Original Article

Comparison the Rate of Complications Between Mesh and Darn Repair in Inguinal Hernias

Complications **Between Mesh** and Darn Repair in Inguinal Hernias

Naseebullah Zarkoon, Mohyuddin Kakar and Samina Karim

ABSTRACT

Objective: To compare the rate of complications especially of recurrence in inguinal hernias treated with mesh repair and darn repair.

Study Design: Prospective/randomized control trial study.

Place and Duration of Study: This study was conducted at the Department of Surgery Unit-I, Bolan Medical College Quetta from November 2017 to December 2018.

Materials and Methods: A total of 86 patients had ages 19 to 65 years were included. Patients were divided into two groups. Forty three patients were treated with mesh repair of inguinal hernia and 43 were treated with darn repair procedure. Complications were recorded and compared between two different techniques, such as surgical site infection, length of hospital stay and recurrence of inguinal hernias.

Results: There were 18 (20.93%) patients had ages <30 years, 22 (25.58%) patients ages between 30 to 40 years. 23 (26.74%) patients had ages 41 to 50 years and 23 (26.74%) patients above 50 years. Surgical site infection (superficial), I found in 4 patients in mesh repair group and in 3 patients in darn group. Length of hospital stay was high in mesh group as compared to darn repair group. Recurrence of inguinal hernia found in 2 patients in mesh group while in 5 patients in darn group.

Conclusion: Mesh repair technique is had less rate in recurrence of inguinal hernias as compared to darn repair technique.

Key Words: Inguinal hernias, Mesh repair, darn repair, Recurrence

Citation of article: Zarkoon N, Kakar M, Karim S. Comparison the Rate of Complications Between Mesh and Darn Repair in Inguinal Hernias. Med Forum 2019;30(3):54-56.

INTRODUCTION

Inguinal hernia is the most frequent disorder found in surgical departments and rated 25% in males and 2% in females.¹ Many of researches illustrated that the prevalence of this malignant disorder is high in older age and rated 50% yearly.² In US inguinal hernia repair is the most frequent performing surgical treatment and yearly approximately 0.6 million cases treated.³ This intervention puts the highest burden on health care system.4 During last 10 years many of procedures used for the treatment of inguinal hernia nut the recurrence rate is still high and rated 15 percent.⁵ In 1987, Lichtenstein introduce the mesh technique for repairing the inguinal hernia. This useful and effective procedure shows better results regarding pain and recurrence rate.6,7

Department of Surgery, Bolan Medical College, Quetta.

Correspondence: Dr. Naseebullah Zarkoon, Associate Professor, Surgical Unit-1, Bolan Medical College Quetta Contact No: 0300-3820056

Email: naseebullahzarkoon@gmail.com

January, 2019 Received: Accepted: February, 2019 Printed: March, 2019

Worldwide, polypropylene mesh technique for inguinal hernia repairs taking as a gold standard because of its better surgical results and less complications rate. Lichtenstein mesh technique is the world most common performing procedure and this method is now method of choice.8 However, in many under developed countries Bassini procedure is still using due to limited facilities and procedural cost.9 care Polypropylene mesh technique reduces the prevalence of chronic groin pain and other complications. 10 The use of absorbable meshes like lactic acid polymer and glycolic acid copolymer is very useful procedure to reduce the complications. This exposes the patient to inevitable hernia recurrence because the inflammatory response, through a hydrolytic reaction completely digests the implanted prostheticmaterial. 11,12 A prosthetic mesh repair technique for inguinal hernia is a very useful and better treatment modality and reported less than 5% recurrence rate. ^{13,14} For synthetic mesh repairs many studies have noted their association with numerous complications, including persistent pain, infection, adhesions, bowel erosion, shrinkage, andinflammation. 15,16 Our objective was to compare the complications in Lichtenstein repair with tension free Darn repair. We also looked at the surgical site infections, length of hospital stay, time taken to return to normal routine and recurrence of hernia.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study was conducted at Department of Surgery Unit-I, Bolan Medical College Quetta from 15th November 2017 to 31st December 2018. This study comprised 86 patients had ages 19 to 65 years were included. Patient's detailed medical history was examined after taking informed consent from all the patients. Patients with recurrent inguinal hernia, having ASA class IV and above, patients with other abdominal surgery were excluded from this study. Patients were divided into two groups Mesh repair and Darn repair. 43patients were treated with mesh repair of inguinal hernia and 43 were treated with darn repair procedure. ASA class, smoking history, diabetes mellitus and site was recorded as baseline characteristics of all the patients. Complications were recorded and compared between two different techniques, such as surgical site infection, length of hospital stay and recurrence of inguinal hernias. Statistical data was analyzed by SPSS 19.

