Early versus Delayed Laparoscopic Cholecystectomy for Management of Acute Calculus Cholecystitis: Our Experience at King Hussein Medical Center

Ashraf F. Al-Faouri MD, MRCS*, Salah A. Halasa MD, FRCS*, Saleh A. Al-Hourani MD*, Tariq S. Al-Mnaizel MD*

ABSTRACT

Objective: To compare early laparoscopic cholecystectomy during index admission with delayed (interval) laparoscopic cholecystectomy in the management of acute cholecystitis at King Hussein Medical Center.

Methods: Over the study period of 48 months (June 2005 to May 2009), a total of 317 patients with clinical and radiographic diagnosis of acute cholecystitis were studied. One hundred-thirty one patients underwent laparoscopic cholecystectomy during the index admission (group A) while 186 patients (Group B) underwent cholecystectomy at least six weeks after the attack. Data analyzed included patients' age, gender, duration of symptoms, white blood cell count, operative time, hospital stay, overall surgical outcomes and postoperative morbidity and mortality.

Results: Both groups were demographically and clinically comparable. Surgical outcomes were comparable in group A and B with conversion rates of 8.3% and 7.4% (p = 0.6645), and complication rates of 12.25% and 12.6% (p = 0.9352) respectively. Although delayed surgery shortens operative time significantly (60 versus 100 min, p<0.0001), the overall hospital stay is significantly reduced by early operation (5 versus 14.6 days, p<0.0001).

Conclusion: Although both the early and delayed approaches in management of acute calculus cholecystitis are comparable in terms of complication and conversion rates, the early approach has the advantage of offering patients a definitive treatment while reducing the overall total hospital stay and avoiding the problems of failure of delayed therapy.

Key words: Acute cholecystitis, Cholecystectomy, Laparoscopic

Introduction

Laparoscopic Cholecystectomy (LC) is one of the most common surgical operations performed by general surgeons.^(1,2) Since its introduction in 1985,⁽³⁻⁵⁾ laparoscopic cholecystectomy has become the gold standard management of symptomatic cholelithiasis.^(1,2) Although Acute Cholecystitis (AC) was initially considered a relative contraindication to laparoscopic cholecystectomy,^(6,7) more patients with acute cholecystitis are being successfully managed

JRMS June 2012; 19(2): 10-15

by laparoscopic cholecystectomy. However, there is still controversy about timing of surgery. In the era of cost containment, the question 'when to operate' still persists. The aim of this retrospective study was to compare early cholecystectomy (defined as LC during the first index admission for acute cholecystitis) with interval cholecystectomy (defined as LC six weeks after resolution of acute cholecystitis) in the management of patients with acute calculus cholecystitis at King Hussein Medical Center (KHMC).

^{*} From the Department of Surgery, King Hussein Medical Center, Amman- Jordan

Correspondence should be addressed to Dr. A. Al-Faouri, P.O. Box 516 Amman 11831 Jordan. E-mail: ashraf_faouri@hotmail.com

Manuscript received March 21, 2011. Accepted August 11, 2011

Methods

This retrospective study was conducted over a study period of 48 months (June 2005 to May 2009). A search of our pathology department data-base and our operating theater lists revealed that around 4,000 cholecystectomies were performed during the study period, with more than 600 cholecystectomies performed for acute cholecystitis. Medical records of these patients were reviewed. Data including patients' age, gender, duration of symptoms till time of operation, white blood cell (WBC) count, ultrasonographic findings, operative time, hospital stay and postoperative morbidity and mortality were recorded in a specially designed medical records abstract form. Only forms with complete data were submitted to analysis. A total of 317 patients (237 females and 80 males) with clinical and radiographic diagnosis of acute cholecystitis⁽¹⁾ were eventually included in this study (see Table I). All patients were treated initially with intravenous fluid, antibiotics and analgesia; 131 patients (97F, 34M) underwent LC during the index admission (group A) and the remaining 186 patients were discharged after successful conservative therapy and were scheduled for elective LC after an interval 'cooling off' period (group B). Allocation of patients to both groups was non-systematized and based on many subjective factors, mainly surgeon's preference, availability of operating theater and patients' medical condition. One hundred seventy five patients in Group B eventually tolerated the cooling off period. Postoperatively, all patients who were included in the study and eventually underwent cholecystectomy were followed-up at the surgical outpatient clinic within four weeks after surgery and was confirmed by the histopathology reports. The follow-up period ranged from 2 months to 1 year for both groups. Statistical analysis was done using the GraphPad software.⁽⁸⁾ The significance level was set at p < 0.05. Analysis included unpaired t test, Fisher's exact test or Chi-square test.

