoscopic cholecystectomy (50 patients with difficult and 200 patients without difficult LC) were studied during the study period. We included only those patients who were planned for elective LC and excluded those who underwent emergency LC for cholelithiasis with acute cholecystitis. We divided the patients into two groups based on operative findings of difficult LC; difficult LC group and non-difficult group. We defined difficult LC as those comprising an operative time of more than

two hours, need for conversion to open cholecystectomy, significant bleeding (any hemorrhage that couldn't be managed with manual pressure and cautery and had to be managed with conversion into open surgeries) and those with vascular and biliary injuries.

Patient's demographics, risk factors, and perioperative details were analyzed. Clinical evaluation, abdominal ultrasonography as well baseline investigations were used as a tool to assess all patients for surgery. The patients who presented with acute phase (acute cholecystitis) was planned for surgery after the resolution of symptoms. Therefore, all of these patients were initially managed medically, discharged and readmitted for elective laparoscopic cholecystectomy.

Meanwhile, the selected patients with suspected choledocholithiasis or with dilated biliary duct in ultrasonography had been evaluated with magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography (MRCP). In addition, patients with common bile duct stones had endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP) before cholecystectomy. During operation, all patients received perioperative prophylactic antibiotics. The standard four-port technique was applied for the procedure. Meanwhile, the open method was used to introduce a sub umbilical cannula. In most of the cases, we placed titanium clips for cystic artery and cystic duct ligations and we did not perform intraoperative cholangiography routinely. Furthermore, we only put a closed suction drain in selected cases according to need.

Perioperative data comprising duration of surgery, and operative findings were documented. During analysis of data, independent t-test or Mann–Whitney test was applied for all quantitative variables while Chi-square test or Fisher's exact test was used for all categorical variables. Univariate and multivariate logistic regression were performed to recognize independent predictors associated with difficult LC. Statistical software SPSS version 25.0 (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) was used for statistical analysis. A P value < 0.005 was considered statistically significant.

### Results

**Table 1: Patient's demographics and perioperative data**

Variable	Difficult LC N=50	Non-difficult N=200	P Value
<b>Age, (years)</b>			0.012
≥60	11	22	
<60	39	178	
<b>Sex</b>			0.001
Male	35	32	
female	15	168	
<b>Smoking</b>			0.220
Smoker	24	32	

<b>Non-smoker</b>	26	168	
<b>Past history of acute cholecystitis</b>			0.001
<b>Yes</b>	40	6	
<b>No</b>	10	194	
<b>BMI</b>			0.525
<b>&lt;18.5</b>	2	6	
<b>≥18.5 &lt; 25</b>	45	190	
<b>≥25</b>	3	4	
<b>Comorbidity, %</b>	8	16	0.017
<b>Diabetes mellitus</b>	7	4	
<b>Hypertension</b>	3	6	
<b>Cardiovascular disease</b>	0	2	
<b>Respiratory diseases</b>	0	2	
<b>Neurological problems</b>	0	2	
<b>Renal disease</b>	0	2	
<b>GB wall thickness (mm)</b>			0.001
<b>≥4–5</b>	44	6	
<b>&lt;4–5</b>	6	194	
<b>Fibrotic GB</b>			0.007
<b>Yes</b>	12	20	
<b>No</b>	38	180	
<b>Adhesion in TOC</b>			0.001
<b>Yes</b>	43	4	
<b>No</b>	7	196	

The majority of patients were female. The median age was 48 years. When we assessed different preoperative and intraoperative variables in two groups (difficult LC and non-difficult LC), we found differences based upon age, gender, past

history of acute cholecystitis, gallbladder wall thickness, fibrotic gallbladder, and adhesion at the triangle of Calot (P < 0.05). However, We did not observe significant differences in other variables (P > 0.005).

**Table 2: Association of variables with difficult laparoscopic cholecystectomy**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Univariate analysis OR,(CI) P value</b>	<b>Multivariate analysis OR;(CI); P* value</b>
Age(≥60)	2.08; (1.133–5.004); 0.017	0.232;(0.044–1.205); 0.084
Sex (Male)	4.32; (3.12–5.93); 0.001	0.172;(0.043–0.675); 0.016
Presence of Comorbidity	1.98; (1.01–3.79); 0.048	0.728;(0.120–4.429); 0.733
Past history of acute cholecystitis	22.0; (11.58–38.05); 0.001	0.039; (0.005–0.309); 0.003
GB wall thickness ≥4–5 mm	24.0; (12.77–41.39); 0.001	0.075; (0.008–0.666); 0.022
Fibrotic GB	2.46; (1.325–4.51); 0.005	166.4; (7.946–3492); 0.001
Presence of Adhesion in TOC	34.6; (16.48–72.51); 0.001	0.022;(0.001–0.311); 0.007

We had also evaluated different factors associated with difficult LC. In logistic regression analysis, on multivariate analysis gender (male), past history of acute cholecystitis, gallbladder wall thickness (≥4–5 mm), fibrotic gallbladder, and adhesion at the triangle of Calot were significantly associated with an increased risk of difficult laparoscopic cholecystectomy (P < 0.05).

