

Recent Concepts in Minimal Access Surgery

Volume 1

Deborshi Sharma
Priya Hazrah
Editors

Recent Concepts in Minimal Access Surgery

Deborshi Sharma • Priya Hazrah
Editors

Recent Concepts in Minimal Access Surgery

Volume 1

 Springer

Editors

Deborshi Sharma
Department of Surgery
Lady Hardinge Medical College
New Delhi, India

Priya Hazrah
Department of Surgery
Lady Hardinge Medical College
New Delhi, India

ISBN 978-981-16-5472-5 ISBN 978-981-16-5473-2 (eBook)
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-5473-2>

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd. 2022

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd.
The registered company address is: 152 Beach Road, #21-01/04 Gateway East, Singapore 189721, Singapore

Foreword

It gives me great pleasure to write a foreword for the first volume of 'Recent Concepts in Minimal Access Surgery' edited by Dr. Deborshi Sharma, Co-editor Dr. Priya Hazrah and published by Springer Nature which has expressed a few important recent concepts of minimally invasive laparoscopic, robotic, and endoscopic surgical procedures that have evolved in the past decade. The book is a compilation of contributions from various renowned authors and experts in the field of minimal access surgery and is arranged into 21 chapters.

The topics in this first edition of recent concept series encompass a variety of subjects from basic concepts of ergonomics and meshes to advanced techniques such as robotic and laparoscopic oncological resections, advanced bariatric surgery, organ transplantation and retroperitoneal adrenalectomy. Endoscopic interventions in arenas of surgical practice such as third space endoscopy and endoscopic management of pancreatic fluid collections are also notable attractions of the edition. Catering to this evolving era of cooperative laparoscopic, robotic and endoscopic surgery, written in a simple language with more than 250 illustrations and operative pictures demonstrating the different techniques followed by compilation of recent meta-analysis in the respective subjects. This publication can be of immense aid to students and budding surgeons as also to surgeons/physicians in the field of minimal access surgery.

I congratulate everyone associated with the compilation, edition and publication of the book and extend my best wishes for its successful publication.

Prof (Dr.) Vijay Kumar Shukla, MS, MCh
Ex HOD, Department of Surgery
Institute of Medical Sciences
Banaras Hindu University
Varanasi, India

Rector & Acting Vice Chancellor
Banaras Hindu University
Varanasi, India

Preface

Learning is like rowing upstream, not to advance is to drop back....

The above proverb holds true in the field of minimal access surgery which is in the process of constant rapid metamorphosis.

“Recent Concepts in Minimal Access Surgery” (RCMAS) is an annual publication which aims to highlight the newer evolving concepts and ideas with their current results, in arenas of laparoscopic, robotic and endoscopic surgery. The chapters of this publication are a concise assimilation of knowledge with their concepts and techniques as practiced by experts in the respective arenas. The publication also intends to bring forth the evolving techniques and technological advances to help keep abreast in knowledge and provides a common platform to students, surgeons, and physicians, both trainees and trainers alike, interested in the field of minimal access surgery. With 21 recent topic chapters written by renowned faculty, more than 250 operative photographs and schematic illustrations along with the latest results of relevant meta-analysis on the particular topics tabulated in the “editors note” section of the book can serve as an easy reference guide. It provides step-by-step descriptions accompanied by numerous helpful photographs and anatomical drawings. It also includes the controversies and gives a cumulative opinion on the changes developing in minimal access surgery (MAS). It includes system wise topics and separate chapters on the different topics within the system.

RCMAS is conceptualized as an annual publication with intend to bring forth a yearly update on newer topics in every and subsequent volumes, as also about changes and latest developments on earlier addressed issues.

Editors (RCMAS)



New Delhi, India
New Delhi, India

Deborshi Sharma
Priya Hazrah

Acknowledgements

“it always seems impossible until its done”— Nelson Mandela

The very first volume of RCMAS would not have been impossible to complete without the expertise, dedication and hard work of each of our expert authors. I would like to thank each of the authors for their vision, expertise and enormous dedication in bringing work to this project. I am deeply indebted to them for sharing their knowledge and enthusiasm about their topic, concluding in an outstanding overall product. My thanks to our senior faculty for teaching laparoscopic surgery and their motivation towards this work.

Late (Dr.) U C Biswal, Ex HOD, PGIMER and Dr. RMLH
Dr. V K Ranteke, Ex HOD MAMC and Ex Faculty LHMC
Dr. P K Ganguly, Ex Faculty PGIMER and Dr. RMLH
Dr. K N Srivastava, Ex Faculty PGIMER and Dr. RMLH
Dr. Ajay Kumar, Ex HOD, LHMC
Dr. C K Durga, Ex HOD, PGIMER and Dr. RMLH
Dr O P Pathania Ex HOD, LHMC
Dr. Romesh Lal, HOD, LHMC
Dr. Rana A K Singh, Director, PGIMER and Dr. RMLH
Dr. Chintamani, Faculty, HOD, VMMC and Safdarjung Hospital
Dr. Sanjeev Kumar Tudu, Faculty, LHMC
Dr. Ashok Kumar, Faculty, LHMC
Dr. Munish Guleria, Faculty, PGIMER and Dr. RMLH
and all other faculty and colleagues in LHMC and RMLH.

