



ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Treatment of chronic anal fissure: Is open lateral internal sphincterotomy (LIS) a safe and adequate option?



Turan Acar*, Nihan Acar, Feyyaz Güngör, Erdinç Kamer, Hilmi Güngör, Mehmet Sercan Candan, Halis Bağ, Ercüment Tarcan, Osman Nuri Dilek, Mehmet Hacıyanlı

İzmir Katip Çelebi University, Atatürk Training and Research Hospital, Department of General Surgery, Basın Sitesi, İzmir, Turkey

Received 19 July 2018; received in revised form 4 September 2018; accepted 2 October 2018
Available online 24 October 2018

KEYWORDS

Chronic anal fissure;
Incontinence;
LIS;
Recurrence;
Satisfaction

Summary *Background:* Anal fissure which is defined as a longitudinal tear in anoderm under the dentate line is one of the most common benign diseases of anorectal area, and due to the severe pain during the defecation and emotional stress that it causes may reduce people's quality of life. There are several treatment methods such as medical substances and surgical procedures. In this retrospective study, we aimed to evaluate the safe and adequate option of lateral internal sphincterotomy (LIS) in chronic anal fissure treatment.

Methods: This study is a retrospective study in which 417 patients who were treated for chronic anal fissure were included.

Results: Of 417 patients included in the study, 228 (54.7%) were female and the mean \pm SD age was 36.1 ± 8.96 years (ranging from 17 to 73 years). Major complaints of patients; pain, bleeding, constipation, pruritus, perianal discharge.

Recurrence occurred in 15 patients (3.6%) (12 males, three females) and eight patients (1.9%) developed incontinence (four with gas, four with soiling and seven females, one male). The complaints of all patients with gas incontinence and a patient with fluid incontinence regressed, whereas three patients had permanent fluid incontinence.

Conclusion: LIS is still the gold standard for the treatment of chronic anal fissure when the physicians would like to avoid recurrence and obtain the best pain relief.

© 2018 Asian Surgical Association and Taiwan Robotic Surgery Association. Publishing services by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

* Corresponding author. Fax: +90 232 2431530.

E-mail addresses: drturanacar1982@gmail.com (T. Acar), cosgunnihan@hotmail.com (N. Acar), feyyaz.gngr@gmail.com (F. Güngör), erdinc.kamer@gmail.com (E. Kamer), gungorhilmi@yahoo.com (H. Güngör), msercancandan@gmail.com (M.S. Candan), halisbag@mynet.com (H. Bağ), tarcan2001@yahoo.com (E. Tarcan), ondilek@hotmail.com (O.N. Dilek), mhaciyanlı@hotmail.com (M. Hacıyanlı).

1. Introduction

Anal fissure is a longitudinal tear in anoderm under the dentate line which mostly located posteriorly in the midline (90%).^{1,2} It is one of the most common benign diseases of anorectal area. The main presenting symptom is pain during defecation, rectal bleeding, and emotional stress that it causes may reduce people's quality of life.³

The healing of the chronic anal fissures takes longer than 8–12 weeks and in addition a hypertrophic papilla and a sentinel tubercle accompany the chronic anal fissure and the sphincter muscle fibers at the base of the tear are exposed.^{4,5}

Basically, treatment for anal fissure usually comprises reducing the sphincter pressure with physical or chemical methods. Studies on the methods of treatment of chronic anal fissures range from medical applications to surgery; there is no general agreement on ideal therapy for chronic anal fissures.^{6,7}

The American Society of Colon and Rectal Surgeons (ASCRS) guidelines recommend initial nonsurgical management, which includes stool softeners, high fiber diet and warm sitz bath.⁸ However, a significant proportion of patients will fail conservative management, therefore further treatment options will be required.

Lateral internal sphincterotomy (LIS) is attributed to be the gold standard for surgical management of chronic anal fissures when conservative and medical treatment fails.^{9,10} Besides its efficiency, LIS also have some risks of complications. Although incontinence, which is the most common and the feared one of those complications, was transient in most of the cases, 3% of the cases were considered to have it permanently at the end of the 72 months of follow up.¹¹

In this study our aim was to seek the answers of five questions: 1. Is open lateral internal sphincterotomy (LIS) a safe and adequate option? 2. What are the most common early and late complications of LIS? 3. What are the factors that affect the recurrence and incontinence in patients who underwent LIS? 4. What can be done to avoid the incontinence? 5. Is the patient satisfaction really high after LIS?

2. Methods

The study protocol was approved by the institutional Ethics Committee (Number: 31829978-050.01.04-E.1700085966 Date: 01/12/2017).

