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**Abstract**

While debate rages on as to which is the best surgical method for the treatment of haemorrhoids, none of the surgical methods available today approaches the ideal surgical option, which is one that is effective yet safe and painless. In reality, the less painful the procedure, the more likely it is to be associated with recurrence post-op. Where haemorrhoids surgery is concerned, there isn’t a “one size fits all” option. Most of the randomized controlled trials performed to date include haemorrhoids of various grades, focusing only on comparing surgical methods, while failing to stratify the outcomes according to the grade of haemorrhoids. We believe that surgery needs to be tailored to not only the grade of the haemorrhoids but also the size, the circumferential nature of the disease and also the prevailing symptomatology.
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**Core tip:** While debate rages on as to which is the best surgical method for the treatment of haemorrhoids, none of the surgical methods available today approaches the ideal surgical option, which is one that is effective yet safe and painless. In reality, the less painful the procedure, the more likely it is to be associated with recurrence post-op. Where haemorrhoids surgery is concerned, there isn’t a “one size fits all” option. Most of the randomized controlled trials performed to date include haemorrhoids of various grades, focusing only on comparing surgical methods, while failing to stratify the outcomes according to the grade of haemorrhoids. We believe that surgery needs to be tailored to not only the grade of the haemorrhoids but also the size, the circumferential nature of the disease and also the prevailing symptomatology.

Yeo D, Tan ky. Haemorrhoidectomy - making sense of the surgical options. *World J Gastroenterol* 2014; In press

# Introduction

Haemorrhoids, or “piles”, is one of the most common anorectal disorder with a prevalence of 39% of the population, of whom 44.7% are symptomatic[1,2]. Haemorrhoids may be internal or external, depending on its relation to the dentate line. There are four grades of internal haemorrhoids as described by Goligher, and they can be classified using the definitions in Table 1[3]. While this common classification of internal haemorrhoids is useful in the selection of treatment and comparison of therapeutic outcomes, Goligher only classifies haemorrhoids based on the degree of prolapse, and does not describe the size of the haemorrhoids, or whether they are isolated or circumferential, factors that are important in the selection of surgical treatment.

The ideal operation for haemorrhoids should be effective with a low rate of recurrence, with minimal post-operative pain to allow early return to normal activities, and is safe with minimal morbidity. If recurrence is the main consideration, conventional haemorrhoidectomy (CH) is still considered the “gold standard”. However, it is associated with significant post-operative pain, perianal discharge and irritation. Innovation and evolution of the techniques of haemorrhoidectomy has focused on achieving the “ideal” operation. Many options for surgery on haemorrhoids have been described, and multiple trials conducted. Some techniques have been touted to be superior to others, whilst other techniques have been recommended to be useful uniformly for all presentations of haemorrhoids.

This review aims to evaluate the current surgical options for haemorrhoids and to make sense of all the different modalities of haemorrhoids surgery available.

**literature search**

A comprehensive literature search was performed by the authors using MEDLINE, Embase and the Cochrane Database of Systematic reviews in January 2014. The search was performed using both medical subject headings (MeSH) as well as keyword searches. The terms used for the search included: Haemorrhoids (haemorrhoids or hemorrhoids), Piles, CH (open haemorrhoidectomy or closed haemorrhoidectomy or Milligan Morgan haemorrhoidectomy or Ferguson haemorrhoidectomy or Ligasure haemorrhoidectomy), Stapler haemorrhoidectomy (Procedure for Prolapsed Haemorrhoids or Longo haemorrhoidectomy), Doppler Guided Haemorrhoidal Artery Ligation. The search was restricted to the last 15 years (2000-2014). Articles that were not available in English were excluded. Clinical practice guidelines and retrospective studies were excluded from this study.

## Inclusion criteria

Only prospective comparative studies, randomized controlled trials, review articles and meta-analyses were considered. Articles found using the search terms above were screened by the authors. Only prospective studies and review articles with results stratified according to the grade of the haemorrhoids were included in this study.

## Data interpretation

Primary outcome examined was the efficacy of the surgical method (recurrence at less than one year and recurrence at more than one year). Secondary outcomes included mean operating time, number of days taken to return to work, and post-operative complications such as post-operative bleeding, acute urinary retention, anal fistula and anal stricture.

# Pathophysiology of Haemorrhoids

The anal canal contains three main cushions in the left lateral, right anterior and right posterior locations (3, 7, 11 o’clock positions). Haemorrhoids are defined as the symptomatic enlargement and distal displacement of the anal cushions.

Anal cushions, when engorged with blood, contribute to maintaining anal continence during coughing, straining and sneezing[4]. When engorged with blood, anal cushions protect the underlying anal sphincters during defecation, and play a key role in differentiating liquid, solid, and gas and the subsequent decision to evacuate[5].

The exact pathophysiology of haemorrhoids is poorly understood. Pathological examination of haemorrhoids failed to demonstrate the presence of arterio-venous shunts[6], and while the rectum is the most common site of lower gastrointestinal varices in patients with portal hypertension, it has not resulted in an increased incidence of haemorrhoids in the setting of portal hypertension and varices[7]. Haemorrhoids and anorectal varices have been proven to be two distinct pathologies, hence rendering the previously popular theory that haemorrhoids were caused by anal canal varicosities obsolete.

