ESJTI ISSN:2978-5561

EuroScience Journal of Technological Innovation (ESJTI)

An International Open Access, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed Journal

The Historical Paradigm Shift in Cholecystectomy: A Comparative Evaluation of Surgical Trauma, Infection Rates, Operative Efficiency, and Recovery Kinetics Across Conventional, Laparoscopic, and Robotic Eras

Mabroukh Salim Mohamed Omraan[1], Abduladim Sakeb[1]
Department of Medical Laboratory Technology, Higher Institute of Medical Sciences and Technologies, Bani Walid
*Corresponding author: mabroukh@imst.edu.ly

Received: December 02 , 2025 Accepted: January 21, 2026 Published: March 10, 2026

Abstract:
The use of surgical management of symptomatic cholelithiasis and acute cholecystitis has experienced one of the most radical changes in technology in the history of modern medicine. Since the first effective open cholecystectomy in 1882 done by Carl Langenbuch up until the late 1980s development of the 4-port laparoscopic cholecystectomy and today with robotic-assisted surgical platforms, there has been a continuous push in surgery with biliary surgery leading the pack to reduce surgical trauma. This comparative analysis will look at shifting history of four different eras in the surgical field Open Cholecystectomy (OC), Conventional Laparoscopic Cholecystectomy (LC), Single-Incision Laparoscopic Surgery (SILS), and Robotic-Assisted Cholecystectomy (RAC). This study reveals the influence the use of minimally invasive methods has had on turning a high-morbidity inpatient surgery into an outpatient standard of care by assessing key clinical outcomes, such as rates of surgical site infection (SSI), length of surgical period, systemic inflammatory cytokine cascade, postoperative pain, length of hospital stay (LOS), and bile duct injury (BDI).

Index Terms: *Cholecystectomy, Historical paradigm shift, Conventional surgery, Laparoscopic surgery, Infection rates.*

Introduction

The history of biliary surgery is a main course of the modern course of operative medicine as it represented the shift of the open invasive surgical practice into the micro-incision laparoscopic surgery and computer-assisted robots. Over a century, procedures on the right upper quadrant have been dictated by the requirements of surgery to have a wide exposure which would result in division of the abdominal wall. Although the basic surgical goal, i.e. total removal of the affected gallbladder has remained the same, physiological expense of the operation to the patient has been radically decreased**.**

On July 15, 1882, conventional open cholecystectomy started as the German surgeon Carl Langenbuch excised the gallbladder with previously formed gallstones in the Lazarus Hospital in Berlin with his first successful intervention. Langenbuch theorized that the gallbladder was not a passive depository of the stones, but the most essential organ in their formation and surgery was preferable to a medical lingualalysis or to simple cholecystostomy. The uncased method used by Langenbuch (usually through a right subcostal (Kocher) approach or mid-line laparotomy) was the gold standard in the whole world over a century**.**

Although it was effective in saving lives, open cholecystectomy had high morbidity in terms of physiological and anatomy. The Kocher incision involves a cut through the muscle (rectus abdominis), oblique abdominal muscles, fascia and through parietal peritoneum. This tremendous perturbation of abdominal wall structure stimulated excessive postoperative somatic pain, grossly impaired diaphragm movement, and was associated with a vigorous neuroendocrine and inflammatory stress response with significant elevations in circulating Interleukin-6 (IL-6), C-reactive protein (CRP) and cortisol. As a result, patients experienced longterm postoperative paralytic ileus, had to be placed on heavy parenteral opioid analgesia, length of stay at the hospital was increased to 5-10 days, and patients suffered substantial physical disability of up to six weeks before becoming capable of normal functioning again**.**

Moreover, open surgical access had high complication of wound. The huge opening allowed a large amount of ambient atmospheric air and physical manipulation of the visceral tissue, leading to an increase in the frequency of Surgical Site Infections (SSIs) to 8-15 percent in cases which occurred because of elective surgery and more than 20 percent in cases which occurred because of emergency cholecystitis. Another common long term outcome was the occurrence of incisional hernia, with a rate of up to 1015% in the open laparotomy within five years of follow up.

