

How to Cite:

Jadhav, R. M., Nangare, N. R., & Janugade, H. B. (2022). A comparative study of conventional and sutureless circumcision. *International Journal of Health Sciences*, 6(S2), 3018–3028. <https://doi.org/10.53730/ijhs.v6nS2.5726>

A comparative study of conventional and sutureless circumcision

Rituja Mahadev Jadhav

Resident, Department of General Surgery, Krishna Institute of Medical Sciences Deemed to be University, Karad, Maharashtra (India)

Nitin. R. Nangare

Professor, Department of General Surgery, Krishna Institute of Medical Sciences Deemed to be University, Karad, Maharashtra (India)

Hemant. B. Janugade

Professor and Head, Department of General Surgery, Krishna Institute of Medical Sciences Deemed to be University, Karad, Maharashtra (India)

Abstract---Aims and Objectives: To do comparative study between conventional and suture less circumcision Materials and Methods: The study enrolled 26 cases in total. 13 cases of conventional circumcision and 13 cases of suture less circumcision. The results were compiled and analyzed. Results: Majority of study subjects belonged to age group 26-35 yrs followed by 36-45 yrs. Both groups were compared on basis of - Diagnostic parameters (BXO, congenital phimosis, recurrent balanoposthitis, recurrent UTI, and others). Intra-op parameters (Mean operative time, mean blood loss, mean pain score) Post-op parameters (Mean healing time, mean satisfaction, post-operative stay) We observed that complications such as bleeding, wound dehiscence, oedema and infection were seen in conventional circumcision and no such complications were seen in suture less circumcision. Conclusion- Today is the era of 'Wireless' in technology and here comes era of 'Suture less' in field of surgery. Every surgeon wishes for better wound healing with better cosmesis without complications and early back to activities. All this is possible with use of staplers for circumcision. Stapler circumcision is associated with short operative time, lower blood loss volume, less pain, few post-operative complications and less post-operative stay.

Keywords---circumcision, phimosis, paraphimosis, recurrent balanitis, posthitis, prepuce pearls, redundant foreskin, STD, genital ulcer disease, dorsal slit.

Introduction

Aim

Comparative study between conventional and sutureless circumcision.

Objectives

To do comparative study between conventional and sutureless circumcision in terms of:

1. Operative time
2. Pain score
3. Blood loss
4. Healing time
5. Patient satisfaction
6. Post-operative stay
7. Post-operative complications

Material and Methods

Study Design: Study design is observational prospective study.

Study Site: The prospective study will be conducted in Department of General Surgery, Tertiary care hospital.

Study Duration: December 2019 to June 2021 (18 Months)

Source of Data: Patients admitted to KIMS and presenting as case of Phimosis, balanoposthitis, recurrent balanoposthitis, balanitis xerotica obliterans, recurrent UTI

Sample Size: 13 cases of conventional circumcision and 13 cases of sutureless circumcision. Calculated by formula :

$$n = \frac{SD_s^2 + SD_c^2}{(Ms - Mc)^2} \times (Z_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} + Z_\beta)^2$$

Where,

- n = Sample size
- SDs = Standard deviation in stapler circumcision
- SDc = Standard deviation in conventional circumcision
- Ms = Mean of stapler circumcision
- Mc = Mean of conventional circumcision
- $Z_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ = 95% Confidence level
- Z_{β} = 80% Power

Stapler group			Conventional group		
Ms	±	SDs	Mc	±	SDc
12.5	±	1.8	14.4	±	2.1

$$n = \frac{(SDs^2 + SDc^2)}{(Ms - Mc)^2} \times (Z_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} + Z_{\beta})^2$$

Taking $(Z_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} + Z_{\beta})^2 = 7.84$ and putting above value

We get,

$$n = 16.54$$

Hence, in this study total 13 patients were enrolled in each group (conventional and sutureless)

Study Criteria

Inclusion Criteria

1. Religious or cultural
2. Balanitis Xerotica Obliterans
3. Phimosis
4. Balanoposthitis
5. Recurrent balanoposthitis
6. Recurrent UTI

Exclusion Criteria

1. Hypospadias
2. Concealed penis
3. Sexually Transmitted Diseases
4. Paraphimosis

Period of Follow Up

All patients were evaluated during hospital stay and followed up on - day 1, 1, 2, 3 weeks, 1 and 3 months and were observed for any complications.

Methodology

- Study was based on prospective randomized clinical trial.
- All those cases which satisfy inclusion criteria were included in study.
- Data was collected from detailed history, clinical examination and preoperative investigations, duration of procedure, duration of hospital stay, total expenditure, postoperative pain, postoperative immediate and delayed complications, using a standard, semi-structured, pre-validated case record proforma.




