Original Article

# Patients' Satisfaction after Stapled Ler Hemorrhoidectomy Versus Doppler Guided Hemorrhoidal Artery Ligation

Stapled Hemorrhoidectomy

Ansar Latif<sup>1</sup>, Anila Ansar<sup>2</sup> and Sher Afgan<sup>1</sup>

#### **ABSTRACT**

**Objective:** Assessment of the patient's satisfaction undergoing treatment for haemorrhoids, after stapled haemorrhoidectomy and haemorrhoidal artery ligation methods of surgery at Khawaja Muhammad Safdar Medical College, Sialkot, Pakistan.

Study Design: Prospective and analytic study.

**Place and Duration of study:** This study was conducted at the Department of Surgery, Khawaja Muhammad Safdar Medical College, Sialkot from from December 2012 to June 2015.

Materials and Methods: All patients presenting in surgical out patients department above 18 years with third degree haemorrhoids were included in the study. Data of 82 patients (stapled haemorrhoidectomy n=55 and haemorrhoidal artery ligation n=27) was collected from December 2012 to November 2015. Patients were distributed in two groups depending upon the surgical procedures carried out. Full detailed history, examination, and investigations were performed. Patients with grade III hemorrhoids underwent at RAR procedure (Recto Anal Repair) i.e. Doppler guided haemorrhoidal artery ligation (DG-HAL) combined with estoration of prolapsed hemorrhoids to their anatomical position with longitudinal sutures. Results of real nent were assessed by regular follow up. Recording of variables and feedbackof the patients with minimum 3 months follow up, was made and analysed.

**Results:** Out of 82 patients included in our study, Male patients were more in number in our study while 43 years came out to be, of the mean age. Something coming out from the anal canal, painful evacuation of bowels, bleeding per rectum and constipation are the chief presenting complaint.

Conclusion: Generally, patients with piles except having severe prolapsed haemorrhoids had postoperative pain, lesser complications and acceptable results in long term can be achieved, in patients undergoing Doppler Guided Haemorrhoid Artery Ligation and Recto Anal Repair Haemorrhoid artery ligation is a procedure associated with much less pain, in comparison to the stapled haemor hordectomy and patients can resume normal routine job, early. Long-term complications still require to be seen and assessed by studies with longer follow up. A lot depends on treating surgeon, his experience, skill and acceptance.

**Keywords:** Hemorrhoids, Ligation, RAL (Reco-anal repair), DG-HAL (Doppler guided Haemorrhoidal artery ligation), Stapled Haemorrhoidectomy.

Citation of article: Latif A, Ansary, Can S. Patients' Satisfaction after Stapled Hemorrhoidectomy Versus Doppler Guided Hemorrhoidal Artery Ligation. Med Forum 2016;27(4):61-65.

### INTRODUCTION

Haemorrhoids is one of the commonest illnesses making up major work load in the surgical set up<sup>1</sup>. The pathophysiology of this condition is uncertain. Majority of the population elder than 50 years are likely to suffer from haemorrhoids of some severity<sup>2</sup>. Almost all human beings will get this disease minimum once

<sup>1.</sup> Department of Surgery, Khawaja Muhammad Safdar Medical College, Sialkot

Correspondence: Dr. Ansar Latif,

Assoc. Prof. / Head of Department, Surgical Unit I, Govt. Khawaja Muhammad Safdar Medical College, Sialkot.

Contact No.: 03217103994 E-mail: ansarlatif2013@gmail.com

Received: January 03, 2016; Accepted: March 29, 2016

during their life<sup>3</sup>. Classifying haemorrhoids: Stage I Haemorrhoids presenting with bleeding only, Stage II Haemorrhoids that prolapse and reduce at own, Stage III Haemorrhoids which prolapse and require reduction and Stage IV Prolapsed haemorrhoids that cannot be reduced. Depending upon presenting complaints, varied methods of treatment like Baron's band ligation, Cryotherapy, Electro cautery and Injection of