Today, the most widely accepted theory is that of the sliding anal canal[8]. This theory proposes that haemorrhoids develop due to the deterioration of the supporting tissues of the anal cushions, and is supported by the fact that muscle tissues are replaced by collagen fibres when examined microscopically. In addition to the above findings, histological studies reveal a severe inflammatory process affecting the connective tissue, walls of the arterial and venous blood vessels, leading to ischemia with subsequent mucosal ulceration and bleeding[6].

# Background of Surgical methods Doppler Guided Haemorrhoidal Artery Ligation

First described in 1995 by Morinaga *et al*[9], doppler guided haemorrhoidal artery ligation (DGHAL) involves using a special proctoscope with an integrated Doppler transducer and a lateral ligation window. The level of artery ligation is dictated by the length of the Doppler anoscope, but should be performed above the dentate line. Typically, the intraluminal arteries are located in the right posterior lateral, right middle lateral, right anterior lateral, left anterior lateral, left middle lateral, and left posterior lateral (1, 3, 5, 7, 8 and 11 o’clock) positions[10]. The arterial signal is clearly audible when the Doppler probe is directly over the haemorrhoidal artery. A “figure of eight” stitch is then placed through the lateral ligation window, and ligation of the vessel confirmed by the absence of the Doppler arterial signal distal to the suture line. A reduction in the blood inflow to the haemorrhoidal plexus will facilitate the shrinkage of the internal piles.

DGHAL can be done with local anesthetic and sedation, with the patient in lithotomy position[10]. This procedure alone does not deal with the prolapse of the haemorrhoids. In patients with prolapse piles, additional procedures have been proposed in addition to DGHAL, such as DGHAL with mucopexy[11,12]. The attractiveness of this technique lies in the minimally invasive nature of the procedure with no actual excision of tissue per se. The systematic dearterialization of the haemorrhoidal tissues also promises effective intervention for haemorrhoids with recalcitrant bleeding. However, the ability to reduce severe prolapse is not addressed as effectively as when there is tissue excision.

## Stapler Haemorrhoidectomy

First described by Longo[13] in 1998, stapler haemorrhoidectomy (SH) is also known as Procedure for Prolapsed Haemorrhoids (PPH). It was developed as an alternative to CH. In contrast to the traditional approach of removing haemorrhoidal tissue, SH involves excising a circumferential ring of mucosa four centimeters above the dentate line using a circular stapler. This interrupts the superior haemorrhoidal vessels, and restores the haemorrhoidal tissues back to their anatomic position. As the excision occurs above the dentate line, it avoids a painful wound in the somatically innervated anoderm. The circumferential nature of the procedure and the ability to restore the anatomy of the anal canal are the cornerstones of the technique's success.

To perform SH, all prolapsing haemorrhoids are first reduced, after which a pursestring suture of 2/0 polypropylene is placed three to four centimeters above the dentate line, catching only the mucosa and submucosa. The circular stapler is opened and inserted through the anus. The pursestring suture is tied on the stapler shaft, and the head of the stapler is closed on the anvil, incorporating the mucosal and submucosal tissue in the pursestring suture. The stapler is then fired and withdrawn. In females, a vaginal examination should be performed to exclude vaginal wall impingement prior to firing of the stapler. The suture line is inspected and any bleeding points ligated.

Complications for SH are similar to those of CH. In addition, rare but potentially life-threatening complications have been described, including anastomotic leakage with pelvic sepsis, anovaginal fistula, and Fournier’s gangrene[14-17].

While SH causes less post-operative pain than CH, a small but significant number of patients have complained of chronic pain post-SH. Unrelenting pain of unknown etiology after SH is known as PPH syndrome. 15.1% of surgeons surveyed reported having patients who had excessive pain lasting for months, and 2.4% reported pain lasting for years[18]. Chronic pain has been postulated to be related to the fibrosis around the staples, or direct trauma to the pudendal and sacral nerve spindles by the staples[19]. Ielpo *et al*[20] reported two patients (1.59%) who complained of persistent pain seven months after SH, which only resolved after the staples were removed.

## CH

CH is the most widely performed operation for piles[21]. The original operation involves the excision of haemorrhoidal cushions off the internal anal sphincter with scissors, with ligation of the vascular pedicle.

The two most commonly practiced techniques are the ones described by Milligan-Morgan *et al*[22] and Ferguson *et al*[23]. Open haemorrhoidectomy, first described by Milligan and Morgan in 1937, is CH performed with the wound left open. Closed haemorrhoidectomy, described by Ferguson *et al*[23] in 1971, involves apposition of the mucosa and skin after excision of the haemorrhoids. CH as described by Ferguson *et al*[23] is more commonly performed in North America, while the Milligan-Morgan method is more commonly performed in Europe.

Today, CH is performed with diathermy instead of scissors. Open diathermy haemorrhoidectomy, compared to scissors, has been shown to have a significantly shorter operative time with lower analgesic requirements[24]. There is also no increased risk of postoperative hemorrhage without pedicle ligation when using diathermy[25].

Despite the interest in SH and DGHAL, CH remains a widely practiced technique due to the lower cost of the operation, and remains the most effective treatment available currently. CH is still considered the current “gold standard” for surgical management of haemorrhoids, as there is effective excision of the prolapsed haemorrhoidal tissue mass. However, pain after CH continues to be a major issue, with prolonged wound healing and delayed return to normal activities.