Results

The demographic and clinical data of both groups were comparable at time of index admission as presented in Table II.

Patients in Group A (131 patients) underwent LC during the index admission. The time interval from onset of symptoms until the start of operation ranged from 17-126 hours with a mean of 57 hours. Eleven patients (8.3%) required conversion to open cholecystectomy due to obscured anatomy (6

patients), severely thickened gallbladder wall (2 patients), bleeding (2 patients) and Mirizzi syndrome (1 patient) (see Table III). Mean operative time was 100 minutes with a range of 45-180 minutes. Postoperative drainage tubes were used in 38 patients (29%) for a maximum of two days. The overall hospital stay ranged from three to seven days with an average of five days, while the mean postoperative hospital stay was two days. There was no mortality. Postoperative complications included minor wound infection (7 patients); minor bile leaks (5 patients) and postoperative jaundice due to slipped or retained stones (4 patients). Two patients required Endoscopic Retrograde Cholangiopancreaticography (ERCP). There were no major bile duct injuries (see Table IV).

Patients in group B (186 patients) were discharged after successful non surgical therapy and were scheduled for delayed elective cholecystectomy after an interval of about six weeks. The mean hospital stay during index admission ranged from four to seven days with a mean of five days. Forty-nine patients (26.3%) were readmitted during the interval waiting period, of which 11 patients (5.9%) underwent emergency cholecystectomy (failed delayed therapy) and were excluded from the study. Five patients in this subgroup were converted to open cholecystectomy (45%). Table V shows the indications for readmission for this group of patients and the interventions that were performed.

The remaining 175 patient were operated as scheduled after the interval cooling off period which ranged from 42-134 days with a mean of 59 days.

Conversion to open cholecystectomy was required in 13 patients (7.4%) due to obscured anatomy (10 patients), difficulty in grasping a thick hard gallbladder (2 patients), and bleeding (1 patient) (see Table III). Operative time ranged from 35-160 minutes with a mean of 66 minutes. Postoperative drainage tubes were used in 42 patients (24%) for a maximum of two days. The mean postoperative hospital stay was two days with a range from 1-8 days. The mean total hospital stay for group B including the readmissions was 13 days with a range of 8-27 days. There was no mortality in this group of Postoperative patients. complications included wound infections (11 patients), minor bile leaks (6 patients) and postoperative jaundice due to slipped or retained stones (5 patients of whom 4 required postoperative ERCP) (Table IV). There were no major bile duct injuries. Table VI summarizes the overall results of this study.