RESULTS

Out of 86 male patients 18 (20.93%) patients had ages < 30 years, 22 (25.58%) patients were ages between 30 to 40 years. 23 (26.74%) patients had ages 41 to 50 years and 23 (26.74%) patients were ages above 50 years (Table 1). Baseline clinical examination was recorded as ASA class I and II.

Table No.1: Age-wise distribution of all the patients (n=86)

Age (years)	No.	%
<30	18	20.93
30-40	22	25.58
41-50	23	26.74
>50	23	26.74

Table No.2: Clinical examination of patients of each group

Characteristics	Mesh Repair (n=43)	Darn Repair (n = 43)
ASA Class		
I	29(67.44%)	30(69.77%)
II	14(32.56%)	13(30.23%)
Controlled DM	6	10
COPD	5	5
Smoking history	19	21
Site		
Right	19	20
Left	9	8
Bilateral	8	7
Direct	7	7

Control diabetes mellitus, COPD, smoking history, surgical site (Table 2). Surgical site infection (superficial) I found in 4 patients in mesh repair group and in 3 patients in darn group. Deep surgical site infection found in 2 patients treated with darn repair technique. Length of hospital stay was high in mesh

group as compared to darn repair group. Recurrence of inguinal hernia found in 2 patients in mesh group while in 5 patients in Darn group (Table 3).

Table No.3: Complications recorded in both groups

Variable	Mesh Repair	Darn Repair		
Surgical site infection				
Found	4 (9.30%)	3(6.98%)		
Not Found	39 (90.70%)	40 (93.02%)		
DSSI				
Found	1 (2.33%)	2(4.65%)		
Not Found	42 (97.67%)	41 (95.35%)		
Recurrence				
Found	2(4.65%)	5(11.63%)		
Not Found	41 (95.35%)	38(88.37%)		
Hospital Stay	3-15 Days	3-5 days		

DISCUSSION

Worldwide, repair of inguinal hernias is the second most common performing surgical procedure after appendectomy and accounted 11-16%.¹⁷ In 1887 the Bassini's repair technique was introduced and till that many operative methods have been used for repair of inguinal hernias but there is no definitive technique is considered as the bestmethod.¹⁸ The material used remains controversial. Now a days many of techniques applying for repairing the inguinal hernias to gain the better results and tension free procedure and to provide the better treatment, from those procedure Mesh repair reported as the best procedure to achieve the better results.^{19,20}

In mesh repair group the most common age groups was 30 to 50 years and there was no significant difference found in both groups regarding age. These results shows similarity to some other studies conducted in Pakistan.²¹

In the present study, we found that surgical site infection (superficial) found in 9.30% patients in mesh repair group and in 6.98% patients in darn group. Deep surgical site infection found in 2 patients treated with darn repair technique. There was no haematoma found in our study in both groups. A study conducted by Shilcutt et al²² in which hematoma was 4.4% and surgical site infection was 1.7%. Many other studies regarding repair of inguinal hernias illustrated different rates of complication.²³

In this study, the recurrence of inguinal hernia in mesh group was 4.65% and in Darn repair group it was 11.63%. These results shows similarity to some other studies in which recurrence rate in Mesh group was 3 to 5% and in Darn group was 8 to 12%. There was no significant difference was observed except recurrence in both groups of the present study.

CONCLUSION

Repair of inguinal hernia is the most common surgical procedure performed all over the world and different modalities are used to attain better outcomes. In our study, it is concluded from this study that Mesh repair technique is had less rate in recurrence of inguinal hernias as compared to darn repair technique. Hospital stay was higher in mesh group than darn group. Moreover, there was no significant difference was observed regarding wound infection.

Author's Contribution:

Concept & Design of Study: Naseebullah Zarkoon
Drafting: Mohyuddin Kakar
Data Analysis: Samina Karim
Revisiting Critically: Naseebullah Zarkoon,
Mohyuddin Kakar
Final Approval of version: Naseebullah Zarkoon