Sclerozing Agents and ultimately Surgery. Surgery remains the acceptable final treatment of grade III piles<sup>4</sup>. Each method ofhaemorrhoidectomy has its merits and demerits as well as method-specific complications, including anal canal strictures, sensory loss, and sphincter damage resulting in incontinence<sup>5</sup>. Conventional open and closed haemorrhoidectomy is being replaced by newer techniques with less complications and recurrence is almost negligible, but the patients havepainful defecation after surgery and delayed return to normal daily activities<sup>6</sup>. Invention and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2.</sup> Department of Gynae & Obs, Sialkot Medical College, Sialkot

use of circular stapling gun for treating haemorrhoids has good results as regards to postoperative pain, lesser hospital stay and resuming daily routine<sup>7</sup>.

Haemorrhoidal artery ligation is also gaining popularity with even more advantages but requires specialised equipment of Doppler sensors to exactly locate the site and depth of feeding arteries<sup>8,9</sup>. First introduced by Morinaga et al. in 90s', is a procedure that ligates and contracts haemorrhoid tissue after indicating the upper rectal artery branch supplying the haemorrhoid with the help of Doppler signal and monitor<sup>10</sup>.

International studies are there analysing merits and demerits of these methods of treatment but not much work has been done in Pakistan. The present study was a prospective analysis of the outcome of haemorrhoidectomies by stapled method and Doppler guided haemorrhoidal artery ligation, in Department of Surgery, Allama Iqbal Memorial Teaching Hospital affiliated with Government Khawaja Muhammad Safdar Medical College, Sialkot. A comparison of stapled haemorrhoidectomy with HAL and RAR (recto anal repair)as regards duration of surgery, blood loss, pain after the procedure, early and delayed morbidity, hospital stay, time required to return to normal activities, and the cost of the surgical procedure.

#### MATERIALS AND METHODS

Prospective study based on a treatment of 82Patients who were followed up for at least 3 months. Amongst these 55 patients opted for haemorrhoidectomy by stapled method and 27 patientsunderwent Haemorrhoidal artery ligation with Recto Anal Kepan This analysis was not randomized, detailed the procedures were told to the patients and choice of operating technique done by the patients according to affordability and wishes. Preoperative antibiotics were given to all the patients. This makes was not randomized, details of the procedures were told to the patients and choice of operating technique done by the patients according and wishes. Preoperative antibiotics were given to all the patients. All the surgeries were done using general and spinal

All the surgeries were done using general and spinal anaesthesia in lithotomy position. A specialized Anoscope with Doppler sensor was used and introduced to anal canal along with a specially designed sleeve. The sensor is required to be placed about 3-5 cm from upper dentate line to indicate the rectal arteries. The exact site and depth of the arteries were confirmed using Doppler ultrasound and displayed on the monitor. Then a double stitch is applied with Vicryl 2/0 at the identified spot. After application of ligature, it was checked by loss of signals on Doppler sensor and the knot tightened using a knot pusher.

Postoperative pain was assessed by grading as no pain, pain requiring no treatment, treatment with oral analgesics and treatment with intravenous analgesia. Recurrence of disease, morbidity data, Duration of hospitalization, pain in postoperative period, duration of

operating time and time taken for resuming daily activities was recorded. Every patient was assessed in person. The assessment of result was recorded on a proforma, inclusive of symptomatology as pain and discomfort, itching, bleeding per rectum, urgency and incontinence and patient's opinion of outcome grading as poor, fair, good or excellent.

The patients having grade III haemorrhoids were included. Symptomatic haemorrhoidal disease with prolapsing haemorrhoids, reducible manually and no history of faecal incontinence prior to enrolment. Patients with recurrent haemorrhoids, diabetes, grade I and II as well as having less than 3 months follow up were excluded from the study. Similarly, Patients with co-existing medical problems, perianal sepsis, inflammatory bowel disease, colorectal tumours, pre-existing sphincter injury; Pregnancy and patients unfit for general or spinal anaesthesia were excluded as well as patients currently taking certain medication like antiplatelet drugs.