Clinical	Right upper quadrant (RUQ) pain & tenderness			
	Positive Murphy's sign			
	Fever \geq 38 C° rectally			
	Leukocytosis > 11,000 Presence of gallbladder stones Gallbladder wall thickening >4mm			
Ultrasonographic				
	Pericholecystic fluid Positive ultrasonographic Murr	hy's Sign		
Fable II: Demographic and clinical charact Criterion	Group A	Group B	P value	
Number	131	175	i vulue	
Age (mean±2SD)	50.5±25.9	51.0±21.8	0.7013	
F:M ratio	2.9:1	3:1	0.7015	
Mean duration of symptoms from onset t		59.2 days (range 42-	Not applicable	
operation	hours)	134 days)		
WBC count (mean±2SD)	14.9±3.9	14.7±3.6	0.5019	
Fable III: Indications for conversion to ope	en cholecystectomy			
Indication	Group A	Group B		
Obscure Anatomy	6	1(10	
Thick gallbladder wall	2	2	2	
Bleeding	2	1		
Mirizzi syndrome	1		0	
Total (%)*	11 (8.3%)	13 (7.	13 (7.4%)	
P value is 0.6645 and considered insignific	ant			
Table IV: Postoperative complications				
Complication	*		P value	
Total	16		0.9352	
Port/wound infection	7		0.8096	
Minor bile leak/cystic stump leak	5		1.0000	
Retained & slipped stones Need postoperative ERCP *	4 2		1.0000 1.0000	
Major CBD** injury	2	4 1.0000 0		
Endoscopic Retrograde Cholangiopancreat	č	•		
Fable V: Indications of readmission in Group	up B			
	Number Intervention			
	31 Conservative treatm	nent		
		ent cholecystectomy		
		Conservative treatment followed by emergent cholecystectomy		
Acute pancreatitis	3 Conservative treatm		ERCP followed by emergent cholecystectomy	
Acute pancreatitis	Conservative treatrERCP followed by	emergent cholecystectomy		
Acute pancreatitis Choledocholithiasis ± cholangitis	Conservative treatrERCP followed by			
Acute pancreatitis Choledocholithiasis ± cholangitis Total Table VI: Outcome in early and interval La	3Conservative treatr4ERCP followed by49 (26.3%)11 (5.9%) underweaparoscopic Cholecystectomy in Additional	emergent cholecystectomy nt emergent cholecystector cute Cholecystitis	ny	
Acute pancreatitis Choledocholithiasis ± cholangitis Total Table VI: Outcome in early and interval La Criterion	3 Conservative treatr 4 ERCP followed by 49 (26.3%) 11 (5.9%) underwe aparoscopic Cholecystectomy in Ac Group A	emergent cholecystectomy nt emergent cholecystector cute Cholecystitis Group E	ny	
Acute pancreatitis Choledocholithiasis ± cholangitis Total Fable VI: Outcome in early and interval La Criterion Number	3 Conservative treatr 4 ERCP followed by 49 (26.3%) 11 (5.9%) underwe aparoscopic Cholecystectomy in Ac Group A 131	emergent cholecystectomy nt emergent cholecystector cute Cholecystitis Group E 175	ny B p value	
Acute pancreatitis Choledocholithiasis ± cholangitis Total Fable VI: Outcome in early and interval La Criterion Number Conversion rate (%)	3 Conservative treatr 4 ERCP followed by 49 (26.3%) 11 (5.9%) underwe paroscopic Cholecystectomy in Ad Group A 131 8.3	emergent cholecystectomy nt emergent cholecystector cute Cholecystitis Group E 175 7.4	ny 8 p value 0.6645	
