Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Laparoscopic peritoneal lavage for perforated colonic diverticulitis: a systematic review

Toorenvliet, B.R.; Swank, H.; Schoones, J.W.; Hamming, J.F.; Bemelman, W.A.

Citation

Toorenvliet, B. R., Swank, H., Schoones, J. W., Hamming, J. F., & Bemelman, W. A. (2010). Laparoscopic peritoneal lavage for perforated colonic diverticulitis: a systematic review. *Colorectal Disease*, 12(9), 862-7. doi:10.1111/j.1463-1318.2009.02052.x

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/119051>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

European Colorectal Congress

29 November – 2 December 2020, St.Gallen, Switzerland

Sunday, 29 November 2020

MASTERCLASS

Introduction & course objectives

Michel Adamina, Winterthur, CH

Myths and facts about oral antibiotics, bowel preparation, and timing of iv antibiotics to reduce surgical site infection

Frédéric Ris, Geneva, CH

Management of colorectal GIST – all you should know from diagnosis to handling recurrences

Paris Tekkis, London, UK

Do and don't in taTME surgery – a decade of experience explained

Roel Hompes, Amsterdam, NL

What your pathologist can do for you: from standard margins recommendations to molecular pathology, liquid biopsies, and the microbiome

Phil Quirke, Leeds, UK

Prehabilitation, patient blood management, frailty index – welcome addition or resource wasting

Des Winter, Dublin, IE

Selective use of neoadjuvant and adjuvant radiotherapy for rectal cancer

Chris Cunningham, Oxford, UK

Handling large rectal adenoma and malignant polyps

Willem Bemelman, Amsterdam, NL

All techniques to avoid staple line intersections in colorectal surgery

Antonino Spinelli, Milano, IT

Management of pelvic sepsis after colorectal / coloanal anastomosis and oncological outcomes of the GRECCAR 5 trial

Quentin Denost, Bordeaux, FR

Best practices in colostomy construction and repair of parastomal hernia

Eva Angenete, Göteborg, SE

The EBSQ Coloproctology Examination

Michel Adamina, Winterthur, CH

Wrap-up

Michel Adamina, Winterthur, CH

Sunday, 29 November 2020

COURSE OF PROCTOLOGY

Introduction & course objectives

Bruno Roche, Geneva, CH

Complex pelvic fistula revisited: established wisdom and innovative approaches

Alexander Herold, Mannheim, DE

Obstetrical trauma: assessment, timing and options to repair

Patrick Hohlfield, Lausanne, FR

The painful bottom – Proctalgia beyond the classical abscess, fissures, and hemorrhoids

Bruno Roche, Geneva, CH

Sexually transmitted diseases in proctology

Karel Skala, Geneva, CH

Anorectal trauma and foreign bodies

Richard Cohen, London, UK

Pilonidal sinus – strategies and outcomes

Frédéric Ris, Geneva, CH

Fecal incontinence: investigations and conservative treatment

Beatrice Salvio, Milano, IT

Fecal incontinence: neuromodulation and interventional options

Joan Robert-Yap, Geneva, CH

The pelvic floor revealed: transperineal / transvaginal / transanal repairs explained

Bruno Roche, Geneva, CH

The pelvic floor revealed: investigations and pelvic floor therapy

Jacqueline de Jong, Bern, CH

Obstructed defecation and IBS: investigations, differential diagnosis, and treatment strategies

Daniel Pohl, Zurich, CH

Obstructed defecation: surgical options

André d'Hoore, Leuven, BE

Wrap-up

Alexander Herold, Mannheim, DE

Monday, 30 November 2020

SCIENTIFIC PROGRAMME

Opening and welcome

Jochen Lange, St. Gallen, CH

Is cancer an infectious disease: role of the microbiome

Philip Quirke, Leeds, UK

Ethical considerations in crisis – lessons from Covid-19

Omar Faiz, London, UK

SATELLITE SYMPOSIUM Medtronic

Prophylactic mesh in colorectal surgery

René H. Fortelny, Wien, AT

Lars Pahlman lecture: Extending the limits of liver surgery

Markus Büchler, Heidelberg, DE

Multimodal approaches to colorectal liver metastases

Mohammed Abu Hilal, Brescia, IT

SATELLITE SYMPOSIUM Ethicon

Urogenital dysfunction in patients treated for rectal cancer – what do we know and what can we do?

