

ПРОЕКТ



Электронды базалардан соқыр ішектің асқынуы туралы мәліметтер табу



Орындаған: Базет Ж
Тобы: ҚДС 11-001-01к
Курс:3
Тексерген: Мартикенова Д

Есеп

20 жастағы науқасты жедел-жәрдем ауруханаға алып келді. Тексеріп қарағанда, оң жақ мықын аймағында ауыру сезімі байқалды. Анамнез барысында диарея, дене қызуының көтерілуі, тәбеттің төмендеуі анықталды. Науқас жүрген кезде ауруының үдейтінін айтты. Дәрігердің қойған диагнозы - соқыр ішек.

Хирургиялық ем тағайындады.

Хирургиялық емнің орнына эндоскопиялық ем тағайындауға болады ма?


РІКО бойынша

- **Р** - 26 жастағы науқас
- **І** - хирургиялық ем тағайындау
- **С** - Эндоскопиялық ем
- **О** - Денсаулықтың жақсаруы



КІЛТ СӨЗІ: Соқыр ішектің асқынуы

KEY WORDS: Complication of appendicitis



PUBMED САЙТЫНЫҢ БАСТАПҚЫ БЕТІ

Firefox | Глюкозамин и хонд... | Хондроитин и Глюк... | Ответы на вопросы ... | Medicus Amicus - Гл... | Переводчик онлай... | Effects of glucosami... | Home - PubMed - NC... | + | - | X


Яндекс | www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed | Перевести | USD HBRK 150,25

NCBI Resources How To Sign in to NCBI

PubMed.gov PubMed [Search] Advanced Help

US National Library of Medicine
National Institutes of Health

Filters activated: Free full text available, published in the last 5 years, Humans, Meta-Analysis, Systematic Reviews [Clear all](#)



PubMed

PubMed comprises more than 22 million citations for biomedical literature from MEDLINE, life science journals, and online books. Citations may include links to full-text content from PubMed Central and publisher web sites.

Using PubMed

[PubMed Quick Start Guide](#)

[Full Text Articles](#)

[PubMed FAQs](#)

[PubMed Tutorials](#)

[New and Noteworthy](#)

PubMed Tools

[PubMed Mobile](#)

[Single Citation Matcher](#)

[Batch Citation Matcher](#)

[Clinical Queries](#)

[Topic-Specific Queries](#)

More Resources

[MeSH Database](#)

[Journals in NCBI Databases](#)

[Clinical Trials](#)

[E-Utilities](#)

[LinkOut](#)

Windows taskbar: Mail.Ru Are..., Проект Ан..., Презентац..., Home - Pu..., EN, 17:51

КІЛТ СӨЗ БОЙЫНША ІЗДЕУ

Show additional filters Display Settings: Summary, 20 per page, Sorted by Recently Added Send to: Filters: Manage Filters

Clear all Results: 1 to 20 of 69 Selected: 1 << First < Prev Page 1 of 4 Next > Last >>

Filters activated: Free full text available, published in the last 10 years, Humans. Clear all to show 910 items.

Single-incision laparoscopic appendectomy is comparable to conventional laparoscopic and laparotomic appendectomy: our single center single surgeon experience.

Ceci F, Orsini S, Tudisco A, Avallone M, Aiuti F, Di Girolamo V, Stefanelli F, De Angelis F, Martellucci A, Costantino A, Di Grazia C, Nicodemi S, Cipriani B, Napoleoni A, Mosillo R, Corelli S, Casciaro G, Spaziani E, Stagnitti F. G Chir. 2013 Jul-Aug;34(7-8):216-9. doi: 10.11138/gchir/2013.34.7.216. PMID: 24091177 [PubMed - indexed for MEDLINE] Free PMC Article

Clinical outcomes compared between laparoscopic and open appendectomy in pregnant women.

Chung JC, Cho GS, Shin EJ, Kim HC, Song OP. Can J Surg. 2013 Oct;56(5):341-6. PMID: 24067519 [PubMed - indexed for MEDLINE] Free PMC Article

Perforation of Meckel's diverticulum by foreign body, a rare complication.