The results of the treatment in this study was shown as mean  $\pm$  standard de tiation. The analysis of statistics was done on programme of SPSS version 21.

#### RESULTS

In time period of 2 years and 11 months, the patients of 3<sup>rd</sup> degree piles with varied presentations were admitted and operated: with conventional open and closed base prhoidectomy in surgical department of Allama Iqual Memorial Teaching Hospital affiliated with Chawaja Muhammad Safdar Medical College Sialkot, Pakistan. Total of 779 haemorrhoidectomies were carried out, of which 102 patients opted for new techniques. Only 82 patients fulfilled the inclusion criteria of this study as regards grade III and follow up after treatment. The general data of our patients in the study is shown in Table I.

Table No.I: General data (n=82)

A	20.40	
Age	20-40 years: 26(31.70%)	
	40-60 years: 48(58.53%)	
	>60 years: 8(9.75%)	
Sex (m : f)	(59:23) (70.8%:29.2%)	
Presenting	Bleeding 42(64.6%)	
complaints	Something coming out of	
	anus: 21(32.3%)	
	Painful defecation: 18	
	(27.7%)	
	Constipation: 6(9.2%)	
	Perianal itching: 11(16.9%)	
	Weakness: 4 (6.2%)	
Degree of	3 <sup>rd</sup> degree- 82 (100%)	
haemorrhoids		
Stapled	55 (69.2%)	
haemorrhoidectomy		
Haemorrhoidal artery	27 (30.8%)	
Ligation		

The differential data collected in the two groups is highlighted in Table 2.

