

Surgery in Africa - Monthly Review

When is Primary Anastomosis Safe in the Colon?

[Introduction](#)

[History - Development of the Paradigm](#)

[Revision of the Paradigm - Colonic Injuries](#)

[Revision of the Paradigm - The Morbidity of Colostomy](#)

[Revision of the Paradigm - Diverticulitis, Obstruction and Sigmoid Volvulus](#)

[Do Stapled or Hand-Sewn Techniques Influence Results?](#)

[Revision of the Paradigm - The Need for Mechanical Bowel Preparation \(MBP\)](#)

[Conclusions](#)

[References](#)

[Clinical Scenarios](#)

Introduction

The repair by suture or resection of diseased or injured colon is one of the most important skills in general surgery. Untreated or treated improperly these conditions cause significant morbidity in terms of intra-abdominal infection, fistulae, or death from generalized peritonitis. Today in Western medicine the two most common conditions requiring emergency colonic resection are obstructing colon cancers and complicated diverticulitis. In Africa, the equivalent conditions are gangrenous sigmoid volvulus and penetrating injuries resulting in colonic perforation. The deleterious consequences of primary anastomosis of the obstructed left colon with a tenuous blood supply, filled with pathogenic organisms and/or of the perforated colon with various degrees of peritoneal contamination fostered a surgical paradigm which precluded primary anastomosis of the left colon unless preoperative mechanical bowel preparation and antibiotic prophylaxis had been undertaken.

This was certainly the paradigm I was taught and which I practised throughout 1980-2000 in Canada. As **Primary Surgery, Non-Trauma**, an exemplary text for International surgeons from which I plan to quote extensively in these Reviews, states: *“You cannot safely anastomose large gut to large gut when it is obstructed and instead you have to let its contents escape through an ostomy. When large gut is to be anastomosed, it has to be carefully prepared first with enemas and antibiotics...”* **King, 1990 (1)** A similar attitude held for colonic injuries. The definitive International Committee of the Red Cross 1990 edition of **Surgery for Victims of War** states: *“The general rule is that a damaged colon should be exteriorized or defunctioned by proximal colostomy”*. **Dufour, 1990 (2)**

Over the last decade the tenets underlying this paradigm have been seriously questioned and the whole approach to emergency colonic surgery has been revised. This Review will briefly consider the historical development of the paradigm and then detail its decline through experience with colon injuries, the morbidity of colostomies themselves, alternatives in acute colonic disease such as obstruction, diverticulitis and sigmoid volvulus and finally the fundamental questioning of the value of mechanical bowel preparation.

History - Development of the Paradigm

The history of the development of treatments for perforated, gangrenous or obstructed colons reflects the fear surgeons had for the dangers of anastomotic dehiscence. The late 19th century saw the development of standardized techniques for “two-layer” bowel anastomosis **Ellis, 1989 (3)** and at the same time non-anastomotic techniques for the acutely diseased colon - the colostomy. The Paul-Mikulicz operation exteriorized the diseased colon as a double-barreled colostomy. Mayo in 1907 recommended temporary transverse colostomy for obstructing diverticulitis. In the 20th century treatment for perforated diverticulitis evolved towards the Hartmann procedure, proposed for colon cancer by Henri Hartmann in 1921, with resection of the perforated segment and proximal colostomy. This procedure showed an improvement in mortality over proximal colostomy, suture and drainage. **Parks, 1989 (4)**

For obstructing left-sided carcinomas a traditional three-staged process was initially proposed which included initial transverse colostomy, followed by resection-anastomosis and finally closure of the colostomy. Because of the recognized delay and difficulties of three operations, alternatives such as sub-total colectomy as well as techniques for on-table bowel cleansing and intra-colonic stents were developed. Lesions of the right and transverse colon could be managed by forms of right hemicolectomy and ileo-colic anastomosis. But the taboo of anastomosing unprepared left colon without proximal diverting colostomy persisted.