In the late 1980s, surgical scene changed drastically. In 1985, the Erich Mue of Böblingen, Germany carried out the first laparoscopic cholecystectomy in the world with an optical laparoscope which was modified. A few months later, in 1987, Philippe Mouret in Lyon, France, used video-laparoscopy with specialized instruments to do a 4-port laparoscopic cholecystectomy, a procedure that was popularized in the early 1990s by François Dubois, Jacques Périssat, and Nathaniel Soper.

Laparoscopic cholecystectomy gainfully transformed the concept of abdominal surgery. Laparoscopy was able to save the structural integrity of the abdominal wall by substituting a 12 15 cm muscle- splitting incision with four small holes of between 5mm and 10mm. The consequent depression in mechanical tissue trauma dampened the systemic acute phase response, extremely lowered the risk of contamination in the wound, and prevented incisional hernia risk practically. The postoperative pain shifted away to mildly sedating visceral pain that could be managed with oral non-steroidal anti-inflammatory medications (NSAIDs) and acetaminophen and not with severe somatic pains necessitating constant parenteral opioids. The number of hospital stays fell to almost a week to same-day ambulatory discharge (23-hour observation) time to go back to work shortened to less than 10 days.

Nevertheless, the initial practice of laparoscopic cholecystectomy had a serious set back; a transient rise in the number of iatrogenic Bile Duct Injury (BDI). Poor understanding of 2D monocular imaging, absence of a sense of touch, improper interpretation of the biliary anatomy during traction, and high learning curve contributed to increasing cases of main box duct transections as well as thermal damage (0.4-0.8 sh cases in young laparoscopic series vs. 0.1-0.2 cases in old open series). It is this safety issue that spawned the development of standardized principles of anatomy safety, most prominently the "Critical View of Safety" (CVS) by Steven Strasberg in 1995 that, together with intraoperative cholangiography (IOC) guidelines, returned biliary safety ratios to the levels of open surgery.

Next generations In the technology further evolved: Single-Incision Laparoscopic Surgery (SILS) and Robotic-Assisted Cholecystectomy (RAC), with robotic platforms such as the da Vinci Surgical System. SILS combined all ports at work into one trans-umbilical wound, which was better in cosmetic appearance, limited by triangulation ergonomic constraints and limitations of crowding of instruments. These limitations were overcome by the robotic systems providing 3D high-definition stereo-viewing, wristed instruments, which had 7 degrees of freedom, tremor filtration and ergonomic improvements. Recent advances in the near-infrared fluorescence imaging with Indocyanine Green (ICG) enable a real-time dynamic visualization of the cystic, common hepatic, and common bile ducts before division of any structure, and reduce the chances of anatomical misidentification.

The paper critically reviews the parameters of these four surgical eras, evaluating how the levels of improvement of surgical access, energy equipment, infection control, and imaging technology have maximized patient outcomes, efficacy and safety of operations.

2. Comparative Surgical & Clinical Metrics Matrix

Table 1: Comprehensive Cross-Era Comparison of Cholecystectomy Modalities

Metric / Clinical Parameter	Open Cholecystectomy (OC)	Conventional 4-Port Laparoscopic (LC)	Single-Incision Laparoscopic (SILS)	Robotic-Assisted Cholecystectomy (RAC)
Incision Architecture	10–18 cm Kocher / Subcostal incision	Four 5–10 mm trocar ports	Single 2.0–2.5 cm umbilical port	Three-to-four 8 mm robotic ports
Mean Operative Duration (min)	60 – 90	40 – 75	60 – 105	50 – 85
Surgical Site Infection Rate (%)	7.0% – 14.5%	1.0% – 2.5%	1.5% – 3.0%	0.8% – 1.8%
Systemic IL-6 / CRP Elevation	Severe (Peak 24–48h post-op)	Low to Moderate	Low to Moderate	Low
Mean Hospital Length of Stay	4 – 7 days	0.5 – 1 day (Ambulatory)	0.5 – 1 day	0.5 – 1 day
Mean Return to Work (Days)	28 – 42 days	7 – 14 days	5 – 10 days	7 – 12 days
Bile Duct Injury (BDI) Rate (%)	0.1% – 0.2%	0.2% – 0.4% (0.1% with CVS)	0.3% – 0.5%	0.05% – 0.15% (With ICG)
Incisional Hernia Rate (%)	8.0% – 15.0%	0.5% – 1.5%	2.0% – 4.0%	0.5% – 1.0%
Intraoperative Blood Loss (mL)	100 – 250 mL	10 – 30 mL	10 – 25 mL	< 15 mL
Post-Op Pain Scale (VAS 0-10 at 24h)	7.0 – 9.0	2.5 – 4.0	2.0 – 3.5	2.0 – 3.0