Eva Angenete, Göteborg, SE

Hemorrhoids – new options and time-tested solutions

Alexander Herold, Mannheim, DE

Anal pain and emergency proctology: what every surgeon should know & do

Richard Cohen, London, UK

All you need to know about anorectal fistula

Bruno Roche, Genève, CH

Strategies and outcomes for obstructive cancers of the colon and rectum

Willem Bemelman, Amsterdam, NL

Tuesday, 1 December 2020

BREAKFAST SYMPOSIUM Karl Storz

Lessons learned along the robotic learning curve: a video guide for colorectal surgeons

Jim Khan, Portsmouth, UK

EAES presidential lecture: Strategies for lifelong learning and implementation of new technologies

Andrea Pietrabissa, Pavia, IT

SATELLITE SYMPOSIUM Intuitive

A journey in global surgery – why getting out of the comfort zone

Raffaele Rosso, Lugano, CH

Enhanced recovery pathways reloaded – a practical guide to success

Roberto Persiani, Roma, IT

Cancer at the extremes of age: are there any differences in handling youngsters and seniors

Des Winter, Dublin, IE

Management pearls for early rectal cancer

Roel Hompes, Amsterdam, NL

Ventral rectopexy: indications, tricks of the trade, and long-term results

Chris Cunningham, Oxford, UK

SATELLITE SYMPOSIUM BBraun

Total neoadjuvant therapy for colon and rectum cancers

Ronan O'Connell, Dublin, IE

Randomized trial evaluating chemotherapy followed by pelvic reirradiation vs chemotherapy alone as preoperative treatment for locally recurrent rectal cancer (GRECCAR 15)

Quentin Denost, Bordeaux, FR

Timeline of surgery following neoadjuvant radiotherapy – balancing morbidity and efficacy

Torbjörn Holm, Stockholm, SE

Poster award

Michel Adamina, Winterthur, CH

Wednesday, 2 December

Place and outcome of total colectomy in the surgical armamentarium

Neil Mortensen, Oxford, UK

Kono S anastomosis and over the valve stricturoplasties: hope for better outcomes

André d'Hoore, Leuven, BE

New drugs, old fears: state of the art management of IBD patients

Gerhard Rogler, Zurich, CH

SATELLITE SYMPOSIUM Takeda

Do resection of the mesentery in Crohn's & appendectomy in ulcerative colitis alter the course of disease

Christianne Buskens, Amsterdam, NL

The septic abdomen: getting out of misery and closing the case

Marja Boermeester, Amsterdam, NL

Management strategies for patients with advanced colorectal cancers

Paris Tekkis, London, UK

Anastomotic leak in colorectal surgery: insights, perspectives, and practical strategies

Antonino Spinelli, Milano, IT

Closing words

Michel Adamina, Winterthur, CH

The publication of this advertisement does not constitute endorsement by the society, publisher, or Editors, and is unrelated to the content that follows

Information & Registration

www.colorectalsurgery.eu

Laparoscopic peritoneal lavage for perforated colonic diverticulitis: a systematic review

B. R. Toorenvliet*, H. Swank†, J. W. Schoones‡, J. F. Hamming* and W. A. Bemelman†

*Department of Surgery, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, †Department of Surgery, Academic Medical Center, Amsterdam and ‡Walaeus Library, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands

Received 16 March 2009; accepted 9 April 2009; Accepted Article online 26 September 2009

Abstract

Aim This systematic review aimed to evaluate the efficacy, morbidity and mortality of laparoscopic peritoneal lavage for patients with perforated diverticulitis.

