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ABSTRACT

Background: Minimally invasive and endoscopic techniques are increasingly being used by surgeons nowadays in the management of patients with cholecystitis and choledocholithiasis. However, there is a high failure rate in the extraction of large impacted stones using the conventional flexible choledochoscope by the laparoscopic approach. Improvisation of this technique will reduce the failure rate. The present study explored the safety, feasibility, and efficacy of a semirigid ureteroscope (SRUS) in the laparoscopic management of common bile duct (CBD) stones.

Methods: A prospective observational clinical study was carried out in an experienced GI surgical unit from January 2020 to December 2021. It included 36 patients diagnosed with radiologically proven gallstone disease with bile duct calculi who underwent Laparoscopic CBD exploration (LCBDE) and stone extraction using SRUS with lap cholecystectomy (LC) as a single-stage procedure. The success rate in terms of complete CBD clearance is the primary outcome measure. Post-procedure complications, 24 hr pain score, in-hospital stay, and patient satisfaction score are the secondary outcome measures.

Results: Mean age of the study subjects was 50.45±9.12 years. The most common clinical symptom was biliary colic followed by jaundice. The primary outcome measure of complete CBD clearance was achieved in 94%. A complication following surgery was bile leak in one patient (3%). There were no surgical site infections or T-tube related complications. The average WHO 24-hour pain score was 4.9±1.9. The mean in-hospital stay was 3.3±1.4 and the mean patient satisfaction score was 2.42±0.3.

Conclusion: Laparoscopic approach avoids the complications of endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP) sphincterotomy/sphinteroplasty and keeps the sphincter of Oddi (SOD) intact. LCBDE with SRUS is a safe and effective single-stage approach without any radiation hazards. The pneumatic lithotripter with its pneumatic ballistic effect is more efficacious, cost-effective, and safe as compared to other lithotripsy techniques. This lithotripter is capable of dealing with different varieties of stones regardless of their composition, size and degree of impaction. However, future comparative studies are needed to prove the superiority of this technique.

© 2022, Katheresan V. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

INTRODUCTION

Minimally invasive surgeries and endoscopic techniques are increasingly becoming standardized nowadays in hepatobiliary diseases. Choledocholithiasis is no exception to this and needs an individualized tailored approach depending on the clinical situation. Gallstones constitute a significant health problem worldwide including India, with an incidence ranging from 6% to 10% in the adult population [1]. Majority of the gallstones are cholesterol stones which are formed in the gallbladder and migrate down into the CBD as secondary stones [2]. CBD stones are found in 10-15% of patients having gallstone disease [3]. Compared to younger age groups, its incidence is much higher in older age groups. In patients aged more than 60 years with gallstone disease, concurrent CBD stones are seen in 20-25%. Serious consequences like cholangitis and gallstone pancreatitis may occur as a result of complete or incomplete bile duct obstruction of CBD stones [4].

CBD stones can be managed either by endoscopic or surgical approach [5]. Various studies have concluded that LCBDE is superior to endoscopic clearance in terms of safety and efficacy [6]. The National
Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidelines suggest that LCBDE is an APT and suitable approach in the management of CBD stones [7]. Traditionally LCBDE is performed using a flexible choledochoscope. However, it has inherent problems and maintenance is difficult [5,8]. In addition expensive equipment like cholangioscopy-guided electrohydraulic lithotripsy (EHL) or laser lithotripsy (LL) are needed as an adjunct to fracture large impacted stones. On the contrary, SRUS with pneumatic lithotripsy (that is used for urinary tract stones) is easily available at an affordable cost for managing large impacted CBD stones [8,9]. Hence this study was undertaken to investigate the efficacy, safety and feasibility of Semirigid ureteroscope in the laparoscopic management of common bile duct stones at a tertiary hospital.

MATERIALS AND METHOD

A prospective clinical study was conducted between January 2020 to December 2021 in our GI surgical unit. The study population included patients with radiologically proven CBD stones with a CBD diameter of >8 mm (arbitrarily) and irrespective of the LFT values. Post ERCP failure cases were also included in this study. Patients with CBD diameter <8 mm, acute cholangitis, severe acute biliary pancreatitis, evidence of cirrhosis, severe adhesive bowel syndrome due to prior open procedures and those unwilling or unfit to undergo laparoscopic surgery were excluded from the study.

