



Small incision—no small brain: the changing frontiers of laparoscopic surgery

Martin Hoffmann¹, Erik Schloericke²

¹Department of General, Visceral and Minimally-Invasive Surgery, Asklepios Paulinen Klinik Wiesbaden, Wiesbaden, Germany; ²Department of Visceral, Thoracic and Vascular Surgery, WKK Heide, Heide, Germany

Correspondence to: PD Dr. med. Martin Hoffmann. Department of General, Visceral and Minimally Invasive Surgery, Asklepios Paulinen Klinik, Geisenheimer Strasse 10, 65197 Wiesbaden, Germany. Email: drmartinhoffmann@gmail.com.

Comment on: Leon P, Iovino MG, Giudici F, *et al.* Oncologic outcomes following laparoscopic colon cancer resection for T4 lesions: a case-control analysis of 7-years' experience. *Surg Endosc* 2017. [Epub ahead of print].

Received: 20 November 2017; Accepted: 11 December 2017; Published: 21 December 2017.

doi: 10.21037/ales.2017.12.03

View this article at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21037/ales.2017.12.03>

During the implementation of laparoscopic surgery, “open” surgeons used to speak of “small incision—small brain” to disqualify the new procedures and its pioneers (1). Now some 20 years later and after a major triumph laparoscopic surgery is undisputed. Nevertheless, there is an ongoing discussion on which operations are not suitable for the laparoscopic access. Especially guideline recommendations often 10 years old (2,3) argue for open access surgery in T4 colon cancer.

Leon and coworkers (4) presented their oncologic outcomes following laparoscopic colon cancer resections in T4 colon cancer in *Surgical Endoscopy* 2017. They included 147 patients into their retrospective analysis of whom 68 underwent laparoscopic resection. Groups were comparable concerning age, gender, BMI, ASA score, tumor localization and previous surgeries. Patients with open surgery had significantly more often invasion of the duodenum, pancreas and the retroperitoneum. There were no statistically significant differences between patients with open and laparoscopic surgery with regard to disease-free and overall survival, number of lymph nodes harvested and rates of R1 resections. Patients with laparoscopic resections had shorter operation time, less intra-operative blood loss, and shorter hospital stay. Morbidity and mortality were comparable between the groups but less frequent in the laparoscopic patients.

The study showed the known advantages of laparoscopy in selected patients with T4 colon cancer pushing known boundaries even more forward. Limitations of the study are the retrospective design and a selection bias. The study also

underlines that guidelines are nowadays often outdated by the evolution of operative techniques and technical devices. A fact that is also undisputed is that the results observed by the study are not to be generalized for all colorectal surgeons in the world and that these results and the results of multicenter, randomized controlled trials are often associated with a substantial learning curve.

Because of the always-faster introduction of new techniques into the surgical armamentarium (robotic assisted surgery, TEM, TAMIS, single-port, scarless surgery) the primary goal for the future has to be the implementation of surgical knowledge management programs. These programs have to involve on the one hand tools for decision-making processes based on evidence-based interventions and on the other hand on-site training programs of surgical novices and attendants. The surgeons cognitive cost is significantly higher in new and more minimally invasive procedures (5). On the other hand, it was shown that novices could be guided to gaze like experts onto the operation field and have thus less errors and steeper learning curves (6). Another important aspect is the institutional experience. The learning curve of new surgeons is truncated in institutions that already established a specialized program (7).

The future holds enough secrets to be discovered by future surgeons. It is not known until now to which extent the outcome of the patients is influenced by the laparoscopic access itself, fast-track recovery programs and epidural analgesia (8-11). The future of laparoscopic surgery is bright for surgeons that know how to deal with small incisions and better results and that are able to pass on

their knowledge to the following generations.

Acknowledgments

Funding: None.

Footnote

Provenance and Peer Review: This article was commissioned and reviewed by the Section Editor Section Editor Wanglin Li (Department of Gastrointestinal Surgery, Guangzhou First People's Hospital, Guangzhou Medical University, Guangzhou Digestive Disease Center, Guangzhou, China).

Conflicts of Interest: Both authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form (available at <http://dx.doi.org/10.21037/ales.2017.12.03>). The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

Ethical Statement: The authors are accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

Open Access Statement: This is an Open Access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0), which permits the non-commercial replication and distribution of the article with the strict proviso that no changes or edits are made and the original work is properly cited (including links to both the formal publication through the relevant DOI and the license). See: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.

References

1. Reynolds W Jr. The first laparoscopic cholecystectomy. *JLS* 2001;5:89-94.
2. Veldkamp R, Gholghesaei M, Bonjer HJ, et al. Laparoscopic resection of colon Cancer: consensus of the European Association of Endoscopic Surgery (EAES). *Surg Endosc* 2004;18:1163-85.
3. Society of American Gastrointestinal and Endoscopic Surgeons (SAGES). Guidelines for Laparoscopic Resection of Curable Colon and Rectal Cancer. 2012. Available online: <https://www.sages.org/publications/guidelines/guidelines-for-laparoscopic-resection-of-curable-colon-and-rectal-cancer/>
4. Leon P, Iovino MG, Giudici F, et al. Oncologic outcomes following laparoscopic colon cancer resection for T4 lesions: a case-control analysis of 7-years' experience. *Surg Endosc* 2017. [Epub ahead of print].
5. Di Stasi LL, Díaz-Piedra C, Ruiz-Rabelo JF, et al. Quantifying the cognitive cost of laparo-endoscopic single-site surgeries: Gaze-based indices. *Appl Ergon* 2017;65:168-74.
6. Vine SJ, Masters RS, McGrath JS, et al. Cheating experience: Guiding novices to adopt the gaze strategies of experts expedites the learning of technical laparoscopic skills. *Surgery* 2012;152:32-40.
7. Ballantyne GH, Ewing D, Capella RF, et al. The learning curve measured by operating times for laparoscopic and open gastric bypass: roles of surgeon's experience, institutional experience, body mass index and fellowship training. *Obes Surg* 2005;15:172-82.
8. Wang G, Jiang Z, Zhao K, et al. Immunologic response after laparoscopic colon cancer operation within an enhanced recovery program. *J Gastrointest Surg* 2012;16:1379-88.
9. Veenhof AA, Vlug MS, van der Pas MH, et al. Surgical stress response and postoperative immune function after laparoscopy or open surgery with fast track or standard perioperative care: a randomized trial. *Ann Surg* 2012;255:216-21.
10. Tsimogiannis KE, Tellis CC, Tselepis AD, et al. Toll-like receptors in the inflammatory response during open and laparoscopic colectomy for colorectal cancer. *Surg Endosc* 2012;26:330-6.
11. Vogelaar FJ, Abegg R, van der Linden JC, et al. Epidural analgesia associated with better survival in colon cancer. *Int J Colorectal Dis* 2015;30:1103-7.

doi: 10.21037/ales.2017.12.03

Cite this article as: Hoffmann M, Schloerick E. Small incision—no small brain: the changing frontiers of laparoscopic surgery. *Ann Laparosc Endosc Surg* 2017;2:173.