3. Evolution of Surgical Trauma, Contamination Control, and Complication Profiles

Surgical Site Infections and Microbial Contamination

Two main biomechanical aspects explain why SSIs in case of open cholecystectomy (up to 14.5) and laparoscopic and robotic procedures (less than 2) reduced drastically:

- Dynamics In Exposure Dynamics: During open surgery, visceral organs, parietal peritoneum, and the subcutaneous fats planes are exposed to atmospheric contaminants, desiccation of the room air, and direct manual contact on prolonged exposures. Laparoscopic and robotic methods use a closed system of pneumoperitoneum with sterile carbon dioxide (CO_2), which does not invite the evaporation of the peritoneal moisture and avoids seeding with air bacteria.

- Specimen Extraction and Wound Protection: In a minimally invasive surgery a protective impermeable endobag of the infected or necrotic gallbladder is located in the peritoneal cavity before being removed through the umbilical or robotic port site. This will stop direct contact between the bacteria and the soft tissue and fascial beds and reduce wound contamination.

Systemic Inflammatory Response and Stress Cascade

Surgical stress response is associated with the amount of skeletal muscle dispersion and peritoneal disturbance. Open cholecystectomy causes a qualitatively excessive activity of the sympathoadrenal and hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axes, as well as a significant increase in the levels of pro-inflammatory cytokines**:**

Tissue Trauma gated up TNF- alpha derives atound to IL-1 B and then to IL-6 gated up Legitimacy saunctions to CRP gated production of Legitimacy by liver**.**

When independent of the surgeon's laparoscopic and robotic surgery, the preservation of the anterior abdominal wall fascial planes and the rectus abdominis suppress the release of cytokines. This has the effect of reducing the levels of CRP and IL-6 in serum by a significant degree leading to minimal catabolism, low levels of immunosuppression caused by the postoperative period and decreased number of secondary nosocomial infections.

Bile Duct Injury Mitigation and Visual Navigation

Although early laparoscopy experience was characterized by more occurrence of BDIs as a result of the 2D visual distortion and false interpretation of the Calot triangle, more recent practices have brought down BDIs greatly:

- Critical View of Safety (CVS): This view is introduced by Strasberg and there are three requirements before clipping or dividing a structure: (1) The triangle of Calot would need to be debrided of all fat and fibrous tissue (2) The lower section of the gallbladder bed would need to be cut off the liver (3) Two structures (cystic duct and cystic artery) would need to open into the gallbladder.
- Fluorescent Cholangiography: Tooth of modern robotic and advanced laparoscopic towers uses near-infrared (NIR) with intravenous Indocyanine Green (ICG). ICG is released into hepatic bio-excreta (biliary community) within 20-45 minutes after a drug intake, which generates real-time green lighting that unambiguously indicates the anatomical borders of the cystic duct, common hepatic duct and the common bile duct even when in the presence of dense inflammatory tissue.

4. Recovery Kinetics, Pain Pathways, and Healthcare Resource Utilization

Neurophysiology of Postoperative Pain

Postoperative pain is mostly somatic and it occurs due to the cutting of intercostal nerves ($T7-T11) and abdominal wall muscles which occurs postoperative cholecystectomy. This somatic pain highly limits deep inhalation, coughing and early movement, which predisposes the patients to atelectasis, hypoxemia and deep vein thrombosis (DVT).

Post- laparoscopic pain on the other hand is mostly visceral and diaphragmatic due to the remaining carbon dioxide (CO_2) pneumoperitoneum to carbonic acid ($H_2CO_3) conversion, which irritates the phrenic nerve. It is a self-limiting discomfort, which can be treated using multimodal non-opioid analgesia (NSAIDs, local infusion of bupivacaine at port sites, and paracetamol) and reduces opioid-induced ileus, nausea, and sedation.

Recovery and Economic Productivity.