## CH Adjuncts That Potentially Improve Short-term Outcomes

***LigaSure***

Use of LigaSure (Valleylab, Boulder, CO), a bipolar electrothermal tissue-sealing device, allows sealing of blood vessels up to seven millimeters in diameter with minimal collateral damage to the surrounding tissues and limited tissue charring as the thermal spread is confined to within two millimeters of the adjacent tissues[26]. This device uses a very high frequency current, and provides hemostasis by denaturing collagen and elastin from the vessel wall and surrounding connective tissues[27].

The limited spread of thermal energy reduces anal spasm and permits a bloodless haemorrhoidectomy with reduced post-operative pain and faster wound healing. The procedure is carried out in the same way as CH, except that the Ligasure tissue-sealing device is used in place of a diathermy. The haemorrhoids masses are retracted and dissected off the internal sphincter using the Ligasure device, the pedicles secured clear of the internal sphincter and the resected wound left open to heal with adequate skin bridges. Ligasure haemorrhoidectomy has been shown to improve the short-term outcomes of CH[27,28].

***zero point two percent GTN ointment***

It is believed that post-operative pain causes spasm of the internal anal sphincter, which leads to further increase in the anal pressure and further propagates the pain. Delayed wound healing also contributes to the pain. Topical GTN reduces the spasm of the internal anal sphincter, and the reduced pressure increases anodermal blood flow and hence improves wound healing[29]. Improved wound healing also results in reduced perianal irritation, discharge and pain[30]. Use of GTN has certain side effects, of which headache is the most common. Other side effects include dizziness and rebound hypertension. However use of topical GTN is unlikely to result in significant systemic complications[31].

A meta-analysis of five double-blinded, prospective randomized controlled trials on GTN ointment by Ratsingham *et al*[32] demonstrated significant reduction in pain score on post-operative day three and seven in the GTN ointment group when compared to placebo. Use of GTN ointment was associated with significantly improved wound healing at three weeks, while there was no increase in the incidence of headaches.

***Methylene blue***

The use of methylene in haemorrhoids surgery arose when Tan *et al*[33] first noticed that patients who were undergoing surgery for perianal fistula has lesser post-operative pain when methylene blue was used to delineate the tracts.

Injection of local anaesthetic into the intersphincteric groove and the perianal region during perianal surgery blocks the autonomic inferior hypogastric plexus. Methylene blue, a biological dye, results in the destruction of dermal nerve endings, as evidenced by the absence of cutaneous nerve endings on electron microscopy in perianal skin biopsies after methylene blue therapy[34,35].

We have since conducted a randomized controlled trial of intradermal methylene blue during CH and have found it to be effective in reducing post-operative pain during the initial few days after surgery[36].

***Metronidazole***

It has been postulated that secondary infection after haemorrhoidectomy, as well as poor or delayed wound healing, contributes to the post-operative pain experienced. In a double-blinded randomized controlled trial by Carapeti *et al*[37], patients given prophylactic metronidazole three times a day for seven days post-CH reported significantly less pain than those in the placebo group on days five to seven post-surgery, as well as significantly faster median time to return to work or normal activity, and higher patient satisfaction score. Oral and topical metronidazole has been shown to promote wound healing, and hence reduces post-operative pain[37,38].

***Micronized flavonidic fraction***

Micronized flavonoid complex consisting of 90% diosmin and 10% hesperidin (Dalfon 500 mg) inhibits prostaglandin E2 (PGE2) and thromboxane A2 (TxA2) synthesis. Daflon reduces microvascular hyperpermeability and increased lymphatic flow, thus reducing perivascular edema and venous stasis[39].

Ho *et al*[40] demonstrated that Daflon 500 mg for one week post-CH significantly reduces the risk of secondary bleeding compared to placebo.

# Surgical options for haemorrhoids

The majority of randomized controlled trials performed thus far focus on comparing the various surgical options available for haemorrhoids, often presenting a mixed population or not even mentioning the disease stage. The focus of these studies has been on the technique rather than how to tailor the option to the individual. Haemorrhoids presentation and symptomatology is extremely heterogeneous, thus a surgeon cannot have the mindset of one-technique fits all.

As our understanding and experience of each surgical method evolves, we now understand that the grade of haemorrhoids has a profound effect on the evaluation of outcome. One method that is effective for a certain grade of haemorrhoids may have a high rate of recurrence with another grade.

It is in our opinion that each grade of haemorrhoids should be considered as a separate entity when evaluating a surgical option. Besides the grade, the size of the haemorrhoids and the circumferential nature of the haemorrhoids need to be taken into account, together with the predominant symptoms of the patient. Only then can surgical management be truly tailored to the patients' needs.

## Grade I haemorrhoids

Haemorrhoids that are bleeding but do not prolapse are classified as grade I. Surgery is rarely indicated for grade I haemorrhoids, and treatment involves lifestyle modification, medications and office-based procedures.

Lifestyle modification includes adequate fluid intake and a high fibre diet. Randomized controlled trials have shown micronized, purified flavonoids to be safe and effective, with rapid cessation of bleeding[41-43].

Failing lifestyle modification and medical treatment, grade I haemorrhoids are candidates for office-based procedures, of which rubber band ligation is the most effective[44]. Other office-based modalities include sclerotherapy, cryotherapy, infra-red photocoagulation and bicap coagulation.