Method We searched PubMed, EMBASE, Web of Science, the Cochrane Library and CINAHL databases, Google Scholar and five major publisher websites without language restriction. All articles which reported the use of laparoscopic peritoneal lavage for patients with perforated diverticulitis were included.

Results Two prospective cohort studies, nine retrospective case series and two case reports reporting 231 patients were selected for data extraction. Most (77%) patients had purulent peritonitis (Hinchey III). Laparo-

scopic peritoneal lavage successfully controlled abdominal and systemic sepsis in 95.7% of patients. Mortality was 1.7%, morbidity 10.4% and only four (1.7%) of the 231 patients received a colostomy.

Conclusion There have been no publications of high methodological quality on laparoscopic peritoneal lavage for patients with perforated colonic diverticulitis. The published papers do, however, show promising results, with high efficacy, low mortality, low morbidity and a minimal need for a colostomy.

Keywords Diverticulitis, colonic, laparoscopy, peritonitis, peritoneal lavage

Introduction

Peritonitis caused by perforated diverticulitis is a particularly serious condition and is classified according to Hinchey [1] into purulent (Hinchey III) or faecal (Hinchey IV). It is commonly treated by sigmoid resection with or without a colostomy. These operations are characterized by a high mortality [2,3] and morbidity [4]. In many patients, the stoma is never reversed.

Several recent articles have reported laparoscopic peritoneal lavage, drainage and antibiotic treatment as an alternative to acute colonic resection [5–7]. The authors concluded that laparoscopic peritoneal lavage was safe and effective treatment, with a low mortality, low morbidity and without the need for a stoma.

This systematic review evaluates the efficacy, mortality and morbidity of laparoscopic peritoneal lavage for patients presenting with perforated colonic diverticulitis.

Method

The following databases were searched: PubMed, EMBASE (OVID version), Web of Science, the Cochrane library, CINAHL databases, Google Scholar and the ScienceDirect (Elsevier), LWW-journals@OVID (Lippincott Williams & Wilkins), HighWire (Society journals), SpringerLink and Wiley/Blackwell publisher website search engines. All searches were performed without language restriction. Two combinations of key words were constructed. These were applied to all databases taking into account the terminological differences between them. The first one consisted of a combination of diverticulitis AND laparoscopy AND lavage. The second consisted of the combination of diverticulitis AND peritonitis AND laparoscopy. Two reviewers (BT and HS) independently screened titles and abstracts for their relevance. All articles that reported the use of laparoscopic peritoneal lavage for patients with perforated diverticulitis were included except for commentaries and correspondence. The bibliographies of all included articles were then searched for relevant references. References citing all included articles were finally retrieved. Data extraction

Correspondence to: Boudewijn R. Toorenvliet, MD, Department of Surgery, Leiden University Medical Center, P.O. Box 9600, 2300 RC, Leiden, The Netherlands.
E-mail: br.toorenvliet@tiscali.nl

and quality assessment were independently conducted by two reviewers (BT and HS). Disagreements were reconciled by discussion.

Results

The search produced 411 publications, of which 28 were considered relevant to the topic (Fig. 1). Three articles

Figure 1 Summary of the literature search and exclusion process.

[8–10] and three abstracts [11–13] were excluded because of the double publication of results as were nine publications including comments and correspondence [14–22]. Thirteen remaining articles were selected for further data analysis.

Quality assessment

There were no randomized controlled trials. There were two prospective cohort studies [5,7], nine retrospective case series [6,23–30] and two case reports [31,32]. In the selected papers, different variables on patient characteristics and ‘materials and methods’ were reported. All publications gave figures on conversion, failure of lavage, mortality, morbidity and the number of colostomies and secondary resections performed. Confirmation of diverticular colonic disease was usually acquired by colonoscopy or a double contrast barium- or water-soluble contrast enema. Only five studies reported on the length of patient follow up [5,6,23–25] (Table 1). A meta-analysis could not be performed, but a summary of the data is presented below, with pooled estimates and averages where possible.

