



Comparison of 3-Port Versus 4-Port Laproscopic Cholecystectomy- A Prospective Comparative Study

Authors

Shekhar Gogna¹, Priya Goyal², Prateek Thakur³, Sonia Goyal⁴

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Surgery, PGIMS Rohtak, Haryana , India- 124001

Email: drshekhar23@hotmail.com

Res: 478-GF, Omaxe city, rohatk , India 124001.

²Resident, Department of Surgery, PGIMS Rohtak, Haryana , India- 124001

Email: goyalpriya@hotmail.com

Res: 478-GF, Omaxe city, rohatk , India 124001

³Resident, Department of Surgery, PGIMS Rohtak, Haryana , India- 124001

Email: prat7ms@gmail.com

⁴Intern, Department of Surgery, PGIMS Rohtak, Haryana, India- 124001

Abstract

Laposcopic cholecystectomy (LC) is gold standard treatment for gall stones. Since its birth in 1987 it has undergone various changes, reduced number of ports from standard 4-port LC to 3-port LC being one of them. Three-port LC has been shown to be equal to standard 4-port LC in terms of safety, complications, pain, hospital stay. we conducted a prospective comparative study amongst these two technique. 3-port LC was found to be superior in terms of less post operative pain, less need of analgesia, shorter hospital stay and ease of dissection. We concluded that 3-port LC is a better operative technique than 4-port LC.

Key Words –3-port Laproscopic cholecystectomy, Benefits, Safety

Introduction

Standard laparoscopic cholecystectomy (LC) is done by using 4 trocars. Exposing Calot's triangle for satisfactory anatomical details is of paramount importance in safe and proper surgery. The fourth (lateral) trocar is used to grasp the fundus of the gallbladder so as to expose Calot's triangle. The use of the fourth trocar which is generally used for

fundic retraction in the American technique seemed unnecessary by some surgeons.¹ and LC can be performed safely without using it. With widespread advent of laparoscopic cholecystectomy comes the advent of reduction in port size.² Most of these studies have demonstrated the advantages of 3-port LC including less postoperative pain, early hospital discharge, less

analgesic requirement. We did a prospective comparative clinical study to investigate the safety, and benefit of 3-port LC versus standard 4-port LC in our setup. Benefits associated with 3-port LC were compared in terms of pain on Visual analogue scale (VAS), requirement of analgesia and hospital discharge.

Materials & Methods

This was comparative prospective study performed in the Department of Surgery, from January 2014 to January 2015. A total of 50 patients were diagnosed to have gall stone disease and confirmed on ultrasound examination, who are willing to participate in the study and giving valid consent were included in the study. They were allocated into two groups of three-port LC group and four-port LC group each 25 patients.

Exclusion criteria

Patients with suspected common bile duct stones, history of obstructive jaundice, gallstone pancreatitis, acute cholecystitis or

Pre-operative work-up was carried out, which included complete history, clinical examination and standard laboratory investigations for the fitness of surgery including ultrasonography of abdomen, Liver function tests.

In standard four-port technique one 10 mm umbilical port for camera was made after creating capnopneumoperitoneum with closed technique, another 10 mm epigastric port 5 cm below the xiphisternum (main working port), one 5 mm port in the right midclavicular line 5 cm below the right costal margin (accessory working port) and

another 5 mm port i.e., the fourth port in the right anterior axillary line at the level of umbilicus were used. In three-port technique the fourth port (which was put at right anterior axillary line at the level of umbilicus) was not used (Figure 1). The outcomes were measured in terms of operating time, conversion rate, intra-operative complications, pain score, analgesic requirement and hospital stay. Intra-operative complications include gall bladder wall perforation, bile leak, bleeding from liver bed, iatrogenic liver injury and bile duct injury. In all patients the same analgesics were used. Pain score was measured using visual analog score (VAS) every 12 and 24 hourly. A VAS score 1-3 is called as low pain score (mild) and 4-10 as high pain score (severe).

Statistical tests

The Student's *t* test was used to evaluate the difference in each parameter. A *p* value <0.05 was considered statistically significant. Statistical Package for Social Science version 19.0 for Windows (SPSS, Chicago, Illinois) was used for statistical analysis.

Observations

On comparing two groups we made the following observations:

1. Operating time: Mean operating time in 3-port group was 38.3 min and it was 41.0 min in 4-port group. This comparison was statistically non significant (*p*=0.06).
2. Conversion rate: Both the groups were equal in terms of conversion rate as it was zero in both of them.

