Article type: observational cohort study

Retrospective cohort analysis of current trends in the surgical management of congenital diaphragmatic eventration in children.

Khalid Alzahrani[1], M.D., Lymeymey Heng[1], M.D., Naziha Khen-Dunlop[2],M.D., Ph.D., Nicoleta Panait[3], M.D., Erik Hervieux[4],M.D., Lucie Grynberg[5], M.D., Olivier Abbo[6], M.D., Ph.D., Frédéric Hameury[7], M.D., Frédéric Lavrand[8], M.D., Ph.D., Olivier Maillet[9], M.D., Aurore Haffreingue[10], M.D., Anne Lehn[11], M.D., Stephan De Napoli Cocci[12], M.D., Edouard Habonimana[13], M.D., Jean-Luc Michel[14], M.D., Ph.D., Louise Montalva[15], M.D., Quentin Ballouhey[16], M.D., Ph.D., Arnaud Fotso Kamdem[17], M.D., Jean-François Lecompte[18], M.D., Antoine Liné[19], M.D., Anna Poupalou[20], M.D., Pierre Meignan[21], M.D., Loren Deslandes[22], M.D., Guillaume Podevin[1], M.D., Ph.D., Françoise Schmitt[1], M.D., Ph.D.

[1] Pediatric Surgery Unit, Federation of Pediatrics, University Hospital Center, Angers, France
[2] Pediatric Surgery Department, Hôpital Necker-Sick Children, AP-HP, Paris, France
[3] Pediatric Surgery Department, AP-HM, Marseille, France
[4] Pediatric Surgery Department, Trousseau Hospital, AP-HP, Paris, France
[5] Pediatric Surgery Department, University Hospital Center, Rouen, France
[6] Pediatric Surgery Department, University Hospital Center, Toulouse, France
[7] Pediatric Surgery Department, Hospices civils de Lyon, Bron, France
[8] Pediatric Surgery Department, University Hospital Center, Bordeaux, France
[9] Pediatric Surgery Department, University Hospital Center, Montpellier, France
[10] Pediatric Surgery Department, University Hospital Center, Caen, France
[11] Pediatric Surgery Department, Regional University Hospital Center, Strasbourg, France
[12] Pediatric Surgery Department, University Hospital Center, Nantes, France
[13] Pediatric Surgery Department, South Hospital, University Hospital Center, Rennes, France
[14] Pediatric Surgery Department Nord, University Hospital Center -Réunion, Saint-Denis, France
[15] Pediatric Surgery Department, Robert Debré Hospital, AP-HP, Paris, France
[16] Pediatric Surgery Department, University Hospital Center, Limoges, France
[17] Pediatric Surgery Department, University Hospital Center, Besançon, France
[18] Pediatric Surgery Department, University Hospital Center - Lenval, Nice, France
[19] Pediatric Surgery Department, University Hospital Center, Reims, France
[20] Pediatric Surgery Department, HUDERF, Bruxelles, Belgique
[21] Pediatric Surgery Department, University Hospital Center, Tours, France
[22] Pediatric Surgery Department, University Hospital Center, Clermont-Ferrand, France

Corresponding author:

Françoise Schmitt, MD, PhD

Pediatric Surgery Department, University Hospital of Angers

4, Rue Larrey; 49933 ANGERS cedex 9, FRANCE

Tel:+33.2.41.35.42.90

Fax: +33.2.41.35.36.76

Mail: FrSchmitt@chu-angers.fr

Financial support disclosure: This research received no specific grants from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Declarations of interest: None.

Abstract

Background: Diaphragmatic plication is the most widely used surgical approach for treating congenital diaphragmatic eventration (CDE) in children. This study aims to assess current surgical practice for this pathology in children.

Methods: Retrospective data analysis of a multicentric cohort of pediatric patients operated on for CDE between 2010 and 2021. Comparative description of the different surgical approaches and their outcomes, including robot-assisted thoracoscopic surgery (RATS). (Clinical Trials NCT04862494).