Cotirlet A, Anghel R, Tincu E, Rau S, Motoc I, Popa E. Chirurgia (Bucur). 2013 May-Jun;108(3):411-3. PMID: 23790794 [PubMed - indexed for MEDLINE] Free Article

Hematocele after laparoscopic appendectomy.

New feature Try the new Display Settings option - Sort by Relevance

Titles with your search terms Laparoscopic appendectomy for perforated appendicitis in children ha [J Pediatr Surg. 2013] Superior mesenteric vein thrombosis as a complication of acut [Clin J Gastroenterol. 2013] Septic thrombophlebitis of the porto-mesenteric veins as a complic [World J Gastroenterol. 2008] See more...

119 free full-text articles in PubMed Central Review Laparoscopic versus open appendectomy in ot [J Minim Access Surg. 2014] Delayed appendectomy versus early appendectomy in the [World J Emerg Surg. 2014] Para-iliac actinomycetoma presenting as sarcoma, a late com [Int J Surg Case Rep. 2014] See all (119)

КЕРЕКТІ МАҚАЛАНЫ ТАҢДАП АЛУ

pubmed.com - 49 тыс. резуль x Single-incision laparoscopic app x Переводчик Google x +

www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24091177

Язык этой страницы английский Хотите перевести ее? Перевести Нет Настройки x

NCBI Resources How To Sign in to NCBI

PubMed US National Library of Medicine National Institutes of Health PubMed Search Help

Advanced

Display Settings: Abstract Send to: FREE FULL TEXT Free in PMC free full-text archive

Chir. 2013 Jul-Aug;34(7-8):216-9. doi: 10.111138/gchir/2013.34.7.216.

Single-incision laparoscopic appendectomy is comparable to conventional laparoscopic and laparotomic appendectomy: our single center single surgeon experience.

Ceci F, Orsini S, Tudisco A, Avallone M, Aiuti F, Di Girolamo V, Stefanelli F, De Angelis F, Martellucci A, Costantino A, Di Grazia C, Nicodemi S, Cipriani B, Napoleoni A, Mosillo R, Corelli S, Casciaro G, Spaziani E, Stagnitti F.

Abstract

Several studies have demonstrated the clinical and technical benefits of the laparoscopic surgery for complicated and uncomplicated appendicitis. Our retrospective study included 12 patient who underwent SILS appendectomy (SILS-A), 14 who received conventional laparoscopic surgery (VL-A), and 12 who received laparotomic appendectomy (OA); performed in all cases by the same surgeon (C.F.). The aim of this study was the comparison between this three different surgical techniques on same features: post operative leukocytosis, post operative pain, need abdominal drainage, esthetic viewpoint, incidence of complication, hospital stay. The results showed no significant differences between SILS-A and VLS-A, while an evident improvement shows versus O-A, even though not statistically significative. SILS was more effective in decreasing the risk of postoperative wound infection.

PMID: 24091177 [PubMed - indexed for MEDLINE] PMCID: PMC3915604 Free PMC Article

Publication Types, MeSH Terms

LinkOut - more resources

PubMed Commons PubMed Commons home

0 comments

PubReader

Journal List > G Chir > v.34(7-8); Jul-Aug 2013 > PMC3915604

PubReader format: click here to try



Formats:

Article | PubReader | ePub (beta) | PDF (229K)

Related citations in PubMed

- Impact of previous abdominal surgery on laparoscopic appendectomy for acute appendicitis. [Surg Endosc. 2007]
Transumbilical laparoscopic assisted appendectomy compared with laparoscopic and laparotomic approa [Arq Bras Cir Dig. 2012]
Comparison of outcomes of laparoscopic and open appendectomy in management of uncomplicated and complicat [Ann Surg. 2011]
Meta-analysis of studies comparing single-incision laparoscopic appendectomy and conventional multiport lapar [J Surg Res. 2013]
Laparoscopic appendectomy for complicated appendicitis: an evaluation of postoperative factors. [Surg Endosc. 2004]

Links

PubMed

G Chir. 2013 Jul-Aug; 34(7-8): 216-219.
Published online 2013 October 2.

