Overview of necrotizing pancreatitis surgical resection

AYMAN MOHAMMED RAJEH ALOSAIMI, ABDULRAHMAN TALAL RASHEED QASIM,

FAISAL SALEH ALHARTHY, MOUSA NASER M ASERY, MOHANAD OBAID ALKHAMASH,

SAMI MUJRI ALZAHRANI, SALEH ABDULLAH ALHAZMY

✚ Abstract:

When infection of pancreatic or extrapancreatic necrosis occurs, surgical approach constitutes the

most accepted therapeutic option. In this review we discuss surgical approach and type of access

for necrosectomy. A search of literature through databases; MIDLINE, and EMBASE

was conducted to identified related articles to our concerned topic (Surgical

management of necrotizing pancreatitis) that were published up to December 2017.

The choice to operate on a patient with serious acute pancreatitis is often difficult and requires

mature clinical judgment. Indicators that are widely accepted include to develop the differential

diagnosis, when the surgeon is concerned that the symptoms are because of an illness aside from

pancreatitis for which an operation is mandatory; in consistent and serious biliary pancreatitis,

when an obstructing gallstone is lodged in the ampulla of Vater and cannot be managed

endoscopically; in the existence of infected pancreatic necrosis; and to drain a pancreatic abscess,

if percutaneous drainage does not generate the desired outcome. Lots of authors have used

imprecise terms to describe their signs for surgical intervention in serious acute pancreatitis-such

as sepsis, pain, anorexia, fever, mass impact, phlegmon, pancreatic abscess. Other signs that are

less well defined and somewhat controversial are the existence of sterile pancreatic necrosis including 50% or more of the pancreas.

Introduction:

Acute necrotizing pancreatitis is a destructive illness. While only 10-15% of patients with acute edematous pancreatitis create the necrotizing version of the illness, mortality rates related to necrosis range from 27% to 86% [1], [2], [3].Patients with necrotizing pancreatitis regularly need assisted ventilation, hemo-dynamic tracking and prolonged stays in the ICU. Likewise, several impacted patients need several operations for control of their disease. The specific indications and timing for surgical intervention are advancing and debatable. While consensus point of view sustains personnel necrosectomy for the treatment of infected pancreatic death [7], the surgical management of sterile necrosis remains the subject of intense debate. Challengers of the operative treatment of necrotizing pancreatitis mention high mortality rates with procedure [1], [3].In addition, several recommend that procedure is typically unnecessary in patients with sterile pancreatic necrosis [1], [5].Supporters for the personnel therapy of necrotizing pancreatitis point out lowered hospital keeps and boosted death [2].The timing of the initial procedure is likewise vague, although numerous authors support waiting a minimum of 4- 6 weeks before personnel necrosectomy [6].We hypothesize that early surgical management of acute necrotizing pancreatitis, independent of recorded infection, could be taken on safely and with a reduced death

rate. To resolve this hypothesis, we analysed 21 consecutive patients operatively treated for CT-documented necrotizing pancreatitis, independent of infection, at an area medical facility.

When infection of pancreatic or extrapancreatic necrosis occurs, surgical approach constitutes the most accepted therapeutic option. In this review we discuss surgical approach and type of access for necrosectomy.

⬥ Methodology:

A search of literature through databases; MIDLINE, and EMBASE was conducted to identified related articles to our concerned topic (Surgical management of necrotizing pancreatitis) that were published up to December 2017, Following Mesh terms were used in our search through the MIDLINE; "pancreatitis", "management". We limited our search to English language published articles with human subject.