Results: 112 patients, aged 12 [5 – 21] months, were operated on for CDE. Diaphragmatic plication was performed using thoracoscopy or RATS in 69 (62%) cases, postero-lateral thoracotomy (PLT) in 15 (13%), and using an abdominal approach in 28 (25%). Relief of symptoms and improvement in the diaphragmatic level on chest radiographs were obtained in 88% and 90% of the cases, respectively. We recorded 32 peri- or early postoperative complications (29%) and eight recurrences of eventration (7%), but found no correlation between these complications and the surgical approach used. Compared to other approaches, PLT multiplied the duration of intravenous analgesia by three (96 vs 36h, $p<0.0001$), and the length of hospital stay by two (8 vs 4d, $p = 0.002$). Compared to thoracoscopy, RATS provided more perioperative hepatic injuries and equivalent short-term results, but all five patients remained symptomatic and two of them experienced chest wall deformities in long-term follow-up.

Conclusions: Diaphragmatic plication via a minimally invasive thoracic approach may be the best treatment option for cases of symptomatic CDE. RATS emerges as a promising surgical approach, but further is required to confirm that it is, at least, not inferior to thoracoscopy.

Keywords: congenital diaphragmatic eventration, diaphragmatic plication, thoracoscopic plication, mini-invasive surgery, robot-assisted thoracoscopy.

1. Introduction

Congenital diaphragmatic eventration (CDE) is a rare diaphragmatic malformation affecting about five out of every 10,000 live births [1], leading to an ascent of the diaphragmatic dome in the chest and to a paradoxical motion of the diaphragm. Most patients present with pulmonary and/or digestive symptoms and are often treated by a surgical diaphragmatic plication [2–4]. Until recently, a left transverse laparotomy had been recommended for left-sided CDE and a postero-lateral thoracotomy for right-sided procedures [5], both with good results in the short and long terms [1]. But the development of mini-invasive surgical approaches (e.g., video-assisted surgery, robotic surgery) has improved surgical recovery [6] without negatively impacting long-term outcomes, which are usually described as excellent [1,6,7].

The main goal of this study was to provide an overview of current practices in the surgical management of CDE. Our secondary objectives were to establish which surgical approach is the best surgical for CDE and to explore the immediate and long-term outcomes and complications of these.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Subjects

Data were extracted from a retrospective multicenter cohort study on CDE management conducted in 22 French and Belgian pediatric surgery departments between January 1, 2010, and August 31, 2021 [8]. We included all patients under the age of 16 who had undergone operations for CDE. Patients with diaphragmatic hernia and diaphragmatic eventration secondary to surgery, obstetrical trauma, or oncological causes were excluded from analysis, as were all patients whose representatives were opposed to their participation in this study. Our research was conducted in accordance with the principles of the Declaration

of Helsinki, obtained the agreement of our local ethics committee (n°2021-013) and of the French National Commission on Informatics and Liberty CNIL (Commission Nationale de l'Informatique et des Libertés, authorization ar21-001v0), and has been registered in ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT04862494).

Data recorded from medical charts included preoperative demographic and clinical symptoms at diagnosis and results from medical imaging studies on thoracic radiographs, CT scans, and MRIs when available. Perioperative data included the surgical approach, type of repair, material used, and the occurrence of complications, as well as early postoperative events. Clinical outcomes were assessed on postoperative recovery or the persistence of symptoms on the radiographic level of the diaphragmatic dome, and, on the occurrence of complications, the need for re-intervention or hospital stays.

2.2. Outcome measures

The primary outcome was to describe current standards of surgical care for CDE patients.

Secondary outcomes were to compare the different surgical approaches, classified as abdominal repair (open or laparoscopic), postero-lateral thoracotomy (PLT), and thoracic mini-invasive thoracoscopic surgery (MITS, including thoracoscopy and robot-assisted thoracic surgery) and to provide the initial results of a few cases of robotic surgery for CDE.