Figure : The circular stapler comprises an inner bell and an outer bell. The inner bell is designed to protect the glans. The outer bell has two cutting trigger handles, a regulating screw, a circular blade, staples, a safety shield, and a bolt. The circular blade and staples are hidden in the outer bell and protected by the safety shield and bolt.




Figure :

- 1) The penis is measured just below the glans to determine the appropriate size of the stapler device.
- 2) After surgically scrubbing the penis with povidone-iodine, a dorsal penile nerve block and circumferential block are performed with 1% lidocaine.
- 3) The inner bell is placed inside the foreskin to cover the glans; the edge of the bell is at the level of the coronal sulcus. If the patient has severe phimosis, a dorsal slit should be made to correctly position the inner bell.
- 4) The safety shield is removed from the outer bell.
- 5) The outer bell is placed over the inner bell. The frenulum should be kept intact. The safety bolt is then removed.
- 6) The screw is rotated clockwise to sandwich the foreskin tightly; the handles are triggered to cut the foreskin and the wound is closed by staples at the same time.
- 7) The device is unscrewed and removed.
- 8) The wound in the foreskin is checked and pressed with gauze for 1 to 2 min to stop any bleeding.
- 9) Hemostasis is achieved with a compression bandage.

Results

Age distribution

In the present study we assessed the age distribution of the study subjects. We observed that majority of the study subjects belonged to the age group of 26 to 35 years (38.46% and 46.15% in either group), followed by 36 to 45 years (15.38% and 23.08% in either group.)

Age distribution	Conventional group		Sutureless group	
	Number of subjects	Percentage	Number of subjects	Percentage
Less than 25 years	3	23.08	2	15.38
26 to 35 years	5	38.46	6	46.15
36 to 45 years	2	15.38	3	23.08
46 to 55 years	2	15.38	2	15.38
More than 55 years	1	7.69	0	0.00
Total	13	100	13	100

Diagnosis

In the current study we assessed the Diagnosis among the study subjects. We observed that Balanitis Xerotica Obliterans was reported in 15.38% subjects in first group, while 7.69% subjects in second group, Congenital phimosis was reported in 7.69% subjects in first group, while 15.38% subjects in second group, Recurrent balanoprophthitis was reported in 30.77% subjects in both groups, Recurrent UTI was reported in 23.08% subjects in both groups, Others was reported in 23.08% subjects in both groups.

Diagnosis	Conventional group		Sutureless group	
	Number of subjects	Percentage	Number of subjects	Percentage
Balanitis Xerotica Obliterans	2	15.38	1	7.69
Congenital phimosis	1	7.69	2	15.38
Recurrent balanoprophthitis	4	30.77	4	30.77
Recurrent UTI	3	23.08	3	23.08
Others	3	23.08	3	23.08
Total	13	100.00	13	100.00

Sexual satisfaction

In the current study we assessed Sexual satisfaction among the study subjects. We observed that 53.85% subjects in first group and 61.54% subjects in second group had sexual experience. The study subjects were comparable (The chi-square statistic is 0.1576. The p-value is .691398. Not significant at $p < .05$.)

Sexual satisfaction	Conventional group		Sutureless group	
	Number of subjects	Percentage	Number of subjects	Percentage
Yes	7	53.85	8	61.54
No	6	46.15	5	38.46
Total	13	100.00	13	100.00
significance	The chi-square statistic is 0.1576. The p-value is .691398. Not significant at $p < .05$.			

Intra operative parameters

In the current study we assessed **Intra operative parameters** among the study subjects. We observed that Mean Operating time in Conventional group was 24.2 min and in Sutureless group was 6.8 min, Mean Blood loss in Conventional group was 9.4 ml and in Sutureless group was 1.8 ml, Mean Pain score in Conventional group was 5.8 and in Sutureless group was 4.

Parameters	Conventional group	Sutureless group	Significance
Mean Operating time	24.2 ± 3.41 min	6.8 ± 1.5 min	The t-value is 18.66649. The p-value is < .00001. The result is significant at p < .05.
Mean Blood loss	9.46 ± 1.19ml	1.8 ± 0.68 ml	The t-value is 19.86633. The p-value is < .00001. The result is significant at p < .05.
Mean Pain score	5.84 ± 0.80	4 ± 0.70	The t-value is 6.23149. The p-value is < .00001. The result is significant at p < .05.