I must also thank our residents Dr. Akshay Kumar, Dr. Ankit Raj, Dr. Parikshith Manjunatha, Dr. Ashutosh Nagpal and Mr. S. Gupta for their help in proofreading the chapters, arranging references, designing the images and tables.

I would also like to thank the publishing team at Springer, who again has been instrumental in making this volume a reality.



Dr Deborshi Sharma and Dr Priya Hazrah, Editors RCMAS

Contents

Laparoscopic Nissen’s Fundoplication for GERD: Current Perspective	1
Rajinder Parshad and Aditya Kumar	
Recent Advances in Laparoscopic Gastrectomy for Gastric Cancer with Special Reference to D2 Lymphadenectomy	33
Rakesh Shivhare, Manish Khasgiwale, Mohit Gangwal, and Akshat Dhanuka	
Laparoscopic Subtotal Cholecystectomy	63
Kalpesh Jani and Samir Contractor	
Prediction and Grading Methods of a Difficult Laparoscopic Cholecystectomy	83
Nikhil Gupta, Priya Hazrah, and Gautam Anand	
Robotic Assisted Pancreaticoduodenectomy	111
Brij B. Agarwal and Neeraj Dhamija	
Laparoscopic Surgery for Rectal Prolapse	133
Manash Ranjan Sahoo, Suyash Bajoria, and Ankit Sahoo	
Laparoscopic Lymphadenectomy for Colorectal Cancers: Concepts and Current Results	155
Saumitra Rawat, Chelliah Selvasekar, and Saurabh Bansal	
Ergonomics in Laparoscopic Surgery: An Appraisal of Evidence	193
Priya Hazrah, Deborshi Sharma, Gautam Anand, and Kayenaat Puran Singh Jassi	
Surgical Meshes Used in Laparoscopic Procedures	219
Anubhav Vindal, Yashika Gupta, and Piyush Kumar Agrawal	
Staging Laparoscopy in Intra-Abdominal Cancers	247
Sudhir Kumar Singh, Farhanul Huda, Rajkumar Kottayasamy Seenivasagam, and Somprakas Basu	

Role of ICG Fluorescence Imaging in Laparoscopic Bowel Anastomosis	267
Deborshi Sharma, Sanjay Meena, Amanjeet Singh, and Priya Hazrah	
Minimizing Pain in Laparoscopic Hernia Surgery	283
Naveen Sharma, Deborshi Sharma, and Sanjay Meena	
Extended-View Totally Extraperitoneal Approach (eTEP) for Inguinal Hernia Repair	293
Deborshi Sharma, Gautam Anand, and Priya Hazrah	
Mini Gastric Bypass	305
Anshuman Poddar, Om Tantia, and Tamonas Chaudhuri	
Robotic Roux-en-Y Gastric Bypass	331
Vivek Bindal	
Third Space Endoscopy	351
Ashok Dalal, Ujjwal Sonika, and Amol S. Dahale	
Endoscopic Management of Pancreatic Fluid Collection	371
Vaishali Bhardwaj and Vikram Bhatia	
Management of Solitary Pulmonary Nodule	401
Kamran Ali and Sabyasachi Bal	
Minimally Invasive Thymectomy	419
Aloy J. Mukherjee, Mohsin Khan, and Charu Gauba	
Retroperitoneoscopic Minimally Invasive Adrenalectomy	443
Sameer Rege	
Laparoscopic Donor Nephrectomy	469
Umesh Sharma and Hemant Goel	

About the Editor

Priya Hazrah graduated from the Institute of Medical Sciences, Banaras Hindu University, India. She further pursued training in surgical oncology from Gujarat Cancer Research Institute, Ahmedabad and Tata Memorial Hospital, Mumbai, India. Currently, she is working as a Professor in the Department of Surgery, Lady Hardinge Medical College, New Delhi under the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India and affiliated with the University of Delhi. With a keen interest to consolidate her training in minimal access surgery, she completed her diploma in minimal access surgery (HPB surgery) from the college of Association of Minimal Access Surgeons of India (AMASI). She has several publications and has been a peer reviewer of many national and international journals. She has also delivered numerous CME lectures and presentations in various national and international conferences/meetings.

Deborshi Sharma is presently Director Professor of surgery in the department of surgery, Lady Hardinge Medical College and Associated with Dr. RMLH, New Delhi with a teaching experience of more than 20 years. He is a past faculty of the Institute of Medical Sciences, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi. Dr. Sharma is examiner and expert in various commissions, committees and universities around the country. He has 57 publications on surgery and minimal access surgery in peer-reviewed journals. Over the years, he has presented numerous scientific papers and delivered lectures in India and abroad. Dr. Sharma has made immense contribution to minimal access surgery in the central government sector in Delhi, treating the poor and underprivileged and is a pioneer of many minimal access procedures in these hospitals. He has been the Vice President (CZ) for last 4 years and joint secretary, the preceding 2 years of the Association of Minimal Access Surgeons of India. He is also the past secretary of Delhi state chapter of the Association of Surgeons of India (ASI) in 2016–2017. Since 2012, he also has served as an associate editor of the *Indian Journal of Surgery* (IJOS) and since 2019 he is an editorial board member of IJOS.