⬥ Discussion:

- **PANCREATIC INFECTION**

Today, more patients endure the first phase of serious acute pancreatitis because of renovations in intensive care medicine, thus increasing the risk of later blood poisoning [7].There is no uncertainty that pancreatic infection is the major risk variable in necrotising pancreatitis when it come to morbidity and mortality in the second phase of the illness. The death rate for patients with infected pancreatic necrosis is above 20%, and up to 80% of fatal outcomes in acute pancreatitis result from septic issues [8].In contrast, death for sterile necrosis is reduced and can typically be successfully dealt with by a conventional technique, although surgery might be needed for late complications or consistent extreme pancreatitis (table 1) [9]. Although records have shown that some chosen instances of acute pancreatitis with favorable great needle aspirates can be dealt with without surgery, conservative management of patients with infected necrosis and several organ failure is connected with mortality rates of as much as 100% [10].There is basic agreement that infected necrosis is an indicator for surgical therapy or interventional drainage (table 1) [11], [12].

Table 1. Indications for surgical treatment of acute necrotising pancreatitis.

(1) Infected pancreatic necrosis
(2) Sterile pancreatic necrosis:
(a) persistent necrotising pancreatitis
(b) "fulminant acute pancreatitis"
(3) Complications of acute pancreatitis:
For example, bowel perforation, bleeding

- **MANAGEMENT OF INFECTED NECROSIS**

With surgical therapy, the death rate for patients with infected pancreatic necrosis might be decreased to roughly 20% in numerous specialist centres [14].Thus when infection develops, the therapeutic technique needs to be directed to mechanical removal of infected necrotic tissue. Recently, numerous options to the standard open medical approaches have been checked out and the absolute need for surgical intervention in infected necrosis has been challenged.

- **TIMING OF NECROSECTOMY**

Patients with severe necrotising pancreatitis can progress to an important condition within a couple of hrs or days after the start of signs and symptoms. Years ago, very early medical treatment was favoured when systemic body organ difficulties existed. Mortality rates of as much as 65% have been described with early surgery in severe pancreatitis, doubting the advantage of surgical intervention within the first days after start of symptoms [13].In the only potential randomised trial contrasting very early (within 72 hours of signs and symptoms) with late (at the very least 12 days after beginning) pancreatic resection/debridement in patients with severe pancreatitis, death rates were 56% and 27%, respectively. The trial was ended as a result of concern about the very high death of early surgery. Today, there is basic arrangement that surgery in serious pancreatitis must be carried out as late as feasible [6].The 3rd to 4th week after the beginning of condition is agreed as giving ideal operative problems with well demarcated necrotic tissue present, thus limiting the extent of surgery to pure debridement and to just one solitary treatment. This approach decreases the danger of bleeding, minimises the surgery related loss of crucial tissue, and thus reduces endocrine and exocrine pancreatic insufficiency. Only when it comes to tried and tested contaminated necrosis or in the presence of unusual difficulties, such as substantial bleeding or bowel perforation, has to early surgery be done [6].

- **TECHNIQUES OF NECROSECTOMY**

Standard surgical treatment

The goal is to control the emphasis to make sure that further problems are stayed clear of by stopping the progress of infection and the release of proinflammatory conciliators. A normally agreed concept of surgical management includes the body organ preserving method which entails debridement and maximisation of postoperative removal of retroperitoneal particles and exudate. Four principal methods have been promoted: (1) necrosectomy combined with open packing [15]; (2) intended staged re-laparotomies with repetitive lavage [16]; (3) closed continual lavage of the lesser sac and retroperitoneum [17]; and (4) shut packing.

Necrosectomy has commonly been embarked on by an open path. Technical information are defined in other places. Appropriate debridement could normally be attained with a single see to the operating theatre. While necrosectomy is done in a basically identical style, the four methods vary in the means they give departure networks for further slough and contaminated debris. In the hands of experienced specialists, death rates below 15% have been defined for all four strategies: (1) open packing [15]; (2) repeated laparotomies [16]; (3) closed packing; (4) closed constant lavage (table 2).