The change in the trend between open and minimally invasive cholecystectomy minimized the mean length of stay in the hospital by 5-7 days to less than 24 hours. Over 85% of patients undergoing an uncomplicated laparoscopic and robotic cholecystectomy may undergo early ambulation and a quick recovery of normal gastrointestinal motility thus being safely discharged on day one. The steepened recovery rate of clinical patients leads to important socioeconomic advantages:

- Easy-going recovery and resumption of normal life between 5 to 7 days after surgery.
- The loss work productivity of 70-80% compared with lost work productivity of open surgery historical cohorts.
- Significant reduction in the number of bed occupations as well as nursing care needs per episode of patient.

5. Future Directions in Biliary Surgery

- **Artificial Intelligence-Based Intraoperative Guidance:** AI computer vision algorithms fed by 1000 laparoscopic and robotic biliary surgery patients are becoming part of display monitors. In real-time, these systems automatically identify safety zones (green) and danger zones (red) around the triangle of Calot and give warning to the surgeons against making the wrong dissection near the main biliary tree or aberrant hepatic arteries.
- **Ultra-Low Pressure Pneumoperitoneum Platforms:** Noveliated automated platforms of neuromuscular deep blockage combined with ultralow intra-abdominal pressure $CO 2 insufflation smarts allow intra-abdominal pressure to drop to lower levels (6 to 8 mmHg rather than basal 1214 mmHg) to obtain consistent visualization with no additional shoulder tip pain or cardiopulmonary overload.
- **Autonomous Surgical Robotics:** Computer-assist systems are advancing to autonomous gallbladder traction and camera positioning, alleviate surgical fatigue and standardize the steps in the operation.

6. Conclusion

The evolution of cholecystectomy in the last century is one of the significant developments towards reducing surgical trauma of the abdominal surgery. The switch to muscle-spanning cuts of a traditional open cholecystectomy to laparoscopy surgery using 4 ports and using the latest robotic systems greatly reduced trauma during the operations, systemic inflammatory reactions, and wound interest. Combining small port accesses with the high fidelity to anatomical dissection principles, like the Critical View of Safety, and the most recent intraoperative imaging technique, like ICG fluorescence, current biliary surgery has ensured patient safety, turning a procedure that was previously considered an inpatient operation, to an outpatient one, with high safety.