A written informed consent was obtained from each patient. The study was conducted in accordance with the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki.

2.1. Study design

From the 653 patients who underwent surgery for anal fissure, 417 patients who were under regular follow-up were included in the study.

This study is a retrospective study in which 417 patients who were treated for chronic anal fissure in our General Surgery Department between January 2010 and October 2017 were included. All patients had prior medical

management including a combination of stool softener, laxative, high fiber diet and warm sitz bath.

Inclusion criteria were, suffering from anal fissure for more than 6 weeks, exposed fibers of internal sphincter, appearance of sentinel tubercle and hypertrophied anal papilla for supporting the diagnosis of chronic fissure. Patients with simultaneous anal abscesses, anal fistula and/or hemorrhoidal diseases, diagnosis of inflammatory bowel diseases (IBD), who underwent partial LIS (the distal half of the internal sphincter is almost completely cut) and the ones whose medical records were unachievable were excluded from the study. The patients had no history of anal or rectal cancer.

Patients were asked to fill out a questionnaire that queried their symptoms. Anal pain was assessed before the treatment and at follow-up visits using a linear visual analog pain score. Anal incontinence was assessed by means of a validated scoring and grading system, as previously reported by Pescatori et al¹²

2.2. Surgical procedures (Figs. 1 and 2)

Surgical procedures (LIS) were carried out in the lithotomy position with open sphincterotomy under general or regional anesthesia. Prophylactic antibiotic and rectal enemas were not used. The anal canal was visualized with an anoscope, a longitudinal incision was made in the anoderm, and the distal half of the internal anal sphincter was divided under direct vision followed by closure of the mucosa. Internal anal sphincter was almost completely cut in LIS. The defect was not closed.




Figure 1 Chronic anal fissure (white arrow) accompanied by hypertrophic papilla (yellow arrow).



Figure 2 Internal anal sphincter (white arrow).

2.3. Postoperative management and follow-up

Prophylactic cephazolin or gentamicin when patient is allergic to penicillin and metronidazole were administered intravenously to all patients 30 min before the skin incision. A single dose of a non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID) was injected intramuscularly on recovery and was repeated if additional analgesia was needed. Oral metronidazole twice daily for one week was given post-operatively, NSAID and stool softeners were also prescribed to be used when needed at hospital discharge.

Anorectal examination was performed in every follow-up clinic visit and the fissure healing was monitored. Pain relief was also assessed by using a visual analog scale which represents severity of pain from 0 (no pain) to 10 (worst imaginable pain).

The medical records of the patients were retrospectively reviewed and demographic data (sex, age), medical history, referral symptoms and findings, first-second-fourth-eighth week examination findings, response to the treatment (pain relief and evaluation of the fissure, erythema and/or inflammation), side effects of the treatment and presence of recurrence of the disease were recorded and analysed.

3. Results

Clinical profile of the patients is shown in Table 1.

Of 417 patients included in the study, 228 (54.7%) were female and the mean \pm SD age was 36.1 ± 8.96 years (ranging from 17 to 73 years). In vast majority of the patients, the primary complaints were pain (97.4%) and rectal bleeding (77.9%) during and/or after defecation.

Table 1 Clinical profile of study groups.

Clinical features	n (%)
Gender	
Female	228 (54.7)
Male	189 (45.3)
Age (years); mean \pm SD	36.1 \pm 8.96
Complaints	
Pain during defecation	406 (97.4)
Rectal bleeding	325 (77.9)
History of constipation	154 (36.9)
Pruritus	71 (17)
Perianal discharge	14 (3.36)

Additionally, the other major complaints were constipation, pruritus and perianal discharge.

The patients had been evaluated at first, second, fourth and eighth weeks from the beginning of the treatment for assessing the response to the treatment and the status of complaints (Table 2).

The pain relief was obtained in 263 patients (63.1%) in the first week, 322 (77.2%) in the second week, 363 (87%) in the fourth week and 381 (91.4%) in the eighth week. Relief was not observed in 36 patients at the end of the eighth week.

The median duration of the disease was 27 months (ranging from 1 to 34 months). Table 3 shows the outcomes of the procedure with median follow up 7 years.

There was no decrease in the distribution of early and late complications' rates according to the years (Fig. 3).

In the early postoperative period, rectal bleeding was a common problem in 182 patients (34.1%). In addition, three patients had perianal abscess and two patients who used anticoagulants (i.e., clopidogrel or acetylsalicylic acid) had perianal hematoma. These patients relieved after drainage of the abscess and hematoma.