Table No.2: Morbidity data

Hemorr-hoidectomy group (n=55)(100%)   Group (n=55)(100%)   Group (n=27) (100%)   Grou		·	Stapled	Hemorrh
Group (n=55)(100%)   ligation group (n=27) (100%)			Hemorr-	oidal
Complication   Comp			hoidectomy	artery
Operating time			group	ligation
Operating time			(n=55)(100%)	group
Operating time				(n=27)
Complicati ons   Comp				(100%)
Postope-rative pain   Pain but no treatment Pain requiring oral analgesia Pain requiring intravenous analgesia   Parente Pain analgesia   Parente Pain requiring oral analgesia   Pain requiring intravenous   Pain r	Operating ti	me	35 – 90 mins	35 - 65
Postope-rative pain   No pain   19(34.54%)   12(44.44   15(27.27%)   %)   12(44.44   15(27.27%)   %)   8(29.62   16(29.09%)   %)     (29.09%)   %)     (27.40%)   (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)   (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)   (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)   (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)   (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)   (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)   (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)   (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)     (27.40%)			( mean 51	mins(
Postope rative pain   Pain but no treatment Pain requiring oral analgesia Pain requiring intravenous analgesia   Pain generative pain requiring oral analgesia   Pain requiring intravenous   Pain requiring intraven			mins)	mean 39
Pain but no treatment				mins)
treatment   Pain requiring   16(29.09%)   %)	Postope-	No pain	19(34.54%)	12(44.44
Pain requiring oral analgesia   Pain requiring intravenous analgesia   Pain requiring intravenous analgesia   2(7.40%)	rative pain	Pain but no	15(27.27%)	%)
Oral analgesia   Pain requiring intravenous analgesia   2(7.40%)		treatment		8(29.62
Pain requiring intravenous analgesia   2(7.40%)     First defecation after surgery   18 hrs   16 hrs     Early complicati ons   2(3.63%)   1(3.70%)     Early complicati ons   2(3.63%)   1(3.70%)     Incontinence   1(1.81%)   0     Wound infection   0   0     Incontinence   1(1.81%)   0     Voltage   0   0     Late complicati ons   2(3.63%)   1(3.70%)     Early complicati ons   1(1.81%)   0     Early complicati ons   0   0     Early complication   0   0     Early complication   0     Early co		Pain requiring	16(29.09%)	%)
Intravenous analgesia   2(7.40%)		oral analgesia		
Analgesia   2(7.40%)		Pain requiring	5(9.09%)	5(18.5%)
First defecation after surgery		intravenous		
surgery         18 hrs         time 16 hrs           Early complications         Urine retention         3(5.45%)         0           Secondary bleeding Incontinence         2(3.63%)         1(3.70%)           Wound infection         5(9.09%)         1(3.70%)           Others         0         0           Late complications         Anal stenosis         0         0           Anal incontinence         1(1.81%)         0           Stricture Recurrence         0         0           Recurrence         4(7.27%)         10.70%)		analgesia		2(7.40%)
Early complication	First defecat	tion after		
Early complication         Urine retention         3(5.45%)         0           Ons         Secondary bleeding Incontinence         2(3.63%)         1(3.70%)           Incontinence         1(1.81%)         0           Wound infection         5(9.09%)         1(3.70%)           Others         0         0           Late complications         Anal stenosis         0         0           Anal incontinence         1(1.81%)         0           Stricture         0         0           Recurrence         4(7.27%)         10.70%)	surgery		18 hrs	time 16
complicati ons         retention         2(3.63%)         1(3.70%)           Secondary bleeding         2(3.63%)         1(3.70%)           Incontinence         1(1.81%)         0           Wound infection         5(9.09%)         1(3.70%)           Others         0         0           Late complicati ons         Anal stenosis         0         0           Anal incontinence         1(1.81%)         0           Stricture Recurrence         0         0				hrs
ons         Secondary bleeding bleeding         2(3.63%)         1(3.70%)           Incontinence         1(1.81%)         0           Wound infection         5(9.09%)         1(3.70%)           Others         0         0           Late complications         Anal stenosis         0         0           Anal incontinence         1(1.81%)         0           Stricture         0         0           Recurrence         4(7.27%)         12.70%)	,	Urine	3(5.45%)	0
bleeding	complicati	retention		
Incontinence   1(1.81%)   0	ons	Secondary	2(3.63%)	1(3.70%)
Wound infection 5(9.09%) 1(3.70%)  Others 0 0  Late complicati ons 1(1.81%) 0  Stricture 0 0  Recurrence 4(7.27%) 1/2,70%)		bleeding		
infection		Incontinence	1(1.81%)	0
Others 0 0  Late Anal stenosis 0 0  complicati ons incontinence Stricture 0  Recurrence 4(7.27%) 0  Others 0 0  (1.81%) 0		Wound	5(9.09%)	1(3.70%)
Late complications         Anal stenosis         0         0           Anal stenosis ons         1(1.81%)         0           Anal incontinence         5tricture         0           Recurrence         4(7.27%)		infection		
complicati ons         Anal incontinence         1(1.81%)         0           Stricture         0         0           Recurrence         4(7.27%)         \$2.70%)		Others	0	0
ons incontinence   Stricture   0   0   Recurrence   4(7.27%)   (2.70%)	Late	Anal stenosis	0	0
Stricture         0         0           Recurrence         4(7.27%)         10.70%)	complicati	Anal	1(1.81%)	0
Recurrence 4(7.27%)	ons	incontinence		
		Stricture	0	0
		Recurrence	4(7.27%)	12.70%)
			0	<u> </u>

The Recto Anal Repair procedure was performed in 35 minutes time (25 – 75 minutes) calculated from induction of anaesthes pand shifting back to surgical postoperative wardfrom the operation theatre. On average 5, (4 – 8) ligaturys / number of Sensored arteries were done for HAL, the commonest site being 3 and 11 o' clock position in supine patient. Recurrence of clinical complaints were bleeding in 6 (7.31%) patients, itching in 5 (4.1%) and pain in (3.3%). Complications of haemorrhoidectomy were urgency of stools in 2(3.65%), incontinence to flatus 2(3.65%) and persistent pain 1(1.81%).

For assessment of patient's satisfaction, following parameters were recorded. Table 3.

One of the 27 patients (3%), 73-year-old male, reported occasional incontinence problems at the follow up, Check-up 3 months postoperative (incontinence to flatus, off and on soiling of undergarments) having complaints started 30 days after operation.

