



OPEN INGUINAL HERNIA VERSUS LAPAROSCOPIC HERNIA REPAIR FOR UNILATERAL INGUINAL HERNIA: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Dr.M.Arafath Natchiar^{1*}, Dr.B.Sankararaman², Dr.Nishanth³, Dr.Noel⁴

^{1*} Assistant professor of general surgery, Vinayaka missions medical College hospital Karaikal

² Professor of general surgery, Vinayaka missions medical College hospital Karaikal

³ Resident in general surgery, Vinayaka missions medical College hospital Karaikal

⁴ Resident in general Surgery, Vinayaka missions medical College hospital Karaikal

Abstract

Introduction:

Inguinal hernia is one of the most common surgical disorders encountered in general surgery practice, particularly in males. Advances in minimally invasive surgery have introduced laparoscopic repair as an alternative to conventional open hernia repair. This study compares open and laparoscopic inguinal hernia repair for unilateral hernias, focusing on recurrence rates, postoperative complications, and recovery outcomes.

Methods:

A systematic review of the literature was conducted using PubMed, Scopus, and Google Scholar databases for studies published between 2010 and 2023. Randomized controlled trials, cohort studies, and meta-analyses comparing open and laparoscopic repairs were included. Outcome measures analyzed were recurrence rate, incidence of postoperative complications (especially chronic pain and wound infection), and recovery time.

Results:

Open inguinal hernia repair demonstrated recurrence rates of 1–3%, while laparoscopic repair showed slightly lower rates of 0.5–2%. Chronic pain was reported in 10–15% of patients undergoing open repair compared to 5–10% after laparoscopic repair. Wound infections were significantly less common following laparoscopic repair. Mean recovery time was 1–2 weeks for laparoscopic repair and 3–4 weeks for open repair, indicating earlier return to normal activity and reduced morbidity in the laparoscopic group.

Conclusion:

Both open and laparoscopic techniques are effective for unilateral inguinal hernia repair. However, laparoscopic repair offers advantages in terms of lower recurrence, reduced postoperative pain, and faster recovery. Surgical approach should be individualized based on patient factors, hernia type, and surgeon expertise. Continued research is needed to evaluate long-term outcomes and refine mesh technology.

Keywords: Inguinal hernia, Laparoscopic repair, Open repair, Mesh, Recurrence rate, Postoperative pain, Recovery time.

Hernia Types

Inguinal hernias can be categorized into direct and indirect types. Direct inguinal hernias occur due to a weakness in the transversalis fascia, typically associated with aging and increased intra-abdominal pressure. In contrast, indirect inguinal hernias arise from a congenital defect in the processus vaginalis, allowing abdominal contents to traverse through the inguinal canal. The distinction between these two types is crucial, as it influences surgical technique and mesh placement.

Surgical Techniques

Open inguinal hernia repair has been the traditional approach for many years. This technique involves making an incision in the groin, reducing the hernia, and placing a mesh to reinforce the abdominal wall. The use of mesh has been shown to reduce recurrence rates significantly. On the other hand, laparoscopic hernia repair is a minimally invasive technique that utilizes small incisions and a camera to guide the repair. This method has gained popularity due to its associated benefits, including reduced postoperative pain, shorter recovery times, and lower rates of wound infections.

Mesh Utilization

The use of mesh in hernia repair has been a subject of extensive research. Mesh materials vary with options including polypropylene, polyester, and biologic meshes. The choice of mesh can impact the risk of complications such as chronic pain and mesh-related infections.

Studies have shown that while mesh repair reduces recurrence rates, it may also introduce complications that require careful consideration during surgical planning.

Methodology

This analytical study involved a comprehensive review of existing literature comparing open and laparoscopic hernia repair techniques for unilateral inguinal hernias. A systematic search was conducted in medical databases, including PubMed, Scopus, and Google Scholar, focusing on studies published between 2010 and 2023. Inclusion criteria encompassed randomized controlled trials, cohort studies, and meta-analyses that reported on outcomes such as recurrence rates, postoperative complications, and recovery times.

Results

The analysis revealed several key findings. Open inguinal hernia repair demonstrated a recurrence rate of approximately 1-3%, while laparoscopic repair showed a slightly lower recurrence rate of 0.5-2%. Postoperative complications, including chronic pain, were reported in 10-15% of patients undergoing open repair compared to 5-10% in laparoscopic repair. Recovery times were significantly shorter in the laparoscopic group, with patients returning to normal activities within 1-2 weeks, compared to 3-4 weeks for open repair.

Discussion

The choice between open and laparoscopic hernia repair for unilateral inguinal hernias remains a topic of debate among surgeons. While laparoscopic repair offers advantages in terms of reduced pain and quicker recovery, open repair has a long-standing history and is often preferred in cases of direct hernias due to the straightforward nature of the procedure. The use of mesh is critical in both techniques, as it significantly reduces the risk of recurrence. However, the potential for complications associated with mesh must be carefully weighed against the benefits.

Conclusion

In conclusion, both open and laparoscopic hernia repair techniques are effective for managing unilateral inguinal hernias, each with its advantages and disadvantages.

Laparoscopic repair may offer superior outcomes in terms of recovery and postoperative pain, while open repair remains a reliable option, particularly for direct hernias. Future research should focus on long-term outcomes and the development of new mesh materials to minimize complications.

References

1. Amid, P. K. (2014). Laparoscopic versus open inguinal hernia repair: A systematic review of the literature. *Surgical Endoscopy*, 28(3), 675-684.
2. Bittner, R., et al. (2017). The European Hernia Society guidelines on the treatment of inguinal hernia in adult patients. *Hernia*, 21(1), 1-20.
3. Köckerling, F., et al. (2016). Open versus laparoscopic inguinal hernia repair: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Surgical Clinics of North America*, 96(6), 1347-1360.
4. LeBlanc, K. A., & Booth, W. H. (2015). Laparoscopic inguinal hernia repair: A review of the literature. *Journal of the American College of Surgeons*, 220(6), 1035-1042.
5. McCormack, K., et al. (2011). Laparoscopic versus open surgery for inguinal hernia repair. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, (3), CD008202.
6. Puri, V., & Gupta, A. (2019). Mesh-related complications in inguinal hernia repair: A review. *Journal of Surgical Research*, 243, 1-8.