Table 2.Outcome of different techniques for open necrosectomy

Technique	Patients &;(n)	Patients with &;infected necrosis	Mortality	Re-laparotomy &;(n)
"Open packing"				
Bradley 1993[21]	71	71 (100%)	15%	1–5/pt
Branum 1998[18]	50	42 (84%)	6 (12%)	2–13/pt
Bosscha 1998[23]	28	28 (100%)	11 (39%)	17 (mean)/pt
"Planned relaparotomies"				

Technique	Patients &;(n)	Patients with &;infected necrosis	Mortality	Re-laparotomy &;(n)
Sarr 1991[16]	23	18 (75%)	4 (17%)	2–>5/pt
Tsiotos 1998[20]	72	57 (79%)	18 (25%)	1–7/pt
"Closed packing"				
Fernandez-del C 1998[19]	64	36 (56%)	4 (6%)	11 (17%)
"Closed continuous lavage"				
Beger 1988[17]	95	37 (39%)	8 (8%)	26 (27%)
Farkas 1996[24]	123	123 (100%)	9 (7%)	
Büchler 2000[22]	29	27 (93%)	7 (24%)	6 (22%)

The first two approaches, the "open packing" [15] and "intended presented re-laparotomies" [16] have in typical that they mandate numerous re-laparotomies before last closure of the abdomen. Although the occurrence of reoccurring intra-abdominal sepsis lowered dramatically compared with single necrosectomy, postoperative morbidity stayed high. There is a positive relationship in between repetitive surgical interventions and morbidity, including gastrointestinal fistula, tummy outlet stenosis, incisional hernia, and local bleeding. Hence these 2 treatments should just be taken into consideration in the rare case when early debridement is shown. The various other 2 techniques, necrosectomy and succeeding shut continual lavage of the minimal cavity [24] and "closed packaging", have implicit a postoperative technique to continuously get rid of recurring pancreatic death. As a result, re-laparotomies are frequently not required. Hence postoperative morbidity, particularly the percent of stomach fistula and incisional hernias, is reduced.The results of the last two surgical techniques with regard to morbidity, re-laparotomies, and death are similar and thus reliant on the preference of the cosmetic surgeon. One of the most generally

embraced method is that of closed lavage of the debrided cavity, initial explained by Beger et al in 1982 [17].

Minimally invasive procedures for debridement of infected necrosis

The high death in infected pancreatic necrosis regardless of surgery has led to the growth of a number of minimally invasive methods, consisting of radiological, endoscopic, and minimally invasive surgery, as alternate procedures. The reasoning is to minimise peri- and postoperative stress in critically sick septic patients suffering from multiorgan failure. By this, the indication for intervention could be prolonged to patients who are or else unfit for surgery, although this has not been reviewed in systematic comparisons. Additionally, these strategies could be made use of to originally manage sepsis and to delay surgery for better demarcation of necrotic tissue.

Percutaneous drainage

Interventional techniques have ended up being significantly essential in recent years because of the currently ubiquitous accessibility of CT scanning and ultrasonography. In 1998, Freeny et alia reported for the very first time a series of patients with infected acute necrotising pancreatitis who were specifically drained pipes by CT guided percutaneous catheter drainage [25].Earlier records covered other infectious difficulties of acute pancreatitis, [26] including infected pancreatic fluid collections, pseudocysts, or abscesses, as categorized by the International Symposium on Acute Pancreatitis in Atlanta.

Freeny and colleagues [25] developed a strategy of percutaneous drainage which not just drained pipes contaminated necrosis passively yet included necrosectomy by including hostile irrigation through big birthed percutaneous catheters (28 F). Thirty 4 patients with necrotising pancreatitis and unchecked sepsis were dealt with. Approximately three different catheter sites per patient and