PMCID: PMC3915604

Single-incision laparoscopic appendectomy is comparable to conventional laparoscopic and laparotomic appendectomy: our single center single surgeon experience

F. CECI, S. ORSINI, A. TUDISCO, M. AVALLONE, F. AIUTI, V. DI GIROLAMO, F. STEFANELLI, F. DE ANGELIS, A. MARTELLUCCI, A. COSTANTINO, C. DI GRAZIA, S. NICODEMI, B. CIPRIANI, A. NAPOLEONI, R. MOSILLO, S. CORELLI, G. CASCIARO, E. SPAZIANI, and F. STAGNITI

Author information Copyright and License information

Summary

Go to: [dropdown]

Several studies have demonstrated the clinical and technical benefits of the laparoscopic surgery for complicated and uncomplicated appendicitis.

Our retrospective study included 12 patient who underwent SILS appendectomy (SILS-A), 14 who received conventional laparoscopic surgery (VL-A), and 12 who received laparotomic appendectomy (O-A); performed in all cases by the same surgeon (C.F.). The aim of this study was the comparison

See reviews...

See all...

A); performed in all cases by the same surgeon (C.F.). The aim of this study was the comparison between this three different surgical techniques on same features: post operative leukocytosis, post operative pain, need abdominal drainage, esthetic viewpoint, incidence of complication, hospital stay.

The results showed no significant differences between SILS-A and VLS-A, while an evident improvement shows versus O-A, even though not statistically significative. SILS was more effective in decreasing the risk of postoperative wound infection.

Keywords: SILS appendectomy, Conventional laparoscopic appendectomy, Open appendectomy, Post-operative complications

Introduction

Go to:

Laparoscopic appendectomy is now considered the gold standard for appendectomy, even in complicated appendicitis (1). In numerous studies, when the conventional laparoscopic appendectomy (VL-A) is compared with laparotomy (O-A), it has advantages of reduced pain, reduced hospital stay and enhanced aesthetic effect (2). Multiple comparative analyses have recently described single-port or single-incision surgery for treatment of acute appendicitis (3,4).

In studies comparing single-incision laparoscopic surgery for appendectomy (SILS-A) with conventional laparoscopic appendectomy, although early pain was observed, the former was superior from the aesthetic viewpoint, and the incidence of complications was not different.

In this study we examine the application and the safety of SILS-A by comparing single-incision laparoscopic an appendectomy whit a conventional laparoscopic appendectomy and laparotomy.

Methods

Go to:

The retrospective study involves 12 patients who received laparoscopic single-port appendectomy (SILS-A), compared with 14 patients who received conventional laparoscopic appendectomy (VL-A) and 12 patients who received laparotomic appendectomy performed by the same surgeon (C.F.) at a single institution. Written informed consent was provided by all the patients. Medical records were used to conduct a retrospective comparative analysis of sex, age, body mass index (BMI), duration of hospital

Recent Activity

Turn Off Clear

- Single-incision laparoscopic appendectomy is comparable to conventional laparosc... PMC
- Single-incision laparoscopic appendectomy is comparable to conventional laparosc... PubMed
- complication of appendicitis AND (free full text[sb] AND "last 10... (69) PubMed
- complication of appendicitis AND (free full text[sb] AND "last 10... (124) PubMed
- complication of appendicitis AND (free full text[sb] AND "last 5 ... (90) PubMed

See more...

conduct a retrospective comparative analysis of sex, age, body mass index (BMI), duration of hospital stay, bowel movements, presence of complications.

Subjects were diagnosed based on medical history, physical examination, abdominal ultrasonography.

Surgical technique

Surgery was performed in all patients after the insertion of a Foley catheter under general anaesthesia.