In long-term follow-up, recurrence occurred in 15 patients (3.6%) (12 males, three females) and eight patients (1.9%) developed incontinence (four with gas, four with soiling and seven females, one male). The recurrence rate was higher in anterior fissures (67%). Of the patients with recurrence, nine of them had one and two of them had two prior surgeries. All females with incontinence had prior vaginal deliveries and the male with incontinence had prior anorectal surgery. The complaints of all patients with gas incontinence and a patient with fluid incontinence (male) regressed on the postoperative fourth month, whereas three patients (all females) had permanent fluid incontinence.

Table 2 Results of pain relief.

	Number of patients whose complaints relieved (%)
First week	263 (63.1)
Second week	322 (77.2)
Fourth week	363 (87)
Eighth week	381 (91.4)

Table 3 Early and late complications outcomes reported during 8 year follow up.

Complications	n	(%)
Rectal bleeding	182	(34.1)
Perianal abscess	3	(0.7)
Perianal hematoma	2	(0.5)
Recurrence	15	(3.6)
Female	3	(20)
Male	12	(80)
Sited anteriorly	10	(67)
Sited posteriorly	5	(33)
Incontinence	8	(1.9)
Female	7	(87.5)
Male	1	(12.5)
Patients satisfaction	384	(92.1)
Patients healing	395	(94.7)

**Figure 3** Comparison of early and late complications.

Patient satisfaction was high (92.1%) and the healing was nearly complete (94.7%) at the end of the eighth week.

4. Discussion

The aim of our study was to determine the efficiency of lateral internal sphincterotomy (LIS) in chronic anal fissure, the complications of the surgery and the factors affecting the complications.

Our data supports prior studies in the literature with respect to incontinence and recurrence rates, pain relief, satisfaction and healing of patients.

Notaras described subcutaneous lateral internal sphincterotomy in 1971.¹³ The main goal of sphincterotomy is to increase the blood flow of the anoderm by decreasing the maximum anal sphincter pressure by 18–50%. This technique provides an improvement between 82% and 100%.¹⁴

Araujo et al performed a prospective clinical trial with 190 patients in three groups comparing medical treatment (n : 128) vs. LIS (n : 62) and reported pain relief rates of 100% for LIS after eighth week (93% in two weeks and 100% at the end of the eighth week).¹⁵ Vaithianathan et al evaluated preoperative and postoperative first, fourth and sixth week pain relief by visual analogue scale (VAS) in 45 patients who underwent LIS. Pain relief was

obtained in almost all patients at the end of the sixth week.¹⁶ Although this rate was slightly lower (91.4%) in our study compared to previous two, it was observed that the majority of our cases relieved after eight weeks. This difference may be due to the higher number of patients in our study (n : 417).

Most of the patients were satisfied in the early stage of treatment after LIS. A study, in which results of Botox and LIS were compared, showed that only 7% of the patients in LIS group were dissatisfied with their treatment.¹ This rate was 1% in a single center study by Salih et al.¹⁷ Garcia-Aguilar et al also reported that 80% of patients were very satisfied or satisfied after surgery.¹⁸ In addition, Gupta evaluated the contribution of the removal of hypertrophied anal papillae and fibrous anal polyps to the patient satisfaction.¹⁹ He found out that the patients who had these lesions removed had significantly higher rate of satisfaction, while the others suffered from some residual symptoms such as pain and irritation during defecation, pricking or foreign body sensation in the anus, and pruritus or wetness around the anal verge.

In our study, due to the recurrence, incontinence and/or other early complications, almost 8% of patients were dissatisfied with the outcomes of their LIS surgery. Although we did not have the data for evaluating this condition, we believe that removal of the hypertrophied anal papillae and fibrous anal polyps will increase the patient satisfaction since the most patients' common complaint was palpable hypertrophic papillae after surgery.

Fecal incontinence (FI) is the most prominent disadvantage of LIS.²⁰ In varying severity, up to 47.6% of the patients developed post-operative disturbance of continence after LIS.²¹ Furthermore, there are other publications in the literature reporting that partial sphincterotomy is also effective in reducing the risk of incontinence.²²

FI after LIS usually occurs mildly (soiling or flatus incontinence) and lasts only for few weeks up to 6 months^{23,24}; even so some authors had reported persistent fecal incontinence for 12 months after LIS surgery.²⁵

A novel meta-analysis showed that long-term risk of incontinence after LIS is significant (approximately 15%) with the obvious fecal incontinence rate of 1%.²⁶

Arroyo et al reported healing rates of 92.5% in patients undergoing LIS surgery. However, the rate of anal incontinence was associated with the procedure was 5%.²⁷

Nyam et al concluded the healing rate as 96% and some degree of incontinence in 45% of patients after LIS. The study by Menteş and colleagues displayed that very few patients suffered from decline in the quality of life after LIS due to incontinence (1.2% among 244 patients undergoing LIS for IAS).¹¹

The potential risk of FI after LIS seems to be variable according to many factors, such as age, anatomic differences between men and women, pregnancy and vaginal delivery, pelvic surgery history, surgical inexperience and inappropriate technique.