**Discussion**

Laparoscopic cholecystectomy (LC) is the gold standard treatment for symptomatic cholelithiasis due to its effectiveness, and safety. Moreover, the benefits of laparoscopic cholecystectomy are; less postoperative pain, faster recovery, earlier return of bowel function, and shorter hospital stay when compared to conventional cholecystectomy. [8,9]

Although, the LC is the most common operation performed these days, some of the intended LC require conversion due to several factors. Many a time it demands conversion to open cholecystectomy due to intraoperative complications for the safe ending of the procedure and takes more than anticipated time. However, current literature has mentioned a conversion rate of nearly about (2%–10%). [10]

The majority of patients were female. The median age was 48 years. When we assessed different preoperative and intraoperative variables in two groups (difficult LC and non-difficult LC), we found differences based upon age, gender, past history of acute cholecystitis, gallbladder wall thickness, fibrotic gallbladder, and adhesion at the

triangle of Calot ( $P < 0.05$ ). However, We did not observe significant differences in other variables ( $P > 0.005$ ). We had also evaluated different factors associated with difficult LC. In logistic regression analysis, on multivariate analysis gender (male), past history of acute cholecystitis, gallbladder wall thickness ( $\geq 4-5$  mm), fibrotic gallbladder, and adhesion at the triangle of Calot were significantly associated with an increased risk of difficult laparoscopic cholecystectomy ( $P < 0.05$ ). The literature has mentioned different predictors for difficult LC such as age 60 or more, male gender, comorbid condition, past history of acute cholecystitis, previous abdominal surgery, gall bladder wall thickness 4–5 mm, contracted gall bladder, and impacted stone. [11,12] When we analyzed the predictors of difficult LC in DLC, we found that gender (male), past history of acute cholecystitis, gall bladder wall thickness (4–5 mm), fibrotic gallbladder, and adhesion in the triangle of Calot were significant risk factors for difficult LC likewise reported in other studies. [13]

In Our study we found that there was delayed presentation of symptoms by male as compared to female patients. The possible reason could be less attention to mild symptoms leading to presentation only after disease progression. This scenario has also been mentioned in other studies. [14,15] Most of the time, the levels of difficulties are hard to assume. Nevertheless, it is necessary to predict so that the patient can be informed regarding the possibility of conversion. Likewise, the surgeon can get mentally prepared to be ready for having a good surgical team, intraoperative cholangiogram, the timing of the procedure and have overall preparedness to defy the difficult cholecystectomy for better postoperative outcomes. It is always better to know the predictors to complete such challenging surgeries. Based upon the risk factors like; patient demographics such as age, gender, body weight, comorbidity, and ASA score, along with clinical findings (acute versus chronic cholecystitis), and the surgeon's experience; the chance of possible complications, and conversion into open surgery can be estimated. [16,17]

In literature, the role of CT scan has been maintained in difficult LC. [18] However, we could not perform CT scans routinely because of the economic constraints of our patients. We perform the preoperative ultrasonographic evaluation of patients scheduled for surgery. Preoperative ultrasonographic findings of gallbladder wall thickness are also a significant predictor for difficult LC in our study, similarly reported by Giuseppe et al. [19] Some studies have highlighted the use of laparoscopic ultrasound during cholecystectomy and incorporate its benefit in difficult situations while the anatomy is not clear. [20] Besides, several approaches have been

described for the management of difficult LC in the literature including laparoscopic subtotal cholecystectomy, fundus first or antegrade or other techniques. [21,22] Though we usually performed laparoscopic subtotal cholecystectomy being very loyal to conversion, this study could not make a single recommendation about these techniques to manage difficult LC and this has been agreed about growing consensus in laparoscopic subtotal cholecystectomy and fundus first methods.

### Conclusion

Gender (male), past history of acute cholecystitis, gallbladder wall thickness (4–5 mm), fibrotic gallbladder, and adhesion at Calot's triangle are significant predictors for difficult LC. Moreover, an awareness about reliable predictors for difficult LC would be helpful for an appropriate treatment plan and application of the resources to anticipate difficult LC.