The aim of our study was to describe the clinical presentation, biochemical data, and imaging characteristics in the study population. The primary outcome measure of the study was the success rate in terms of complete CBD clearance by the LCBDE approach using SRUS and mechanical lithotripter. The second outcome measures are intraoperative and post-procedure complications, 24 hr pain score, in-hospital stay, and patient satisfaction score, obtained on an indigenous scale of 1 to 3.

METODOLOGY:

The study was pursued after due approval from the Institutional Ethics Committee. A total of 36 patients with CBD stones diagnosed using a magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography (MRCP) were included in the study after obtaining an informed consent. The patient’s symptoms were recorded. All of them underwent baseline blood investigations, which included an LFT in particular. All were subjected to an ultrasound abdomen, an upper GI endoscopy, and an MRCP. The MRCP data were analyzed to assess the gallbladder (GB) wall thickness, number of CBD stones, CBD stone size, and CBD diameter. All the study participants underwent cardiorespiratory evaluation using an echocardiogram and a pulmonary function test. Those patients deemed fit for LCBDE were subjected to the procedure under general anaesthesia. A summary of the demographic data is depicted in Table 1.

Table 1: A Summary of the demographic profile of the study population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>No(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Total no of Patients(n)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Post Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography failure patients</td>
<td>8(33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Completed laparoscopically- Using semirigid ureteroscope</td>
<td>34(94%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Need for bilioenteric anastomosis – Lap choledochoduodenostomy</td>
<td>6(17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dormia basket extraction</td>
<td>18(50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pneumatic Lithotripter assisted patients</td>
<td>19(53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Patients with impacted stones in the distal CBD</td>
<td>11(31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Patients with CBD closure over T tube</td>
<td>28(78%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Conversions- (Dense adhesions, suspect Mirizzi)</td>
<td>2(6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mean operative time</td>
<td>186 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Intra op Complications – CBD injury</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Semirigid Ureteroscope Specifications:

The semirigid ureteroscope used for this procedure has a seven-degree telescope for improved visualization with an atraumatic tip design. It has a separate attachment with two irrigation channels and a two-way port for a single working channel. The working channel can simultaneously accommodate both a guidewire and a pneumatic lithotripter probe for stone manipulation. It has two irrigation ports for saline irrigation which is two-way and helps to dilate the CBD for improved visualization. The size of the scope is 9.8Fr x 430 mm with a 6.4 Fr working channel.

Pneumatic Lithotripter:

Pneumatic lithotripter works on the principle of electro-pneumatic ballast energy applied by the impact of the projected air on the CBD stone. The internal mechanism has no contact with water; therefore problems such as hanging and clogging are never encountered.

Operative Procedure:

Through a routine four-port approach for a standard laparoscopic cholecystectomy. Calot’s triangle is dissected and critical view of safety established. Cystic artery is then clipped and cut. Then the cystic duct is clipped as it prevents any migration of gallstones into the CBD during manipulation of the GB. Our preferred approach is the routine transcholedochal route after delineating the supra duodenal part of the CBD. A choledochotomy is made in the supraduodenal part of CBD. Then a separate 5 mm port is inserted in line with the CBD, midway between the epigastric and midclavicular port, through which the SRUS is inserted for CBD exploration.
to entangle the stones to be removed through the choledochotomy. After stone clearance, the SRUS is passed distally up to the ampulla to ensure complete distal clearance. SRUS is then passed proximally through the choledochotomy and any proximal stones are cleared in a similar fashion. The retrieved stone fragments are collected in an endo bag.

The procedure was completed laparoscopically in 34 patients using SRUS with complete ductal clearance. Laparoscopy was converted to open in 2 patients because of dense adhesions. All the patients were routinely given parenteral third-generation cephalosporins for 3 days, converted to oral antibiotics for the next two days, and discharged postoperatively. Patient demographic data, intraoperative findings, duration of in-hospital stay, post-intervention events, and Patient satisfaction scores were recorded.