Post operative parameters

In the current study we assessed **Post operative parameters** among the study subjects. We observed that Mean Healing time in Conventional group was 14.4 days and in Sutureless group was 12.5 days, Mean Satisfaction in Conventional group was 90% and in Sutureless group was 92%, Post operative hospital stay Conventional group was 3.5 days and in Sutureless group was 2.2 days

Parameters	Conventional group	Sutureless group	Significance
Mean Healing time	14.4 ± 0.87 days	12.5 ± 1.05 days	The t-value is 5.06803. The p-value is .000017. The result is significant at p < .05.
Mean Satisfaction	90 ± 1.47 %	92 ± 1.77 %	The t-value is 3.1225. The p-value is .002315. The result is significant at p < .05.
Post operative hospital stay	3.5 ± 0.51 days	2.2 ± 0.43 days	The t-value is 6.94022. The p-value is < .00001. The result is significant

			at p < .05
--	--	--	------------

Complications

In the current study we assessed Complications among the study subjects. We observed that conventional group reported higher percentage of complications as compared to sutureless group. Conventional group: Bleeding (15.38%), Wound dehiscence (7.69%), edema (23.08%), and infection (15.38%). Sutureless group did not report any case of bleeding, edema and infection.

Complications	Conventional group		Sutureless group	
	Number of subjects	Percentage	Number of subjects	Percentage
Bleeding	2	15.38	0	0.00
Wound dehiscence	1	7.69	0	0.00
Edema	3	23.08	0	0.00
Infection	2	15.38	0	0.00

Discussion

Male circumcision is removal of the foreskin (prepuce skin) from the penis. According to the World Health Organization (WHO), global estimates suggest that 30% of males are circumcised. In India incidence of circumcision in general population is approximately 33%. Most circumcisions are performed during adolescence for cultural or religious reasons.

The incidence of circumcision varies mostly with religious affiliation and sometimes due to culture.^[8] Adult and adolescent circumcision is carried out using one of the methods: Dorsal slit method or sleeve method. Local anesthesia is the preferred method. The widely used dorsal slit method is used in the present study. All the methods of adult and adolescent circumcision require suturing and dressing. Surgical complications of male circumcision comprise excessive bleeding, hematoma formation, sepsis, unsatisfactory cosmetic effect, lacerations of the penis and injury to the glans, too little or too much of foreskin excised, meatal stenosis, urinary retention, phimosis and buried penis. Amongst all these complications, hemorrhage and infection are the most common complications.

The WHO recommends three conventional methods to perform circumcision, and these techniques are used worldwide. However, conventional circumcision still has some drawbacks: it requires training; it may have a high complication rate, especially in some African countries, where circumcision is often performed by poorly trained and underequipped health workers; and it takes time, even when performed by experienced surgeons, which challenges the medical MC scale-up for HIV prevention in Africa. The circular stapler is a new device used to perform circumcision. It was commercially developed in China and is applied in some Chinese hospitals. In line with a study by Yuan et al., our data show that MC with a stapler has some advantages: a short operative time, minimal pain, and a low blood loss volume comparable with those of another new circumcision device, the Chinese Shang Ring. Therefore, the stapler also has the potential to be used in high-volume settings by health care providers with minimal training and

experience because of its simplicity, short operative and recovery times. Currently, its most substantial deterrent to widespread use is cost. A reusable version of the circular stapler might be a solution.

The other solution is to improve the material of the staples so that they fall off spontaneously within 1 month. In children in some countries, circumcision is mainly performed for religious reasons. One study showed that neonatal MC is cost-effective for disease prevention. The herein-described circular stapler may eventually be applied to children and infants because of its simplicity, short operative and recovery time.

Summary

In the present study majority of the study subjects belonged to the age group of 26 to 35 years (38.46% and 46.15% in either group), followed by 36 to 45 years (15.38% and 23.08% in either group.). Balanitis Xerotica Obliterans, Recurrent balanoposthitis was, Recurrent UTI, and Congenital phimosis were the commonest presentations of the patients.

In the current study we assessed Sexual satisfaction among the study subjects. We observed that 53.85% subjects in first group and 61.54% subjects in second group had sexual satisfaction. Mean Operating time in Conventional group was 24.2 min and in Sutureless group was 6.8 min which was significantly lesser in sutureless group. Mean Blood loss in Conventional group was 9.4 ml and in Sutureless group was 1.8 ml which was also significantly lesser in sutureless group. Mean Pain score in Conventional group was 5.8 and in Sutureless group was 4 it was lesser in sutureless group.

Mean Healing time in Conventional group was 14.4 days and in Sutureless group was 12.5 days which was significantly lesser in sutureless group. Mean Satisfaction in Conventional group was 90% and in Sutureless group was 92% which was greater in sutureless group. Post operative hospital stay Conventional group was 3.5 days and in Sutureless group was 2.2 days which was significantly lesser in sutureless group. Among the commonest complications in the Conventional group: Bleeding (15.38%), Wound dehiscence (7.69%), edema (23.08%), and infection (15.38%). Sutureless group did not report any case of bleeding, edema and infection.