2.3. Statistical methodology

Statistical analysis was performed using GraphPad Prism 8.0.2 and IBM-SPSS 29.0.0.0 for Windows. All tests were 2-sided and the statistical level for significance was set at $p < 0.05$. Patients' characteristics were described as median with interquartiles for continuous variables, and as percentages for qualitative variables. Two-by-two comparative

analysis of quantitative variables was performed using the non-parametric Mann-Whitney test after failing to pass a Shapiro-Wilk normality test and of qualitative variables with the Fisher's exact test. Comparisons between multiple groups were made using the Kruskall-Wallis test for quantitative data and a Pearson's Chi^2 test for qualitative variables. Association analysis was performed on potentially relevant variables (p-value under 0.20 on bivariate analysis) using logistic regression, with a backward stepwise likelihood-ratio test, on the software. Data were then expressed as odds ratios (OR) with 95% confidence intervals.

3. Results

3.1. Description of the patients

During the 12-year recruitment period, 112 patients underwent surgical treatment for CDE in the 22 pediatric surgery departments that participated in this study. The median age at diagnosis was eight [1 – 16] months with extremes going from antenatal diagnosis to 15.8 years, and 34 patients were diagnosed after 12 months (30.4%). Seventy-six (67.9%) of them were boys and CDE was right-sided in 73 (64.6%) cases. Eighty-one patients (72.3%) were symptomatic, with respiratory issues in 76 (67.9%) cases, gastro-intestinal symptoms in 15 (13.4%) cases, and orthopedic abnormalities in nine (8.8%) cases. On chest radiographs, the diaphragmatic dome was at a median 6th rib level [5 – 7]. Imaging was completed by CT scan for 64 (57.1%) patients and by MRI for 10 (8.9%) patients, showing an inferior pulmonary lobe atelectasis in 29 cases (39.2%), 2 or 3-lobe atelectasia in four cases (5.4%), cardiac deviation in three cases (4.1%), and an associated pulmonary malformation in two cases (2.7%).

3.2. Description of surgical techniques

The median delay before surgery was 35 [5 – 120] days. A diaphragmatic plication was realized in 105 out of 112 patients (93.8%), consisting of a central plication as described by Patrini *et al.* [9] in 82 (73.2%) cases and a flag plication [3] in 23 (20.5%) patients; seven patients (6.3%) had a resection of the central fibrous part of the cupola and a plasty of the diaphragmatic muscle. Non-absorbable sutures were used in 99 (88.4%) patients, absorbable sutures in seven (6.3%), staples and prosthesis in two (1.8%) patients each. Plication was performed abdominally in 28 (25.0%) patients, including 12 (10.7%) laparotomies and 16 (14.3%) laparoscopies, and using a thoracic approach in the remaining 84 patients, comprising 15 (13.4%) postero-lateral thoracotomies (PLT), 64 (57.1%) video-assisted thoracoscopies (VATS) and five (4.5%) robot-assisted thoracoscopies (RATS) (Fig. 1). There was no correlation between the surgical approach and the plication technique or the material used for the intervention (Suppl. data, tables 1 - 3).

3.3. Comparative analysis of surgical approaches and outcomes

Analysis of preoperative data (Table 1) showed that the median age at diagnosis was not different between the three groups of patients divided according to surgical approach (abdominal approach, PLT, and MITS). It also showed that there was no late diagnosis in the PLT group, in contrast to a rate of over 30% in the other groups. Patients operated on using PLT only presented right-sided CDE and none of them suffered from digestive or orthopedic problems. There was no difference between the three groups with regard to the proportion of symptomatic patients, but patients with digestive symptoms were three times more likely to be operated on using an abdominal approach than a thoracic approach. Furthermore, patients who had been treated using an abdominal approach had half as many respiratory symptoms as those who had undergone a thoracotomy. The level of the diaphragmatic dome and the side of

the CDE did not appear to be a factor in the choice of the surgical approach, nor did the patient's age at the time of surgery or the first or second intention surgery. On multivariate analysis, none of these factors was found to predispose patients to one specific surgical approach (Suppl. data, tables 4 - 6).