During the follow up one year after Recto Anal Repair, there was one new patient of prolapsed haemorrhoidsi.e. recurrence.Not a single case of persistent bleeding per rectum was reported and patient's opinion of satisfaction assessment questionnaire came out to be excellent in majority 95%, in stapled group and 98% in HAL group.

**Table No.3: Patients parameters** 

	Stapled	Hemorrhoidal
	Hemorrhoidectomy	artery ligation
	group	group
Expenses of	37000/=(+7000)	42000/=( <u>+</u>
Surgery		9000)
Hospital stay	2.5 days	1.5 days
Return to work	4-7 days( mean 5.3)	2-5 days(
	•	mean
		3.1days)
Recommendation	95%	98%
for surgery for	<b>1</b>	
recurrence and		
for other patients		
with same		
complaints		

## DISCUSSION

Most of our patients were in the group ranging from 41-60 years while above 60 years were less. Reason being that older age group is still convinced of conventional techniques while the age group of 41-60 years because of better communication and access to modern technologies could easily be counselled for treatment and expenses to be borne.

Our patients were mostly male as expected but too less number of female patients in our study can be explained on local cultural and religious grounds; disliking of female patients to be treated by male surgeons.

Operating time in DG HAL group is relatively less as compared to SH group as more dissection is involved. However this was not a major factor for patients' satisfaction

The time of surgery was quite short in the method of DG HAL patients (mean 38.75 minutes) versus the stapling technique i.e. (mean 50.75 minutes) in our study.

Bickchandani et al.<sup>11</sup>, in his study Comparison of Open Haemorrhoidectomy with stapling method published the finding of lesser blood loss and shorter duration of operation time in Stapled Haemorrhoidectomy. Other studies by Gravieet al.<sup>12</sup> and Mehigan et al.<sup>13</sup> came out with similar findings. The problem of pain in SH (Stapled Haemorrhoidectomy) group was more in this procedure.

Hospital stay in our study was on average remained 3.5  $\pm 1.5$  days in the two groups which was comparable to the studies of Bikhchandani et al. 11, and Shalaby et al. 14 The patient's main concern was early return to normal work without complications, and that was 4-7 days and 7-12 days for stapled haemorrhoidectomy and

haemorrhoidal artery ligation respectively. These findings were not much different as shown in the above mentioned studies.

In injury of coming back to activities of day to day life; Mean value,  $2.3 \pm 2.0$  days following operation. Cost because of equipment involved in HAL and its disposable sensors, the expense borne by the patients in HAL group is relatively high that is average PKR 42000/- while PKR 37000/- in Stapled haemorrhoidectomy. These can be compared with other studies which show the cost in their local currencies.

The judgement by the patients about their surgical outcome was declared , poor in 6% ( n=5 ) , fair in 5% ( n=4 ) , good in 11% ( n=9 ) and excellent by 79.4% ( n=64 ).

Regarding the inquiry for opting surgery for second time; the reply was "yes" in 94.841% in stapled group and 98.02% in HAL group: similarly recommendation of the same procedure for other patients having same disease.

Retropneumoperitoneum and pneumomediastinum which has been reported in some studies and having grave effects were not encountered in our patients. Major postoperative complications like, sepsis, perforation of rectum or Fournier's gangrene were not encountered in our patients. Recent onset pain inAnorectum was reported by 2 patients. Reason being the purse string suture located near the dentate line, thus touching the sensible Anoderm, might be a reasonable explanation for anal pain. Gencosmanogluet al. 15 and Carapeti et al. 16 i.e., had results which are comparable to our patients. You and Colleagues 16 showed that he pain after surgery was reportedly less in patient with closed haemorrhoidectomy. Arbman et al die not find any difference among the results of two pethods of haemorrhoidectomy. Post-operative Complications like acute intestinal obstruction, rectal perforation or rectovaginal fistula after starling method reported in literature were not encountered in our study 13,14. These complications happened due to in dequate experience and can be overcome once the learning of the technique is matured. We were fortunate for not having such complications.