Acute pancreatitis Choledocholithiasis ± cholangitis Total Fable VI: Outcome in early and interval La Criterion Number Conversion rate (%) Mean operative time (min)	3 Conservative treatr 4 ERCP followed by 49 (26.3%) 11 (5.9%) underwe paroscopic Cholecystectomy in Ad Group A 131 8.3 100.5(range 45	emergent cholecystectomy nt emergent cholecystector cute Cholecystitis Group E 175 7.4 -180) 66.5(35-15	ny p value 0.6645 50) <0.000	
Acute pancreatitis Choledocholithiasis ± cholangitis Total Table VI: Outcome in early and interval La Criterion Number Conversion rate (%) Mean operative time (min) Drain	3 Conservative treatr 4 ERCP followed by 49 (26.3%) 11 (5.9%) underwe paroscopic Cholecystectomy in Ad Group A 131 8.3 100.5(range 45 29%	emergent cholecystectomy nt emergent cholecystector cute Cholecystitis Group E 175 7.4 5-180) 66.5(35-15 24%	ny p value 0.6645 50) <0.000	
Acute pancreatitis Choledocholithiasis ± cholangitis Total Table VI: Outcome in early and interval La Criterion Number Conversion rate (%) Mean operative time (min) Drain Mortality	3 Conservative treatr 4 ERCP followed by 49 (26.3%) 11 (5.9%) underwe paroscopic Cholecystectomy in Ad Group A 131 8.3 100.5(range 45 29% 0	emergent cholecystectomy nt emergent cholecystector cute Cholecystitis Group E 175 7.4 5-180) 66.5(35-15 24% 0	ny p value 0.6645 50) <0.000 0.3926	
Acute pancreatitis Choledocholithiasis ± cholangitis Total Table VI: Outcome in early and interval La Criterion Number Conversion rate (%) Mean operative time (min) Drain Mortality Morbidity (%)	3 Conservative treatr 4 ERCP followed by 49 (26.3%) 11 (5.9%) underwe paroscopic Cholecystectomy in Ad Group A 131 8.3 100.5(range 45 29% 0 16 (12.2%)	emergent cholecystectomy nt emergent cholecystector cute Cholecystitis Group E 175 7.4 5-180) 66.5(35-15 24% 0) 22 (12.6%	ny p value 0.6645 50) <0.000 0.3926 6) 0.9352	
Acute pancreatitis Choledocholithiasis ± cholangitis Total Table VI: Outcome in early and interval La Criterion Number Conversion rate (%) Mean operative time (min) Drain Mortality Morbidity (%) Wound infection	3 Conservative treat 4 ERCP followed by 49 (26.3%) 11 (5.9%) underwee aparoscopic Cholecystectomy in Ad Group A 131 8.3 100.5(range 45 29% 0 16 (12.2% 7 (5.3%) 7 (5.3%)	emergent cholecystectomy nt emergent cholecystectom cute Cholecystitis 175 7.4 4-180) 66.5(35-15 24% 0) 22 (12.6% 11 (6.3%	ny 0.6643 50) <0.000 0.3926 6) 0.9352 0) 0.8096	
Acute pancreatitis Choledocholithiasis ± cholangitis Total Table VI: Outcome in early and interval La Criterion Number Conversion rate (%) Mean operative time (min) Drain Mortality Morbidity (%) Wound infection Minor bile leak	3 Conservative treat 4 ERCP followed by 49 (26.3%) 11 (5.9%) underwee aparoscopic Cholecystectomy in Accord Group A 131 8.3 100.5(range 45 29% 0 16 (12.2% 7 (5.3%) 5 (3.8%)	emergent cholecystectomy nt emergent cholecystectom cute Cholecystitis (-180)	ny 0.6642 0.6642 0.000 0.3926 0.0.9352 0.0.8096 0.1.0000	