Peri- and 30-day postoperative complication rates and types did not differ between groups (Table 2), but the duration of intravenous analgesia was three to four times longer in the PLT group (96 hours, versus 24 after abdominal approach and 36 after MITS, p = 0.0003), and its median 8-day hospital stay was longer than after MITS (4 days, p = 0.0007). With a median follow-up of more than two years, there was no difference between groups concerning the persistence of symptoms or complication rates. Among the thoracic approach groups, nine patients (10.7%) underwent another surgery, consisting in an iterative plication for one patient in the PLT group and seven repeated plications or acquired diaphragmatic hernia cures and one hiatal hernia repair in the MITS group. No pre- or perioperative factor was predictive for the risk of recurrence on bi- and multivariate analysis (Suppl. data, table 7). On chest radiographs, the level of the cupola was improved by 3.5 costal height in the PLT group, higher than the two-point improvement on the other groups (p = 0.043), and there were no pulmonary or orthopedic abnormalities.

3.4. Robot-assisted thoracoscopic plication

Five patients, aged from three to120 months (median 29 [11.5 – 76.5]) at surgery, underwent RATS for CDE. Their preoperative characteristics did not differ from those of the 64 other patients operated on by VATS (Table 3). Indication to surgery was respiratory and/or digestive symptoms for three of them, an associated pulmonary sequestration for one, and an important elevation of the cupola (4th rib) for the last one. Compared to VATS patients, diaphragmatic plication was the procedure that was performed the most (four patients) and

resection-suturing of the diaphragm for the last case, but the perioperative use of absorbable suture was higher in the RATS group (40 versus 3%, p = 0.02). The risk of perioperative complication seemed identical, but the type of complications differed, with four pulmonary/pleural injuries and a tracheal tube dislodgement in the VATS group and two hepatic injuries with RATS. Median intravenous analgesia duration and hospital stay did not differ either. There was one recurrence of eventration after RATS and seven (11%, ns) after VATS, all of which required surgery to redo the procedure. After a median 48-month survey, symptoms remained stable or appeared in all five RATS patients, while they had disappeared for 35 (56.5%) VATS patients (p = 0.02). The radiographic level of the diaphragmatic cupola was improved in 40 (87%) patients following VATS and in all RATS patients, but orthopedic deformations had appeared in four (6%) and two (40%, p = 0.06) VATS and RATS patients, respectively.

4. Discussion

With 112 patients operated on for CDE during the past 12 years, our series is one of the most important to date and allows us to provide a reliable description of current trends in surgical care. The most widely used technique was the central plication, performed in 72% of the cases, followed by the “flag plication” technique in 20%. Excision-suturing of the cupola was only performed in few cases, maybe linked to the perioperative difficulty of accurately distinguishing between CDE with a congenital diaphragmatic hernia and a hernia sac. Furthermore, non-absorbable sutures were privileged to other closing means. On the whole, no difference in terms of efficiency or complications, including recurrence of diaphragmatic eventration, was found between the two plication techniques. Very few studies have addressed this topic. Bawazir *et al.*[10] compared interruptive sutures and the pleated technique in video-assisted thoracoscopy while Le Pimpec *et al.* [1] reported the flag plication

as gold standard for thoracoscopy, with a similar conclusion to ours. No study has, however, specifically examined the usefulness of absorbable or permanent materials.

Video-assisted thoracoscopy was the most frequently used surgical approach, and is now challenged by the use of RATS, for which this study presents the first national cases of diaphragmatic plication. Thoracotomy and abdominal approaches tended to be used less, but if there was a trend to favor an abdominal approach in patients with digestive symptoms, no preoperative factor has been identified that guides the surgical approach and the latter was not related to the plication technique or the material used. In our series, MITS allowed for better and faster recovery than after PLT, slashing the length of hospital stays in half and decreasing the use of IV analgesics by three. These data agree with the findings previously published by Zhao *et al.*[6] where early postoperative recovery including mechanical ventilation, chest drainage time, and hospital stay was improved after thoracoscopy. After thoracoscopy, the lowering of the diaphragmatic cupola was certainly less important than after PLT, but the clinical resolution of symptoms during follow-up was the same in both groups.