Conflict of Interest: The study has no conflict of

interest to declare by any author. **REFERENCES**

- Nicks BA, Askew K. Hernias. In: eMedicine [online database]. Omaha, NE: eMedicine.com;
 2010 Jan 25. http://emedicine.medscape.com/article/775630-overview.
- Inguinal hernia: epidemiology [online database]. San Mateo, CA: Epocrates, Inc.; 2010. Accessed July 14, 2010.
- 3. Society of American Gastrointestinal Endoscopic Surgeons [2013] Available at: www.sages.org
- 4. Zhao G, Gao P, Ma B, Tian J, Yang K. Open mesh techniques for inguinal hernia repair: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Ann Surg 2009;250(1):35-42.
- 5. Junge K, Binnebösel M, Rosch R, Öttinger A, Stumpf M, Mühlenbruch G, et al. Influence of mesh materials on the integrity of the vas deferens following Lichtenstein hernioplasty: an experimental model. Hernia 2008; 12(6):621-7.
- 6. Lichtenstein IL, Shulman AG, Amid PK, Montllor MM. The tension-free hernioplasty. Am J Surg 1989;157(2): 188-93.
- 7. Matyja A, Kibil W, Pach R, Solecki R, Kulig J, Kamtoh G, et al. Assessment of inguinal hernia treatment results in patients operated on with mesh using Lichtenstein, PHS and Robbins-Rutkow techniques. Video Surgery Miniinv 2010;5:27-34.
- 8. Battocchio F, Terranova O, De Santis L. Grande Atlante di Tecnica Chirurgica: Chirurgia Delle Ernie. UTET Scienze Mediche, Torino 2004: 1-383.
- Adesunkanmi AR, Badmus TA, Ogundoyin O. Determinants of outcome of inguinal herniorrhaphy in Nigerian patients. Ann Coll Surg Hong Kong 2004;8(1):14-21.
- 10. Sajid MS, Leaver C, Baig MK, Sains P. Systematic review and meta-analysis of the use of lightweight versus heavyweight mesh in open inguinal hernia repair. Br J Surg 2012;99(1):29-37.
- 11. Abd El Maksoud W, Abd El Salam M, Ahmed HH. Comparative study between Lichtenstein procedure and modified darn repair in treating primary inguinal hernia: a prospective

- randomized controlled trial. Hernia 2014; 18:231–6.
- Ansaloni L, Catena F, Coccolini F, Gazzotti F, D'Alessandro L, Pinna AD. Absorbable versus permanent mesh in abdominal operations. Am J Surg 2009; 198(3):303-12.
- 13. Amid PK, Shulman AG. Open "tension-free" repair of inguinal hernias: the Lichtenstein technique. Euro J Surg 1996;162(6):447-53.
- 14. Kark AE, Kurzer MN, Belsham PA. Three thousand one hundred seventy-five primary inguinal hernia repairs: advantages of ambulatory open mesh repair using local anesthesia. J Am Coll Surg 1998;186(4):447-55.
- 15. Post S, Weiss B, Willer M, Neufang T, Lorenz D. Randomized clinical trial of lightweight composite mesh for Lichtenstein inguinal hernia repair. Br J Surg 2004;91(1):44-8.
- 16. Breuing K, Butler CE, Ferzoco S, Franz M, Hultman CS, Kilbridge JF, et al. Ventral Hernia Working Group. Incisional ventral hernias: review of the literature and recommendations regarding the grading and technique of repair. Surgery 2010;148(3):544-58.
- 17. Olasehinde O, Lawal OO, Agbakwuru EA, Adisa AO, Alatise OI, Arowolo OA, et al. Comparing Lichtenstein with darning for inguinal hernia repair in an African population. Hernia 2016; 20(5):667–74.
- 18. Khan M, Mufti TS. A study of incidence of external hernias in NWFP. J Pak Med Assoc 1982;32(5):119-21.
- 19. Pokorny H, Klingler A, Schmid T, Fortelny R, Hollinsky C, Kawji R, et al. Recurrence and complications after laparoscopic versus open inguinal hernia repair: results of a prospective randomized multicenter trial. Hernia 2008;12(4):385-9.
- 20. Montgomery A, Kallinowski F, Köckerling F. Evidence for replacement of an infected synthetic by a biological mesh in abdominal wall hernia repair. Front Surg 2015; 2(67):1–6
- 21. Rasool MI, Idress A, Qayyum F. Inguinal hernia clinical presentation. Rawal Med J 1992;20(1):23-26.
- 22. Shillcutt SD, Clarke MG, Kingsnorth AN. Costeffectiveness of groin hernia surgery in the Western Region of Ghana. Arch Surg 2010; 145(10): 954-61.
- 23. Stephenson BM, Kingsnorth AN. Inguinal hernioplasty using mosquito net mesh in low income countries an alternative and cost effective prosthesis. Christmas; Surgery BMJ 2011; 18: 1237-47.
- 24. Sterne JAC, Hernán MA, Reeves BC, Savović J, Berkman ND, Viswanathan M et al. ROBINS-I: a tool for assessing risk of bias in non-randomised studies of interventions. BMJ 2016; 355:i4919.
- 25. Memon GA, Shah SKA, Rehman H. An experience with mesh versus darn repair in inguinal hernias. Pak J Med Sci 2017; 33(3):699–702.