Laparoscopic Nissen's Fundoplication for GERD: Current Perspective

Rajinder Parshad and Aditya Kumar

Introduction

Fundoplication is a surgical technique used as a treatment modality for GERD with or without hiatus hernia, large symptomatic hiatus hernias and as an adjunct to Heller's cardiomyotomy in patients of achalasia cardia. Since its inception in 1991 [1], Laparoscopic Nissen's Fundoplication (LNF) has gained popularity and has largely replaced open fundoplication. Before proceeding with the description of LNF, a brief introduction of GERD, the most common indication of LNF, is in order.

GERD is a condition causing troublesome reflux of stomach contents or associated complications. The prevalence of GERD is variable, with rates of up to 20% in the west and less than 5% in Asia [2]. Studies from India show a prevalence ranging from 7.6 to 18.7% [3].

Some degree of postprandial reflux is physiological and may be asymptomatic [2]. Pathological reflux occurs consequent to disruption of the anti-reflux barrier between the stomach and esophagus and is associated with symptoms or mucosal injury. GERD may or may not co-exist with an associated hiatus hernia [4].

Hiatus hernias have been classified as: Type I (Sliding hernia) where the GEJ (gastroesophageal junction) migrates above the diaphragm with the stomach in its normal longitudinal axis and fundus in its normal location. Type II (Rolling) where the GEJ is in its normal position and the fundus of the stomach herniates. Type III (Mixed) where both the GEJ and fundus herniates through the hiatus (Combination of types I and II). Type IV is characterized by the presence of structures other than the stomach such as omentum, colon and small bowel [5].

A recent review published in 2017 addressed the historical practice of routine repairing of incidentally found hiatus hernia. This view has been challenged since

R. Parshad (✉) · A. Kumar

Department of Surgical Disciplines, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi, India

studies have shown that probability of developing symptoms needing emergent repair is only around 1% per year and watchful waiting can be safely adopted in 83% of symptomatic patients. Type I hiatal hernias associated with GERD however need fundoplication with hiatal repair to prevent reflux [6, 7]. For asymptomatic paraesophageal hernia the risk of progression to symptoms is estimated to be approximately 14% per year and the need for emergency surgery is about 2% per year. Further, it has been suggested that that elective laparoscopic repair of asymptomatic paraesophageal hernia may even be detrimental in patients over 65 years of age. Recommendations are to consider the patients age and co-morbidities prior to planning intervention [7, 8]. Symptomatic para-esophageal hernia however should be repaired.

Clinical Presentation

The patients with GERD, classically present with heartburn and regurgitation. Other symptoms include chest pain, dysphagia, waterbrash, globus sensation and odynophagia. Another spectrum of symptoms includes the extraesophageal symptoms such as cough, wheeze and hoarseness. A summary of symptoms associated with GERD is included in Table 1.

For the successful outcome of fundoplication, it is important to establish GERD as the cause of patient's symptoms. It is common to find a small hiatus hernia and to operate on such patients without establishing the symptom correlation, is bound to result in a disgruntled patient.

The following investigations help in establishing the diagnosis, correlation with symptoms and planning the surgery.

1. **Barium Esophagogram:** Barium studies are losing favour in western literature with the advent of newer modalities for diagnosing GERD. It is suggested that they are now limited to evaluate the complications of GERD (e.g. peptic stricture) and in cases of post-operative dysphagia [9]. However, they are useful in setups where these advanced diagnostic modalities are not available.

Table 1 Montreal Consensus definition of symptoms of GERD

Esophageal Symptoms		Extraesophageal Syndromes	
Symptomatic Syndromes	Syndromes with Esophageal Injury	Established Associations	Proposed Association
Typical Reflux	Reflux esophagitis	Cough	Pharyngitis
Reflux Chest Pain Syndrome	Reflux stricture	Laryngitis	Sinusitis
	Barret's Esophagus (BE)	Asthma	Idiopathic Pulmonary Fibrosis
	Esophageal Adenocarcinoma (EAC)	Dental Erosion	Recurrent Otitis Media

Apart from GERD, they are helpful in locating GEJ in relation to the hiatus and help in estimating the size and reducibility of hiatus hernias. It is recommended as a key investigation in the diagnosis of Hiatus Hernia's [7].

2. **CT Scans:** A CT Scan may be useful in hiatus hernia to demonstrate cephalad migration of the GEJ and fundus especially on oral contrast films [7]. They are also useful in emergency cases of paraesophageal volvulus.
3. **Upper Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (UGIE):** It is used to evaluate symptomatic patients and especially those with alarm symptoms or suspected associated esophageal syndromes (peptic strictures, Barrett's esophagus and esophageal adenocarcinoma). Biopsies can be taken in presence of any abnormal mucosa or mass. Grading of esophagitis according to Los Angeles Classification is done. LA-C/D are considered indications for surgery in GERD [10]. UGIE also is useful to visualize hiatal hernias and remains the mainstay in its diagnosis [7].
4. **Ambulatory pH monitoring:** It provides confirmatory evidence of GERD. It is especially useful in patients with normal UGIE findings and in patients with atypical symptoms. This test provides the number of reflux episodes and acid exposure times (AET) of the esophagus. Increased yield is seen with the wireless capsule study which may be used for 48–96 h. Esophageal reflux is defined as a pH value <4 and a composite pH score or deMeester score >14.72.