Conclusions

- Balanitis Xerotica Obliterans, Recurrent balanoposthitis, Recurrent UTI, and Congenital phimosis were the commonest presentations of the patients.
- Mean Operating time in Conventional group was 24.2 min and in Sutureless group was 6.8 min, Mean Blood loss in Conventional group was 9.4 ml and in Sutureless group was 1.8 ml, Mean Pain score in Conventional group was 5.8 and in Sutureless group was 4.
- Mean Healing time in Conventional group was 14.4 days and in Sutureless group was 12.5 days, Mean Satisfaction in Conventional group was 90% and in Sutureless group was 92%, Post operative hospital stay Conventional group was 3.5 days and in Sutureless group was 2.2 days

- Bleeding, wound dehiscence, edema and infection were the common complications reported in the conventional group, whereas Sutureless group did not report any case of bleeding, edema and infection.
- Thus the sutureless technique is an easy and user-friendly technique for performing male circumcision. It is associated with a shorter operative time, lower blood loss volume, and fewer postoperative complications than conventional circumcision. This new technique may greatly facilitate and standardize circumcision procedures.

References

1. Albero G, Castellsague X, Giuliano AR, Bosch FX. Male circumcision and genital human papillomavirus: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sexually transmitted diseases*. 2012 Feb 1;39(2):104-13.
2. Mehta SD, Moses S, Parker CB, Agot K, Maclean I, Bailey RC. Circumcision status and incident herpes simplex virus type 2 infection, genital ulcer disease, and HIV infection. *AIDS (London, England)*. 2012 Jun 1;26(9):1141.
3. Bailey RC, Moses S, Parker CB, Agot K, Maclean I, Krieger JN, Williams CF, Campbell RT, Ndinya-Achola JO. Male circumcision for HIV prevention in young men in Kisumu, Kenya: a randomised controlled trial. *The lancet*. 2007 Feb 24;369(9562):643-56.
4. Hayashi Y, Kohri K. Circumcision related to urinary tract infections, sexually transmitted infections, human immunodeficiency virus infections, and penile and cervical cancer. *International Journal of Urology*. 2013 Aug;20(8):769-75.
5. Larke NL, Thomas SL, dos Santos Silva I, Weiss HA. Male circumcision and penile cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Cancer causes & control*. 2011 Aug;22(8):1097-110.
6. Hargreave T. Male circumcision: towards a World Health Organisation normative practice in resource limited settings. *Asian journal of andrology*. 2010 Sep;12(5):628.
7. Ceylan K, Burhan K, Yilmaz Y, Can Ş, Kuş A, Mustafa G. Severe complications of circumcision: an analysis of 48 cases. *Journal of pediatric urology*. 2007 Feb 1;3(1):32-5.
8. Wilcken A, Keil T, Dick B. Traditional male circumcision in eastern and southern Africa: a systematic review of prevalence and complications. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*. 2010;88:907-14.
9. Yuea C, Ze-juna Y, Wua KR, Sua XJ, Hua JS, Maa JW, Guoa CM, Fanga HW, Sua R, Zhangb Y, Zhangc QH. A Randomized Clinical Study of Circumcision with a Ring Device Versus Conventional Circumcision (Retraction of vol 188, pg 1849, 2012). *JOURNAL OF UROLOGY*. 2012 Dec 1;188(6):2443-.
10. Wu X, Wang Y, Zheng J, Shen W, Yan JA, Ji H, Li X, Zhang H, Zhou Z. A report of 918 cases of circumcision with the Shang Ring: comparison between children and adults. *Urology*. 2013 May 1;81(5):1058-63.
11. El Bcheraoui C, Zhang X, Cooper CS, Rose CE, Kilmarx PH, Chen RT. Rates of adverse events associated with male circumcision in US medical settings, 2001 to 2010. *JAMA pediatrics*. 2014 Jul 1;168(7):625-34.
12. Kim HH, Goldstein M. High complication rates challenge the implementation of male circumcision for HIV prevention in Africa. *Nature Clinical Practice Urology*. 2009 Feb;6(2):64-5.

13. Sheldon WR, Nhemachena T, Blanchard K, Chipato T, Ramjee G, Trussell J, McCulloch CE, Blum M, Harper CC. Male circumcision for HIV prevention: clinical practices and attitudes among healthcare providers in South Africa and Zimbabwe. *Sexually transmitted diseases*. 2012 Jul;39(7):567.
14. Sgaier SK, Reed JB, Thomas A, Njeuhmeli E. Achieving the HIV prevention impact of voluntary medical male circumcision: lessons and challenges for managing programs. *PLoS medicine*. 2014 May 6;11(5):e1001641.
15. Yuan Y, Zhang Z, Cui W, Gao B, Peng J, Xin Z, Guo Y. Clinical investigation of a novel surgical device for circumcision. *The Journal of urology*. 2014 May;191(5):1411-5.