## Grade II Haemorrhoids

eighteen point four percent of haemorrhoids are classified as grade II[1]. Surgery is not the first line treatment for grade II haemorrhoids as most are amenable to less invasive modalities such as medication and rubber band ligation (RBL). RBL has a reported cure rate of 86.6% at one-month post treatment, a recurrence rate of 11% after two years, and 7.5% requiring additional surgical treatment[45]. Surgery is indicated when there is failure of less invasive modalities. Failures of less invasive methods for grade II haemorrhoids may be associated with the size of the haemorrhoidal tissue mass.

DGHAL has been shown to be effective, with a recurrence rate of 5.3%-6.7% at less than 12 mo follow-up[10,46], and a recurrence of 12% when patients were followed-up for more than 12 mo[46]. The complications observed in DGHAL are comparable to those associated with other methods, if not less. No severe complications were observed[10].

Our literature search did not show any studies on SH, CH or CH with Ligasure that stratified data on grade II haemorrhoids or looked at patients with grade II haemorrhoids only (Table 2).

## Grade III haemorrhoids

DGHAL, while effective for grade II haemorrhoids, reveal a recurrence rate of 18%-31%[46,47] when used for grade III haemorrhoids and followed-up for more than 12 months. The only factor associated with recurrence was the grade of haemorrhoids, and recurrent prolapse was the main symptom in patients in whom DGHAL was unsuccessful[46]. In a randomized controlled trial of DGHAL versus SH for grade III haemorrhoids by Avital *et al*[47], DGHAL was shown to have a shorter operating time, significantly lower mean pain scores at 24 h and one week after the operation, significantly less post-operative discomfort and less post-operative complications. In a randomized trial of DGHAL with mucopexy versus conventional open haemorrhoidectomy for grade III haemorrhoids by De Nardi *et al*, DGHAL with mucopexy did not show statistically lower median pain scores, shorter median days to return to work or patient satisfaction. Long-term cure rates at 24 mo were similar between DGHAL with mucopexy and CH[48].

In various randomized controlled trials on SH versus CH for grade III haemorrhoids, SH was consistently associated with a significantly shorter mean operating time[49-51], less pain at first defecation, lower mean pain scores and less analgesia consumption[49-51], as well as earlier return to work[49,50]. However, if concomitant anorectal procedures involving perianal wounds such as skin tag excision, anal wart excision or external haemorrhoidectomy are performed, the benefits of reduced pain with PPH may be dimnished[51]. With longer follow-up periods, there was a trend towards a greater rate of recurrence with SH than CH. Ammaturo *et al*[49] reported a lesser mean satisfaction score with SH compared to CH at a follow-up of two years, owing to a higher rate of bleeding and prolapse.

Rare but major complications such as rectovaginal fistulas, pelvic sepsis and Fournier’s gangrene have been reported in literature, but none of the above trials[49-51] reported major complications, perhaps owing to the greater training and experience of the surgeons as SH becomes more widely performed.

In a randomized controlled trial of SH versus CH in circumferential grade III haemorrhoids by Kim *et al*[52], the recurrence rate for SH and CH at the end of five years follow up was 18% and 23% respectively, and not statistically significant. The mean operative time was significantly shorter in the SH group, and patients who underwent SH reported significantly less post-operative pain, less burning and less itching compared to the CH group. Other early post-operative complications such as urinary retention, bleeding and prolonged wound healing were not significantly different (Table 3).

## Grade IV Haemorrhoids

Grade IV haemorrhoids are symptomatic, prolapsed and irreducible piles. DGHAL does not deal with prolapse, and is grossly inadequate for grade IV haemorrhoids as shown by the high rate of recurrent prolapse when DGHAL is used in isolation[10]. In piles with significant prolapse, DGHAL has been combined with mucopexy to lift and secure the protruding haemorrhoids in place. In a study by Faucheron *et al*[53], DGHAL and rectoanal repair (RAR) was shown to be both safe and effective for grade IV haemorrhoids, with recurrence observed in 9% of the study population at a mean follow-up of 34 mo.

Most randomized studies on SH include patients with both grade III and IV haemorrhoids without stratification of data according to grade of haemorrhoids, and often grade IV haemorrhoids form the minority of the study population. In studies analyzing SH on grade IV haemorrhoids, SH has a significantly lower mean operating time compared to CH, and is associated with significantly less post-operative pain[54]. There is, however, a surprisingly high rate of recurrence of 50%-53.3% at follow-up of one year or longer[54,55]. In a randomized study by Ortiz *et al*[54], 40% of the patients who had undergone SH suffered from tenesmus one year after the operation, a symptom not reported in patients who had undergone CH.

While CH remains the current standard of treatment, especially in the treatment of grade IV haemorrhoids, CH performed with Ligasure instead of diathermy has shown to be promising. Ligasure CH is associated with significantly shorter operating time, earlier return to work, and a similar rate of post-operative complications and recurrence to the diathermy group[56] (Table 4).

# Conclusion

While debate rages on as to which is the best surgical method for the treatment of haemorrhoids, none of the surgical methods available today approaches the ideal surgical option, which is one that is effective yet safe and painless. In reality, the less painful the procedure, the more likely it is to be associated with post-operative recurrence.