Acute pancreatitis Choledocholithiasis ± cholangitis Total Table VI: Outcome in early and interval La Criterion Number Conversion rate (%) Mean operative time (min) Drain Mortality Morbidity (%) Wound infection Minor bile leak Retained stones	3 Conservative treat 4 ERCP followed by 49 (26.3%) 11 (5.9%) underwee aparoscopic Cholecystectomy in Ad Group A 131 8.3 100.5(range 45 29% 0 16 (12.2% 7 (5.3%) 5 (3.8%) 4 (3.1%) 4 (3.1%)	emergent cholecystectomy nt emergent cholecystectom cute Cholecystitis 7.4 5-180) 66.5(35-15 24% 0 0) 22 (12.6% 11 (6.3% 6 (3.4%) 5 (2.9%)	ny 0.6645 0.000 0.3926 0.0.000 0.3926 0.0.9352 0.0.000 0.1.0000 0.1.0000	
Acute pancreatitis Choledocholithiasis ± cholangitis Total Table VI: Outcome in early and interval La Criterion Number Conversion rate (%) Mean operative time (min) Drain Mortality Morbidity (%) Wound infection Minor bile leak Retained stones Need for ERCP	3 Conservative treatr 4 ERCP followed by 49 (26.3%) 11 (5.9%) underwe paroscopic Cholecystectomy in Ac Group A 131 8.3 100.5(range 45 29% 0 16 (12.2% 7 (5.3%) 5 (3.8%) 4 (3.1%) 2 (1.5%)	$\begin{array}{r} \text{emergent cholecystectomy} \\ \text{nt emergent cholecystectom} \\ \hline \\ \text{cute Cholecystitis} \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \text{Comp E} \\ \hline \\ 175 \\ 7.4 \\ -180) \\ 66.5(35-15) \\ 24\% \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ $	ny 0.6645 0.6645 0.000 0.3926 0.0.9352 0.0.8096 0.1.0000 0.1.0000	
Acute pancreatitis Choledocholithiasis ± cholangitis Total Table VI: Outcome in early and interval La Criterion Number Conversion rate (%) Mean operative time (min) Drain Mortality Morbidity (%) Wound infection Minor bile leak Retained stones Need for ERCP Major BD injury	$\begin{array}{cccc} 3 & & Conservative treatr \\ 4 & & ERCP followed by \\ 49 (26.3\%) & 11 (5.9\%) underwee \\ \hline \\ aparoscopic Cholecystectomy in Accord \\ \hline \\ & & Group A \\ \hline \\ & & 131 \\ & 8.3 \\ 100.5 (range 45 \\ & 29\% \\ & & 0 \\ & & 0 \\ 16 (12.2\% \\ & & 7 (5.3\%) \\ & & 5 (3.8\%) \\ & & 4 (3.1\%) \\ & & 2 (1.5\%) \\ & & & 0 (0\%) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} \text{emergent cholecystectomy}\\ \underline{\text{nt emergent cholecystectom}}\\ \underline{\text{cute Cholecystitis}}\\ \hline \\ \hline \\ 175\\ 7.4\\ -180) & 66.5(35-15\\ 24\%\\ 0\\ 0\\ 0\\ 0\\ 0\\ 0\\ 11 (6.3\%\\ 6 (3.4\%\\ 5 (2.9\%\\ 4 (2.3\%)\\ 0 (0\%) \end{array}$	ny 0.6645 0.000 0.3926 0.0.000 0.3926 0.0.9352 0.8096 0.1.0000 0.1.0000 0.1.0000	
Acute pancreatitis Choledocholithiasis ± cholangitis Total Table VI: Outcome in early and interval La Criterion Number Conversion rate (%) Mean operative time (min) Drain Mortality Morbidity (%) Wound infection Minor bile leak Retained stones Need for ERCP	$\begin{array}{cccc} 3 & & Conservative treatr} 4 & & ERCP followed by \\ 49 (26.3\%) & 11 (5.9\%) underwee \\ \hline \\ aparoscopic Cholecystectomy in Accord \\ \hline \\ & & Group A \\ \hline \\ & & 131 \\ & 8.3 \\ 100.5(range 45 \\ & & 29\% \\ & & 0 \\ & & 16 (12.2\% \\ & & 7 (5.3\%) \\ & & 5 (3.8\%) \\ & & 4 (3.1\%) \\ & & 2 (1.5\%) \\ & & 0 (0\%) \\ & & 2.1 (range 1) \end{array}$	emergent cholecystectomy Group E cute Cholecystitis Group E 175 7.4 -180) 66.5(35-15) 24% 0) 22 (12.6%) 11 (6.3%) 6 (3.4%) 5 (2.9%) 4 (2.3%) 0 (0%) -7) 2.3 (range 2)	ny 0.6645 0.6645 0.000 0.3926 0.0.03926 0.0.9352 0.8096 0.1.0000 0.1.0000 0.1.0000 0.2425	