Patient characteristics

The thirteen included publications reported 231 patients with acute colonic diverticulitis who were treated by laparoscopic peritoneal lavage. The majority (77%) had purulent peritonitis (Hinchey III). The male:female ratio was 1.7:1. Four articles stated the ASA grades in a total

Table 1 Quality assessment of the included articles.

Author, year	Country	N	Study design	Study type	Confirmation of diverticular disease	Length of follow up in months
O’Sullivan, 1996	Ireland	8	Case series	Retrospective	C/BE	12–48
Aouad, 1997	France	1	Case report	Retrospective	GE	NR
Faranda, 2000	France	18	Case series	Retrospective	BE	(4)
Da Rold, 2004	Italy	7	Case series	Retrospective	NR	6–70 (38)
Taylor, 2006	Australia	14	Case series	Retrospective	C	NR
Mutter, 2006	France	10	Case series	Retrospective	NR	NR
Galleano, 2007	Italy	4	Case series	Retrospective	GE	NR
Lippi, 2007	Italy	5	Case series	Retrospective	NR	NR
Myers, 2008	Ireland	92	Cohort study	Prospective	C/BE	12–84 (36)
Franklin, 2008	USA	40	Case series	Retrospective	NR	1–168 (96)
Jaffer, 2008	UK	1	Case report	Retrospective	BE	NR
Bretagnol, 2008	France	24	Cohort study	Prospective	C	NR
Favuzza, 2009	USA	7	Case series	Retrospective	NR	NR

Values in parentheses are mean follow-up periods.

NR, not reported; C, colonoscopy; BE, barium enema; GE, gastrografin enema.

of 86 patients [6,7,24,28]. Of these, 24 were classified as ASA grade 1, 42 as grade 2, 15 as grade 3 and 5 as grade 4. Forty-six of 189 (24%) patients were reported to have had a previous history of colonic diverticular disease in six studies [5–7,24,26,32], and eight reported that 173/187 (93%) patients had generalized peritonitis [5,6,23–26,30,31]. Abdominal computed tomography prior to surgery was mandatory in four studies [6,25,27,30], was never used in one [24], and not reported in eight. Eleven articles reported the presence of free abdominal air, which was present in 156/225 (69%) patients (Table 2).

Treatment

Between two and five trocars were used for the laparoscopic procedure and the volume of irrigant used varied from 3 to 25 l. Warmed saline solution was generally used, but in one institute, the additional diluted iodine and heparin were administered [6]. In some institutions, adhesions were left intact [5,7,27] while others divided adhesions and searched for the perforation which was either glued or sutured [6,24,25]. Nearly all patients were given one or two drains (closed suction or nonsuction) at the end of the procedure. The mean operating time was 70 min (range 40–150 min) for 69 patients from four studies [6,24,25,28]. All patients received antibiotics which were usually given intravenously pre- and postoperatively and changed to oral medication after 4–7 days. Eleven articles reported the mean hospital stay which was 8.5 days (range: 4–35 days) [5,7,23–28,30–32].

Outcome

Table 3 provides an overview of the pooled data on conversion, failure of lavage, mortality, morbidity, the number of colostomies and secondary resections. Eighty-seven (38%) of the 231 patients underwent delayed elective resection of the diseased portion of the colon usually laparoscopically. Recurrent diverticulitis was reported in 5/128 patients who did not undergo secondary resection. Follow-up periods were given as a mean in four studies with a weighted mean total of 48 months for 153 patients [5,6,24,25].

Discussion

Patients with acute colonic diverticulitis present with differing severity of disease. The Hinchey classification is often used to categorize these patients and some subsequent modifications have been published since it was described [1,33,34]. The recommended treatment for patients with purulent or faecal peritonitis (Hinchey III and IV) is an urgent sigmoid resection [35]. In this situation, a Hartmann's procedure is favoured by most surgeons although colonic resection with a primary anastomosis with or without a defunctioning colostomy is also feasible [36,37]. Regardless of the selected strategy, emergency operations for patients with acute perforated diverticulitis are associated with substantial morbidity (up to 44%) [4] and mortality. In a recent prospective analysis of 200 patients who underwent emergency resection for acute diverticulitis, the mortality was 27% [2], whilst another recent publication on the

Table 2 Patient characteristics (ages are given in means).

