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Study on 60 cases of common bile duct stone, there different modality of management and its inference
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ABSTRACT

Background: The aim of the study was to determine the best treatment modality for common bile duct stone become more challenging as large number of options available such as endoscopic, laparoscopic or open surgical methods, we need to choose specific therapy according to patient’s clinical conditions, and individual expertise.

Methods: It is prospective study including 60 patient having common bile duct stone along with gall bladder stone, its different modality of management and its inference, conducted in Bhopal Memorial Hospital and Research Centre, Bhopal, during period of January 2017 to January 2020.

Results: In 60 cases 41 patients undergoes to endoscopic retrograde cholangio pancreatograhy (ERCP) first, stone successfully removed in 34 patients and stent placed, one patients developed pancreatitis after ERCP, managed conservatively, In 6 patients retained stone after ERCP procedure, one patients developed surgical emphysema after procedure, managed with ICD and conservatively, and one patient had bleeding during sphincterotomy so its procedure abandoned and one of the patient failed to cannulate common bile duct (CBD). 21 patients undergo laparoscopic common bile duct explorations, 2 lap CBD exploration converted to open CBD exploration with cholecystectomy, due to adhesion at hepatocystic triangle. Five patients undergoes open CBD exploration, in one patient hepaticojejunostomy was done as patient was having CBD stone with stricture. No mortality during and after procedure.

Conclusions: Management of CBD stone is depends upon individual expertise and available modality. If surgeons are expertise then lap CBD exploration with cholecystectomy without attempting to ERCP guide stone removal is best approach in majority of patients.
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INTRODUCTION

The incidence of choledocholithiasis in patients undergoing cholecystectomy varies with age, ranging from 6% in patients younger than 80 years of age to 33% in patients older than 80 years.1 It is estimated that 5% to 12% of patients with choledocholithiasis may be completely asymptomatic, with normal liver function tests.2-5 Most CBD stones originate from the gallbladder, and only a small percentage of patients develop CBD stones de novo.

The evaluation and treatment of choledocholithiasis has evolved over the 100 years. As newer and less invasive techniques emerge, the surgeons will find a variety of options that can lead to the successful treatment of a patient with CBD stones. The diagnosis of choledocholithiasis cannot be made on the basis of
METHODS

This prospective study was conducted in department of Gastro-surgery including 60 patients in Bhopal Memorial Hospital and Research Centre Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh, India over period of January 2017 to January 2020. Following written informed consent with patients to undergo procedure.

Patients included in study are those presented to OPD or emergency department from different regions of Madhya Pradesh, India.

Inclusion criteria’s included, all patients referred from other hospital with diagnosed case of CBD stone, patients having cholecystitis, cholangitis, fever, gallstone pancreatitis, biliary colic and jaundice with raised alkaline phosphate, direct bilirubin with USG abdomen suggesting of CBD stone or dilated CBD, patient detected on intraoperative cholangiography or postoperative on MRCP and all patients suspected of choledocholithiasis and diagnosed on MRCP as CBD stone. Exclusion criteria have included, cirrhosis/portal hypertension, suspicious of hepatobiliary malignancy, pregnancy, age less than 13 yrs.

Patients suspected to common bile duct stone if presented with cholangitis, fever, pancreatitis, or jaundice with increase bilirubin, AST and ALT. Then trans-abdominal ultrasound done, if patient detected common bile duct exploration of the CBD was done in 1890 by Ludwig Courvoisier, a Swiss surgeon who made an incision in the CBD and removed a gallstone.\(^{15,16}\)

Laparoscopic choledochotomy is an excellent approach to the CBD. It is indicated when the CBD diameter is larger than 6 mm, in cases when calculi are larger than 1 cm, when there are multiple calculi, or when lithotripsy is required for impacted calculi. It is contraindicated in small ducts because of the risk of stricture secondary to omy closure.

Surgical biliary drainage procedures must be considered in situations of multiple stones; incomplete removal of all stones; impacted, irremovable distal bile duct stones; markedly dilated CBD; distal bile duct obstruction from tumor or stricture; and reoccurrence after previous bile duct exploration. The methods of surgical drainage include transduodenal sphincteroplasty, choledochojenostomy, and choledochojejunostomy (CDJ). Patients presenting with CBD stones after cholecystectomy generally are treated with ERCP.\(^{15}\)

Objective of the study was to determine best modality of treatment for common bile duct stone with gall bladder stone, on basis of available modality and expertise of surgeons. And to aware of complications arising during and after the procedure, so as to decreases such complications in further patient’s management.

In patients for whom ERCP is not available, not possible secondary to anatomic considerations, or not successful, an alternative method of cholangiography and non-surgical therapy is percutaneous trans-hepatic cholangiography (PTC) followed by transhepatic methods of stone removal. Treatment may be endoscopic, percutaneous, open, or laparoscopic. Given the multiple alternatives available, sometimes it is difficult to decide on the right one for a particular patient. Frequently, the best path is the one the surgeon is most adept at or the one that local expertise can accomplish most safely.\(^{14}\)

After bile duct clearance is achieved by non-operative methods, cholecystectomy generally is recommended in younger patients to decrease the risk of future cholecystitis and recurrent biliary colic. The first surgical
stone or having intrahepatic/Extra-hepatic biliary dilatation then MRCP advised to confirm the ultrasound report, missed stone or other pathology and after confirmation with MRCP patient planned for procedure according to available modality as we are not having facility of Endoscopic ultrasound, Laparoscopic ultrasound, intraoperative ultrasound and spyglass cholangioscopy.

