

School of Medicine

OUR LADY OF THE LAKE

Introduction

Hernia repairs are one of the most common surgical procedures performed. Hernias occur when intestinal contents protrude because of a defect in the fascia of the abdominal wall. In robotic ventral/incisional hernia repair, 90% of the hernias are incisional. Additional comorbid conditions that can lead to herniation include obesity, smoking, diabetes, etc.

Common hernias include inguinal, hiatal, congenital diaphragmatic, and ventral hernias (umbilical, subxiphoid, off-midline, lumbar, spigelian, and parastomal). The first laparoscopic hernia repair surgery was performed in 1991 at Our Lady of the Lake (OLOL) hospital in Baton Rouge by Dr. Karl LeBlanc, with the first paper about this approach published by him in 1993. However, over the last several years, the robotic approach has gained popularity. Since April of 2014, Dr. LeBlanc, the principal investigator, has been performing hernia repairs robotically—rather than laparoscopically. The defect size affects operative time, hospital length of stay, and outcomes.

The purpose of this IRB-approved medical chart review study, a retrospective analysis of prospectively collected data, is to evaluate the effect of ventral/incisional hernia defect size on operative time, length of stay, and outcomes. Our hypothesis is that larger size hernia defects will be associated with longer operative time, hospital stay, and perhaps adversely affecting outcomes.

Types of Hermias	
Type of Hernia	Description
Incisional	 Refers to any hernia that occurs due to incomplete surgical wound healing 90% of ventral hernias 90% of incisional hernias are midline defects
Umbilical	 Congenital, acquired Intestines herniate at umbilicus due to a weak anterior abdominal waat the umbilical ring
Lumbar	 Congenital, primary acquired, secondary acquired (incisional) Defects in transversalis fascia of the abdominal muscles Superior and inferior lumbar hernias
Spigelian	 Congenital or acquired Lateral ventral hernia Herniation between abdominal muscles along semilunar lines
Table 1. Characteristics of common ventral hernias	



Figure 1. Ventral hernia types (imaging from Radiopaedia). (A) Umbilical hernia with small bowel protruding. (B) Left lumbar hernia with bowel protruding into inferior triangle. (C) Bilateral spigelian hernia (right side more easily seen in this image)

The Effect of Hernia Size on Length of Stay and Outcomes in **Robotic Ventral Hernia Repair** Yasmeen Kawji; Leslie Son, PhD; Karl LeBlanc, MD, MBA. LSUHSC, Department of Surgery, Our Lady of the Lake Hospital



- **Data Collection (REDCap):**
- Date
- Diagnosis
- Hernia type and size
- Mesh/Suture type and size
- Procedure/console time
- Length of stay
- 30-day post-operative complications (infection, hematoma, thrombosis, etc.)



Analysis:

- Hernia size categorized based on: • Area (small = $< 100 \text{ cm}^2$; large = $>100 \text{ cm}^2$)
- Width (small = < 10 cm; large = > 10 cm)
- Length (small = < 10 cm; large = >10 cm)
- Length of stay and post-operative complications will be compared to ventral hernia sizes
- Further analysis will compare variables specifically within each type of ventral hernia