Ogilvie’s WWII experience established exteriorization of the damaged bowel and fecal diversion as the primary modalities of therapy for wartime colon injuries. Mortality dropped from 50% to 10% and

this approach was initially applied to civilian penetrating colonic injury. The treatment for extra-peritoneal rectal injuries included colostomy, irrigation of the rectal stump and wide perineal drainage. While some form of fecal diversion was considered mandatory for emergency left-sided colon lesions, an elaborate preparation was undertaken for elective colon surgery. Mechanical bowel preparations (MBP) to remove the fecal contents were developed. These progressed from prolonged fasting, fluids only and cathartics to rapid polyethylene glycol solution and sodium phosphate administration. At the same time multiple different regimes of peri-operative antibiotics have been found to be useful in reducing post-operative septic complications and mortality **Song, 1998 (5)**. The antibiotics need to be active against enteric aerobic and anaerobic organisms and should be limited to the operative period. A single dose is adequate for operations less than 2 hours in duration. Gentamycin and metronidazole are a good combination. Parenteral and oral antibiotics may have a cumulative effect. **Lewis, 2002 (6)** Of all the traditional recommendations concerning colon surgery only those relating to peri-operative antibiotics have withstood scientific scrutiny and are uniformly practised.

While much of surgical practise is a learned behaviour arising from the apprenticeship system of surgical education, the second half of the 20th century has seen the rise of evidence-based medicine and the prospective, randomized clinical trial (RCT). These types of studies have begun to alter surgical practise.

Revision of the paradigm – colonic injuries

It was in the field of colon trauma that exceptions to the rule prohibiting primary colon repair initially began to be advocated. Beginning first with right-sided injuries, subsequently extending to left sided lesions, those that could be repaired without resection, then to resection with proximal colostomy and finally the most recent recommendations accepting resection and primary anastomosis without fecal diversion as appropriate surgery. The initial caveats to this most radical treatment included limited time from injury to repair, minimal contamination, few associated injuries. Whereas **Cornwell, 1998 (7)** questioned the use of primary repair for high risk penetrating trauma patients, by 2001, the same group, **Demetriades, 2001 (8)**, having undertaken a multi-center prospective study, concluded that all colon injuries could be managed without fecal diversion without influencing morbidity or mortality. **Gonzalez, 1996 (9)** drew similar conclusions. However, **Miller, 2002 (10)** still raised a cautionary note for high risk patients, those with high trauma scores, destructive colon injuries, need for multiple blood transfusions, etc. In a meta-analysis, (which pools results from multiple RCTs), **Singer, 2002 (11)** clearly favoured primary repair without diversion for all risk categories. **Kamwendo, 2002 (12)** from South Africa showed that increasing time after injury did not preclude primary repair. **Esrighi, 1998 (13)** reflected the changing opinions of American surgeons on this question. **Demetriades, 2004 (14)** sums up current thinking. Note should be made that the need remains for colostomy in rectal injuries, because of the particular anatomy of this problem. These changes are reflected in the 1998 edition of **Surgery for Victims of War** which tentatively states that fecal diversion for colonic injuries “*has been the rule in war surgery, but the ICRC’s working experience has shown that it is seldom necessary.*” **(15)**

Revision of the paradigm – the morbidity of colostomy

While colostomy itself in the proper setting may be a valuable procedure, the need for and risks of additional surgical procedures increase the morbidity to the patient. **Khoury, 1996 (16)** reviewed the results of colostomy closure in 46 patients with a complication rate of 24%. **Riesener, 1997 (17)** reviewed 548 closures since 1972. He advocated MBP and peri-operative antibiotics. However their best complication rate was still 27%. In **Mealy, 1996 (18)** only 50% of patients had their stomas closed. **Berne, 1998 (19)** reviewed colostomy closures after trauma and also found high morbidities, although this was not the case after rectal injury. **Chandramouli, 2004 (20)** reviewed the experience of colostomies and their closure in children.

Revision of the paradigm – diverticulitis, obstruction and sigmoid volvulus

With the recognition of the increased morbidity of subsequent surgical procedures have come alternatives such as on-table lavage **Sitzler, 1998 (21)** and intra-colonic stenting. However, in the 1990s more surgeons began to perform resection and primary anastomosis in acute non-traumatic colon conditions. **Trillo, 1998 (22)** reported 43 cases without mortality. **Goozen, 2001 (23)** reported 45 patients with acute obstructive or perforated diverticulitis treated with resection and primary anastomosis. There were three deaths from anastomotic leaks-all in obstructed patients. They cautioned its use in these cases. **Salem, 2004 (24)** reviewed 98 published studies since 1957 and called for a RCT comparing resection and colostomy with primary anastomosis in acute surgical diverticulitis. **Whetstone, 2004 (25)** giving guidelines for management of diverticulitis insisted that the Hartmann procedure is the appropriate operation when emergency surgery is indicated.