Reflux monitoring is possible in both 'off PPI (proton pump inhibitor)' and 'on PPI'. The Lyon Consensus states that testing always be performed off therapy to demonstrate baseline AET in 'unproven GERD', which includes no (or low-grade) oesophagitis at endoscopy, and no prior positive pH testing. 'On PPI' testing is recommended in patients with 'proven GERD' (prior LA grade C or D oesophagitis, long segment Barrett's oesophagus or prior abnormal pH-metry) and should be evaluated on double-dose PPI therapy to establish correlation between refractory symptoms and reflux episodes and/or to exclude inadequate acid suppression or poor compliance as the mechanism of persisting symptoms [11].

5. **High Resolution Manometry (HRM):** It is usually performed to place leads for impedance pH monitoring. Other uses include, diagnosing additional motor disorders or when symptoms don't improve with PPI.

Recent interest has arisen on the use of HRM in GERD due to understanding of the complex anatomical and pathophysiological aberrations leading to GERD. Assessment of transient LES relaxation, GEJ location and morphology, esophageal motor function and contraction reserve have been evaluated through HRM in patients who don't respond to empiric medical therapy and have normal UGI Endoscopy [12].

Various therapeutic modules have been described in managing these patients which starts from lifestyle modification (raise head end of bed, avoid bedtime meals, weight loss) to medical therapy (proton pump inhibitors, H2 receptor antagonists, antacids and prokinetics), surgical techniques (laparoscopic fundoplication, magnetic ring implants) and endoluminal techniques (transoral incisionless fundoplication and radiofrequency ablation).

Medical vs Surgical Therapy

Use of proton pump inhibitors is the backbone of medical therapy for GERD [13] but its use is limited by long term use, patient compliance, costs, relapse of symptoms on discontinuation and side effects of long term use. Two metaanalysis have been published comparing medical therapy with surgical management. The first metaanalysis by Rickenbacher et al included 11 publications, 7 trials concluded that patients under the surgical arm had a better quality of life, improved symptoms and were more satisfied as compared to the medical arm. However, a considerable proportion (16–62%) of patients needed medical therapy post-surgery. They concluded that surgery is an equivalent alternative to medical therapy [14]. This study however did not include a subgroup analysis based on follow up time. Another metaanalysis published a year later found similar findings to the previous study and also conducted a subgroup analysis on follow up. They observed that surgery had significantly better results in the short-term period (<3 year) but did not find statistically significant improvement on long term over medical management. De-Meester scores were lower in patients in the surgery arm. This metaanalysis also favoured surgical therapy over medical therapy, especially in a follow up of three years [15].

Fundoplication

Introduction

The first fundoplication was described by Rudolf Nissen in 1955 and included a 360° wrap of the fundus of the stomach around the esophagus by plication of both the anterior and posterior walls of the gastric fundus around the lesser curvature. Several modifications to his original technique have been described and the modified Nissen's Fundoplication (NF) is the most widely performed surgical procedure for GERD [16].

Laparoscopic Nissen's Fundoplication (LNF) was first described in 1991 by Dallemagne, following which, it has gained popularity and largely replaced the open techniques [1]. LNF is commonly performed in patients of GERD and Hiatus Hernia's.

Antireflux Barrier Mechanism and Fundoplication

An intricate valve mechanism is present at the level of the GEJ that counteracts the positive gastric pressure and the negative thoracic pressures. A lack of balance in this natural antireflux mechanism is thought to be the primary cause of GERD. Components of this barrier mechanism is postulated to include [17]:

- (a) Lower Esophageal Sphincter (LES) tone, length and intra-abdominal length. These may be defective in GERD and hiatus hernias.
- (b) Pinchcock action of the crural diaphragm on the GEJ.

- (c) Intact phreno-esophageal membrane.
- (d) Acute "Angle of His" leading to a longer distance between the gastric fundus, where the food is stored, and the EGJ
- (e) Intact esophageal motility contributes to adequate clearance of acid that may enter esophagus due to transient LES relaxations (TLESR). These are physiological LES relaxations occurring in the absence of swallowing, lasting more than 10 s. They are probably secondary to gastric distension, and are associated with crural inhibition.

The aim of fundoplication is to correct the defective hiatal anatomy in the hope of restoring anti reflux barrier.

Indications of Surgery

After objective confirmation for GERD and evaluation for associated problems, surgical therapy is recommended in patients with [6]:

- Failed medical management (inadequate symptom control, severe regurgitation not controlled with acid suppression, or medication side effects)
- Patient opts for surgery despite successful medical management (due to quality of life considerations, lifelong need for medication intake, expense of medications, etc.) or
- Complications of GERD (e.g., Barrett's esophagus, peptic stricture) or
- Extra-esophageal manifestations (asthma, hoarseness, cough, chest pain, aspiration) attributable to reflux

Apart from these indications individual evaluation of patients is important for improved outcomes. Results have been better in healthy, thin patients with typical symptoms. Patients who are partial responders to PPI may not have satisfactory results post fundoplication [18]. Although there has been no difference seen with age, female patients have shown worse outcomes than males [19]. Morbid obesity, psychological conditions such as depression and underlying motility disorders are some other factors which affect outcomes adversely. In presence of any of these risk factors, further evaluation and discussion with the patient is advisable prior to proceeding with surgery in order to set realistic and achievable outcomes.