In the stapling method group, one patient had recurrence of haemorrhoids and one patient had incontinence to flatus. A long-term follow-up study by Ganioet al.<sup>17</sup>in his study has shown no differences between the outcome of both the surgical approaches. While, Van de Stadt et al. found a higher incidence of recurrence in prolapse after heamorrhoidectomy by stapling technique.

In contrast, Van de Stadtet al. 18 revealed a higher risk of reprolapsing piles requiring surgery after stapled Anopexy.

Skin tags after surgery were found in 13% (n=11) of the patients.

Smyth et al. found incidence of residual skin tags in 45% of their patients after stapled technique. Most of the patients were completely symptom free and no further procedure was required. Our patients in the study were not at all concerned about these tags.

The early complications were minor. Cheetham et al.<sup>20</sup>, showed 31% patients to have in their study of stapled haemorrhoidectomy, found 31% of patients to have faecal incontinence of minor grade and Postoperative pain persisting for 15 months. Reportedly the cause was not defined speculating that incorporation of muscle in the doughnut mightOr it could be because of close placement of purse string suture to dentate line causing sensitive skin and muscle impingement.

Studies by Bickchandaniet al. <sup>11</sup>, Shalaby et al. <sup>14</sup> and Mehigan et al. <sup>13</sup>showed almost same complications in open and stapled haemorrhoidectomy. Molloy and Kinsmore <sup>21</sup> highlighted a patient of retroperitoneal sepsis following stapling projecture and suggest routine use of antibiotic prophysical. All our patients had prophylactic antibiotics and no lepsis was reported.

Mean ligations of hac nor holdal artery and Recto Anal Repair shown were 6 times. Duration of surgical procedure came a be mean 35 minutes. Almost similar operating times and number of times the arteries ligated.

Similarly, in other studies by Senagore AJ et al<sup>22</sup> and Nsar PJ<sup>23</sup> et al, Mean number of ligations were 5-10. This number was lesser to the number of Recto Anal Repairs done in this study.

#### CONCLUSION

The circular stapling technique offers a much less painful haemorrhoidectomy and is associated with an earlier return to normal life. Stapling method of hemorrhoidectomy is a new and reliable surgical technique for treating grade III and grade IV hemorrhoids. Patients have less postoperative pain, short hospital stay, little time away from routine life, morbidity similar to the conventional surgery, and patients having better satisfaction having no perianal wound. Hemorrhoidal artery ligation under Doppler control is a new technique, its cost remains relatively high in our setting which limit the availability of this technology to the public. However, more trials with longer follow up are essential to study any long-term complications.

**Conflict of Interest:** The study has no conflict of interest to declare by any author.

#### **REFERENCES**

- 1. Holzheimer RG. Hemorrhoidectomy: indications and risks. Europ J Med Res 2004;9(1):18–36.
- 2. Herold A, Kirsch JJ. Complications after circular stapled hemorrhoidectomy. Coloproctol 2001;23 (1):8–16.