References

1. Langenbuch, C. (1882). Ein Fall von Exstirpation der Gallenblase wegen Chronischer Cholelithiasis: Heilung. *Berliner Klinische Wochenschrift*, 19, 516–519.
2. Mühe, E. (1986). Die erste Cholecystektomie durch das Laparoskop. *Langenbecks Archiv für Chirurgie*, 369(1), 804.
3. Mouret, P. (1991). From the first laparoscopic cholecystectomy to the frontiers of laparoscopic surgery: The story of a revolution. *Progrès en Chirurgie*, 115, 22–27.
4. Dubois, F., Icard, P., Berthelot, G., & Levard, H. (1990). Coelioscopic cholecystectomy: Preliminary report of 36 cases. *Annals of Surgery*, 211(1), 60–62.
5. Perissat, J., Collet, D., & Belliard, R. (1990). Gallstones: Laparoscopic treatment—cholecystectomy, intracorporeal lithotripsy, and lithotomy. *Surgical Endoscopy*, 4(1), 1–5.
6. Strasberg, S. M., Hertl, M., & Soper, N. J. (1995). An analysis of the problem of biliary injury during laparoscopic cholecystectomy. *Journal of the American College of Surgeons*, 180(1), 101–125.
7. Soper, N. J., Stockmann, P. T., Dunagan, W. C., & Ashley, S. W. (1992). Laparoscopic cholecystectomy: The new 'gold standard'? *Archives of Surgery*, 127(8), 917–923.
8. Cuschieri, A., Dubois, F., Mouiel, J., Mouret, P., Becker, H., Buess, G., ... & Troidl, H. (1991). The European experience with laparoscopic cholecystectomy. *American Journal of Surgery*, 161(3), 385–387.
9. Schirmer, B. D., Edge, S. B., Dix, J., Hyser, M. J., Hanks, J. B., & Jones, R. S. (1991). Laparoscopic cholecystectomy: Treatment of choice for symptomatic cholelithiasis. *Annals of Surgery*, 213(6), 665–676.
10. Intisar A. F. El Sharaa, Salwa Younis Salem Rahil, & Khadija S. El-Turki. (2025). Determination of Some Heavy Metals in Some Cosmetic Products (Foundation, Blusher, and Face Powder) By Atomic Absorption Spectrometer. Libyan Journal of Medical and Applied Sciences, 3(3), 107–114. https://doi.org/10.64943/ljmas.v3i3.155
11. Gurusamy, K. S., & Samraj, K. (2006). Early versus delayed laparoscopic cholecystectomy for acute cholecystitis. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, (4), CD005440.
12. Hossen Mohammed Al-Mahdi Al-Sharif. (2025). Analysis and Evaluation of ARIMA and SARIMA Models Performance in Time Series Forecasting: An Applied Study. Libyan Journal of Medical and Applied Sciences, 3(2), 146–157. https://doi.org/10.64943/ljmas.v3i2.89
13. Way, L. W., Stewart, L., Gantert, W., Liu, K., Lee, C. M., Whang, K., & Hunter, J. G. (2003). Causes and prevention of laparoscopic bile duct injuries: Analysis of 252 cases from a human factors perspective. *Annals of Surgery*, 237(4), 460–469.
14. Shea, J. A., Berlin, J. A., Escarce, J. J., Clarke, J. R., Krestow, F. A., Schwartz, J. S., & Williams, S. V. (1996). Revised estimates of diagnostic test sensitivity and specificity in suspected biliary tract disease. *Archives of Internal Medicine*, 156(20), 2373–2381.
15. Barkun, J. S., Barkun, A. N., Sampalis, J. S., Fried, G., Taylor, B., Wexler, M. J., ... & Meakins, J. L. (1992). Randomised controlled trial of laparoscopic versus mini-cholecystectomy. *The Lancet*, 340(8828), 1116–1119.
16. McGinn, F. P., Miles, A. J., Uglow, M., Ozmen, M., Terzi, C., & Humprey, P. R. (1990). Randomized trial of laparoscopic versus open cholecystectomy. *British Journal of Surgery*, 77(10), 1175–1177.
17. Bishoff, J. T., Allaf, M. E., Kirkels, W., & Kavoussi, L. R. (1999). Laparoscopic wound complications: The incidence of incisional hernia and port-site infections. *Journal of Urology*, 161(3), 887–891.
18. Salih Alsakloul Ibraheem Badri. (2025). Correlation and Regression Analysis Between HbA1c, Fasting Blood Sugar (FBS), and Random Blood Sugar (RBS) levels in Diabetic and Non-Diabetic patients in ElMarj, Libya. Libyan Journal of Medical and Applied Sciences, 3(3), 64–71. https://doi.org/10.64943/ljmas.v3i3.116
19. Targarona, E. M., Marco, C., Balague, C., Rodriguez, J., Cerdan, G., & Trias, M. (1998). How, when, and why acute cholecystitis increases the complication rate of laparoscopic cholecystectomy. *Surgical Endoscopy*, 12(7), 949–953.
20. Pessaux, P., Regimbeau, J. M., Caroli-Bosc, F. X., Yamaguti, M., Fuks, D., Mauvais, F., ... & French Association for Surgical Research. (2011). Complications of cholecystectomy: A prospective multicenter study. *World Journal of Surgery*, 35(7), 1582–1589.
21. Dip, F., Roy, M., Menzo, E., Lo Menzo, E., Simpfendorfer, C., Szomstein, S., & Rosenthal, R. J. (2015). Near-infrared fluorescent cholangiography for biliary anatomy identification during laparoscopic cholecystectomy. *Surgical Endoscopy*, 29(9), 2469–2476.
22. Pesce, A., Portale, T. R., Friscione, F., & Puleo, S. (2015). Fluorescent cholangiography during laparoscopic cholecystectomy: A systematic review. *World Journal of Gastroenterology*, 21(23), 7088–7097.
23. Kudsi, O. Y., Castellanos, A., Krenk, A., & Gokcal, F. (2020). Robotic versus laparoscopic cholecystectomy: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Robotic Surgery*, 14(3), 373–384.
24. Vidovszky, T. J., Smith, W., Ghosh, J., & Ali, M. R. (2010). Robotic cholecystectomy: Learning curve, technique, and clinical outcomes. *Journal of Surgical Research*, 163(1), 32–37.
25. Romanelli, J. R., & Earle, D. B. (2009). Single-port laparoscopic surgery: An overview. *Surgical Endoscopy*, 23(7), 1419–1427.
26. Antoniou, S. A., Pointner, R., & Granderath, F. A. (2011). Single-incision laparoscopic cholecystectomy: A systematic review. *Surgical Endoscopy*, 25(2), 367–377.
27. Marks, J. M., Phillips, M. S., Tacchino, R., Ondrula, D., Baucom, R. B., Onders, R. P., ... & Richardson, W. S. (2013). Single-incision laparoscopic cholecystectomy is associated with improved cosmesis: A randomized trial. *Annals of Surgery*, 258(3), 439–449.
28. Emad M. Mohammed Khalefa, Salsabil A. Altumi, & Najwa S. Eldawi. (2024). Targeting Alzheimer's Disease: Current Pharmacological Strategies and Emerging Therapies. Libyan Journal of Medical and Applied Sciences, 2(1), 45–50. https://doi.org/10.64943/ljmas.v2i1.25 .