All patients received a 2nd generation cephalosporine intravenously at induction of anaesthesia. After surgery, patients were administered with two or more further doses of antibiotics. The umbilicus was cleaned thoroughly before the incision in cases of laparoscopy. In VL-A a small midline incision inside the umbilicus and the fascia was made and an Hasson's trocar was inserted to obtain pneumoperitoneum at intra-abdominal pressure of 10 to 12 mmHg. A 30°, 5 mm laparoscope was used to visualize the abdominal cavity. A 5 mm trocar was inserted, relying on the laparoscopic light source and avoiding contact with the abdominal wall vessels, in the immediately sovrapubic area on both sides of the lower abdomen. Patient position was 20° Trendelenburg and tilted in left lateral position to 15° to 20° to secure easy access to the appendix. The operation was performed using the standard procedures of laparoscopic appendectomy. The mesoappendix was dissected by ultrasonic shears (Ultracision, Ethicon Endo-Surgery Inc., Cincinnati, OH, USA), and the base of appendix was ligated using two endoloops (Ethicon Inc., Sommerville, NJ, USA) and cut with Ultracision. The resected appendix was removed through the Hasson's trocar with the aid of a bag (Endocatch, Ethicon Endo-Surgery Inc., Cincinnati, OH, USA). The umbilical fascia was closed with 2-0 Vicryl sutures, and the umbilical and sovrapubic skin sutures was made with 3-0 silk stiches. When request a drain tube was inserted through the right 5mm sovrapubic trocar.

In SILS-A a 2-2,5 cm longitudinal incision was made through the umbilicus and the fascia and peritoneum were opened under direct vision. The SILS port (Covidien, Norwalk, CT, USA) was then inserted with three 5 mm cannulas at different heights to reduced clashes between their own, and CO₂ insufflated through a three way catheter to achieve pneumoperitoneum. Patient position and surgical technique performed with basic laparoscopic instruments, was the same that in VLS-A. Drain tube was inserted through an adjunctive 5mm trocar positioned in the right iliac fossa.

G Chir

In SILS-A a 2-2,5 cm longitudinal incision was made through the umbilicus and the fascia and peritoneum were opened under direct vision. The SILS port (Covidien, Norwalk, CT, USA) was then inserted with three 5 mm cannulas at different heights to reduced clashes between their own, and CO₂ insufflated through a three way catheter to achieve pneumoperitoneum. Patient position and surgical technique performed with basic laparoscopic instruments, was the same that in VLS-A. Drain tube was inserted through an adjunctive 5mm trocar positioned in the right iliac fossa.

The surgical technique in O-A was that described by Mc-Burney with transverse incision in the right sovrapubic area (Kustner incision). Drainage was inserted through another incision below.

All patients were allowed a clear fluid diet after subjective full recovery from general anaesthesia; and diet was advanced as tolerated.

Results

Go to:

All of 12 SILS-A patients were female, 11 (91,6%) aged <30 and 1 (8,4%) from 61 to 70 years old, mean age 23,3 years. 6 (42,8%) of the VLS-A patients were male, 8 (57,1%) female; 10 (71,4%) aged from < 20 to 30 and 4 (28,5%) from 41 to 80 years old, with mean of 34,16 for male and 32,12 for female. Of O-A group 7 (58,3%) were male and 5 (41,6%) female with age from <20 to 30 in 9 patients (75%), 2 (16,6%) from 41 to 60 and 1(8,4%) from 71 to 80 years old; mean age was 38,6 for male and 17,2 years for female. 2 of O-A, 6 of VLS-A and 11 of SILS-A group had normal BMI, 7, 4 and 0 respectively was overweight, 1 for each one obese ([Table 1](#)).

[Table 1](#)
FEATURES AND RESULTS.

Postoperative period was characterized by fever only in 4 (30%) of 12 cases of SILS-A, 6 (43%) of the 14 VLS-A and 5 (42%) in O-A. 58,3 % of SILS-A had neutrofil leukocytosis in the 1st post-operative day (from 11.05 to 14.48 ×10³ u/l), as 42% in VLS-A (from 11.47 to 26.36 ×10³u/l), and 41,6% in O-A group (from 9.25 to 21.83 ×10³). The leukocytosis decreased in 2nd post-op day in all groups.