Various forms of right-hemicolectomy and ileo-colic anastomosis have been accepted for some time as the surgical procedure of choice in acute right-sided obstructions. For left-sided obstructions some authors advocate subtotal colectomy and ileo-colic anastomosis. **Remst, 1998 (26)** is an example. **Edino, 2005 (27)** carried out on table lavage in 32 consecutive patients without mortality. **Harris, 2001 (28)** reviewed the use of endoluminal stents obviating the need for emergency surgery. **DeSalvo, 2004 (29)** carried out a literature review and concluded that there existed inadequate studies comparing primary anastomosis and colostomy in left-sided obstructions and recommended further RCTs. Clearly no definitive conclusion can be drawn concerning the safety of primary anastomosis without colostomy for acute left-sided obstructions.

The non-Western experience with sigmoid volvulus also favours divergence from the paradigm. **Kuzu, 2002 (30)** reported 102 patients with sigmoid volvulus requiring emergency surgery. Although the operative procedure was chosen by the surgeon about half the patients had resection and primary anastomosis and their infectious complications and death rates were similar to those with the Hartmann procedure. **De, 2003 (31)** reported 197 patients who all had resection and primary anastomosis without preoperative or intra-operative bowel preparation. There were only 2 leaks and 2 deaths, a remarkable result. **Raveenthiran, 2004 (32)** reported 57 patients half of whom had gangrenous colons with similar results. Despite the lack of clinical trials, surgeons in developing countries are using resection and primary anastomosis in sigmoid volvulus requiring acute surgical intervention..

Do stapled or hand-sewn techniques influence results?

Demetriades, 2002 (33) published a prospective, but uncontrolled, study in colonic injuries comparing stapled and sutured repairs and found no difference in terms of anastomotic leak or morbidity. **Lustosa, 2001** (34) performed a meta-analysis of 9 RCTs and concluded that the two surgical techniques were indistinguishable in terms of results. These results are very significant for the African experience where hand-sewn techniques predominate.

Revision of the paradigm – the need for mechanical bowel preparation (MBP)

While the value of peri-operative antibiotics has stood the test of scientific scrutiny, the other “sacred cow” of elective colon surgery, the mechanical bowel prep, has not. Hughes in 1972 was the first to conduct a RCT of patients undergoing primary anastomosis after elective left-sided colon resection with and without MBP. No differences in terms of anastomotic leaks and morbidity were found. **Geldere, 2001** (35) reported 250 patients undergoing elective and emergency right and left colon resections and anastomoses without MBP. This series had an anastomotic failure rate of only 1.25%. **Zmora, 2003** (36) and **Ram, 2005** (37) each published RCTs comparing elective resection and anastomosis with and without MBP and could find no difference in leakage rates or morbidity. Finally, **Bucher, 2004** (38) did a meta-analysis of 7 RCTs and found that MBP might actually be harmful. Patients undergoing MBP had a higher rate of septic complications than those with unprepared bowels. These reports show the capability of scientific studies to throw doubt on traditional surgical practise.

Conclusions

What kinds of recommendations can be made for African surgeons undertaking colon surgery in 2005?

- 1. Any recommendation must be dependent on the surgeon’s experience, the local conditions, anaesthetic facilities, etc.**
2. Almost all colonic injuries can be repaired without fecal diversion. The sole exception would be for severe injuries requiring major resection, where the patient requires multiple blood transfusions, is in shock or has massive contamination.
3. Sigmoid resection and primary anastomosis without bowel preparation may be advised as the emergency operation for gangrenous or irreducible sigmoid volvulus.
4. The results of surgical repair are the same for stapled or sutured techniques.
5. In acute surgical left-colon diverticulitis and obstruction, the evidence is not yet conclusive as to the role of anastomosis without fecal diversion. Hartmann procedure may be the safer route, but this is not proven. On-table colonic lavage is an option instead of colostomy.
6. Colostomy closure is not a benign procedure.
7. Antibiotics with activity against aerobic and anaerobic bacteria need to be given parenterally in the peri-operative period alone. Their post-operative use should be restricted to cases with established infection. Pre-operative oral antibiotics may have an added value.
8. In elective colon operations there appears to be no value to mechanical bowel preparation. Even as I write this my surgical prejudices rebel against such a notion.

Brian Ostrow MD, FRCS(C)
Guelph, Ontario
Canada

[Click here to comment on this article.](#)

References

(Please click on the blue title of the article to view the full text article, text book chapter or abstract - you will need an [Adobe Reader](#) to view these files.)