Where haemorrhoids surgery is concerned, there is no “one size fits all” option. Most of the randomized controlled trials performed to date include haemorrhoids of various grades, focusing only on comparing surgical methods, while failing to stratify the outcomes according to the grade of haemorrhoids. We believe that surgery needs to be tailored not only the grade of the haemorrhoids but also the size, the circumferential nature of the disease and also the prevailing symptomatology. A summary of our recommendations is represented in this decision-making matrix (see table 5).

# References

1 **Riss S**, Weiser FA, Schwameis K, Riss T, Mittlböck M, Steiner G, Stift A. The prevalence of hemorrhoids in adults. *Int J Colorectal Dis* 2012; **27**: 215-220 [PMID: 21932016 DOI: 10.1007/s00384-011-1316-3]

2 **Johanson JF**, Sonnenberg A. The prevalence of hemorrhoids and chronic constipation. An epidemiologic study. *Gastroenterology* 1990; **98**: 380-386 [PMID: 2295392]

3 **Salvati EP**. Nonoperative management of hemorrhoids: evolution of the office management of hemorrhoids. *Dis Colon Rectum* 1999; **42**: 989-993 [PMID: 10458119 DOI: 10.1007/BF02236687]

4 **Aigner F**, Gruber H, Conrad F, Eder J, Wedel T, Zelger B, Engelhardt V, Lametschwandtner A, Wienert V, Böhler U, Margreiter R, Fritsch H. Revised morphology and hemodynamics of the anorectal vascular plexus: impact on the course of hemorrhoidal disease. *Int J Colorectal Dis* 2009; **24**: 105-113 [PMID: 18766355 DOI: 10.1007/s00384-008-0572-3]

5 **Sneider EB**, Maykel JA. Diagnosis and management of symptomatic hemorrhoids. *Surg Clin North Am* 2010; **90**: 17-32, Table of Contents [PMID: 20109630 DOI: 10.1016/j.suc.2009.10.005]

6 **Morgado PJ**, Suárez JA, Gómez LG, Morgado PJ. Histoclinical basis for a new classification of hemorrhoidal disease. *Dis Colon Rectum* 1988; **31**: 474-480 [PMID: 3378471 DOI: 10.1007/BF02552621]

7 **Goenka MK**, Kochhar R, Nagi B, Mehta SK. Rectosigmoid varices and other mucosal changes in patients with portal hypertension. *Am J Gastroenterol* 1991; **86**: 1185-1189 [PMID: 1882798]

8 **Lohsiriwat V**. Hemorrhoids: from basic pathophysiology to clinical management. *World J Gastroenterol* 2012; **18**: 2009-2017 [PMID: 22563187 DOI: 10.3748/wjg.v18.i17.2009]

9 **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 flowmeter. *Am J Gastroenterol* 1995; **90**: 610-613 [PMID: 7717320]

10 **Scheyer M**, Antonietti E, Rollinger G, Mall H, Arnold S. Doppler-guided hemorrhoidal artery ligation. *Am J Surg* 2006; **191**: 89-93 [PMID: 16399113 DOI: 10.1016/j.amjsurg.2005.10.007]

11 **Gupta PJ**, Kalaskar S, Taori S, Heda PS. Doppler-guided hemorrhoidal artery ligation does not offer any advantage over suture ligation of grade 3 symptomatic hemorrhoids. *Tech Coloproctol* 2011; **15**: 439-444 [PMID: 22033542 DOI: 10.1007/s10151-011-0780-7]

12 **Ratto C**. THD Doppler procedure for hemorrhoids: the surgical technique. *Tech Coloproctol* 2014; **18**: 291-298 [PMID: 24026315 DOI: 10.1007/s10151-013-1062-3]

13 **Longo A**. Treatment of hemorrhoidal disease by reduction of mucosal and hemorrhoidal prolapse with circular suturing device: a new procedure. Proceedings of the 6th World Congress of Endoscopic Surgery. Rome, Italy. Bologna: Monduzzi Publishing, 1998: p. 777-84.

14 **Molloy RG**, Kingsmore D. Life threatening pelvic sepsis after stapled haemorrhoidectomy. *Lancet* 2000; **355**: 810 [PMID: 10711934 DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(00)02208-X]

15 **Herold A**, Kirsch JJ. Pain after stapled haemorrhoidectomy. *Lancet* 2000; **356**: 2187; author reply 2190 [PMID: 11191562 DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(05)67258-3]

16 **Ripetti V**, Caricato M, Arullani A. Rectal perforation, retropneumoperitoneum, and pneumomediastinum after stapling procedure for prolapsed hemorrhoids: report of a case and subsequent considerations. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2002; **45**: 268-270 [PMID: 11852343 DOI: 10.1007/s10350-004-6159-3]

17 **Wong LY**, Jiang JK, Chang SC, Lin JK. Rectal perforation: a life-threatening complication of stapled hemorrhoidectomy: report of a case. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2003; **46**: 116-117 [PMID: 12544531 DOI: 10.1007/s10350-004-6505-5]

18 **Khubchandani I**, Fealk MH, Reed JF. Is there a post-PPH syndrome? *Tech Coloproctol* 2009; **13**: 141-14; discussion 144 [PMID: 19484345 DOI: 10.1007/s10151-009-0471-9]