- 3. Morinaga K, Hasuda K, Ikeda T. A novel therapy for internal hemorrhoids: ligation of the hemorrhoidal artery with a newly devised instrument (Moricorn) in conjunction with a Doppler flow-meter. Am J Gastroenterol 1995; 90(4):610-13.
- 4. Scheyer M, Antonietti E, Rollinger G, Mall H, Arnold S. Doppler-guided hemorrhoidal artery ligation. Am J Surg 2006;191(1):89–93.
- 5. Walega P, Scheyer M, Kenig J, et al. Two-center experience in the treatment of hemorrhoidal disease using Doppler-guided hemorrhoidal artery ligation: functional results after 1-year follow-up. Surgical Endoscopy and Other Interventional Techniques 2008; 22(11):2379–83.
- Jayaraman S, Colquhoun PH, Malthaner RA. Stapled versus conventional surgery for hemorrhoids. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2006;(4):p. CD005393.
- 7. Oughriss M, Yver R, Faucheron JL. Complications of stapled hemorrhoidectomy: a French multicentric study. Gastroenterologie Clinique etBiologique 2005;29(4):429–33.
- 8. Forrest NP, Mullerat J, Evans C, Middleton SB. Doppler-guided haemorrhoidal artery ligation with recto anal repair: a new technique for the treatment of symptomatic haemorrhoids. Int J Colorectal Dis 2010;25(10):1251–1256.
- 9. Walega P, Krokowicz P, Romaniszyn M, et al. Doppler guided haemorrhoidal arterial ligation with recto-anal-repair (RAR) for the treatment of advanced haemorrhoidal disease. Colorectal bis 2010;12(10): e326–e329.
- 10. Patti R, Almasio PL, ArcaraM ,, et al. Ding-term manometric study of anal sphincter function after hemorrhoidectomy. Int J Colorectal Dis 2007;22 (3):253–57.
- 11. Bickchandani J, Agarwa P IV, , Kant R ,, Malik VK. Randomized controlled that to compare the early and mid-term results of stapled versus open haemorrhoidetomy. An J Sarg 2005;189: 56-60.
- 12. Gravie JF, Lehur PA, Hyen N, Papillon M, Fantoli M, Descottes B, et al. Stapled hemorrhoidopexy versus Milligan Morgan hemorrhoidectomy: a prospective, randomized, multicenter trial with 2-year postoperative follow up. Ann Surg 2005;242: 29.35
- 13. Mehigan BJ, Monson JR, Hartley JE. Stapling procedure for haemorrhoids versus Milligan-

- Morgan haemorrhoidectomy: randomised controlled trial. Lancet 2000;355(9206):782-85.
- 14. Shalaby R, Desoky A: Randomised clinical trial of stapled versus Milligan-Morgan haemorrhoidectomy. Br J Surg 2001; 88: 1049-1053.
- 15. Gençosmanoglu R, Sad O, Koç D, Inceoğlu R. Hemorrhoidectomy: open or closed technique? A prospective, randomized clinical trial. Dis Colon Rectum 2002;45 (1):70-75.
- Carapeti EA, Kamm MA, Mcdonald PJ, Chadwick SJ, Phillips RK, Randomised trial of open versus closed day-case haemorrhoidectomy. Br J Surg 1999;86(5):612-13.
- 17. Ganio E, Altomare DF, Gabrielli F, Milito G, Canuti S. Prospective randomized multicentre trial comparing stapled with open haemorrhoidectomy. Br J Surg 2001; 88(5):669–74.
- 18. Van de Stadt J, D'Hoore A, Duinslaeger M, Chasse E, Penninckx F. Long-term results after excision haemorrhoit stomy versus stapled haemorrhoidopery for propapsing haemorrhoids; a Belgian prospective randomized trial. ActaChirB (lg 2005, 05: 44–52.
- 19. Smyth EF, Baler RP, Wilken BJ, Hartley JE, White TJ, Monson JR. Stapled versus excision haen rrhoidectomy: long-term follow-up of a randomized controlled trial. Lancet 2003;361: 1487-8.
- MA, Phillips RK. Persistent pain and faecal urgency after stapled haemorrhoidectomy. Lancet 2000; 356:730–33.
- 21. Molloy RG, Kingsmore D. Life threatening pelvic sepsis after stapled haemorrhoidectomy. Lancet 2000; 355:810.
- 22. Senagore AJ, Singer M, Abcarian H, Fleshman J, Corman M, Wexner S, et al. Procedure for Prolapse and Hemmorrhoids (PPH) Multicenter Study Group: A prospective, randomized, controlled multicenter trial comparing stapled hemorrhoidopexy and Ferguson haemorrhoidectomy: perioperative and one-year results. Dis Colon Rectum 2004; 47: 1824-1836.
- 23. Nisar PJ, Acheson AG, Neal KR, Schoelfield JH. Stapled haemorrhoidopexy compared with conventional haemorrhoidectomy; systematic review of randomized controlled trials. Dis Colon Rectum 2004;47:1837-45.