1. King M, editor. [Primary Surgery Volume 1: Non-Trauma](#). Kuala Lumpur. Oxford University Press; 1990 p. 120.
2. Dufour D, Kromann Jensen S, Owen-Smith M, Salmela J, Stening GF, Zetterstrom B. editors. [Surgery for Victims of War. 2nd ed](#). Geneva. International Committee of the Red Cross; 1990 p. 125.
3. Ellis H. [Resection of the colon](#). In: Seymour I, Ellis H, editors. Maingot's Abdominal Operations. 9th ed. Volume II. Connecticut. Appleton & Lange; 1989. p. 1049-1075.
4. Parks TG. [Diverticular Disease of the colon](#). In: Seymour I, Ellis H, editors. Maingot's Abdominal Operations. 9th ed. Volume II. Connecticut. Appleton & Lange; 1989. p. 1014-1017.
5. Song F, Glenny AM. [Antimicrobial prophylaxis in colorectal surgery: a systematic review of randomized controlled trials](#). Br J Surg 1998 Sept 85(9): 1232-1241.
6. Lewis RT. [Oral versus systemic antibiotic prophylaxis in elective colon surgery: a randomized study and meta-analysis send a message from the 1990s](#). Can J Surg 2002 June 24(3): 173-180.
7. Cornwell EE, Velmahos GC, Berne TV, Murray JA, Chahwan S, Asensio J, Demetriades D. [The fate of colonic suture in high-risk trauma patients: a prospective analysis](#). J Am Coll Surg 1998 187 (1); 58-63.