RESULTS:
A total of 36 patients were included in the study. Among this, 19 (53.0%) were males, and 17 (47.0%) were females. The mean age of the study subjects was 50.45±9.12 years. The Majority of them presented with biliary colic (72.0%), followed by jaundice (50.0%). Other symptomatic presentations were as furnished in (Table 2). The majority of the study population had multiple stones (56%) with a stone diameter of more than 1 cm (75%), impacted stone in the distal CBD in 11 (31%) (Table 3). Among this, successful laparoscopic CBD exploration was performed in 34 patients, need for biliaryenteric anastomosis in the form of laparoscopic choledochoduodenostomy in 6 (17%) patients, dormia basket was used for stone retrieval in 18(50%) patients, pneumatic lithotripter was used for breaking the stone in 19(53%) patients. There were conversion to open CBDE in two patients because of dense adhesions and suspected Mirizzi syndrome. The mean operative time was 186 minutes. Postoperative bile leak was encountered in one patient. During the first 24h after surgery, the pain scores were measured by the WHO visual analogue scale and the mean was 4.9±1.9. The In-hospital stay was 3.3±1.4. The mean patient satisfaction score was 2.42±0.3; measured on an indigenous verbal rating scale of 0–3 during discharge. There were no postoperative T tube related complications (Table 4).

Table 2: Distribution of the study population based on presenting symptoms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presenting symptoms</th>
<th>N=36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biliary colic</td>
<td>26(72%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaundice</td>
<td>18 (50 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fever</td>
<td>14 (39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pruritus</td>
<td>12( 33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vomiting</td>
<td>4 (11%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Laboratory findings & MRCP data of the study subjects were as follows:

Table 3: Distribution of the study population based on presenting symptoms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laboratory parameters</th>
<th>N=36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total bilirubin</td>
<td>5.15± 4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alanine Aminotransferase (ALT)</td>
<td>96.04± 75.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspartate transaminase (AST)</td>
<td>70.72± 56.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alkaline Phosphatase (ALP)</td>
<td>327.6± 168.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MRCP characteristics</th>
<th>N=36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBD diameter &gt;8mm</td>
<td>36(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone diameter &gt; 10mm</td>
<td>27(75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone diameter ≤ 10mm</td>
<td>9(25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple stones</td>
<td>20(56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single stone</td>
<td>16(44%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under laparoscopic guidance, SRUS is inserted into the CBD to visualize the bile duct distal to the choledochotomy. Then larger sized stones more than 1 cm or those impacted in the distal CBD are broken with a mechanical lithotripter probe, and inserted through one of the working channel of the SRUS. The stones are broken by a pneumatic ballistic effect and the fragmented stones are either flushed into the duodenum or flushed out of the choledochotomy. The smaller fragments can be retrieved using grasping forceps. We also use a basket.
Laparoscopic CBD exploration (LCBDE) has been widely available, which is a single-stage procedure with shorter hospital stay and better patient satisfaction. LCBDE can be done either through a transcutaneous route or transcholedochal route. Transcutaneous route is preferred over the other.

The major difficulty faced in LCBDE is in the management of large impacted CBD stones with a flexible choledochoscope. A comparison of flexible choledochoscope with an SRUS is provided in the table. As the semirigid ureteroscope has been sturdier, durable with seamless working ability, we prefer it to break the large impacted stones.

A thorough search of the available literature for LCBDE using Ureteroscope and comparison with our study is furnished in the below table.

In the present study, the success rate was 94% and only 6% (2/34) were converted to open CBD exploration because of dense adhesions and suspected Mirizzi syndrome. No patients were converted due to equipment failure. Bile leak was the only pre-operative complication that was present in 3% (1/34) of the study population. In our study, the procedure was completed laparoscopically in 34/36 (94%) which includes 8(33%) post-ERCP failure patients. In a similar study by Muneer Khan et al, the procedure was completed laparoscopically in 32(86.5%)patients with 28(75.7%) post-ERCP failure cases and converted to open CBD in 5(13.5%) because of equipment failure, biliary leak, and suspected Mirizzi syndrome. No patients were converted due to equipment failure.

Laparoscopic CBD exploration with SRUS is easily available where much harder stones are broken during urological interventions. Compared to urinary tract stones, CBD stones are much easier to break. Hence we have utilized the SRUS instead of a flexible choledochoscope to address the CBD stones and in cases where biliary enteric anastomosis and suspected Mirizzi syndrome. No patients were converted due to difficulties in cannulation.

In the present study, the post-operative complications are noted in the study subjects. The limitation of our study is that it is an observational single centre study design. In the near future, further randomized controlled trials comparing the efficacy and safety of flexible choledochoscope with the SRUS will give further insights into the pros and cons of each technique or will prove the superiority of one technique over the other.