Besides, complications such as wound infection, hematoma, abscess, anal fistula may develop after LIS.^{26,28,29}

Since we excluded the cases who underwent partial LIS, our results of incontinence and recurrence are based on complete LIS. Gas and/or liquid incontinence were seen in 1.9% of LIS surgery (eight patients) and four patients with

gas incontinence resolved without any intervention after eight months, according to our data. However, other three patients had permanent liquid incontinence. All patients who developed permanent incontinence were female and had a history of vaginal delivery. Our most common early stage complication was rectal bleeding, and also three patients developed perianal hematoma and two patients developed perianal abscess. While there was no need of additional intervention for rectal bleeding, hematomas and abscesses had to be drained.

Despite the high success rate in fissure healing after sphincterotomy, recurrence may occur between 1.6% and 6%.^{27,30} The most common cause of recurrence is inadequate sphincterotomy. Also, the localization of the fissure affects the recurrence. The recurrence rate is higher in anterior fissures.³¹ In such cases, sphincterotomy can be repeated. In our study, the recurrence rate of LIS group was compatible with the literature (3.6%), and the majority of the recurrent cases were young men with anterior fissures. This can be explained with the strong pelvic muscles of men, resulting with insufficient sphincterotomy.

Its retrospective design, being single-centered and not being a randomized controlled study, and the fact that the procedures were performed by different surgeons can be count as the major limitations of this study. In addition, anal canal pressures were unknown since the anal manometer was not performed. A further limitation relates to this study is that it does not consist a comparison with other treatment methods.

However, despite the fact that it is a single center study, the high number of patients is its greatest advantage. We believe, our results of LIS which we shared objectively will make great contribution to surgeons who are interested in anorectal surgery.

The results of this study support high healing and patient satisfaction rates after LIS. Since the most feared complication of LIS is permanent incontinence, the patient selection should be done carefully in preoperative period, sphincter pressure should be measured and alternative treatments such as Botox should be considered in patients with high incontinence risk. Additionally, the surgeon should make sure that the sphincterotomy is done properly in order to reduce the recurrence rates.

Conflict of interest

The authors have no conflict of interests.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank all the general surgery staff for their cooperation.

All the authors read and approved the paper.

The authors declare no financial issues to disclose.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asjsur.2018.10.001>.

References

1. Brady JT, Althans AR, Neupane R, et al. Treatment for anal fissure: is there a safe option? *Am J Surg.* 2017;214:623–628.
2. Collins EE, Lund JN. A review of chronic anal fissure management. *Tech Colorectal.* 2007;11:209–223.
3. Gil J, Luján J, Hernández Q, Gil E, Salom MG, Parrilla P. Screening for the effectiveness of conservative treatment in chronic anal fissure patients using anorectal manometry. *Int J Colorectal Dis.* 2010;25:649–654.
4. Wald A, Bharucha AE, Cosman BC, Whitehead WE. ACG clinical guideline: management of benign anorectal disorders. *Am J Gastroenterol.* 2014;109:1141–1157.
5. Andjelkov K, Sforza M, Barisic G, Soldatovic I, Hiranyakas A, Krivokapic Z. Novel method for treatment of chronic anal fissure: adipose-derived regenerative cells – a pilot study. *Colorectal Dis.* 2017;19:570–575.
6. Acheson AG, Scholefield JH. Anal fissure: the changing management of a surgical condition. *Langenbeck's Arch Surg.* 2005;390:1–7.
7. Yücel T, Gönüllü D, Öncü M, Koksoy FN, Özkan SG, Aycan O. Comparison of controlled-intermittent anal dilatation and lateral internal sphincterotomy in the treatment of chronic anal fissures: a prospective, randomized study. *Int J Surg.* 2009;7:228–231.
8. Perry WB, Dykes SL, Buie WD, Rafferty JF. Standards practice task force of the American Society of Colon and Rectal Surgeons Practice parameters for the management of anal fissures (3rd. revision). *Dis Colon Rectum.* 2010;53:1110–1115.
9. Nelson RL, Chattopadhyay A, Brooks W, Platt I, Paavana T, Earl S. Operative procedures for fissure in ano. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2011;9:CD002199.
10. Hsu TC, MacKeigan JM. Surgical treatment of chronic anal fissure. A retrospective study of 1753 cases. *Dis Colon Rectum.* 1984;27:475–478.
11. Mentés BB, Tezcaner T, Yılmaz U, Leventoğlu S, Oguz M. Results of lateral internal sphincterotomy for chronic anal fissure with particular reference to quality of life. *Dis Colon Rectum.* 2006;49:1045–1051.
12. Pescatori M, Anastasio G, Bottini C, Mentasti A. New grading and scoring for anal incontinence. Evaluation of 335 patients. *Dis Colon Rectum.* 1992;35:482–487.
13. Notaras MJ. The treatment of anal fissure by lateral subcutaneous internal sphincterotomy: a technique and results. *Br J Surg.* 1971;58:96–100.
14. Poh A, Tan KY, Seow-Choen F. Innovations in chronic anal fissure treatment: a systematic review. *World J Gastrointest Surg.* 2010;2:231–241.
15. Araujo SE, Sousa MM, Caravatto PP, Habr-Gamai A, Ceconello I. Early and late results of topical diltiazem and bethanechol for chronic anal fissure: a comparative study. *Hepato-Gastroenterology.* 2010;57:81–85.
16. Vaithianathan R, Panneerselvam S. Randomised prospective controlled trial of topical 2% diltiazem versus lateral internal sphincterotomy for the treatment of chronic fissure in ano. *Indian J Surg.* 2015;77:1484–1487.
17. Salih AM. Chronic anal fissures: open lateral internal sphincterotomy result: a case series study. *Ann Med Surg (Lond).* 2017;15:56–58.
18. García-Granero E, Sanahuja A, García-Botello SA, et al. The ideal lateral internal sphincterotomy: clinical and endosonographic evaluation following open and closed internal anal sphincterotomy. *Colorectal Dis.* 2009;11:502–507.
19. Gupta PJ. Hypertrophied anal papillae and fibrous anal polyps, should they be removed during anal fissure surgery? *World J Gastroenterol.* 2004;10:2412–2414.