8. Demetriades D, Murray JA, Chan L, Ordonez C, Bowley D, Nagy KK, et al. [Penetrating colon injuries requiring resection: diversion or primary anastomosis? An AAST prospective multicenter study.](#) J Trauma 2001 50(5); 765-775.
9. Gonzalez RP, Merlotti GJ, Holevar MR. [Colostomy in penetrating colon injury: Is it necessary?](#) J Trauma 1996 41(2); 271-275.
10. Miller PR, Fabian TC, Croce MA, Magnotti LJ, Pritchard FE, Minard G, Stewart RM. [Improving outcomes following penetrating colon wounds - Application of a clinical pathway.](#) Ann Surgery 2002 235(6); 775-781.
11. Singer MA, Nelson RL. [Primary repair of penetrating colon injuries - A systematic review.](#) Dis Colon Rect 2002 45(12); 1579-1587.
12. Kamwendo NY, Modiba MCM, Matlala NS, Becker PJ. [Randomized clinical trial to determine if delay from time of penetrating colonic injury precludes primary repair.](#) Br J Surg 2002 89; 993-998.
13. Eshraghi N, Mullins RJ, Mayberry JC, Brand DM, Crass RA, Trunkey DD. [Surveyed opinion of American trauma surgeons in management of colon injuries.](#) J Trauma 1998 44(1); 93-97.
14. Demetriades D. [Colon injuries: New perspectives.](#) Int J Care Injured 2004 35; 217-222.
15. Dufour D, Kromann Jensen S, Owen-Smith M, Salmela J, Stening GF, Zetterstrom B. [Surgery for Victims of War. 3rd ed.](#) Geneva. International Committee of the Red Cross; 1998. p. 103-124..
16. Khoury DA, Beck DE, Opelka FG, Hicks TC, Timmeke AE, Gathright JBJ. [Colostomy closure. Ochsner clinic experience.](#) Dis Colon Rect 1996 Jun 39(6); 605-609.
17. Riesener KP, Lehnen W, Hofer M, Kasperk R, Braun JC, Schumpelick V. [Morbidity of ileostomy and colostomy closure: Impact of surgical technique and perioperative treatment.](#) World J Surg 1997 Jan 21(1); 103-108.
18. Mealy K, O'Broin E, Donohue J, Tanner A, Keane FB. [Reversible colostomy--what is the outcome?](#) Dis Colon Rect 1996 Nov 39(11); 1227-31.
19. Berne JD, Velmahos GC, Chan LS, Asensio JA, Demetriades D. [The high morbidity of colostomy closure after trauma: further support for the primary repair of colon injuries.](#) Surg 1998 Feb 123(2); 157-64.
20. Chandramouli B, Srinivasan K, Jagdish S, Anathakrishnan N. [Morbidity and mortality of colostomy and its closure in children.](#) J Ped Surg 2004 Apr 39(4); 596-599.
21. Sitzler PJ, Stephenson BR, Nicholls RJ. [On-table colonic lavage: An alternative](#) JR Coll Surg Edinb 2003 Aug 43(4); 276-277.
22. Trillo C, Paris MF, Brennan JT. [Primary anastomosis in the treatment of acute disease of the unprepared left colon.](#) Am Surg 1998 Sept 64(9); 821-5.
23. Goozen AW, Tollenaar RAEM, Geelkerken RH, Smeets HJ, Bemelman WA, Van Schaardenburgh P, Goozen HG. [Prospective study of primary anastomosis following sigmoid resection for suspected acute complicated diverticular disease.](#) Br J Surg 2001 May 88(5); 693-697.
24. Salem L, Flum DR. [Primary anastomosis or Hartmann's procedure for patients with diverticular peritonitis? A systematic review.](#) Dis Colon Rect 2004 Nov 47(11); 1953-64).
25. Whetsone D, Hazey J, Pofahl WE, Roth JS. [Current management of diverticulitis.](#) Cur Surg 2004 July/Aug 61(4); 361-5.
26. Reemst PHM, Kuijpers HC, Wobbes T. [Management of left-sided colonic obstruction by subtotal colectomy and ileocolic anastomosis.](#) Eur J Surg 1998 164; 537-40.
27. Edino ST, Mohammed AZ, Anumah M. [Intraoperative colonic lavage in emergency surgical treatment of left-sided large bowel lesions.](#) Trop Doc 2005 Jan 35(1); 37-8.
28. Harris GJC, Senagore AJ, Lavery IC, Fazio VW. [The management of neoplastic colorectal obstruction with colonic endoluminal stenting devices.](#) Am J Surg 2001 181; 499-506.
29. De Salvo GL, Gava C, Pucciarelli S, Lise M. [Curative surgery for obstruction from primary left colorectal carcinoma: Primary or staged resection?](#) The Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2004, Issue 2. Art. No.: CD002101.pub2. DOI: 10.1002/14651858. CD002101.pub2.
30. Kuzu MA, Aslar AK, Soran A, Polat A, Topcu O, Hengirmen S. [Emergent resection for acute sigmoid volvulus - results of 106 consecutive cases.](#) Dis Colon Rect 2002 45(8); 1085-90.
31. De U, Ghosh S. [Single stage primary anastomosis without colonic lavage for left-sided conlonic obstruction due to acute sigmoid volvulus: A prospective study of one hundred and ninety-seven cases.](#) ANZ J Surg 2003 73; 390-92.
32. Raveenthiran V. [Restorative resection of uprepared left-colon in gangrenous vs. viable sigmoid volvulus.](#) Int J Colorectal Dis 2004 19; 258-263
33. Demetriades D, Murray JA, Chan LS, Ordonez C, Bowley D, Nagy KK, et al. [Handsewn versus stapled anastomosis in penetrating colon injuries requiring resection: A multicenter study.](#) J Trauma 2002 Jan 52; 117-121.
34. Lustosa SAS, Matos D, Atallah AN, Castro AA. [Stapled versus handsewn methods for colorectal anastomosis surgery.](#) The Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2001, Issue 3. Art.No.: CD003144. DOI: 10.1002/14651858. CD003144.
35. van Geldere D, Fa-Si-Oen P, Noach LA, Rietra PJGM, Peterse JL, Boom RPA. [Complications after colorectal surgery without mechanical bowel preparation.](#) J Am Coll Surg 2002 194(1); 40-47.
36. Zmora E, Mahajna A, Bar-Zakai B, Rosin D, Hershko D, Shabtai M, et al. [Colon and rectal surgery without mechanical bowel preparation - a randomized prospective trial.](#) Ann Surg 2003 237(3); 363-367.
37. Ram E, Sherman Y, Weil R, Vishne T, Kravarusic D, Dreznik Z. [Is mechanical bowel preparation mandatory for elective colon surgery?](#) - A prospective randomized study. Arch Surg 2005 Mar 140; 285-288.
38. Bucher P, Mermillod B, Gervaz P, Morel P. [Mechanical bower preparation for elective colorectal surgery - a meta-analysis.](#) Arch Surg 2004 Dec 139; 1359-1364.

[Click here to comment on this article.](#)

[\(Back to Top\)](#)

[Surgery in Africa Home](#)

[Next Review Article](#)

If you would like to sign up or are already signed up to the Surgery in Africa discussion forum, and would like to comment on this review, please enter the Surgery-in-Africa discussion forum here:

<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/Surgery-in-Africa/>

You will need to create a Yahoo ID and then sign up to the Surgery in Africa group to post comments.

1.

If you are not already a member of the Surgery in Africa discussion forum, please consider signing up below:

Subscribe to Surgery-in-Africa

Powered by groups.yahoo.com

If you are having technical difficulties in viewing these pages or the articles, please let us know by contacting anne.sorvari@sw.ca