There are very little data available on robot-assisted surgery for diaphragmatic eventration. A recent study by Bin Asaf *et al.* [11] including 18 adults patients proved its feasibility using thoracic and abdominal approaches, with a systematic improvement of pulmonary function test results. Studying children specifically, Slater *et al.*[12] in 2008 and Xu *et al.* [13] in 2020 have shown on two and nine patients, respectively, that robot-assisted diaphragmatic plication was feasible; just as in our five cases, they reported the same results pertaining to the efficacy of video-assisted surgery and without any additional complications. As Lampridis *et al.* [14], they report a shorter operative time due to greater ease during suturing, and an even better recovery. In our study, perioperative complications differed

between RATS and VATS patients. There were two liver injuries with RATS, a known complication of diaphragmatic plication surgeries, which might be linked here to the absence of force feedback in robotic surgery, which causes the exact position of the hepatic dome to be underestimated. On the contrary, RATS and its 3D-improved visibility and enhanced ergonomy may help in preventing the pulmonary or pleural effusion encountered with VATS. It is worth noting that postoperative outcomes showed that more patients remained symptomatic after RATS than after VATS, with, in particular, two surgery-related chest wall abnormalities that might be linked to the larger diameter of robotic trocars.

Overall outcomes were satisfactory with 88.3% of immediate resolution of symptoms and 90% of diaphragmatic level improvement on chest radiographs. On the whole, most series describe prompt and durable improvement or resolution of symptoms after surgery in 91 to 100% of the cases [2,4,6,7,10], with 0 to 7% of incomplete repair or eventration recurrence [10,15,16], which is comparable to our 7.1% recurrence rate. Seven out of the eight recurrences of diaphragmatic eventration occurred following thoracoscopy. It may be compared to the higher recurrence rate already described after the thoracoscopic repair of congenital diaphragmatic hernia, even if all potential technical explanations do not fit the context of CDE [17,18]. Twenty-two patients (20%) experienced postoperative complications, mostly infections and pneumothorax that were medically treated, and only three were deemed to be serious (grades 3 – 4) according to the Clavien-Dindo classification [19]. Few publications specifically report on postoperative complications of diaphragmatic plication, which are close to the ones described after pulmonary surgery [3], associated with a higher risk of intra-abdominal organ injury [9]. A recent publication on RATS for diaphragmatic plication reported a similar 26.8% rate of postoperative complications [20].

The main weakness of our study is its retrospective and multicentric character, linked to the rarity of CDE, which does not allow for a prospective monocentric study design. The small size of the group does not permit us to entertain definite conclusions, particularly on the association analysis which were carried out for the purposes of gathering further information. Nevertheless, our study offers a good reflection of current surgical practices in treating CDE. It also shows technological adaptive changes in surgical approaches with the appearance of robotic surgery, which contributes to the options available to a pediatric surgeon seeking to offer the best treatment to their patients, thanks to technological innovations.

5. Conclusions

Plication for congenital diaphragmatic eventration represents an efficient means to improve pulmonary and/or digestive symptoms and to normalize the level of the diaphragm on postoperative chest radiographs. Owing to a greater level of early, postoperative recovery, mini-invasive techniques should be preferred over thoracotomy, and an abdominal approach may be favored in cases of associated digestive surgery, on bilateral forms, or when the patient's respiratory status does not allow for a thoracic approach but may expose them to a somewhat higher risk of recurrence. Robot-assisted thoracoscopy emerges as a valuable approach to diaphragmatic plication in children. Further studies are, however, required to determine whether or not it exposes patients to a higher rate of surgically induced chest wall deformations.