19 **De Nardi P**, Corsetti M, Passaretti S, Squillante S, Castellaneta AG, Staudacher C, Testoni PA. Evaluation of rectal sensory and motor function by means of the electronic barostat after stapled hemorrhoidopexy. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2008; **51**: 1255-1260 [PMID: 18470557 DOI: 10.1007/s10350-008-9349-6]

20 **Ielpo B**, Venditti D, Balassone V, Favetta U, Buonomo O, Petrella G. Proctalgia as a late complication of stapled hemorrhoidectomy. Report of our case series. *Int J Surg* 2010; **8**: 648-652 [PMID: 20797456 DOI: 10.1016/j.ijsu.2010.07.303]

21 **Jayaraman S**, Colquhoun PH, Malthaner RA. Stapled versus conventional surgery for hemorrhoids. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2006; **(4)**: CD005393 [PMID: 17054255]

22 **Milligan ETC**, Morgan C, Nanton LE, Officier R. Surgical anatomy of the anal canal and the operative treatment of haemorrhoids. *Lancet* 1937; **2**: p.1119 [DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(00)88465-2]

23 **Ferguson JA**, Mazier WP, Ganchrow MI, Friend WG. The closed technique of hemorrhoidectomy. *Surgery* 1971; **70**: 480-484 [PMID: 5568533]

24 **Seow-Choen F**, Ho YH, Ang HG, Goh HS. Prospective, randomized trial comparing pain and clinical function after conventional scissors excision/ligation vs. diathermy excision without ligation for symptomatic prolapsed hemorrhoids. *Dis Colon Rectum* 1992; **35**: 1165-1169 [PMID: 1473420 DOI: 10.1007/BF02251970]

25 **Bassi R**, Bergami G. [The surgical treatment of hemorrhoids: diathermocoagulation and traditional technics. A prospective randomized study]. *Minerva Chir* 1997; **52**: 387-391 [PMID: 9265122]

26 **Kennedy JS**, Stranahan PL, Taylor KD, Chandler JG. High-burst-strength, feedback-controlled bipolar vessel sealing. *Surg Endosc* 1998; **12**: 876-878 [PMID: 9602010 DOI: 10.1007/s004649900733]

27 **Nienhuijs S**, de Hingh I. Conventional versus LigaSure hemorrhoidectomy for patients with symptomatic Hemorrhoids. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2009; **(1)**: CD006761 [PMID: 19160300]

28 **Tan KY**, Zin T, Sim HL, Poon PL, Cheng A, Mak K. Randomized clinical trial comparing LigaSure haemorrhoidectomy with open diathermy haemorrhoidectomy. *Tech Coloproctol* 2008; **12**: 93-97 [PMID: 18545884 DOI: 10.1007/s10151-008-0405-y]

29 **Kua KB**, Kocher HM, Kelkar A, Patel AG. Effect of topical glyceryl trinitrate on anodermal blood flow in patients with chronic anal fissures. *ANZ J Surg* 2001; **71**: 548-550 [PMID: 11527267 DOI: 10.1046/j.1440-1622.2001.02182.x]

30 **Tan KY**, Sng KK, Tay KH, Lai JH, Eu KW. Randomized clinical trial of 0.2 per cent glyceryl trinitrate ointment for wound healing and pain reduction after open diathermy haemorrhoidectomy. *Br J Surg* 2006; **93**: 1464-1468 [PMID: 17115390 DOI: 10.1002/bjs.5483]

31 **Jonas M**, Barrett DA, Shaw PN, Scholefield JH. Systemic levels of glyceryl trinitrate following topical application to the anoderm do not correlate with the measured reduction in anal pressure. *Br J Surg* 2001; **88**: 1613-1616 [PMID: 11736974 DOI: 10.1046/j.0007-1323.2001.01932.x]

32 **Ratnasingham K**, Uzzaman M, Andreani SM, Light D, Patel B. Meta-analysis of the use of glyceryl trinitrate ointment after haemorrhoidectomy as an analgesic and in promoting wound healing. *Int J Surg* 2010; **8**: 606-611 [PMID: 20691294 DOI: 10.1016/j.ijsu.2010.04.012]

33 **Tan KY**, Seow-Choen F. Methylene blue injection reduces pain after lateral anal sphincterotomy. *Tech Coloproctol* 2007; **11**: 68-69 [PMID: 17373050]

34 **Eusebio EB**, Graham J, Mody N. Treatment of intractable pruritus ani. *Dis Colon Rectum* 1990; **33**: 770-772 [PMID: 2390913 DOI: 10.1007/BF02052324]

35 **Farouk R**, Lee PW. Intradermal methylene blue injection for the treatment of intractable idiopathic pruritus ani. *Br J Surg* 1997; **84**: 670 [PMID: 9171759 DOI: 10.1002/bjs.1800840524]

36 **Sim HL,** Tan KY. Randomized Single Blind Clinical Trial of Intradermal Methylene Blue on Pain Reduction after Open Diathermy Haemorrhoidectomy. *Colorectal Dis* 2014; Epub ahead of print [PMID: 24506265 DOI: 10.1111/codi.12587]

37 **Carapeti EA**, Kamm MA, McDonald PJ, Phillips RK. Double-blind randomised controlled trial of effect of metronidazole on pain after day-case haemorrhoidectomy. *Lancet* 1998; **351**: 169-172 [PMID: 9449871 DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(97)09003-X]