G Chir

group (from 9.25 to 21.83×10^3). The leukocytosis decreased in 2nd post-op day in all groups. Abdominal drainage was placed in 3 (25%) of SILS-A cases and in 3 (21,4%) of VLS-A; in each of that cases it was removed in 2nd postoperative day. The drainage placed in 4 (33,3%) of O-A cases was removed in 2nd p.o.d. in 1(25%) of it, in 7th in another 1(25%) and in 2 (50%) in 3rd p.o.d. Stool passage occurred in 58,3% (7/12) of SILS-A and in 57,1% of VLS-A (8/14) during p.o.d. two; in 4/12 (33,3%) of O-A in p.o.d. three.

In 2 cases of SILS-A group also ovarian benign cysts were removed. In the VLS-A an haemorrhagic ovarian cyst in one case, and a 6 mm nodule of the cecum (negative for neoplasia) in another case were removed. In O-A group derotation of a volvulus of sigma (detected by a CT scan), and excision of an ovarian cyst were made.

Sutures of surgical wounds were removed in 8th postoperative day in all groups. None of the SILS-A patients show a wound complications. In VLS-A one case of FID abdominal wall abscess; a wound seroma in O-A.

Mean hospital stay was 3,5 days in VLS-A, 4 days in SILS-A and in O-A.

In immediate postoperative days we had a good pain control, as after the discharge. We observed postoperative complications in 1 (7,1%) of VLS-A, a pelvic peritonitis treated with laparotomy and abdominal drainage and discharged in 10th p.o.d.; 1 (8,3%) of O-A group, a IMA arose during the 4th p.o.d. and the patient was transferred to UTIC.

Discussion Go to:

Laparoscopic appendectomy is widely performed for the treatment of acute appendicitis. Single port laparoscopic appendectomy is rapidly gaining momentum due to improved cosmesis and reduced parietal trauma. In our study the clinical data of SILS-A was comparable to that of conventional laparoscopic appendectomy, with no significant differences in hospital stay, bowel movements, return to diet and complication rate.

Clinical evidence and consensus development conferences have stated, so far, some evidence regarding the advantages of VLS-A when compared to open appendectomy (O-A). In comparison with a

G Chir

G Chir

parietal trauma. In our study the clinical data of SILS-A was comparable to that of conventional laparoscopic appendectomy, with no significant differences in hospital stay, bowel movements, return to diet and complication rate.

Clinical evidence and consensus development conferences have stated, so far, some evidence regarding the advantages of VLS-A when compared to open appendectomy (O-A). In comparison with a laparotomy, laparoscopic appendectomy reduces postoperative pain. It reduces not only the tissue injury of patients but also irritation of the intestine and, thus, reduces adhesion that may occur after surgery.

The same was found in our data comparing SILS-A, VLS-A and O-A.

This type of surgery can be a very attractive alternative to patients, especially in the younger population. As laparoscopic minimal invasive surgery draws attention, interest in non-scar surgical methods is on the rise, and together with the development of equipment single incision surgical methods have been applied to diverse disease in the abdominal cavity. Single Incision Laparoscopic Surgery for an appendectomy makes an incision window through the umbilicus in most cases. It is applied because the umbilicus is located in the middle of the abdomen, so diverse intrabdominal approaches can be performed, blood vessels and nerves are absent, so incision windows can be readily created; even after surgery, wounds became depressed within the umbilicus and, thus, may considered as a congenital existing scar.

Reviewing the reports that compared SILS-A with VLS-A, the former was found to reduce soars, thus it is advantageous from cosmetic improvement. The aesthetic satisfaction level was not statically significant in single incision laparoscopic surgery for an appendectomy. However, in patients who underwent SILS-A statistically significant satisfaction levels were shown in literature, in comparison with patients who underwent VLS-A or O-A.

Some cases may require drainage, making the term "single port" meaningless. Although there have been reports of drainage catheters put trough the umbilicus, we chose to add a sovrapubic incision.

In conclusion, no significant differences were found when parameters compare between SILS-A an VLS-A, while an evident improvement shows versus O-A, even though not statistically significant. SILS-

with patients who underwent VLS-A or O-A.

Some cases may require drainage, making the term "single port" meaningless. Although there have been reports of drainage catheters put trough the umbilicus, we chose to add a sovrapubic incision.