The Preferred Approach: Open vs Laparoscopic?

Laparoscopic Nissen's fundoplication (LNF) was first described following the success of laparoscopic cholecystectomy. Following which several studies were performed to evaluate its advantages over open surgery. Two metaanalysis including 12 RCT's (randomized controlled trials) with over 500 procedures have clearly favoured the laparoscopic approach over open technique. Advantages of the technique included

short hospital stay, early return to work, reduced risk of complications and higher patient satisfaction rates. The drawbacks seen included longer operating time and higher long-term reoperation rates. Similar outcomes were noted with both techniques in terms of safety, efficacy and dysphagia rates [20, 21]. The laparoscopic approach is hence preferred and is recommended as approach of choice [6].

Role of Fundoplication in NERD

Non-erosive reflux disease (NERD) is a spectrum of GERD defined as troublesome reflux associated symptoms without mucosal breaks on endoscopy [2]. Confirmation of reflux in these patients is done through 24 h pH monitoring or a positive response to PPI's. Poor response to PPIs have been seen in this subset of patients along with higher relapse rates [22].

Initially NERD was thought to be a milder form of GERD due to absence of endoscopic findings and physicians would be reluctant to refer patients for surgical management. However, the poor response to medical therapy supports an important role of surgery. Recent studies have shown similar benefit of laparoscopic fundoplication in NERD vs GERD patients in short and long term follow up [23, 24].

Role of Fundoplication in Obesity

Obesity has been seen to be associated with increase in GERD, erosive esophagitis and esophageal adenocarcinoma. It has been seen to increase with increasing weight (BMI >30 kg/m²) [25, 26]. The safety and long term of effectiveness of fundoplication in this population is controversial. A recent metaanalysis published on the outcomes of fundoplication in non-obese patients (n = 6246) compared to obese patients (n = 1753) included 13 studies and found no difference in rates of operative morbidity, redo surgery, need for endoscopic dilation, conversion to open surgery or return to theatre. However, recurrence of reflux was higher in the obese group (11.4%) compared to non-obese group (3.4%). This led them to conclude that laparoscopic fundoplication is safe in obese patients but risk of recurrence of GERD is higher, making it important to counsel the patients regarding the possibility of poor outcomes [27]. They were unable to perform a subgroup analysis on the best technique of fundoplication due to heterogeneity and absence of technique reporting in some studies.

LF (laparoscopic fundoplication) has been thought to improve GERD in morbidly obese patients (BMI >35 kg/m²), however, it does not help treat the underlying disease i.e. obesity. Hence, studies have compared laparoscopic gastric bypass (LGB) with laparoscopic fundoplication (LF). It has been seen that both these techniques have similar safety and efficacy in reducing symptoms of GERD but LGB provides additional health benefits by acting as a bariatric procedure for weight loss [28–30]. SAGES (Society of American Gastrointestinal and Endoscopic Surgeons) too recommends use of LGB in morbidly obese patients while suggesting further study in the obese group [6].

Current Controversies Related to the Technique of Laparoscopic Fundoplication

There is some variation in the technique of fundoplication seen amongst different surgeons. This led to difficulty in comparison of outcomes of LNF with other methods such as oral therapy, due to heterogeneity in samples. In 2008 LOTUS trial formed a consensus document with standardized steps and found high degree of conformity amongst participating surgeons for objective assessment and comparison [31]. The same study was incorporated later to formulate guidelines by SAGES for standardization of the steps.

The Key Components of Fundoplication as Recommended Are as Follows:



- Opening the phreno-esophageal ligament to approach the hiatus and the distal esophagus from the left to the right with preservation of the hepatic branch of the anterior vagus nerve where possible.
- Complete dissection of both crura.
- Generous transhiatal mobilization of the esophagus to allow approximately 3 cm of intra- abdominal length of the distal esophagus.
- Division of short gastric vessels to allow a tension-free wrap.
- Posterior crural repair using nonabsorbable sutures. In case of a very large hiatal defect, a few anterior crural sutures may be placed.
- Creation of short (1.5–2 cm) and floppy wrap with the most distal suture (nonabsorbable) incorporating the anterior wall musculature of the esophagus.
- At the time of the construction of the wrap, introduction of a large bougie through the esophagus is recommended but not defined as essential

The images of the aforementioned steps as performed: (Figs. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7)

Complete vs Partial Wrap

Partial wraps have been described to avoid the complications associated with complete 360° Nissen's fundoplication. These include 270° Toupet fundoplication and anterior wraps such as Dor (180–200°). In the era of laparoscopic surgery, the issue of complete vs partial wrap has been revisited.

A systematic review in 2011 suggested significantly lesser dysphagia and inability to belch with partial wraps without any statistical difference in outcomes related to treatment failure when compared with complete wrap. However, the studies analyzed had heterogeneity in surgical procedure and approach, poor methodology, unclear outcome measures and publication bias [32].