20. Khan MS, Akbar I, Zeb J, Ahmad S, Khan A. Outcome of 0.2% glyceryl trinitrate cream versus 2% diltiazem cream in the treatment of chronic anal fissure. *J Ayub Med Coll Abbottabad*. 2017;29:280–284.
21. Chen HL, Woo XB, Wang HS, et al. Botulinum toxin injection versus lateral internal sphincterotomy for chronic anal fissure: a meta-analysis of randomized control trials. *Tech Coloproctol*. 2014;8:693–698.
22. Nessar G, Topbas M. Lateral internal partial sphincterotomy technique for chronic anal fissure. *Indian J Surg*. 2017;79:185–187.
23. Emile SH, Youssef M, Elfeki H, Thabet W, El-Hamed TM, Farid M. Literature review of the role of lateral internal sphincterotomy (LIS) when combined with excisional hemorrhoidectomy. *Int J Colorectal Dis*. 2016;31:1261–1272.
24. Nyam DC, Pemberton JH. Long-term results of lateral internal sphincterotomy for chronic anal fissure with particular reference to incidence of fecal incontinence. *Dis Colon Rectum*. 1999;42:1306–1310.
25. Mathai V, Ong BC, Ho YH. Randomized controlled trial of lateral internal sphincterotomy with haemorrhoidectomy. *Br J Surg*. 1996;83:380–382.
26. Garg P, Garg M, Menon GR. Long term continence disturbance after lateral internal sphincterotomy for chronic anal fissure: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Colorectal Dis*. 2013;15:104–117.
27. Arroyo A, Pérez F, Serrano P, Candela F, Lacueva J, Calpena R. Surgical versus chemical (botulinum toxin) sphincterotomy for chronic anal fissure: long-term results of a prospective randomized clinical and manometric study. *Am J Surg*. 2005;189:429–434.
28. Poritz LS. Anal fissure treatment and management. Medscape. Available at: <http://emedicine.medscape.com/article/196297-treatment#d15>. Accessed 18.07.16.
29. Whatley JZ, Tang SJ, Glover PH, et al. Management of complicated chronic anal fissures with high-dose circumferential chemodenervation (HDCC) of the internal anal sphincter. *Int J Surg*. 2015;4:24–26.
30. Lindsey I, Cunningham C, Jones OM, Francis C, Mortensen NJ. Fissurectomy-botulinum toxin: a novel sphincter-sparing procedure for medically resistant chronic anal fissure. *Dis Colon Rectum*. 2004;47:1947–1952.
31. Emile SH. Indications and technical aspects of internal anal sphincterotomy: highlighting the controversies. *Dis Colon Rectum*. 2017;60:128–132.