Author, year	N	Hinchey classification				Age	Age range	Male	Female	Generalized peritonitis	Free air
		I	II	III	IV						
O'Sullivan, 1996	8	0	0	8	0	57	30–67	5	3	7	1
Aouad, 1997	1	0	0	1	0	37		1	0	1	1
Faranda, 2000	18	0	0	16	2	54	37–74	8	10	11	12
Da Rold, 2004	7	1	1	5	0	65	45–95	5	2	7	7
Taylor, 2006	14	0	2	10	2	57	36–86	8	6	9	10
Mutter, 2006	10	0	0	10	0	60	38–76	9	1	NR	3
Galleano, 2007	4	0	2	2	0	68	60–79	2	2	Local	1
Lippi, 2007	5	0	2	3	0	80	72–90	NR	NR	Local/Gen	NR
Myers, 2008	92	0	25	67	0	63	39–94	61	31	92	92
Franklin, 2008	40	0	5	32	3	60	28–99	26	14	40	13
Jaffer, 2008	1	0	1	0	0	50		1	0	Local	NR
Bretagnol, 2008	24	0	5	18	1	56	26–82	11	13	NR	16
Favazza, 2009	7	0	1	6	0	49	35–66	5	2	6	0
Total/Mean/Range	231	1	44	178	8	60	26–99	142	84	173	156

NR, not reported; Local, local peritonitis in all patients; Local/Gen, local or generalized peritonitis in all patients.

Table 3 Pooled outcome data for laparoscopic peritoneal lavage in 231 patients.

Author, year	N	Conversion to laparotomy	Lavage failure	Mortality	Morbidity	Stoma	Secondary resection
O'Sullivan, 1996	8	0	0	0	2	0	0
Aouad, 1997	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Faranda, 2000	18	0	0	0	3	0	15
Da Rold, 2004	7	1	0	0	2	0	0
Taylor, 2006	14	0	3	0	0*	2	8
Mutter, 2006	10	0	1	0	0	1	6
Galleano, 2007	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
Lippi, 2007	5	0	0	1	1	0	1
Myers, 2008	92	0	2	3	5	1	0
Franklin, 2008	40	0	0	0	8	0	24
Jaffer, 2008	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bretagnol, 2008	24	0	2	0	2	0	24
Favuzza, 2009	7	0	2	0	1	0	4
Total	231	1	10	4	24	4	87
Percentage		0.4	4.3	1.7	10.4	1.7	37.7

*no major morbidity.

incidence of perforated diverticulitis in the UK reported a mortality of 24% [3]. Furthermore, reversal of Hartmann's procedure is not performed in 25–70% of the patients [38–42], thus compromising the quality of life and leading to increasing costs. This may be attributable to the fact that reversal is associated with a high morbidity and even mortality [43].

This systematic review identified 231 patients with acute colonic diverticulitis who were treated by laparoscopic peritoneal lavage, drainage and antibiotics. Abdominal and systemic sepsis was successfully controlled using this minimal invasive strategy in 95.7% of the patients, with minimum mortality (1.7%), morbidity (10.4%) and incidence stoma formation (1.7%). A delayed elective laparoscopic resection was feasible in most patients, but, significantly, those who did not undergo subsequent resection had a long recurrence free follow-up period.

Laparoscopic peritoneal lavage seems to provide adequate control of the acute inflammatory episode in most patients, but it failed to do so in 10 (4.3%) of the 231 patients [26,30]. Two of these required a Hartmann's resection for faecal peritonitis and two underwent open resection and primary anastomosis for purulent peritonitis. Four of five patients with pelvic abscess formation inadequately treated by laparoscopic peritoneal lavage underwent radiological drainage and one had a Hartmann's resection [5,7,30]. One other patient had an early recurrence necessitating surgery 3 weeks later [27]. The overall mortality (1.7%) was low. Two patients died of multiorgan failure, one because of pulmonary embolism and one because of cardiogenic shock.