Fig. 1 Hiatal Dissection**Fig. 2** Mobilization of the esophagus well into the mediastinum

A more recent meta-analysis in 2016 compared the Laparoscopic Nissen fundoplication (LNF) with Laparoscopic Toupet Fundoplication (LTF). It included 8 RCTS with 625 LNF and 567 LTF. There was no difference in postoperative dysphagia, gas-bloating, inability to belch or dilatation for dysphagia between the 2 groups. Reoperation rates were seen to be higher after LNF but specific reasons could not be elucidated [33]. Another meta-analysis in 2017 compared LNF (n = 266) with Laparoscopic anterior 180° fundoplication (n = 265) including 6 RCT's. The authors concluded that both methods were equally effective in reducing reflux and

Fig. 3 Division of Short Gastric Vessels





Fig. 4 Complete crural mobilization and creation of retroesophageal window



providing patient satisfaction, but there is a higher risk of reoperation for recurrent symptoms with anterior wrap [34].

Division vs Non-Division of Short Gastric Vessels

Mobilization of the fundus and cardia by division of the short gastric was added as a modification to Nissen fundoplication by Donahue [35] and De Meester [36] in order to create a tension free floppy fundoplication and reduce some of the troublesome side effects of Nissen fundoplication.

Fig. 5 Crural Approximation






Fig. 6 Shoe shine maneuver



Six RCT's have been performed comparing division vs non-division of short gastric with a follow-up of up to 20 years. The findings suggest that routine division of short gastric do not confer any functional or clinical advantages and was associated with increased surgery time and persistent epigastric bloating syndrome [37–43]. This has been postulated to arise due to absence of the Belch reflex due to division of afferent nerves along with short gastric vessels [44]. SAGES recommends division to be undertaken when a tension free fundoplication can't be achieved with a Grade B recommendation [6].

Fig. 7 Creation of Floppy Wrap



Crural Closure

Closure vs non-closure of crura is a controversial topic with some reporting benefits while others showing no benefit. No Metanalysis or RCT's are available and recommendations made are based on case series. General recommendation is to close crural when hiatal opening is large and mesh reinforcement may benefit in decreasing wrap migration [6].

One RCT comparing anterior (n = 47) vs posterior closure (n = 55) did not show any difference in dysphagia with soft solids/liquids, need for medication and overall satisfaction at 10 years follow up [45]. They concluded that anterior repair was at least as good as posterior repair.

Mesh vs Suture Closure of Hiatus Hernia

A widened hiatus or a hiatus hernia (HH) is frequently associated with GERD and has been tackled using simple suture repair. Few studies showed radiological recurrence on long term follow up which brought about an interest in the use of mesh for repair of large hiatus hernias. Recurrences were usually small and asymptomatic making the routine use of mesh controversial. A recent systematic review and meta-analysis of 11 studies compared mesh (n = 719) vs suture closure (n = 755). Mesh repair was associated with lesser recurrence rates on short term follow up (<12 months), had similar patterns of complications, but increased dysphagia. QOL (quality of life) scores were similar with some improvement seen in patients with biological mesh. A major limitation was a short term follow up which does not bring out the mesh associated problems that are expected on long term [46]. So the routine use of mesh has to be considered with caution.

A systematic review of 16 studies compared use of biological mesh (n = 385) versus synthetic mesh (n = 704) with a median follow up of 53.4 months. It found that recurrence rates in synthetic mesh (6.8%) was much lower than biological mesh

(16.1%) with no significant difference in complication rates of 5.1% vs 4.6% respectively on short term. This suggested no additional advantage on the use of biological mesh [47].

Role of Bougie Dilators

Another addition to Nissen's Fundoplication was the use of bougie dilators to prevent dysphagia. Several studies have investigated use of dilator from 39-60F to prevent dysphagia [48, 49]. However, certain studies have shown no advantage in the use of bougie dilation, especially in short term follow up [50]. Use of bougie dilators has been seen to be associated with problems such as prolonged surgery, esophago-gastric mucosal damage and perforations.

Nevertheless, an RCT on the effect of bougie on dysphagia with 171 patients was conducted and revealed that use of large caliber bougie (56F) decrease long term risk of dysphagia albeit increasing risk of injury [49]. We can conclude that the use of bougie seems to have improved outcomes on dysphagia postoperatively despite a small risk of complications.

Redo Fundoplication

Although laparoscopic fundoplication has satisfactory outcomes postoperatively, some patients have persistent or recurrence of symptoms. Another problem noted with the procedure is development of dysphagia. Apart from these there is a heterogeneous cause of complications associated with the procedure needing reoperation.

Several systematic reviews have been performed on the best method of treating these and outcomes associated. Recurrent reflux and dysphagia were found to be the most common reason for redo fundoplication. The most common causes of failure were seen to be wrap migration, wrap disruption and tight wrap accounting to nearly half the patients. Most of the patients were dealt with redo fundoplication and laparoscopy was the commonly used approach. Morbidity, mortality, longer operative times and conversion to open was higher in redo fundoplication when compared to index surgery. Most commonly witnessed complications were esophago-gastric perforations and bleeding. Symptomatic outcomes of redo fundoplication were good to excellent. Technically this surgery is more complex and should be performed by experienced surgeons [51–53].

Therefore laparoscopic redo fundoplication is safe, feasible and effective with higher complication rates than index surgery and due to its complexity should be performed by experienced surgeons [6].