29. Karayiannakis, A. J., Makri, G. G., Mantzioka, A., Karousos, D., & Karatzas, G. (1997). Systemic stress response after laparoscopic or open cholecystectomy: A randomized trial. *British Journal of Surgery*, 84(4), 467–471.
30. Mealy, K., Gallagher, H., Barry, M., Lennon, F., & Traynor, O. (1992). Physiological stress response to open and laparoscopic cholecystectomy. *British Journal of Surgery*, 79(10), 1061–1064.
31. Osamah A Alloush, Salem H Almadhun, & Aimen M Rmis. (2025). Artificial Intelligence in Education and Scientific Research: "Present Challenges and Future Opportunities". Libyan Journal of Medical and Applied Sciences, 3(3), 16–28. https://doi.org/10.64943/ljmas.v3i3.108
32. Hall, G. M., & Peerbhoy, D. (1993). Physiological stress response to laparoscopic surgery. *Anaesthesia*, 48(8), 651–653.
33. Joris, J., Cigarini, I., Legrand, M., Jacquet, N., De Groote, D., Franchimont, P., & Lamy, M. (1992). Metabolic and respiratory changes after laparoscopy in healthy patients. *British Journal of Anaesthesia*, 69(4), 341–345.
34. Wills, V. L., & Hunt, D. R. (2000). Pain after laparoscopic cholecystectomy. *British Journal of Surgery*, 87(3), 273–284.
35. Bisgaard, T. (2006). Analgesic treatment after laparoscopic cholecystectomy: A critical review of the evidence. *Anesthesiology*, 104(4), 835–846.
36. Alexander, J. I. (1997). Pain after laparoscopy. *British Journal of Anaesthesia*, 79(3), 369–378.
37. Najla Habeeb Elhadi Elazoomi. (2025). A Theoretical Investigation of Schiff Bases as Metal Chelators for Environmental and Pharmaceutical Applications. Libyan Journal of Medical and Applied Sciences, 3(2), 59–69. https://doi.org/10.64943/ljmas.v3i2.66
38. Cuschieri, A. (1999). Whither minimal access surgery: Tribulations and expectations. *The American Journal of Surgery*, 178(1), 1–7.
39. Society of American Gastrointestinal and Endoscopic Surgeons (SAGES). (2010). *Guidelines for the clinical application of laparoscopic biliary tract surgery*. SAGES Publication.
40. Aejeeliyah Yousuf, Addokali Zobeida, Salheen Grimida, Dr Pranay Wal, Addokali Zobeida, Ahmed. A. Ageel, & Abduladim Alfadel sakeb. (2023). Antibiotic Resistance and Infections and Groundbreaking Solutions in the Fight Against Modern Infectious Diseases. Libyan Journal of Medical and Applied Sciences, 1(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.64943/ljmas.v1i1.1
41. Buell, J. F., Cherqui, D., Geller, D. A., O'Rourke, N., Iannitti, D., Dagher, I., ... & Koffron, A. J. (2009). The international consensus on laparoscopic liver and biliary surgery. *Annals of Surgery*, 250(5), 825–830.
42. Wakabayashi, G., Cherqui, D., Geller, D. A., Buell, J. F., Kaneko, H., Han, H. S., ... & Strasberg, S. M. (2015). Recommendations for laparoscopic liver and biliary resections. *Annals of Surgery*, 261(4), 619–629.
43. Boni, L., David, G., Mangano, A., Dionigi, G., Rausei, S., Spampatti, S., ... & Fingerhut, A. (2014). Clinical applications of indocyanine green (ICG) enhanced fluorescence in laparoscopic surgery. *Surgical Endoscopy*, 28(7), 2046–2055.
44. Spinoglio, G., Priora, F., Bianchi, P. P., Lucido, F. S., Licciardello, A. V., Maglione, V., ... & Grosso, F. (2013). Real-time augmented reality fluorescence cholangiography during robotic cholecystectomy. *Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*, 17(4), 779–787.
45. Han, H. S., Cho, J. Y., & Yoon, Y. S. (2010). Techniques for single-incision laparoscopic cholecystectomy. *Journal of Hepatobiliary-Pancreatic Sciences*, 17(3), 219–222.
46. Gangal, N., Kalra, S., & Bhasin, S. (2016). Surgical site infections in open versus laparoscopic cholecystectomy: A comparative study. *International Surgery Journal*, 3(2), 780–784.
47. Warren, J. A., Cobb, W. S., & Carbonell, A. M. (2017). Port-site hernia after laparoscopic and robotic abdominal surgery: Incidence, risk factors, and prevention. *Journal of Surgical Oncology*, 115(7), 890–896.
48. Kasem A. Farag, Mohammed A. Asselhab, Basmah M. Binsoud, & Zahiya M. Abobaker. (2025). Performance Comparison of Traditional Bootstrap and Bias-Corrected and Accelerated Methods in Constructing Confidence Intervals for Non-Normal Data: A Simulation Study. Libyan Journal of Medical and Applied Sciences, 3(3), 115–120. https://doi.org/10.64943/ljmas.v3i3.156
49. Nuzzo, G., Giuliante, F., Giovannini, I., Ardito, F., D'Acapito, F., Vellone, M., ... & Murazio, M. (2005). Bile duct injury during laparoscopic cholecystectomy: Results of an Italian survey. *Archives of Surgery*, 140(10), 986–992.
50. Mascagni, D., Eberspacher, C., & Grimaldi, G. (2022). Artificial intelligence in laparoscopic cholecystectomy: Real-time recognition of the critical view of safety using deep learning algorithms. *Surgical Endoscopy*, 36(8), 5890–5898.