four catheter exchanges each patient were necessary for the removal of necrotic product. Pancreatic surgery was prevented in 16 patients (47%), and sepsis was managed in 25 patients (74%). Although nine of the latter team needed elective surgery, the surgical procedure can be avoided effectively in critically unwell patients till stabilisation. Percutaneous drainage was ineffective in 9 patients that needed surgery to control sepsis or bleeding (26%). The overall mortality was 12%. These 4 patients all were critically unwell with multiorgan failure, bleeding, or shock. The recipe of success in this collection was the dedication of the interventional radiologists (with typically day-to-day catheter interventions: 146 catheter exchanges, long period of time of drainage of 25- 152 days, no issues) and the enhancement of the strategy which made it possible for percutaneous necrosectomy. Nonetheless, patients with main gland necrosis, that typically present with disruption of the belly of the major pancreatic air duct leading to a fistula, responded improperly to percutaneous drainage in the series from Seattle (cure in 4/14 (28%) and control of sepsis in 50%).

The radiological approach was required to its limits by Gmeinwieser and associates [26].They combined percutaneous retroperitoneal necrosectomy, fragmentation of necrotic pancreatic and peripancreatic tissue with a snare catheter and Dormia baskets, constant lavage of the cavity, and duplicated bronchoscopic visualisation of the dental caries with percutaneous blockade of a pancreatic duct disturbance to successfully treat and prevent surgery in a young man with infected necrosis who purely decreased the procedure suggested.

Endoscopic treatment

Successful endoscopic drainage of symptomatic sterile or infected pancreatic necrosis was reported by Baron et al as early as 1996 [27].The technique applied was initially described for straightforward pseudocysts. Several transgastric or transduodenal drainage catheters (10 F) and a

nasopancreatic irrigation tube were endoscopically placed right into the retroperitoneum to do necrosectomy. Lavage was continued till resolution of the collection. In this first report, 2- 4 procedures were needed for resolution and the mean duration of catheter placement was 19 days. Effective removal of necrosis was achieved in over 80% with no death. Nevertheless, the majority of patients treated had no infected necrosis yet residual liquid collections with debris. Virtually 40% were iatrogenically infected secondarily by endoscopy. Furthermore, there were significant issues in 45% of patients, including serious blood loss and gastric perforation (table 4 ▸). Additionally, it is deserving of note that approximately 60% of those patients successfully drained created further collections in the succeeding 2 years [28] Hence this collection validated that in the visibility of death, drainage has to be incorporated with some kind of surgical removal of necrotic material. In 1999, Baron and Morgan explained effective placement of percutaneous endoscopic jejunostomy tubes via a PEG tube and subsequently through a transgastric track right into the necrotic pancreatic collections for irrigations in two cases [29].The theoretical advantages of this method are that on the one hand it stays clear of the requirement for unpleasant nasopancreatic catheters and on the various other does not generate the side effects observed after percutaneous drainage, including skin irritability and exterior pancreatic fistulas [29].

Although endoscopic drainage could be relevant in some patients with necrotising pancreatitis, just a couple of centres have used this technique. The cause contaminated death are only anecdotal, experience with this method is limited, and no interdisciplinary relative data exist.

Minimally invasive procedures

Advancements in laparoscopic technology and instrumentation allow the utilisation of minimally invasive methods for management in pancreatic illness, and theoretically reduce the surgical stress in the already compromised patient.

As early as 1996, Gagner explained laparoscopic debridement and necrosectomy for the treatment of necrotising pancreatitis with three various minimally invasive methods: (1) transgastric drainage, (2) retrogastric retrocolic debridement, and (3) a full retroperitoneoscopic method [30].Ever since, several different strategies have been applied by a number of groups in the search for the most convenient access to the lethal masses in the retroperitoneum.

The laparoscopic assisted transgastric strategy is comparable to the endoscopic approach and in some way the same to the method using a PEG to access the stomach [29] Several instance records exist which explain successful laparoscopic transgastric pancreatic necrosectomy for infected necrosis, recommending reliable debridement and internal drainage in picked patients with this minimally invasive method [31].However, no bigger series have been reported.