At present, in most institutions, a delayed elective laparoscopic resection is advised after resolution of an attack of acute diverticulitis. The current practice of elective resection after two episodes of acute diverticulitis has, however, recently been challenged [44] and was not applied in the institute that reported most of the patients treated by laparoscopic peritoneal lavage reported in this review. In this study, no patient underwent a subsequent elective resection and excellent results were obtained during long-term follow up [5].

The studies published on this topic have mostly been retrospective, nonconsecutive and of low methodological quality. Inclusion and publication bias may partially have been responsible for the favourable results. The pooling of data from heterogeneous studies, as has been done in this review, can also lead to bias.

The thirteen selected articles indicate that laparoscopic peritoneal lavage, for patients with peritonitis caused by perforated diverticulitis, is an effective and safe treatment that may be preferable to colonic resection. There appears to be a general consensus, however, that laparoscopic peritoneal lavage should not be used for patients with Hinchey grade IV diverticulitis [5,7,23,24,26,27]. Other patients who may not benefit from laparoscopic peritoneal lavage include those with pelvic abscess formation. This is consistent with the observation that half of the patients who had a failure of lavage had a pelvic abscess.

There have been different reactions to this new approach. Some remain skeptical [21], whilst others indicate a preparedness to change practice [18] or to reconsider current management of complicated

diverticulitis as a result of the publication by Myers *et al.* [20]. Laparoscopic peritoneal lavage is recommended for selected patients with perforated diverticulitis by the European Association for Endoscopic Surgery (grade of recommendation C) [45] and has been included in a proposed management algorithm for patients with acute colonic diverticulitis [32]. Others, however, believe that this technique warrants further investigation in a controlled prospective setting [14,46].

As laparoscopic peritoneal lavage may be an important new treatment for patients with peritonitis caused by perforated diverticulitis, it is important to establish its value in randomized controlled trials. Such a trial randomizing patients with purulent diverticulitis to either lavage or resectional surgery will start at the end of 2009.

Disclosure

No disclaimers and no financial support/funding has been received for this study.

Author contributions

Conception and design: BT, JS, JH, WB. Analysis and interpretation: BT, HS. Data collection: BT, HS, JS. Writing the article: BT, JS. Critical revision of the article: BT, JH, WB. Final approval of the article: BT, JH, WB. Statistical analysis: BT, HS. Obtained funding: not applicable. Overall responsibility: BT, WB.