38 **Ala S**, Saeedi M, Eshghi F, Mirzabeygi P. Topical metronidazole can reduce pain after surgery and pain on defecation in postoperative hemorrhoidectomy. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2008; **51**: 235-238 [PMID: 18176825 DOI: 10.1007/s10350-007-9174-3]

39 **Labrid C**. Pharmacologic properties of Daflon 500 mg. *Angiology* 1994; **45**: 524-530 [PMID: 8203782]

40 **Ho YH**, Foo CL, Seow-Choen F, Goh HS. Prospective randomized controlled trial of a micronized flavonidic fraction to reduce bleeding after haemorrhoidectomy. *Br J Surg* 1995; **82**: 1034-1035 [PMID: 7648143 DOI: 10.1002/bjs.1800820809]

41 **Kersting S**, Berg E. [Situation-adjusted Treatment of Haemorrhoidal Disease.] *Zentralbl Chir* 2013; Epub ahead of print [PMID: 23824620]

42 **Misra MC**, Parshad R. Randomized clinical trial of micronized flavonoids in the early control of bleeding from acute internal haemorrhoids. *Br J Surg* 2000; **87**: 868-872 [PMID: 10931020 DOI: 10.1046/j.1365-2168.2000.01448.x]

43 **Ho YH**, Tan M, Seow-Choen F. Micronized purified flavonidic fraction compared favorably with rubber band ligation and fiber alone in the management of bleeding hemorrhoids: randomized controlled trial. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2000; **43**: 66-69 [PMID: 10813126 DOI: 10.1007/BF02237246]

44 **MacRae HM**, McLeod RS. Comparison of hemorrhoidal treatment modalities. A meta-analysis. *Dis Colon Rectum* 1995; **38**: 687-694 [PMID: 7607026 DOI: 10.1007/BF02048023]

45 **El Nakeeb AM**, Fikry AA, Omar WH, Fouda EM, El Metwally TA, Ghazy HE, Badr SA, Abu Elkhar MY, Elawady SM, Abd Elmoniam HH, Khafagy WW, Morshed MM, El Lithy RE, Farid ME. Rubber band ligation for 750 cases of symptomatic hemorrhoids out of 2200 cases. *World J Gastroenterol* 2008; **14**: 6525-6530 [PMID: 19030206 DOI: 10.3748/wjg.14.6525]

46 **Avital S**, Inbar R, Karin E, Greenberg R. Five-year follow-up of Doppler-guided hemorrhoidal artery ligation. *Tech Coloproctol* 2012; **16**: 61-65 [PMID: 22190190 DOI: 10.1007/s10151-011-0801-6]

47 **Avital S**, Itah R, Skornick Y, Greenberg R. Outcome of stapled hemorrhoidopexy versus doppler-guided hemorrhoidal artery ligation for grade III hemorrhoids. *Tech Coloproctol* 2011; **15**: 267-271 [PMID: 21678068 DOI: 10.1007/s10151-011-0699-z]

48 **De Nardi P**, Capretti G, Corsaro A, Staudacher C. A prospective, randomized trial comparing the short- and long-term results of doppler-guided transanal hemorrhoid dearterialization with mucopexy versus excision hemorrhoidectomy for grade III hemorrhoids. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2014; **57**: 348-353 [PMID: 24509458 DOI: 10.1097/DCR.0000000000000085]

49 **Ammaturo C**, Tufano A, Spiniello E, Sodano B, Iervolino EM, Brillantino A, Braccio B. Stapled haemorrhoidopexy vs. Milligan-Morgan haemorrhoidectomy for grade III haemorrhoids: a randomized clinical trial. *G Chir* 2012; **33**: 346-351 [PMID: 23095566]

50 **Huang WS**, Chin CC, Yeh CH, Lin PY, Wang JY. Randomized comparison between stapled hemorrhoidopexy and Ferguson hemorrhoidectomy for grade III hemorrhoids in Taiwan: a prospective study. *Int J Colorectal Dis* 2007; **22**: 955-961 [PMID: 17171354 DOI: 10.1007/s00384-006-0244-0]

51 **Senagore AJ**, Singer M, Abcarian H, Fleshman J, Corman M, Wexner S, Nivatvongs S. A prospective, randomized, controlled multicenter trial comparing stapled hemorrhoidopexy and Ferguson hemorrhoidectomy: perioperative and one-year results. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2004; **47**: 1824-1836 [PMID: 15622574 DOI: 10.1007/s10350-004-0694-9]

52 **Kim JS**, Vashist YK, Thieltges S, Zehler O, Gawad KA, Yekebas EF, Izbicki JR, Kutup A. Stapled hemorrhoidopexy versus Milligan-Morgan hemorrhoidectomy in circumferential third-degree hemorrhoids: long-term results of a randomized controlled trial. *J Gastrointest Surg* 2013; **17**: 1292-1298 [PMID: 23670518 DOI: 10.1007/s11605-013-2220-7]

53 **Faucheron JL**, Poncet G, Voirin D, Badic B, Gangner Y. Doppler-guided hemorrhoidal artery ligation and rectoanal repair (HAL-RAR) for the treatment of grade IV hemorrhoids: long-term results in 100 consecutive patients. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2011; **54**: 226-231 [PMID: 21228673 DOI: 10.1007/DCR.0b013e318201d31c]