In our setup we did two stage procedures that is ERCP guided stone removal followed by laparoscopic cholecystectomy. Patient undergoes ERCP guided stone retrieval if stone present in CBD, <1.5 cm size, not impacted and no other contraindication. ERCP done under sedation, CBD cannulate, Sphincterotomy done, with help of balloon catheter or Dormia basket stone retrieved, if fail to removal of stone then patient planned for laparoscopic CBD exploration.

If patient having large stone >1.5 cm, dilated CBD >2 cm, failed ERCP guided stone removal, or any CBD stone then laparoscopic CBD exploration planned. Port inserted same as laparoscopic cholecystectomy, choledochotomy done on anterior surface of CBD with endoblade/endoscissor limited to size of largest stone, bile duct cleared of stone, choledochoscopy done in evaluating the duct system during and after clearance of residual stone and making sure that there is no other pathology. If fail to clear duct stone then procedure converted to open otherwise CBD primary repair and if required then CBD stent same as ERCP placed antegrade manner after laparoscopic CBD exploration in 4 cases, other cases CBD primary repair (Figure 1 and 2).

If patient having previous history of abdominal surgery or fail to retrieve stone by ERC/LCBD or impacted stone in lower CBD then open surgery was done.

RESULTS

In 60 cases 41 patients undergoes to ERCP first, stone successfully removed in 34patients and stent placed, one patients develop pancreatitis after procedure, managed with ICD, and one patient had bleeding during sphincterotomy so its procedure abandoned. One patient failed to cannulate CBD due to edematous duodenal wall and hanging papilla. 21 patients undergoes laparoscopic common bile duct exploration, out of which seven patients are those in which ERCP guided stone removal failed, CBD stent placed antegrade manner after laparoscopic CBD exploration in 4 cases, other cases CBD primary repair (Figure 1 and 2).

If patient having large and impacted stone, stent placed but one patients develop surgical emphysema after procedure, managed with ICD, and one patient had bleeding during sphincterotomy so its procedure abandoned. One patient failed to cannulate CBD due to edematous duodenal wall and hanging papilla. 21 patients undergoes laparoscopic common bile duct exploration, out of which seven patients are those in which ERCP guided stone removal failed, CBD stent placed antegrade manner after laparoscopic CBD exploration in 4 cases, other cases CBD primary repair (Figure 1 and 2).

Table 1: Modality of treatment applied for CBD stone management.

| Variable          | Modality of treatment                  |
|-------------------|----------------------------------------|
| Procedure         | ERCP guide stone removal                |
|                   | Lap CBD exploration                     |
|                   | Open CBD exploration                    |
| Outcome           | Successful-34                           |
|                   | Failed-7 (6-retained stone, 1 failed CBD cannulation) |
|                   | 21 successful and 2 case converted to open |
|                   | 5-Successful                           |
| Complications     | Pancreatitis-1                          |
|                   | Bleeding from papilla-1                 |
|                   | Surgical emphysema-1                    |
|                   | Stent migration-1                       |
|                   | Lap converted to open                   |
|                   | Incisional hernia-1                     |

Lap CBD explorations converted to open CBD exploration with cholecystectomy, due to adhesion at hepatocystic triangle. Five patients undergo open CBD exploration, one patients’ hepaticojejunostom was done as patient having CBD stone with stricture. One patient developed incisinal hernia after surgery. No mortality during and after procedure (Table 1, Figure 3).
Several authors have advocated primary closure of the CBD without the use of T-tubes during laparoscopic choledochotomies with comparable results in selected groups of patients. Noted advantages of this technique include decreased morbidity from external biliary drainage (as high as 15%), and shorter length of hospital stay. After closure of the CBD, a combination of methylene blue dye and hypanque contrast can be injected through a transcystic cholangiogram catheter to assess for leakage or excessive narrowing of the CBD closure.19 Another alternative technique to CBD closure over T-tube and primary CBD closure is laparoscopic placement of an endobiliary stent with primary closure of the choledochotomy.20 The stent, typically 10 French, is advanced into the duodenum until the proximal end is positioned distal to the lower edge of the choledochotomy.

In patient undergoing laparoscopic CBD exploration for single stage of CBDs with removal of gall bladder as a part of same procedure. There are now sufficient number of studies to determine that there is no significant difference in clinical outcome between LCBDE and laparoscopic cholecystectomy combined with preoperative or postoperative ERCP.21 Studies have shown that single stage LCBDE is associated with a reduction in overall hospital stay and cost compared with two stage approach of ERCP and laparoscopic cholecystectomy.22

In cases of open procedure, the average hospital stay are more, there is more chances of wound infections, incisional hernia compare to lap procedure, but for open procedure we not need a complex operation theatre setup as well as expertise in endoscopy and laparoscopy, and we can deal with complex cases, and if needed drainage procedure easy to perform in open procedure.

**Limitation**

No endoscopic ultrasound, laparoscopic ultrasound and spyglass cholangioscopy facility, which are used in management of CBD stone. Modality applied was ERCP, intraoperative choledochoscopy, cholangiography, laparoscopic surgery and open surgical setup.

**CONCLUSION**

If the patient having large stone >1.5 cm, intrahepatic or impacted stone and CBD diameter >2 cm, multiple stone and surgeons are expertise in laparoscopic CBD exploration and facility of cholechochoscopy available then surgeon can proceed to lap CBD exploration with cholecystectomy without attempting to ERCP guided stone removal. It has lesser complications, lesser chance of failure of procedure and lesser hospital stay, although it’s not a protocol and recommendation it will not replace individual expertise and available modality. There is no significant difference in outcome of single stage
laparoscopic cholecystectomy with ERCP and laparoscopic CBD exploration.
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