In conclusion, no significant differences were found when parameters compare between SILS-A an VLS-A, while an evident improvement shows versus O-A, even though not statistically significant. SILS-A and VLS-A showed not much difference in relation to surgical outcomes and performance, but SILS was more effective in decreasing the risk of postoperative wound infection.

Because of the small number of patients compared between the three technique, supplementary studies need to performed in the future to acquire more objective results.

References

Go to: [icon]

1. Masoomi H, Nguyen NT, Dolich MO, Wikholm L, Naderi N, Mills S, Stamos MJ. Comparison of laparoscopic versus open appendectomy for acute nonperforated and perforated appendicitis in the obese population. *The American Journal of Surgery*. 2011;202:733-739. [PubMed]
2. D'ambra L, Berti S, Bonfante P, Bianchi C, Magistrelli P, Bianco A, Gianquinto D, Feleppa C, Deidda E, Falco E. Laparoscopic appendectomy for complicated acute appendicitis. *G Chir*. 2011;32(4):181-184. [PubMed]
3. Rehman H, Rao AM, Ahmed I. Single incision versus conventional multi-incision appendiceotomy for suspected appendicitis. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2011;(7) [PubMed]
4. Chouillard E, Dache A, Torcivia A, Helmy N, Ruseykin I, Gumbs A. Single-incision laparoscopic appendectomy for acute appendicitis: a preliminary experience. *Surg Endosc*. 2010;24:1861-1865. [PubMed]
5. Ferranti F, Corona F, Siani LM, Stefanuto A, Aguzzi D, Santoro E. Laparoscopic versus open appendectomy for treatment of complicated appendicitis. *G Chir*. 2012;33(8/9):263-267. [PubMed]
6. Saia M, Buja A, Baldovin T, Callegaro G, Sandona P, Mantoan D, Baldo V. Trend, variability, and outcome of open vs. laparoscopic appendectomy based on a large administrative database. *Surg Endosc*.

Chir
G Chir

outcome of open vs. laparoscopic appendectomy based on a large administrative database. *Surg Endosc.* 2012;26:2353-2359. [\[PubMed\]](#)

7. Gill RS, Shi X, Al-Adra DP, Birch DW, Karmali S. Single-incision appendectomy is comparable to conventional laparoscopic appendectomy: a systematic review and pooled analysis. *Surg Laparosc Endosc Percutan Tech.* 2012;22:319. [\[PubMed\]](#)

8. Rehman H, Mathews T, Ahmed I. A review of minimally invasive single-port/incision laparoscopic appendectomy. *J Laparoendosc Adv Surg Tech A.* 2012;22:641. [\[PubMed\]](#)

9. Cho MS, Min BS, Hong YK, Lee WJ. Single-site versus conventional laparoscopic appendectomy: comparison of short-term operative outcomes. *Surg Endosc.* 2011;25:36. [\[PubMed\]](#)

10. Tiwari MM, Reynoso JF, Tsang AW, Oleynikov D. Comparison of Outcomes of Laparoscopic and Open Appendectomy in Management of Uncomplicated and Complicated Appendicitis. *Ann Surg.* 2011;254:927-932. [\[PubMed\]](#)

11. Pisanu A, Porceddu G, Reccia I, Saba A, Ucheddu A. Meta-analysis of studies comparing single-incision laparoscopic appendectomy and conventional multiport laparoscopic appendectomy. *J Surg Res.* 2013 Apr 2; [\[PubMed\]](#)

12. Wei B, Qi CL, Chen TF, et al. Laparoscopic versus open appendectomy for acute appendicitis: a meta-analysis. *Surg Endosc.* 2011;25:1199. [\[PubMed\]](#)

13. Masoomi H, Mills S, Dolich MO, Ketana N, Carmichael JC, Nguyen NT, Stamos MJ. Does Laparoscopic Appendectomy Impart an Advantage over Open Appendectomy in Elderly Patients? *World J Surg.* 2012;36:1534-1539. [\[PubMed\]](#)

14. Woodham BL, Cox MR, Eslick GD. Evidence to support the use of laparoscopic over open appendectomy for obese individuals: a meta-analysis. *Surg Endosc.* 2012;26:2566-2570. [\[PubMed\]](#)