3. Intra-operative complications: there were 2 gall bladder wall perforations in 4 port group and no perforation in 3 port group this was statistically significant ($p=$). There was no bleeding from liver bed on comparing both groups, no iatrogenic liver injury in both the groups and fortunately no bile duct injury was found.
4. Pain score: VAS on the scale of 1-10 was used. mean score in 3 port group was 1.8, it was 2.9 in 4 port group. This was statistically significant ($p=$). 3 port group had better outcome in terms of 4 port group when compared on VAS basis. The more pain experienced in 4 port group was probably due to more tissue trauma while putting the 4th port and putting the visceral peritoneum on more stretch.
5. Analgesic requirement: Analgesic requirement was high in 4 port group. Patients in 4 port group required 5.2 injections of I.V Voveron 75mg/2ml/patient, while the mean requirement in 3 port group was of 3.6 injections/per patient. This was statistically significant ($p=$), hence the analgesic requirement was significantly less in 3-port group.
6. Hospital stay: mean hospital stay was 1.3 days in 3-port group as most of the patients were discharged the next day of surgery and it was 2.4 days in 4-port group.

Table I summarizes the overall end points of the study.

Findings	3-port group	4-port group	p value
Operating time (minutes)	38.3	41.0	0.06 (not significant)
Conversion rate	Nil	Nil	NA
Intraoperative complications			
Perforation of gall bladder only	0	2	0.02(significant)
Bleeding	0	0	NA
Hepatobiliary injuries	0	0	NA
Pain score	1.8	2.9	0.01(significant)
Analgesic requirement(number)	3.6	5.2	0.001 (significant)
Hospital stay (days)	1.3	2.4	0.02 (significant)

Discussion

At present, laparoscopic cholecystectomy is the treatment of choice for gallbladder stones.³ Less postoperative pain and early recovery are major goals to achieve better patient care and cost effectiveness. These goals are however cannot be compromised for the patient safety. Since Slim et al reported that 4th port is not necessary in there 710 cases of LC, several studies have shown the technical feasibility, safety, less pain and early hospital discharge to the patients.^{4,5} In our study we demonstrated that advantages of 3-port LC were less intraoperative complications (perforation of gall bladder only), less pain , significant reduced need for analgesia and shorter hospital stay. Operating time was not significantly different in two groups in our study.

In our experience perforations of gall bladder while dissection occurred in 4-port group because of undue and strong traction on fundus of gall bladder by assistant, there is more stretch on the tissues of gall bladder making them prone to perforation. Most of the studies comparing these two techniques conclude that there are either no or equal intra operative complications, but we could prove that gall bladder perforation and subsequently bile spillage was more in 4-port group. Another surgical aspect that we observed is that the operating surgeon has full control while doing dissection of calots triangle and posterior and anterior peritoneal folds were dissected easily so skeletonisation of cystic duct and artery becomes very easy because there is no stretch on gall bladder and its more mobile for dissection (Figure 2,3).

Less pain and significant reduction of analgesia has been a strong push for reduced port surgery, our study is in accordance with most of the other studies.^{2,5-7} Less tissue dissection in abdominal wall, low stretch on visceral peritoneum significantly reduce the post operative pain and shorten the hospital stay.

Significant reduction in pain and requirement of analgesia translates into shorter hospital stay in 3-port LC group. The reduction in hospital stay has been proved by many of the studies.^{6,7} Three-port LC technique is easy to perform as compared to 4-port LC and can be safely performed after good training in LC.

Conclusion

We conclude that the three-port LC technique is feasible, safe and has better outcomes as compared to those of the standard 4-port LC in terms of postoperative pain, need for analgesia and shorter hospital stay. The surgical technique is easy and dissection much easier. It is a better technique over 4-port LC



Figure 1. 3-port positions .



Figure 2 : cystic duct completely dissected in calots triangle.




Figure 3: cystic duct clipped and ready to be cut, cystic artery seen at the back of scissor.

References

1. Osborne D, Boe B, Rosemurgy AS, Zervos EE: Twenty-millimeter laparoscopic cholecystectomy: fewer ports results in less pain, shorter hospitalization, and faster recovery. *Am Surg* 2005, **71**(4):298-302
2. Kumar M, Aggarwal CS, Gupta RK. Three-Port Versus Standard Four-Port Laparoscopic Cholecystectomy: a Randomized Controlled Clinical Trial in a Community-Based Teaching Hospital in Eastern Nepal. *JLS*. 2007 ; **11**(3): 358–362.
3. Soper NJ, Stockmann PT, Dunnegan DL, Ashley SW. Laparoscopic cholecystectomy. The new 'gold standard'? *Arch Surg* 1992;**127**:917-21.
4. Slim K, Pezet D, Stencl J, Jr., et al. Laparoscopic cholecystectomy: an original three-trocar technique. *World J Surg*. 1995; **19** (3): 394–397.
5. Harsha HS, Gunjiganvi M, Singh AK, Moirangthem GS. A study of three-port versus four-port laparoscopic cholecystectomy *Journal of Medical Society*. 2013;**27**(3) : 208-211
6. Hashimoto D , Hirota M , Yagi Y , Baba H Umbilicus Saving Three-Port Laparoscopic Cholecystectomy . *WebmedCentral LAPAROSCOPY* 2011;**2**(4):WMC001882.
7. Al-Azawi D, Houssein N, Rayis AB, McMohan D, Hehir DJ. Three port versus four-port laparoscopic cholecystectomy in acute and chronic cholecystitis. *BMC Surgery* 2007, **7**:8.