Newer Modalities

Robotic Fundoplication

With the advent of robotics in late 1990s and identification of its distinct advantages of improved 3D vision, precise movements, added dexterity and improved

ergonomics, it didn't take time for surgeons to implement it in performing antireflux surgeries. Several RCT's were conducted evaluating its outcomes. A metaanalysis of 6 RCT's including 226 patients compared robotic fundoplication to LNF. Results from this study showed no difference in operative complications, length of hospital stay, need for reoperation or postoperative dysphagia between the two procedures. However, robotic fundoplication was found to be expensive and had longer operative times. Although results were largely comparable robotic fundoplication offered no advantage over LNF [54]. Larger scale RCT's are needed to definitively assess the role of robotics in antireflux surgery.


Magnetic Ring Implants (LINX™ Procedure)

The LINX magnetic implant system was approved for use in GERD in 2012 by the FDA. This device works through a ring of magnets implanted laparoscopically around the LES. They augment LES pressure upto 15–25 mm of Hg to prevent reflux but at same time allow passage of food through it. This device was found to be safe in patients for GERD and the changes it brought were evaluated via manometry and published in a study of 121 patients. Results have been tabulated in Table 2 [55] (Fig. 8).

Table 2 Manometry changes in magnetic ring implants

Parameter	Preoperative Value	Postoperative value	p Value
Median LES Resting pressure	18 mmHg	23 mmHg	0.0003
Residual Pressure	4 mmHg	9 mmHg	<0.0001
Distal esophageal contraction amplitude	80 mmHg	90 mmHg	0.02
Percentage of Peristalsis	94%	87%	0.71

Fig. 8 Schematic diagram showing LINX™ magnetic device applied at Lower oesophageal sphincter



Apart from this, the study also showed that patients with a manometrically defective LES were restored 67% of the time to a normal sphincter and those with a structurally defective or severely defective LES improved to a normal LES in 77% and 56% of patients, respectively. Only 18% of patients with a normal preoperative manometric LES deteriorated to a lower category. The results of this study were very promising with significant improvement in LES tone without deleterious effects on the body and it managed to restore a manometrically defective LES to normal sphincter and leaving a normal sphincter stable.

The excitement following this procedure led to comparisons with the traditional surgical method of fundoplication.

Two metaanalysis and systemic review comparing early outcomes of LINX vs LNF were published with the latter including 7 observational studies including 1211 patients [56, 57]. In both the metaanalysis LINX and LNF were both seen to be safe and effective at 1 year follow-up. PPI suspension, need for endoscopic dilatation and QOL rates were similar for both groups with LINX procedure associated with less gas/bloat symptoms and increased ability to vomit and belch. LNF was found to take longer operative times and was technically challenging needing skilled surgeons. The findings need to be assessed with caution as these included only observational studies and no RCT's were available. Long term safety, efficacy and durability are yet to be ascertained for the LINX procedure.

Conclusion

Although newer modalities such as robotics, magnetic sphincter implants and also the advent of endoscopic fundoplication bring excitement to the field of antireflux surgery, the definite role, safety and reliability are yet to be ascertained on long term follow up studies. Laparoscopic Nissen's Fundoplication remains a tested modality for over four decades and can be considered to be the gold standard surgical approach. LNF remains the alternate therapy of choice for long term/refractory medical management.

Key Clinical Points

1. Laparoscopic Nissen's Fundoplication (LNF) has gained popularity since 1990s and has largely replaced open fundoplication.
2. Postprandial physiological reflux is quite common and may be asymptomatic. Pathological reflux occurs consequent to disruption of the anti-reflux barrier between the stomach and esophagus and is associated with symptoms or mucosal injury.
3. Elective laparoscopic repair of asymptomatic paraesophageal hernia may even be detrimental in patients over 65 years of age.
4. The role of barium esophagogram is currently limited to evaluation of the complications of GERD and is helpful in locating the GEJ in relation to the hiatus, thereby helping in estimating the size and reducibility of hiatus hernias.

5. CT Scan is useful to demonstrate cephalad migration of the GEJ and fundus especially on oral contrast films. It is also useful in emergency cases of paraesophageal volvulus.
6. Ambulatory pH monitoring is especially useful in patients with normal UGI Endoscopy findings and in patients with atypical symptoms.
7. Proton pump inhibitors are the backbone of medical therapy for GERD, but its use is limited by long term use, patient compliance, costs and relapse of symptoms on discontinuation and side effects of long term use.
8. Laparoscopic fundoplication bestows a shorter hospital stay, early return to work, reduced risk of complications and higher patient satisfaction rates. The drawbacks are longer operating time and higher long-term reoperation rates.
9. Complete and partial fundoplication have no difference in postoperative dysphagia, gas-bloating, inability to belch or dilatation for dysphagia.
10. Routine division of short gastric do not confer any functional or clinical advantages and is associated with increased surgery time and persistent epigastric bloat syndrome.
11. Mesh repair of the hiatus is associated with lesser recurrence rates on short term but had similar patterns of complications with increased dysphagia.
12. Presence and size of a bougie may define the incidence of dysphagia. It should be weighed against the risk of possible oesophageal injury and prior consent for it needs to be taken.
13. Laparoscopic redo fundoplication is safe, feasible and effective with higher complication rates than index surgery and due to its complexity should be performed only by experienced surgeons.
14. Robotic fundoplication is expensive and has a longer operative time. No difference has been noted in operative complications, length of hospital stay, need for reoperation or postoperative dysphagia in robotic vs laparoscopic fundoplication.