CONCLUSION:
Laparoscopic CBD exploration with SRUS is a single-stage, safe, feasible and effective approach, with excellent success rates without any radiation hazards. It is cost-effective and easily available. The laparoscopic approach avoids the complications of ERCP and keeps the SOD intact. It is especially preferred in multiple stones, large impacted stones, proximal stones, and in cases where biliary enteric anastomosis is required. The pneumatic lithotripter with its pneumatic ballistic effect is more efficacious, cost-effective, and safe as compared to other lithotripsy techniques. This lithotripter is capable of dealing with different varieties of stones regardless of their composition, size and degree of impaction. LCBDE with SRUS also has the advantage of good patient satisfaction, a shorter in-hospital stay and minimal morbidity. Thus SRUS can be considered a viable alternative to the flexible choledochoscope in the laparoscopic management of CBD stones. However, future RCTs will throw some light on the superiority of this technique over the flexible choledochoscope.

Table 4: Distribution of the study subjects based on primary and secondary outcome.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIMARY OUTCOME MEASURES</th>
<th>Success - Complete CBD Clearance by LCBDE using SRUS with/ without mechanical lithotripsy</th>
<th>Conversion to Open CBD exploration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POST-PROCEDURE COMPLICATIONS</td>
<td>34/36 (95%)</td>
<td>2/36 (5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUCCESSFUL CBD CLEANSING

- Bile leak
- Bleeding
- Wound infection
- T-tube related complications

In hospital stay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEAN±SD</th>
<th>4.9±1.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Patient Satisfaction Score

| MEAN±SD | 2.42±0.3 |

DISCUSSION:
CBD stones are the most common cause of nonmalignant bile duct obstruction. Approximately, 5 in 1000 people are reported to develop gallstones causing biliary obstruction [10]. CBD stones are either primary stones or secondary stones depending upon the site of origin. Secondary stones originate from the GB and migrate into the CBD. 10% to 15% of patients with GB stones have CBD stones [11]. Primary stones originate within the CBD itself. The diagnosis of primary CBD stones is by using Saharia’s criteria. Saharia’s criteria for diagnosis of primary CBD stones includes a past history of cholecystectomy with or without CBD exploration, at least a two years symptom-free interval following biliary tract intervention, easily crushable soft light brown stones in the CBD, and no evidence of a long cystic duct remnant or a biliary stricture resulting from the previous surgery [12].

CBD stones can be asymptomatic or symptomatic. The clinical symptoms of CBD stones include biliary colic, jaundice, and fever. CBD stones can present with life-threatening complications like cholangitis and pancreatitis as well [13]. The new ASGE 2019 high risk criteria for choledocholithiasis includes CBD stones on an ultrasound, total bilirubin >4mg/dl with dilated common bile duct, clinical evidence of ascending cholangitis which indicates to proceed with ERCP directly. Intermediate risk criteria includes abnormal liver function test, age ≥55, dilated CBD on ultrasound, where further evaluation with endoultrasound and MRCP is necessary [14]. The traditional method of managing CBD stones is by open CBD exploration. Open CBD exploration is associated with a higher incidence of surgical site infections and prolonged hospital stay, with an overall morbidity rate of 13% [15].

With the advent of endoscopic and laparoscopic techniques, open CBDE has become a salvage technique for the failure of minimally invasive methods. Similar to any other minimally invasive procedures, LCBDE has the advantage of faster patient recovery and better post-procedure patient comfort. The postoperative morbidity rates have also significantly reduced [16].

ERCP and stone retrieval has become a standard technique for managing CBD stones. But the pitfalls of ERCP are that larger stones cannot be handled with ease. ERCP requires expensive techniques like electrohydraulic, mechanical, or LASER lithotripsy as adjuncts to manage larger stones in the CBD. Moreover, such lithotripsy techniques are not universally available at all centers. Though the success rate of ERCP for clearing the CBD of smaller stones (<1cm) is considerable, the same cannot be reflected for larger (>1cm) and impacted CBD stones. In addition, the success of CBD cannulation and clearance depends on the individual expertise of the endoscopist. Throdestruction is present in case of ERCP techniques for both the patient and the endoscopy team [17]. In contrast, LCBDE with or without mechanical lithotripsy has no risk of radiation exposure and can handle larger-sized CBD stones effectively. The sphincter of Oddi (SOD) prevents reflux of duodenal contents into the bile duct. Compared to the laparoscopic approach which keeps the SOD intact, the endoscopic approach in managing CBD stones requires sphincterotomy or balloon sphincteroplasty and it enhances the rate of bactiaria due to duodenobiliary reflux [18]. In our study, the reasons for failure of the endoscopic approach to clear the CBD are due to distal CBD stricture, deformed duodenum, impacted stones, and periampullary diverticulum.
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