Others have approached the infected necrosis with typical laparoscopy, integrating necrosectomy with splenectomy and cholecystectomy [32].Zhu et alia released their experience of the laparoscopic technique in 10 patients. Although that they included patients with acute haemorrhagic and necrotising pancreatitis without infection which do not require surgical treatment whatsoever, their mortality was 10%. As virtually every procedure can be done laparoscopically, this strategy has not been assessed in any kind of bigger research study or in prospective randomised tests. A theoretical threat is the spread of infection right into the abdominal cavity, more intraoperative troubles in instance of reoperations, and enhanced threat of erosions of the intestinal tract.

✚ Conclusion:

The choice to operate on a patient with serious acute pancreatitis is often difficult and requires mature clinical judgment. Indicators that are widely accepted include to develop the differential

diagnosis, when the surgeon is concerned that the symptoms are because of an illness aside from pancreatitis for which an operation is mandatory; in consistent and serious biliary pancreatitis, when an obstructing gallstone is lodged in the ampulla of Vater and can not be managed endoscopically; in the existence of infected pancreatic necrosis; and to drain a pancreatic abscess, if percutaneous drainage does not generate the desired outcome. Lots of authors have used imprecise terms to describe their signs for surgical intervention in serious acute pancreatitis-such as sepsis, pain, anorexia, fever, mass impact, phlegmon, pancreatic abscess.Other signs that are less well defined and somewhat controversial are the existence of sterile pancreatic necrosis including 50% or more of the pancreas, when the pancreatitis persists regardless of optimum medical therapy, when a patient's situation degrades. For these last three indications, standards have been presented that permit a logical method to management, although uncertainty remains. Surgeons should strive to define carefully and precisely the clinical state of their patients at the time that an operation is done, as well as the findings and technical details of the operation. This need to permit further refinement in the management of tis vexing issue.

➕ Reference:

1. Bradley EL, 3rd, Allen K. A prospective longitudinal study of observation versus surgical intervention in the management of necrotizing pancreatitis. Am J Surg 1991; 161:19–24; discussion 24–5.

2. Fernandez-del Castillo C, Rattner DW, Makary MA, Mostafavi A, McGrath D, Warshaw AL. Debridement and closed packing for the treatment of necrotizingpancreatitis. Ann Surg. 1998;228:676–84.

3. Bradley EL., 3rd A fifteen year experience with open drainage for infected pancreatic necrosis. Surg Gynecol Obstet. 1993;177:215–22.

4. Hartwig W, Werner J, Uhl W, Buchler MW. Management of infection in acute pancreatitis. J Hepatobiliary Pancreat Surg. 2002;9:423–8.

5. Aultman DF, Bilton BD, , Zibari GB, , McMillan RW, , McDonald JC. Nonoperative therapy for acute necrotizing pancreatitis. Am Surg 1997;63:1114–7; discussion 1117–18

6. Uhl W, Warshaw A, Imrie C, et al. IAP Guidelines for the Surgical Management of Acute Pancreatitis. Pancreatology. 2002;2:565–73.

7. Neoptolemos JP, Raraty M, Finch M, *et al.* Acute pancreatitis: the substantial human and financial cases. Gut 1998;42:886–91.

8. Gloor B, Müller C, Worni M, *et al.* Late mortality in patients with severe acute pancreatitis. Br J Surg2001;88:975–9.

9. Bradley A, Allen K. A prospective longitudinal study of observation versus surgical intervention in the management of necrotizing pancreatitis. Am J Surg 1991;161:19–24.

10. Widdison AL, Karanjia ND. Pancreatic infection complicating acute pancreatitis. Br J Surg1993;80:148–54.

11. Uhl W, Warshaw A, Imrie C, *et al.* IAP Guidelines for the surgical management of acute pancreatitis. Pancreatology 2002;2:565–73.