Discussion

Cholelithiasis affects 10-15% of the adult population of whom 1-4% becomes symptomatic in a year making LC one of the most common surgical operations performed by general surgeons. About 20% of symptomatic patients present with acute cholecystitis.^(1,2)

LC was initially performed by the German surgeon, Erich Mühe (Böblingen, Germany) in 1985 and was thereafter made popular by Reddick in 1988 in USA.⁽³⁻⁵⁾ Met early with skepticism, LC has become the gold standard treatment of symptomatic cholelithiasis.⁽⁹⁻¹¹⁾ Acute cholecystitis was initially considered a contraindication relative to laparoscopic cholecystectomy based on the assumption that acute inflammation obscures the anatomy and increases the risk of conversion to open surgery and complications, namely, major common bile duct injuries.^(6-7,12) With increased experience and refinement of instrumentation, more patients with acute cholecystitis are being managed by laparoscopic cholecystectomy successfully.

However, there is still controversy about the timing of surgery.^(13,14) Many Studies in the prelaparoscopic era have proved the efficacy and safety of early open cholecystectomy and its superiority in terms of shorter overall hospital stay and avoidance of recurrent symptoms compared to delayed surgery.⁽¹⁵⁻¹⁹⁾ Many studies have also proved the efficacy, safety and superiority early laparoscopic of cholecystectomy in acute cholecystitis.⁽²⁰⁻²⁴⁾ However, many surgeons, continue to adhere to the old policy of delaying surgery in patients with acute cholecystitis for inflammation to cool down.⁽²⁵⁻²⁶⁾

Some studies have concentrated on operating in the golden period, defined as the first 72 hours from the onset of symptoms,⁽²⁷⁻²⁹⁾ while more recent studies have proved the safety of operation within a week from onset of symptoms. After one week fibrosis occur and the surgery should thus be deferred for 6 weeks thereafter.⁽³⁰⁻³¹⁾ As shown by our study and most studies comparing early LC and delayed LC, the operative time is longer in the early group (100 versus 60 min, p < 0.0001).⁽³²⁻³³⁾ This is due partially to obscured anatomy but also to the operative modifications that are commonly required when faced with acute cholecystitis, such as aspiration of the gallbladder, use of additional trocar and angled laparoscope, suturing of edematous thick cystic duct, subtotal cholecystectomy and the use of retrieval bags and suction drains.⁽³⁴⁻³⁵⁾

Our conversion rates of 8.3% and 7.4% in group A and B respectively, contrast favorably with those stated in the literature which range from 4-30%.^(26,36-37) Most recent studies have failed to prove an increase in conversion rate when LC is done during index admission compared to interval LC.^(20,22,26,32,35) Many earlier studies where actually comparing early LC with elective LC and many of the studied population were actually having chronic rather than acute cholecystitis. The complication rates were comparable in both groups with no major bile duct injury overall. However, it should be stressed that patients with acute cholecystitis should be operated upon by experienced surgeons whether in the early or delayed settings for such outcome to be obtained.⁽³⁸⁻⁴⁰⁾

Most studies have proven that early LC is associated with a shorter total hospital stay compared to delayed $LC^{(20-26)}$ given the high rate of recurrent symptoms and complications during the cooling off period which range from 15-25%.⁽²⁶⁾

In our study, the mean total hospital stay of group A of five days contrasts sharply with that of group B which averaged 14.7 days when all admissions were summed. A total of 26.3% of patients in group B were readmitted during the cooling off period of which 11 patients (6%) underwent emergency cholecystectomy (failed delayed therapy). The shorter total hospital stay may translate into cost effectiveness.⁽⁴¹⁻⁴²⁾

In an international consensus meeting in Tokyo (2006),⁽⁴³⁾ an experienced working group have advocated severity assessment criteria of acute cholecystitis for more objective decision. Accordingly, acute cholecystitis is classified into three grades. Patients in Grade I (mild) can be safely managed by early LC. Those in grade II (moderate) and III (severe) are better managed by delayed cholecystostomy with or without percutaneous cholecystostomy. This study may

allow us to properly select patients who are appropriate candidates for early LC.

Conclusion

The early and delayed approaches in management of acute cholecystitis are comparable in terms of complication and conversion rates. The early approach has the advantage of offering the patients a definitive treatment during the index admission, while reducing the overall total hospital stay and avoiding the problems of failure of delayed therapy. This may translate into an economic benefit and better patient satisfaction when compared with delayed therapy. A more objective allocation of patients based on severity of acute cholecystitis is warranted.