Editor's Note¹

Insertion of the Bougie Across the Esophageal Junction

Insertion of a bougie is often recommended in numerous guidelines including SAGES (Grade B). Few randomized trials have shown significant lower dysphagia rates 12 months later after using bougies, however the size of bougie used made the most important impact in dysphagia rates [1]. Reports are so varied and complex to interpret with many variables, that the results are frequently suggested to have a relation between post-operative dysphagia to undiagnosed pre-operative dysmotility, timing of dysphagia assessment (months after surgery) and scoring system used in assessing post-operative dysphagia [2].

There is definite evidence, which suggest that the presence and size of a bougie may define the incidence of dysphagia. It is always weighed against the risk of possible oesophageal injury and prior consent for it needs to be taken [2].

Incidence of perforation during LF is around 0.8% which is attributed to lack of direction at the tip of bougie and thought to be aggravated due to anterior angulation of the GE junction after posterior crural repair.

LES Electrical Stimulation

It is a novel technique that has been designed to be a successful, minimally invasive and minimal disturbing approach to GERD than laparoscopic fundoplication [3]. Temporary LES stimulation leads to durable increase in LES pressure, without impairing LES relaxation and esophageal peristalsis [3]. It has 3 different components: a bipolar electrical stimulation lead, implantable pulse generator and external programmer. It delivers stimulation waves in sessions which can be adjusted in non-invasive fashion.

Procedure: Anterior right side of esophageal wall is exposed laparoscopically and electrodes are superficially implanted and fixed into LES 1 cm apart along the longitudinal axis of the esophagus. Correct position of electrode is checked under endoscopy at the LES level and to rule out esophageal perforation. Subcutaneous pocket is created for the generator and is attached to the pulse generator.

High success rate is claimed by the proponents, suggesting normalization or a decrease of 50% or more of acid exposure of the distal esophagus in 71% of patients and complete cessation of PPI use in 76% of patients. LES electrical stimulation might have promising results in GERD patients. Robust data will confirm the preliminary outcomes.

Laparoscopic Sleeve Fundoplication

Laparoscopic sleeve gastrectomy has been noted to increase gastroesophageal reflux. It may be beneficial in GERD with concomitant obesity. Therefore, authors have

¹References: Main chapter references are included after the "References Editor's Note" section.

investigated the concept of adding a fundoplication to laparoscopic sleeve gastrectomy termed as laparoscopic sleeve fundoplication (Fig. EN1). Though weight loss and GERD resolution has been promising in the short term, long term results are awaited. A higher incidence in perforation and complications has also been observed [4].

Endoscopic Fundoplication/Transoral Incisionless Fundoplication

TIF (Transoral incisionless fundoplication) is being investigated as a minimally invasive technique for treatment of GERD refractory to PPI and small hiatal hernia (<2 cm). The recommended technique consists of esophagogastric plications in the region of intraabdominal esophagus with fundus being wrapped around the distal

Fig. EN1 Schematic diagram of Laparoscopic sleeve fundoplication





Fig. EN2 Schematic diagram showing the end result of Endoscopic Fundoplication/Transoral incisionless fundoplication



esophagus and secured with fasteners above the Z line (Figure EN2). Though it appears to be promising in PPI refractory GERD in the short term, its long-term efficacy is yet to be evaluated and when compared with LNF currently TIF appears to have an inferior outcome [5–8].

Stretta Procedure

Stretta is a procedure by which radiofrequency treatment is delivered to the lower esophageal sphincter by endoscopic balloon mounted needles. It remodels LES and gastric musculature at cardia and thus improves symptoms of GERD. A recent meta-analysis on the procedure concluded that Stretta improved subjective and objective parameters of GERD. It decreased (improved) health related quality of life score and pooled heartburn score. Only 49% patients receiving PPI required to continue the medicine after the procedure. It reduced erosive esophagitis by 24%, decreased lower esophageal acid exposure, and increased lower esophageal sphincter basal pressure [9]. An earlier metaanalysis however did not find any difference in outcome after Stretta procedure for GERD [10].

Quality of Life

GERD-Health Related Quality of Life Questionnaires convey that heartburn and regurgitation due to GERD is relieved in 84% to 97% after laparoscopic fundoplication [11, 12] and 86% to 96% are well pleased with the end result [13]. No change or worsening related to bloating and swallowing is reported after Laparoscopic fundoplication [11].

Comparison of various meta-analyses has been done and data is included in the following tables:

Table EN1: Meta-analysis on efficacy and safety of endoscopic, transoral incisionless fundoplication

Table EN2: Meta-analysis comparing magnetic sphincter augmentation versus fundoplication in GERD

Table EN3: Meta-analysis comparing robotic with laparoscopic fundoplication

Table EN4: Meta-analyses comparing total and partial laparoscopic fundoplication

Table EN5: Meta-analyses comparing short gastric division versus non division in laparoscopic fundoplication