### References

1. Veerank N, Togale MD. Validation Of A Scoring System To Predict Difficult Laparoscopic Cholecys-Tectomy: A One-Year Cross-Sectional Study. *Journal of the West African College of Surgeons*. 2018 Jan 1;8(1): 23-39.
2. De U. Evolution of cholecystectomy: A tribute to Carl August Langenbuch. *Indian J Surg*. 2004 Mar 1;66(2):97-100.
3. Radunovic M, Lazovic R, Popovic N, Magdelinic M, Bulajic M, Radunovic L, Vukovic M, Radunovic M. Complications of laparoscopic cholecystectomy: our experience from a retrospective analysis. *Open access Macedonian journal of medical sciences*. 2016 Dec 12;4(4):641.
4. Bhondave S, Dash N, Thipse MV, Gadekar J. Proposed diagnostic scoring system to predict difficult laparoscopic cholecystectomy. *J Med Sci Clin Res*. 2017;50:31683-8.
5. Al-Bahlouli SH, Al-Malahi A, Ghallab NH, Al-Dain AS, Al Sabahi AA. Conversion rate of laparoscopic to open cholecystectomy. *Yemeni journal for medical sciences*. 2009 Dec 1;3(1): 1-8.
6. Soper NJ, Stockmann PT, Dunnegan DL, Ashley SW. Laparoscopic cholecystectomy the new 'gold standard'? *Arch Surg*. 1992;127(8): 917-23.
7. Brunt LM, Soper NJ. Outcomes of Minimal Access versus Open Surgical Procedures in the Elderly. In *Principles and Practice of Geriatric Surgery*. Springer, New York, NY. 2001;1036-53.
8. Keus F, Gooszen HG, van Laarhoven CJ. Open, small-incision, or laparoscopic cholecystectomy for patients with symptomatic cholecolithiasis. An overview of Cochrane

- Hepato-Biliary Group reviews. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2010 Jan 20;2010(1): CD008318.
9. Gollan JL, Bulkley GB, Diehl AM, Elashoff JD, Federle MP, Hogan WJ, Kelly KA, Massanari DL, Powell DW, Sorrell M, Wilson JA. Gallstones and laparoscopic cholecystectomy. *Jama.* 1993 Feb 24;269(8): 1018-24.
  10. Livingston EH, Rege RV. A nationwide study of conversion from laparoscopic to open cholecystectomy. *Am J Surg.* 2004 Sep;188(3):205-11.
  11. J. Philip Rothman, J. Burcharth, H.-C. Pommergaard, S. Viereck, J. Rosenberg, Preoperative risk factors for conversion of laparoscopic cholecystectomy to open surgery - a systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies, *Dig. Surg.* 33 (5) (2016) 414-423.
  12. V. Gupta, G. Jain, Safe laparoscopic cholecystectomy: adoption of universal culture of safety in cholecystectomy, *World J. Gastrointest. Surg.* 11 (2) (2019 Feb 27) 62-84.
  13. V. Stanisic, M. Milicevic, N. Kocev, B. Stanisic, A prospective cohort study for prediction of difficult laparoscopic cholecystectomy, *Ann. Med. Surg.* 60 (2020 Dec) 728-733, 2012.
  14. M.A.K.M. Vivek, A.J. Augustine, R. Rao, A comprehensive predictive scoring method for difficult laparoscopic cholecystectomy, *J. Minimal Access Surg.* 10 (2) (2014 Apr) 62-67.
  15. B. Lowndes, C.A. Thiels, E.B. Habermann, J. Bingener, S. Hallbeck, D. Yu, Impact of patient factors on operative duration during laparoscopic cholecystectomy: evaluation from the National Surgical Quality Improvement Program database, *Am. J. Surg.* 212 (2) (2016 Aug) 289-296.
  16. Giger U.F., Michel J.-M., Opitz I., Inderbitzin D.T., Kocher T., Krähenbühl L. Risk factors for perioperative complications in patients undergoing laparoscopic cholecystectomy: analysis of 22,953 consecutive cases from the Swiss association of laparoscopic and thoracoscopic surgery database. *J. Am. Coll. Surg.* 2006 Nov 1;203(5):723-728.
  17. Ghadhban BR. Assessment of the difficulties in laparoscopic cholecystectomy among patients at Baghdad province. *Ann Med Surg (Lond).* 2019 Mar 27;41:16-19.
  18. Maehira H, Itoh A, Kawasaki M, Ogawa M, Imagawa A, Mizumura N, Okumura S, Kameyama M. Use of dynamic CT attenuation value for diagnosis of acute gangrenous cholecystitis. *Am J Emerg Med.* 2016 Dec;34 (12):2306-2309.
  19. Di Buono G, Romano G, Galia M, Amato G, Maienza E, Vernuccio F, Bonventre G, Gulotta L, Buscemi S, Agrusa A. Difficult laparoscopic cholecystectomy and preoperative predictive factors. *Sci Rep.* 2021 Jan 28;11 (1):2559.
  20. Dili A, Bertrand C. Laparoscopic ultrasonography as an alternative to intraoperative cholangiography during laparoscopic cholecystectomy. *World J Gastroenterol.* 2017 Aug 7;23(29):5438-5450.
  21. Hussain A. Difficult laparoscopic cholecystectomy: current evidence and strategies of management. *Surg Laparosc Endosc Percutan Tech.* 2011 Aug;21(4):211-7.
  22. Kitamura H, Fujioka S, Hata T, Misawa T, Yanaga K. Segment IV approach for difficult laparoscopic cholecystectomy. *Ann Gastroenterol Surg.* 2019 Nov 11;4(2):170-174.