References

- 1. **Strasberg SM.** Acute calculous cholecystitis. *NEJM* 2008; 358: 2804-2811.
- 2. **NIH.** NIH consensus statement on gallstones and laparoscopic cholecystectomy. http://consensus. nih.gov/1992/1992GallstonestonesLaparoscopy090h tml.htm
- 3. Litynski GS. Erich Mühe and the rejection of laparoscopic cholecystectomy (1985): a surgeon ahead of his time. JSLS 1998; 2:341-346.
- 4. **Reynolds W.** The First Laparoscopic Cholecystectomy. *JSLS* 2001; 5:89-94.
- 5. Reddick EJ, Olsen DO. Laparoscopic laser cholecystectomy. Surg Endosc 1989; 3:131-133
- 6. Schirmer BD, Edge SB, Dix J, et al. Laparoscopic cholecystectomy: Treatment of choice for symptomatic cholelithiasis. Ann Surg 1991; 213: 665-676.
- 7. Gharaibeh KIA, Ammari F, Al-Heiss H, *et al.* Laparoscopic cholecystectomy for gallstones: A comparison of outcome between acute and chronic cholecystitis. *Ann Saudi Med* 2001; 21: 312-316.
- 8. Graph Pad Software. Available from: URL: http://www.graphpad.com/instat
- 9. Cuschieri A, Dubois F, Mouiel J, et al. The European experience with laparoscopic cholecystectomy. Am J Surg 1991; 161: 385-387
- 10. **The Southern Surgeons Club.** A prospective analysis of 1518 laparoscopic cholecystectomies. *NEJM* 1991; 324: 1073-8.
- 11. **Brandon JC, Velez MA, Teplick SK,** *et al.* Laparoscopic cholecystectomy: Evolution, early results and impact on nonsurgical gallstone therapy. *AJR* 1991; 157: 235-239.
- Russel JC, Walsh SJ, Mattie AS, et al. Bile duct Injuries, 1989-1993: a statewide experience. Arch Surg 1996; 131:382-388.
- 13. Koo KP, Thirlby RC. Laparoscopic

cholecystectomy in acute Cholecystitis. What is the optimal timing for operation? *Arch Surg* 1996; 131: 540-545.

- 14. Daniak CN, Peretz D, Fine JM, et al. Factors associated with time to laparoscopic cholecystectomy for acute cholecystitis. World J gastroenterol 2008; 14: 1084-1090.
- 15. McArthur P, Cuschieri A, Sells RA, *et al.* Controlled clinical trial comparing early with interval cholecystectomy for acute cholecystitis. *BJS* 1975; 62: 850-852.
- 16. Norrby S, Herlin P, Holmin T, *et al.* Early or delayed cholecystectomy in acute cholecystitis? A clinical trial. *BJS* 1983; 70: 163-165.
- Reiss R, Nudelman I, Gutman C, et al. Changing trends in surgery for acute cholecystitis. World J Surg 1990; 14: 567-570.
- Järvinen HK, Hästbacka J. Early cholecystectomy for acute cholecystitis: A prospective randomized study. *Ann Surg* 1980; 191: 501-505.
- 19. Barsoum MS, Hafez MS. Early surgical intervention in acute cholecystitis. *Med J Cairo Univ* 1994; 62: 543-549.
- 20. Casillas RA, Yegiyants S, Collins C. Early laparoscopic cholecystectomy is the preferred management of acute cholecystitis. *Arch Surg* 2008; 143: 533-537.
- 21. Wilson RG, Macintyre IMC, Nixon SJ, *et al.* Laparoscopic cholecystectomy as a safe and effective treatment for severe acute cholecystitis. *BMJ* 1992; 305: 394-396.
- 22. Gurusamy K, Samraj K, Gluud C, *et al.* Metaanalysis of randomized controlled trials on the safety and effectiveness of early versus delayed laparoscopic cholecystectomy for acute cholecystitis. *BJS* 2010; 97: 141-150.
- 23. Kola SB, Aggarwal S, Kumar A, *et al.* Early versus delayed laparoscopic cholecystectomy for acute cholecystitis: a prospective randomized trial. *Surg Endosc* 2004; 18: 1323-1327.
- 24. Cox MR, Wilson TG, Luck AJ, *et al.* Laparoscopic cholecystectomy for acute inflammation of the gallbladder. *Ann Surg* 1993; 218: 630-634.
- 25. Cameron IC, Chadwick C, Phillips J. Management of acute cholecystitis in UK hospitals: time for a change. *Postgrad Med J* 2004; 80: 292-294.
- 26. **Gurusamy K, Samraj K.** Early versus delayed laparoscopic cholecystectomy for acute cholecystitis. Cochrane Database of Systemic Reviewes 2006, issue 4. Art. No.: CD005440.DOI:10.1002/14651858.CD005440.pub2
- 27. Lo CM, Liu CL, Lai ECS, *et al.* Early versus delayed laparoscopic cholecystectomy for treatment of acute cholecystitis. *Ann Surg* 1996; 223: 37-42.
- 28. Rattner DW, Ferguson C, Warshaw AL. Factors associated with successful laparoscopic cholecystectomy for acute cholecystitis. *Ann Surg*

JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL MEDICAL SERVICES Vol. 19 No. 2 June 2012 1993; 217: 233-236.

- 29. Shaheed A, Sakr M, Abdel-Majeed K, *et al.* Early laparoscopic cholecystectomy for acute versus chronic cholecystitis: a prospective comparative study. *Kuwait Med J* 2004; 36: 281-284.
- 30. **Tzovaras G, Zacharoulis D, Liakou P,** *et al.* Timing of laparoscopic cholecystectomy for acute cholecystitis: a prospective non randomized study. *World J gastroenterol* 2006; 12: 5528-5531.
- Sher M, Hinduja T, Fatima S. Complications of laparoscopic cholecystectomy in acute cholecystitis. *J Surgery Pakistan* 2008; 13: 59-61.
- 32. Siddiqui T, MacDonald A, Chong PS, *et al.* Early versus delayed laparoscopic cholecystectomy for treatment of acute cholecystitis: a meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials. *Am J Surg* 2008; 195:40-47.
- 33. Lai PBS, Kwong KH, Leung KL, *et al.* Randomized trial of early versus delayed

laparoscopic cholecystectomy for acute cholecystitis. *BJS* 1998; 85: 764-767.

- 34. Zucker KA, Flowers JL, Bailey RW. Laparoscopic cholecystectomy of acute cholecystitis. *Am J Surg* 1993; 165: 508-514.
- 35. Ji W, Li LT, Li JS. Role of Laparoscopic subtotal cholecystectomy in the treatment of complicated cholecystitis. *Hepatobiliary Pancreat Dis Int* 2006; 5:584-589.
- 36. Fried HH, Joseph L, Clas D, et al. Factors

determining conversion to laparotomy in patients undergoing laparoscopic cholecystectomy. *Am J Surg* 1994, 167: 35-41.

- Singh K, Ohri A. Laparoscopic cholecystectomy-Is there a need to convert? *J Min Access Surg* 2005; 1: 59-62
- Archer SB, Brown DW, Smith CD, et al. Bile duct injury during laparoscopic cholecystectomy: Results of a national survey. Ann Surg 2001; 234: 549-559.
- 39. Al-Bahlooli SH, Al-Malahi A, Ghallag NH, et al. Conversion rate of laparoscopic to open cholecystectomy. Yemeni J Med Science 2009;13: 1-8
- 40. **Gigot JF.** Bile duct injury during laparoscopic cholecystectomy: risk factors, mechanisms, type, severity and immediate detection. *Acta Chir Belg* 2003; 103: 154-160.
- 41. Wilson E, Gurusamy K, Gluud C, *et al.* Costutility and value-of-information analysis of early versus delayed laparoscopic cholecystectomy for acute cholecystitis. *Br J Surg* 2010; 97: 210-219.
- 42. **Teckchandani N, Garg PK, Hadke NS**, *et al.* Predictive factors for successful early laparoscopic cholecystectomy in acute cholecystitis: a prospective study. *Int J Surg* 2010; 8:623-627.
- 43. Hirota M, Takada T, Kawarada Y, *et al.* Diagnostic criteria and severity assessment of acute cholecystitis: Tokyo guidelines. *J Hepatobiliary Pancreat Surg* 2007; 14: 78-82.