54 **Ortiz H**, Marzo J, Armendáriz P, De Miguel M. Stapled hemorrhoidopexy vs. diathermy excision for fourth-degree hemorrhoids: a randomized, clinical trial and review of the literature. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2005; **48**: 809-815 [PMID: 15785901 DOI: 10.1007/s10350-004-0861-z]

55 **Ortiz H**, Marzo J, Armendariz P. Randomized clinical trial of stapled haemorrhoidopexy versus conventional diathermy haemorrhoidectomy. *Br J Surg* 2002; **89**: 1376-1381 [PMID: 12390376 DOI: 10.1046/j.1365-2168.2002.02237.x]

56 **Gentile M**, De Rosa M, Carbone G, Pilone V, Mosella F, Forestieri P. LigaSure Haemorrhoidectomy versus Conventional Diathermy for IV-Degree Haemorrhoids: Is It the Treatment of Choice? A Randomized, Clinical Trial. *ISRN Gastroenterol* 2011; **2011**: 467258 [PMID: 21991510]

**P-Reviewer:** Athanasopoulos PG, Guan YS, Romanelli rg **S-Editor:** Ma YJ **L-Editor:** **E-Editor:**

**Table 1 Classification of internal haemorrhoids**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Grade** | **Definition** |
| **I** | Normal appearance externally, bleeding but not prolapsing |
| **II** | Anal cushions prolapse on straining but reduces spontaneously |
| **III** | Anal cushions prolapse on straining or exertion and require manual reduction |
| **IV** | Permanent prolapse, irreducible |

Table 2 Results for grade II haemorrhoids

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Methods | Mean operating time (min) | Return to work (d) | Recurrence at < 1 yr  | Recurrence at > 1 yr  | Post-op bleeding  | ARU  | Fistula  | Anal stricture  |
| DGHAL | NR | NR | 5.3-6.7 [9,44]  | 12[44]  | 2.2 [9] | 0[9]  | 0 [9]  | NR |
| SH | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR |
| CH | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR |
| CH + Ligasure | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR |

DGHAL: Doppler guided haemorrhoidal artery ligation; SH: Stapler haemorrhoidectomy; CH: Conventional haemorrhoidectomy; ARU: Acute urinary retention; NR: not recorded.

Table 3 Results for grade III haemorrhoids

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Methods | Mean operating time (min) | Return to work (days) | Recurrence at < 1 yr (%) | Recurrence at >1yrs (%) | Post-op bleeding (%) | ARU (%) | Fistula (%) | Anal stricture (%) |
| DGHAL | 19[45] | NR | 13-13.5[9, 44] | 18-31[44,45]  | 0-6.8[9,45] | 1[9] | 0-0.5[9,45] | NR |
| SH | 21-31[45, 47-49]  | 6-7.9[47,48]  | 7.5[47]  | 3-25.6[45,47,49,55]  | 0-9.1[45,47-49] | 1.6-17.5 [45, 47] | 0[49] | 1.3-2.6[48,49]  |
| CH | 35-42.36[47-49] | 10.2-15[47,48] | 5[47] | 0-17.5[47,49,55]  | 1.7-7.5[47-49] | 40[47]  | 2.5[49]  | 0[48,49] |

DGHAL: Doppler guided haemorrhoidal artery ligation; SH: Stapler haemorrhoidectomy; CH: Conventional haemorrhoidectomy; ARU: Acute urinary retention; NR: not recorded.

Table 4 Results for grade IV haemorrhoids

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Methods** | **Mean operating time (min)** | **Return to work (d)** | **Recurrence at < 1 yr (%)** | **Recurrence at > 1 yr (%)** | **Post-op bleeding (%)** | **ARU (%)** | **Fistula (%)** | **Anal stricture (%)** |
| **DGHAL** | NR | NR | 59.3[9] | NR | 3.7[9]  | 3.7[9] | 0[9]  | NR |
| **DGHAL + RAR** | 35[51]  | NR | NR | 9[51] | 4[51] | NR | NR | NR |
| **SH** | 24[52] | NR | NR | 50-53.3[52,55]  | 0[52] | NR | NR | NR |
| **CH** | 27.4-39[52,53]  | 16.4[53]  | NR | 0-6.25[52,53,55] | 6.25-11[52,53]  | 0[53]  | NR | NR |
| **CH + Ligasure** | 22.3[53] | 12.2[53] | NR | 0[53] | 4[53] | 4[53]  | NR | NR |

DGHAL: Doppler guided haemorrhoidal artery ligation; SH: Stapler haemorrhoidectomy; CH: Conventional haemorrhoidectomy; ARU: Acute urinary retention; NR: not recorded; RAR: rectoanal repair.

Table 5 Summary of recommendations

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Small haemorrhoids** | **Large haemorrhoids** | **Isolated haemorrhoids** | **Circumferential haemorrhoids** |
| **Grade II** | Ligation | DGHAL | Ligation | SH |
| **Grade III** | DGHAL | CH/SH | CH | SH |
| **Grade IV** | CH | CH | CH | CH/SH |

DGHAL: Doppler guided haemorrhoidal artery ligation; SH: Stapler haemorrhoidectomy; CH: Conventional haemorrhoidectomy.