15. Southgate E, Vousden N, Karthikesalingam A, Markar SR, Black S, Zaidi A. Laparoscopic vs Open Appendectomy in Older Patients. *Arch Surg.* 2012;147(6):557-562. [\[PubMed\]](#)

16. Gadhikar D, Sanyal MC, Lumbha MA, Reddy R, Ghosh D, Gohla F, Ciampetta A, Ghosh S, Sahasr...

9. Cho MS, Min BS, Hong YK, Lee WJ. Single-site versus conventional laparoscopic appendectomy: comparison of short-term operative outcomes. *Surg Endosc.* 2011;25:36. [[PubMed](#)]
10. Tiwari MM, Reynoso JF, Tsang AW, Oleynikov D. Comparison of Outcomes of Laparoscopic and Open Appendectomy in Management of Uncomplicated and Complicated Appendicitis. *Ann Surg.* 2011;254:927-932. [[PubMed](#)]
11. Pisanu A, Porceddu G, Reccia I, Saba A, Ucheddu A. Meta-analysis of studies comparing single-incision laparoscopic appendectomy and conventional multiport laparoscopic appendectomy. *J Surg Res.* 2013 Apr 2; [[PubMed](#)]
12. Wei B, Qi CL, Chen TF, et al. Laparoscopic versus open appendectomy for acute appendicitis: a meta-analysis. *Surg Endosc.* 2011;25:1199. [[PubMed](#)]
13. Masoomi H, Mills S, Dolich MO, Ketana N, Carmichael JC, Nguyen NT, Stamos MJ. Does Laparoscopic Appendectomy Impart an Advantage over Open Appendectomy in Elderly Patients? *World J Surg.* 2012;36:1534-1539. [[PubMed](#)]
14. Woodham BL, Cox MR, Eslick GD. Evidence to support the use of laparoscopic over open appendectomy for obese individuals: a meta-analysis. *Surg Endosc.* 2012;26:2566-2570. [[PubMed](#)]
15. Southgate E, Vousden N, Karthikesalingam A, Markar SR, Black S, Zaidi A. Laparoscopic vs Open Appendectomy in Older Patients. *Arch Surg.* 2012;147(6):557-562. [[PubMed](#)]
16. Codrich D, Scarpa MG, Lembo MA, Pederiva F, Olenik D, Gobbo F, Giannotta A, Cherti S, Schleef J. Transumbilical laparo-assisted appendectomy: a safe operation for the whole spectrum of appendicitis in children-a single-centre experience. *Minim Invasive Surg.* 2013;2013:216416. [[PMC free article](#)] [[PubMed](#)]

Articles from Il Giornale di Chirurgia are provided here courtesy of **CIC Edizioni Internazionali**

Тақырыптың аты:

Бір-кесінді лапараскопиялық аппендэктомиямен
кәдімгі лапараскопиялық және лапаратомдық соқыр
ішекпен салыстыру: белгілі бір тәжірибелі
хирургтың бірыңғай орталығы



Incision laparoscopic appendectomy is comparable to
conventional laparoscopic and laparotomic appendectomy:
our single center single surgeon experience

Зерттеу жүргізілетін орын: Pontine Campus - “A. Fiorini”
Hospital, Terracina, Latina, Italy, General Surgery Department,
“Sapienza” University of Rome, Rome, Italy (Director: Prof. F.
Stagnitti)

Авторлары: [F. CECI](#), [S. ORSINI](#), [A. TUDISCO](#), [M. AVALLONE](#), [F. AIUTI](#), [V. DI GIROLAMO](#), [F. STEFANELLI](#), [F. DE ANGELIS](#), [A. MARTELLUCCI](#), [A. COSTANTINO](#), [C. DI GRAZIA](#), [S. NICODEMI](#), [B. CIPRIANI](#), [A. NAPOLEONI](#), [R. MOSILLO](#), [S. CORELLI](#), [G. CASCIARO](#), [E. SPAZIANI](#), and [F. STAGNITTI](#)

Шығарылымға шыққан уақыт: 2013жыл 2 қазан

Әдіс: ретроспективті(болған жағдайды-бақылау) әдісі.