References

- Hinchey EJ, Schaal PG, Richards GK. Treatment of perforated diverticular disease of the colon. *Adv Surg* 1978; **12**: 85–109.
- Vermeulen J, Akkersdijk GP, Gosselink MP *et al.* Outcome after emergency surgery for acute perforated diverticulitis in 200 cases. *Dig Surg* 2007; **24**: 361–6.
- Morris CR, Harvey IM, Stebbings WS, Hart AR. Incidence of perforated diverticulitis and risk factors for death in a UK population. *Br J Surg* 2008; **95**: 876–81.
- Constantinides VA, Tekkis PP, Athanasiou T *et al.* Primary resection with anastomosis vs. Hartmann's procedure in nonelective surgery for acute colonic diverticulitis: a systematic review. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2006; **49**: 966–81.
- Myers E, Hurley M, O'Sullivan GC *et al.* Laparoscopic peritoneal lavage for generalized peritonitis due to perforated diverticulitis. *Br J Surg* 2008; **95**: 97–101.
- Franklin ME Jr, Portillo G, Trevino JM, Gonzalez JJ, Glass JL. Long-term experience with the laparoscopic approach to perforated diverticulitis plus generalized peritonitis. *World J Surg* 2008; **32**: 1507–11.
- Bretagnol F, Pautrat K, Mor C *et al.* Emergency laparoscopic management of perforated sigmoid diverticulitis: a promising alternative to more radical procedures. *J Am Coll Surg* 2008; **206**: 654–7.
- Rizk N, Champault G. Two-stage laparoscopic treatment of perforated sigmoid diverticulitis: 2 cases. *Ann Chir* 1996; **50**: 283.
- Rizk N, Barrat C, Faranda C, Catheline JM, Champault G. Laparoscopic treatment of generalized peritonitis with diverticular perforation of the sigmoid colon. Report of 10 cases. *Chirurgie* 1998; **123**: 358–62.
- Franklin ME Jr, Dorman JP, Jacobs M, Plasencia G. Is laparoscopic surgery applicable to complicated colonic diverticular disease? *Surg Endosc* 1997; **11**: 1021–5.
- Taylor CJ, White SI. Managing perforated diverticulitis by laparoscopic lavage. Is Hartmann's overused?: Cr044p. [Abstract]. *ANZ J Surg* 2005; **75**(Suppl): A51.
- Franklin ME, Anwar R, Trevino JM *et al.* Laparoscopic drainage of perforated diverticulitis with peritonitis: colorectal 10479. [Abstract]. *Br J Surg* 2006; **93**(Suppl. S1): 32.
- Myers E, Kavanagh D, Hurley M, O'Sullivan G, Winter D. Laparoscopic peritoneal lavage for generalized peritonitis due to perforated diverticulitis – a feasible alternative. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2008; **51**: 13.
- Arregui ME. Editorial comment to 'Two-stage laparoscopic management of generalized peritonitis due to perforated sigmoid diverticula: eighteen cases'. *Surg Laparosc Endosc Percutan Tech* 2000; **10**: 139–41.
- Heriot AG. Whither laparoscopy? *ANZ J Surg* 2006; **76**: 961.
- O'Riordan JM, O'Connell PR. Practice parameters for sigmoid diverticulitis. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2007; **50**: 402–3.
- Lowenfels AB. Laparoscopy for emergency colonic diverticulitis: a good alternative to radical procedures? *J Am Coll Surg* 2008; **206**: 654.
- Krukowski ZH. Laparoscopic peritoneal lavage for generalized peritonitis due to perforated diverticulitis (Br J Surg 2008; **95**:97–101). *Br J Surg* 2008; **95**: 531–2.
- Winter DC, O'Sullivan GC. Authors' reply: laparoscopic peritoneal lavage for generalized peritonitis due to perforated diverticulitis (Br J Surg 2008; **95**:97–101). *Br J Surg* 2008; **95**: 532–3.
- Mariette C, Benoit S, De Mestier P. Nouvelle approche dans le traitement des péritonites généralisées par perforation diverticulaire: le simple lavage péritonéal par laparoscopie. (Br J Surg 2008; **95**:97–101). *J Chir* 2008; **145**: 398.
- Essani R, Bergamaschi R. Laparoscopic peritoneal lavage for generalized peritonitis due to perforated diverticulitis (Br J Surg 2008; **95**:97–101). *Br J Surg* 2009; **96**: 118.
- Myers E, O'Sullivan GC, Winter DC. Author's reply: laparoscopic peritoneal lavage for generalized peritonitis due to perforated diverticulitis (Br J Surg 2008; **95**:97–101). *Br J Surg* 2009; **96**: 118.
- O'Sullivan GC, Murphy D, O'Brien MG, Ireland A. Laparoscopic management of generalized peritonitis due to perforated colonic diverticula. *Am J Surg* 1996; **171**: 432–4.
- Faranda C, Barrat C, Catheline JM, Champault GG. Two-stage laparoscopic management of generalized peritonitis due to perforated sigmoid diverticula: eighteen cases. *Surg Laparosc Endosc Percutan Tech* 2000; **10**: 135–8.

