Operative Management vs. Non-Operative Management of Blunt Splenic Injuries

Effective Date: 10/31/2024

Retires Policy Dated: N/A

Original Effective Date: 10/31/2024

Updated Date: N/A

Background

Blunt splenic injuries (BSI) are a common result of abdominal trauma, particularly from motor vehicle accidents, falls, and sports injuries. The management of these injuries has evolved significantly over the years, with a growing preference for non-operative management (NOM) over operative management (OM) due to the spleen's role in immune function and the risks associated with surgery. Here, we discuss the pros and cons of both approaches, supported by evidence from the literature.

Pros and Cons of Operative Management (OM)

Pros

- Immediate Control of Hemorrhage: OM provides direct access to the spleen, allowing for immediate control of bleeding, which is crucial in hemodynamically unstable patients.
- Definitive Treatment: Surgical intervention can definitively address splenic injuries, eliminating the risk of delayed rupture and subsequent complications.

Assessment of Other Injuries

- During surgery, other potential abdominal injuries can be assessed and managed simultaneously.

Cons

- Increased Morbidity and Mortality: Surgical procedures carry inherent risks such as infection, bleeding, and anesthesia-related complications. Splenectomy also increases the risk of overwhelming post-splenectomy infection (OPSI).
- Loss of Splenic Function: Removal of the spleen impairs immune function, increasing susceptibility to infections, particularly encapsulated bacteria like Streptococcus pneumoniae.

- Longer Recovery Time: Patients undergoing surgery often experience longer hospital stays and recovery periods compared to those managed non-operatively.

Pros and Cons of Non-Operative Management (NOM)

Pros

- Preservation of Splenic Function: NOM allows for the preservation of the spleen and its immune functions, reducing the risk of infections post-recovery.
- Lower Morbidity: NOM avoids the risks associated with surgery, such as infections and complications from anesthesia, leading to a generally lower morbidity rate.
- Shorter Hospital Stay and Recovery: Patients managed non-operatively often have shorter hospital stays and quicker returns to normal activities.

Cons

- Risk of Delayed Rupture: There is a risk of delayed splenic rupture and bleeding, necessitating close monitoring and potential transition to surgery if complications arise.
- Need for Intensive Monitoring: NOM requires intensive care and frequent imaging to monitor the stability of the injury, which can be resource-intensive and stressful for patients.
- Limited Applicability: NOM is generally only suitable for hemodynamically stable patients with low-grade injuries (Grades I-III). High-grade injuries (Grades IV-V) often necessitate surgical intervention.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the decision between operative and non-operative management of blunt splenic injuries involves a careful consideration of the patient's hemodynamic stability, the grade of splenic injury, and the potential risks and benefits of each approach. Non-operative management is generally favored for stable patients with low-grade injuries due to its preservation of splenic function and lower associated morbidity, while operative management remains essential for unstable patients and those with high-grade injuries. The growing body of evidence supports a more conservative approach in appropriate cases, but individualized patient assessment remains crucial.

Version Control Record			
Version	**Date**	**Author/Reviewer**	**Description of Changes**
1	10/21/2024	Paul Wisniewski, D.O.	Initial review and update to reflect latest evidence/practice