Discussion

- Previous research has compared open, laparoscopic, and robotic-assisted approaches in inguinal hernia repair. LeBlanc et al. has found inguinal hernia repairs to be effectively performed with all three approaches. Moreover, no difference in conversion and complication rate were found between robotic surgery and open surgery groups, as well as no difference between the robotic surgery and laparoscopic surgery. While operative times were generally longer for robotic-assisted surgeries, this approach had time to return to normal activities similar to that of laparoscopic approach and significantly faster than the open approach.
- There is some concern about shifting from previous methods to new robotic methods with regards to the learning curve. Yohannes et al. compared learning curves for robotic versus laparoscopic urological surgeries, in which physicians were given tasks to do via the robotic or laparoscopic approach, and completion times were measured. The robot-assisted approach yielded average times of 242.6 and 101.8 seconds for trials 1 and 5, while the laparoscopic approach had average times of 205.3 and 169 seconds. The learning curve difference for the robotic approach was statistically greater, even though the difference in improvement among the two approaches was not statistically significant. This study suggests that surgeons can be relatively flexible, fast learners of the roboticassisted method.
- Thus, the robotic-assisted approach's comparable outcomes to other methods—combined with its high precision, dexterity, and visualization—has led to increased interest of using this method in the field of surgery.
- Robotic hernia repair is still a relatively new surgical approach. This has sparked is interest in not only investigating the advantages and disadvantages of the procedure itself, but also associations between hernia defects that were repaired by this approach and patient outcomes.
- For our retrospective study of robotic hernia repairs, we predict that larger hernial defects will be associated with longer hospital stays and post-operative complications, compared to smaller hernial defects. We predict a similar pattern when analyzing each type of hernia (umbilical, lumbar, spigelian, etc) individually.

References

1. Yohannes P, Rotariu P, Pinto P, Smith AD, Lee BR. Comparison of robotic versus laparoscopic skills: is there a difference in the learning curve? Urology. 2002;60(1):39-45. doi:10.1016/S0090-4295(02)01717-X (TAKE OUT) 2. How Does Robotic Surgery Differ From Laparoscopic Surgery? MedStar Franklin Square Medical Center. Accessed October 12, 2021. https://www.medstarfranklinsquare.org/our-services/surgical-services/treatments/robotic-surgery/how-doesrobotic-surgery-differ-from-laparoscopic-surgery/

3. Radswiki T. Inferior lumbar hernia | Radiology Case | Radiopaedia.org. Radiopaedia. Accessed October 12, 2021. https://radiopaedia.org/cases/inferior-lumbar-hernia?lang=us

4. Rasuli B. Inferior lumbar hernia | Radiology Case | Radiopaedia.org. Radiopaedia. Accessed October 12, 2021. https://radiopaedia.org/cases/inferior-lumbar-hernia-4?lang=us

5. Gaillard F. Lumbar hernia | Radiology Reference Article | Radiopaedia.org. Radiopaedia. Accessed October 12, 2021. https://radiopaedia.org/articles/lumbar-hernia?lang=us

6. LeBlanc K, Dickens E, Gonzalez A, et al. Prospective, multicenter, pairwise analysis of robotic-assisted inguinal hernia repair with open and laparoscopic inguinal hernia repair: early results from the Prospective Hernia Study. Hernia. 2020;24(5):1069-1081. doi:10.1007/s10029-020-02224-4

7. Maher, Sherif. "Bilateral Spigelian Hernia | Radiology Case | Radiopaedia.Org." Radiopaedia, https://radiopaedia.org/cases/bilateral-spigelian-hernia?lang=us. Accessed 16 Oct. 2021. 8. Allison N, Tieu K, Snyder B, Pigazzi A, Wilson E. Technical Feasibility of Robot-Assisted Ventral Hernia Repair. World J

Surg. 2012;36(2):447-452. doi:10.1007/s00268-011-1389-8 9. Janjua H, Cousin-Peterson E, Barry TM, Kuo MC, Baker MS, Kuo PC. The paradox of the robotic approach to inguinal hernia repair in the inpatient setting. The American Journal of Surgery. 2020;219(3):497-501. doi:10.1016/j.amjsurg.2019.09.012

10. Hamidi H. Umbilical hernia with small bowel obstruction | Radiology Case | Radiopaedia.org. Radiopaedia. Accessed October 12, 2021. https://radiopaedia.org/cases/umbilical-hernia-with-small-bowel-obstruction?lang=us

11. Intuitive / Robotic Assisted Systems / Da Vinci Robot. https://www.intuitive.com/en-us/products-and-services/davinci/systems. Accessed 16 Oct. 2021.