● **Методика**

- Ретроспективное исследование включает в себя 12 пациентов, которые получали лапароскопической один порт аппендицита (SILS-A), по сравнению с 14 больных, получавших обычную Лапароскопическая аппендэктомия (ВЛ-А) и 12 пациентов, которые получали лапаротомной аппендицита в исполнении того же хирурга (CF) в одно учреждение. Письменное информированное согласие было предоставлено всех пациентов. Медицинские документы были использованы для проведения ретроспективного сравнительного анализа пола, возраста, индекса массы тела (ИМТ), продолжительность пребывания в стационаре, испражнения, наличие осложнений.
- Субъекты были диагностированы на основании истории болезни, медицинский осмотр, УЗИ брюшной полости.

● **Methods**

- The retrospective study involves 12 patients who received laparoscopic single-port appendectomy (SILS-A), compared with 14 patients who received conventional laparoscopic appendectomy (VL-A) and 12 patients who received laparotomic appendectomy performed by the same surgeon (C.F.) at a single institution. Written informed consent was provided by all the patients. Medical records were used to conduct a retrospective comparative analysis of sex, age, body mass index (BMI), duration of hospital stay, bowel movements, presence of complications.
- Subjects were diagnosed based on medical history, physical examination, abdominal ultrasonography.

Результаты

Все 12 пациентов SILS-A были женщины, 11 (91,6%) в возрасте <30 и 1 (8,4%) от 61 до 70 лет, средний возраст 23,3 лет. 6 (42,8%) пациентов VLS-A были мужчины, 8 (57,1%) женщины, 10 (71,4%) в возрасте от <20 до 30 и 4 (28,5%) от 41 до 80 лет, с средним 34,16 для мужчин и 32,12 для женщин. ОА группы 7 (58,3%) были мужского пола и 5 (41,6%) женщин с возрастом от <20 до 30 у 9 пациентов (75%), 2 (16,6%) от 41 до 60 и 1 (8,4%) от 71 до 80 лет, средний возраст был 38,6 для мужчин и 17,2 лет для женщин. 2 ОА, 6 из VLS-A и 11-А SILS группе имели нормальный ИМТ, 7, 4 и 0 соответственно был избыточный вес, один для каждого из них ожирением

Results

- All of 12 SILS-A patients were female, 11 (91,6%) aged <30 and 1 (8,4%) from 61 to 70 years old, mean age 23,3 years. 6 (42,8%) of the VLS-A patients were male, 8 (57,1%) female; 10 (71,4%) aged from < 20 to 30 and 4 (28,5%) from 41 to 80 years old, with mean of 34,16 for male and 32,12 for female. Of O-A group 7 (58,3%) were male and 5 (41,6%) female with age from <20 to 30 in 9 patients (75%), 2 (16,6%) from 41 to 60 and 1(8,4%) from 71 to 80 years old; mean age was 38,6 for male and 17,2 years for female. 2 of O-A, 6 of VLS-A and 11 of SILS-A group had normal BMI, 7, 4 and 0 respectively was overweight, 1 for each one obese*



- **ЗАКЛЮЧЕНИЕ:**

Лапароскопическая аппендэктомия является клинически безопасная и эффективная процедура во всех триместрах беременности и должны рассматриваться в качестве стандартного лечения альтернативы ОА. Дальнейшая оценка в том числе перспективных рандомизированных клинических исследований, сравнивающих LA с ОА необходимы, чтобы подтвердить наши результаты.

- **CONCLUSION:**

- Laparoscopic appendectomy is a clinically safe and effective procedure in all trimesters of pregnancy and should be considered as a standard treatment alternative to OA. Further evaluation including prospective randomized clinical trials comparing LA with OA are needed to confirm our results.

Өз пікірім

Менің ойымша, адам өз денсаулығын күтіп, яғни
ширығып, қимылға икемді, жеке бас гигиенасын сақтаса,
тамақтану тәртібі дұрыс болса соқыр ішек болмас еді.
Сондықтан да, жыныс пен жасқа қарамай белсенді
өмірге аяқ басайық!))))))))))

Назар аударғандарыңызға рахмет