- 25 Da Rold AR, Guerriero S, Fiamingo P *et al.* Laparoscopic colorrhaphy, irrigation and drainage in the treatment of complicated acute diverticulitis: initial experience. *Chir Ital* 2004; **56**: 95–8.
- 26 Taylor CJ, Layani L, Ghusn MA, White SI. Perforated diverticulitis managed by laparoscopic lavage. *ANZ J Surg* 2006; **76**: 962–5.
- 27 Mutter D, Bouras G, Forgione A *et al.* Two-stage totally minimally invasive approach for acute complicated diverticulitis. *Colorectal Dis* 2006; **8**: 501–5.
- 28 Galleano R, Di GS, Franceschi A, Falchero F. Two-stage laparoscopic management of complicated acute diverticulitis. Initial experience. *Ann Ital Chir* 2007; **78**: 61–4.
- 29 Lippi CE, Braini A, Cervia S *et al.* Diverticular disease complicated by peritonitis: role of conservative surgical therapy. *Chir Ital* 2007; **59**: 713–21.
- 30 Favuzza J, Friel JC, Kelly JJ, Perugini R, Counihan TC. Benefits of laparoscopic peritoneal lavage for complicated sigmoid diverticulitis. *Int J Colorectal Dis* 2009; **24**: 797–801.
- 31 Aouad K, Bouillot JL, Jaulmes H, Alexandre JH. Two-stage laparoscopic treatment of perforated sigmoid diverticulitis: a case. *Ann Chir* 1997; **51**: 1039–40.
- 32 Jaffer U, Moin T. Perforated sigmoid diverticular disease: a management protocol. *JSLs* 2008; **12**: 188–93.
- 33 Sher ME, Agachan F, Bortul M *et al.* Laparoscopic surgery for diverticulitis. *Surg Endosc* 1997; **11**: 264–7.
- 34 Kaiser AM, Jiang JK, Lake JP *et al.* The management of complicated diverticulitis and the role of computed tomography. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2005; **100**: 910–7.
- 35 Rafferty J, Shellito P, Hyman NH, Buie WD. Practice parameters for sigmoid diverticulitis. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2006; **49**: 939–44.
- 36 Gooszen AW, Tollenaar RA, Geelkerken RH *et al.* Prospective study of primary anastomosis following sigmoid resection for suspected acute complicated diverticular disease. *Br J Surg* 2001; **88**: 693–7.
- 37 Constantinides VA, Heriot A, Remzi F *et al.* Operative strategies for diverticular peritonitis: a decision analysis between primary resection and anastomosis versus Hartmann's procedures. *Ann Surg* 2007; **245**: 94–103.
- 38 Levien DH, Mazier WP, Surrell JA, Raiman PJ. Safe resection for diverticular disease of the colon. *Dis Colon Rectum* 1989; **32**: 30–2.
- 39 Wigmore SJ, Duthie GS, Young IE, Spalding EM, Rainey JB. Restoration of intestinal continuity following Hartmann's procedure: the Lothian experience 1987–1992. *Br J Surg* 1995; **82**: 27–30.
- 40 Belmonte C, Klas JV, Perez JJ *et al.* The Hartmann procedure. First choice or last resort in diverticular disease? *Arch Surg* 1996; **131**: 612–5.
- 41 Wedell J, Banzhaf G, Chaoui R, Fischer R, Reichmann J. Surgical management of complicated colonic diverticulitis. *Br J Surg* 1997; **84**: 380–3.
- 42 Elliott TB, Yego S, Irvin TT. Five-year audit of the acute complications of diverticular disease. *Br J Surg* 1997; **84**: 535–9.
- 43 Aydin HN, Remzi FH, Tekkis PP, Fazio VW. Hartmann's reversal is associated with high postoperative adverse events. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2005; **48**: 2117–26.
- 44 Collins D, Winter DC. Elective resection for diverticular disease: an evidence-based review. *World J Surg* 2008; **32**: 2429–33.
- 45 Sauerland S, Agresta F, Bergamaschi R *et al.* Laparoscopy for abdominal emergencies – evidence-based guidelines of the European Association for Endoscopic Surgery. *Surg Endosc* 2006; **20**: 14–29.
- 46 Danielson D, West MA. Recent developments in clinical management of surgical sepsis. *Curr Opin Crit Care* 2001; **7**: 367–70.