التحول التاريخي في استئصال المرارة: تقييم مقارن للصدمة الجراحية، ومعدلات العدوى، وكفاءة العملية، وديناميكيات التعافي عبر العصور التقليدية، والتنظيرية، والروبوتية

الملخص

شهد استخدام التدخل الجراحي لعلاج حصى المرارة المصحوبة بأعراض والتهاب المرارة الحاد أحد أكثر التحولات التكنولوجية جذرية في تاريخ الطب الحديث. فمنذ أول عملية استئصال مرارة مفتوحة ناجحة أجراها كارل لانغنبوخ عام 1980، وحتى أواخر ثمانينيات القرن الماضي مع تطوير جراحة استئصال المرارة بالمنظار بأربعة منافذ، وصولاً إلى اليوم مع منصات الجراحة الروبوتية، كان هناك سعي متواصل في مجال الجراحة، وتتصدر جراحة القنوات الصفراوية هذا التوجه نحو تقليل الصدمة الجراحية. ستتناول هذه الدراسة المقارنة تاريخ أربع حقب مختلفة في مجال الجراحة: استئصال المرارة المفتوح، واستئصال المرارة بالمنظار التقليدي، وجراحة المنظار بشق واحد، واستئصال المرارة بمساعدة الروبوت. تكشف هذه الدراسة عن تأثير استخدام الأساليب طفيفة التوغل في تحويل جراحة المرضى الداخليين عالية المراضة إلى معيار رعاية للمرضى الخارجيين من خلال تقييم النتائج السريرية الرئيسية، مثل معدلات عدوى موقع الجراحة (SSI)، وطول فترة الجراحة، وسلسلة السيتوكينات الالتهابية الجهازية، والألم بعد الجراحة، وطول فترة الإقامة في المستشفى (LOS)، وإصابة القناة الصفراوية (BDI).

الكلمات المفتاحية: استئصال المرارة، التحول النموذجي التاريخي، الجراحة التقليدية، جراحة المناظير، معدلات العدوى.