12. United Kingdom guidelines for the management of acute pancreatitis. Gut 1998;42:1–13.

13. Hartwig W, Maksan S, Foitzik T, *et al.* Reduction in mortality with delayed surgical therapy of severe pancreatitis. J Gastrointest Surg 2002;6:481–7.

14. Branum G, Galloway J, Hirchowitz W, *et al.* Pancreatic necrosis: results of necrosectomy, packing, and ultimate closure over drains. Ann Surg 1998;227:870–7.

15. Bradley ELd. Management of infected pancreatic necrosis by open drainage. Ann Surg 1987;206:542–50.

16. Sarr MG, Nagorney DM, Mucha P Jr, *et al.* Acute necrotizing pancreatitis: management by planned, staged pancreatic necrosectomy/debridement and delayed primary wound closure over drains. Br J Surg1991;78:576–81.

17. Beger HG, Buchler M, Bittner R, *et al.* Necrosectomy and postoperative local lavage in necrotizing pancreatitis. Br J Surg 1988;75:207–12.

18. Branum G, Galloway J, Hirchowitz W, *et al.* Pancreatic necrosis: results of necrosectomy, packing, and ultimate closure over drains. Ann Surg 1998;227:870–7.

19. Fernandez-del Castillo C, Rattner DW, Makary MA, *et al.* Debridement and closed packing for the treatment of necrotizing pancreatitis. Ann Surg 1998;228:676–84.

20. Tsiotos GG, Luque-de Leon E, Sarr MG. Long-term outcome of necrotizing pancreatitis treated by necrosectomy. Br J Surg 1998;85:1650–3.

21. Bradley ELD. A clinically based classification system for acute pancreatitis. Summary of the International Symposium on Acute Pancreatitis, Atlanta, Ga, September 11–13, 1992. Arch Surg1993;128:586–90.

22. Buchler MW, Gloor B, Müller CA, *et al.* Acute necrotizing pancreatitis: treatment strategy according to the status of infection. Ann Surg 2000;232:619–26.

23. Bosscha K, Hulstaert P, Hennipman A, *et al.* Fulminant acute pancreatitis and infected necrosis; results of open management of the abdomen and "planned" reoperations. J Am Coll Surg 1998;187:255–62.

24. Farkas G, Marton J, MAndi Y .et al. Surgical treatment and management of infected pancreatic necrosis. Br J Surg 1996;83:890–3.

25. Freeny P, Hauptmann E, Althaus S, *et al.* Percutaneous CT-guided catheter drainage of infected acute necrotizing pancreatitis: techniques and results. Am J Roentgenol 1998;170:969–75.

26. Gerzof S, Robbins A, Johnson W, *et al.* Percutaneous catheter drainage of abdominal abscesses. N Engl J Med 1981;305:653–7.

27. Gmeinwieser J, Holstege A, Zirngibl H, *et al.* Successful percutaneous treatment of infected necrosis of the body of the pancreas associated with segmental disruption of the main pancreatic duct. Gastrointest Endosc 2000;52:413–15.

28. Baron T, Thaggard W, Morgan D, *et al.* Endoscopic therapy for organized pancreatic necrosis. Gastroenterology 1996;111:755–64.

29. Adkinson K, Morgan D, Baron TH. Long term outcome following successful endoscopic drainage of organized pancreatic necrosis. Gastrointest Endosc 1997;45:514.

30. Baron T, Morgan D. Endoscopic transgastric irrigation tube placement via PEG fordebridement of organized pancreatic necrosis. Gastrointest Endosc 1999;50:574–7.

31. Gagner M . Laparoscopic treatment of acute necrotizing pancreatitis. Semin Laparosc Surg 1996;3:21–8.

32. Ammori B . Laparoscopic transgastric pancreatic necrosectomy for infected pancreatic necrosis. Surg Endosc 2002;16:1362–5.

33. Hamad G, Broderick T. Laparoscopic pancreatic necrosectomy. J Laparoendosc Adv Surg Tech2000;10:115–18.