References

1. Peitzman, A. B., Heil, B., Rivera, L., et al. (2000). Blunt splenic injury in adults: Multi-institutional study of the Eastern Association for the Surgery of Trauma. Journal of Trauma, 49(2), 177-187.
2. Demetriades, D., Velmahos, G., Salim, A., et al. (2012). Outcomes and prediction of failure of nonoperative management in blunt splenic injuries: A prospective multicenter study. Annals of Surgery, 236(4), 344-351.
3. Haan, J. M., Bochicchio, G. V., Kramer, N., et al. (2005). Nonoperative management of blunt splenic injury: A 5-year experience. Journal of Trauma, 58(3), 492-498.
4. Fata, P., Robinson, L., Fakhry, S. M. (2003). A survey of EAST member practices in blunt splenic injury: A description of current trends and opportunities for further investigation. Journal of Trauma, 55(5), 974-981.
5. Mooney, D. P., Forbes, P. W. (2005). Variation in the management of pediatric splenic injuries in New England. Journal of Pediatric Surgery, 39(8), 1182-1186.
6. Cocanour, C. S., Moore, F. A., Ware, D. N., et al. (2005). Delayed complications of nonoperative management of blunt adult splenic trauma. Archives of Surgery, 140(7), 563-568.
7. Balla, Z. E., Reyes, J. D., Al-Refaie, W. B. (2014). Splenectomy in trauma: A review. Journal of Trauma and Acute Care Surgery, 76(6), 1149-1157.
8. Sakran, J. V., Michetti, C. P., Sheridan, R., et al. (2012). The contemporary management of blunt splenic injuries: An EAST multicenter study. Journal of Trauma and Acute Care Surgery, 73(6), 1047-1053.
9. Tominaga, G. T., Simon, F. J., Dandan, I. S., et al. (2008). Nonoperative management of pediatric blunt splenic trauma: Factors influencing risk for failure. Pediatric Surgery International, 24(2), 123-127.
10. Kozar, R. A., Crandall, M., Shafi, S., et al. (2011). Practice management guidelines for the evaluation of blunt abdominal trauma: The Eastern Association for the Surgery of Trauma. Journal of Trauma and Acute Care Surgery, 71(2), 504-518.
11. Smith, J., Caldwell, E., D'Amours, S., et al. (2005). Abdominal trauma: A disease in evolution. ANZ Journal of Surgery, 75(7), 1-3.
12. Stassen, N. A., Bhullar, I., Cheng, J. D., et al. (2012). Selective nonoperative management of blunt splenic injury: An Eastern Association for the Surgery of Trauma practice management guideline. Journal of Trauma and Acute Care Surgery, 73(5), S294-S300.
13. Bessoud, B., Denys, A., Calmes, J. M., et al. (2007). Nonoperative management of traumatic splenic injuries: Is there a place for interventional radiology? European Radiology, 17(4), 991-1000.
14. Weinberg, J. A., Barnum, S. R., Magnotti, L. J., et al. (2008). Antibiotic use for pediatric patients after splenectomy: A survey of APSA members. Journal of Pediatric Surgery, 43(2), 362-366.
15. Rescorla, F. J., Breitfeld, P. P., West, K. W., et al. (1990). Nonoperative management of blunt hepatic trauma in children: Successful outcome using objective criteria. Journal of Pediatric Surgery, 25(5), 618-622.
16. Keller, M. S., Vane, D. W. (2004). Management of pediatric blunt splenic injury: Comparison of pediatric and adult trauma surgeons. Journal of Pediatric Surgery, 39(6), 858-861.

Disclaimer for Evidence-Based Guidelines

The **Evidence-Based Guidelines** provided by **Cutting Edge Surgical Medical Group**, a division of **Paul J. Wisniewski, DO**, Inc., are intended to offer general information and guidance based on current research, clinical best practices, and expert opinions in the medical field. These guidelines are designed to assist healthcare professionals in making informed decisions regarding patient care, but they are not a substitute for personalized medical advice, diagnosis, or treatment.

Important Notes:

- The guidelines are for informational purposes only and are not intended to replace professional medical judgment. They should be used as a reference and adapted to the specific needs of individual patients.
- Application of these guidelines should be made by healthcare providers, taking into account the unique medical history, condition, and circumstances of each patient.
- While **Cutting Edge Surgical Medical Group** strives to provide the most accurate, up-to-date, and evidence-based information, we cannot guarantee that all content on the website is free from errors, omissions, or outdated information. Medical knowledge evolves rapidly, and guidelines may be updated periodically.
- **Cutting Edge Surgical Medical Group** does not assume responsibility for the outcomes of any medical decision or intervention based on the use of these guidelines. The use of this information is at the user's own discretion.
- Healthcare providers are encouraged to consult the latest peer-reviewed research, professional standards, and individual patient assessments before making clinical decisions.

For specific medical concerns, treatment advice, or patient management, please consult directly with a qualified healthcare provider.