6. Disclosures

Dr Alzahrani, Dr Heng, Pr Khen-Dunlop, Dr Panait, Dr Hervieux, Dr Grynberg, Pr Abbo, Dr Hameury, Pr Lavrand, Dr Maillet, Dr Haffreingue, Dr Lehn, Dr De Napoli Cocci, Dr Habonimana, Pr Michel, Dr Montalva, Pr Ballouhey, Dr Fotso Kamdem, Dr Lecompte, Dr

Liné, Dr Poupalou, Dr Meignan, Dr Deslandes, Pr Podevin and Dr Schmitt have no conflict of interest to disclose.

Financial support: This research received no specific grants from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

7. References

[1] Le Pimpec-Barthes F, Brian E, Vlas C, Gonzalez-Bermejo J, Bagan P, Badia A, et al. Le traitement chirurgical des éventrations et paralysies diaphragmatiques. Revue des Maladies Respiratoires 2010;27:565–78. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rmr.2010.01.015.

[2] Yazıcı M, Karaca İ, Arıkan A, Erikçi V, Etensel B, Temir G, et al. Congenital Eventration of the Diaphragm in Children: 25 Years' Experience in Three Pediatric Surgery Centers. Eur J Pediatr Surg 2003;13:298–301. https://doi.org/10.1055/s-2003-43573.

[3] Gutt CN, Grabensee R. Diaphragm Plication and Repair. In: Dienemann HC, Hoffmann H, Detterbeck FC, editors. Chest Surgery, Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg; 2015, p. 483–94. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-12044-2_47.

[4] Wu S, Zang N, Zhu J, Pan Z, Wu C. Congenital diaphragmatic eventration in children: 12years' experience with 177 cases in a single institution. Journal of Pediatric Surgery 2015;50:1088–92. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpedsurg.2014.09.055.

[5] Favre J-P, Favoulet P, Cheynel N, Benoit L. Traitement chirurgical des éventrations diaphragmatiques. EMC - Chirurgie 2005;2:235–41. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emcchi.2005.03.001.

[6] Zhao S, Pan Z, Li Y, An Y, Zhao L, Jin X, et al. Surgical treatment of 125 cases of congenital diaphragmatic eventration in a single institution. BMC Surg 2020;20:270. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12893-020-00928-z.

[7] Becmeur F, Talon I, Schaarschmidt K, Philippe P, Moog R, Kauffmann I, et al. Thoracoscopic diaphragmatic eventration repair in children: about 10 cases. Journal of Pediatric Surgery 2005;40:1712–5. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpedsurg.2005.07.008.

[8] Heng L, Alzahrani K, Khen-Dunlop N, Panait N, Hervieux E, Grynberg L, et al. Congenital diaphragmatic eventration: Should we maintain surgical treatment? A retrospective multicentric cohort study. Pediatrics; 2024. https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.01.25.24301768.

[9] Patrini D, Panagiotopoulos N, Bedetti B, Lawrence D, Scarci M. Diaphragmatic plication for eventration or paralysis. Shanghai Chest 2017;1:25–25. https://doi.org/10.21037/shc.2017.08.01.

[10] Bawazir OA, Banaja AM. Thoracoscopic repair of diaphragmatic eventration in children: a comparison of two repair techniques. Journal of Pediatric Surgery 2020;55:1152–6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpedsurg.2019.11.019.

[11] Bin Asaf B, Kodaganur Gopinath S, Kumar A, Puri HV, Pulle MV, Bishnoi S. Robotic diaphragmatic plication for eventration: A retrospective analysis of efficacy, safety, and feasibility. Asian J Endosc Surg 2021;14:70–6. https://doi.org/10.1111/ases.12833.

[12] Slater BJ, Meehan JJ. Robotic repair of congenital diaphragmatic anomalies. J Laparoendosc Adv Surg Tech A 2009;19 Suppl 1:S123-127. https://doi.org/10.1089/lap.2008.0200.supp.

[13] Xu P, Chang X, Tang S, Li S, Cao G, Zhang X, et al. Robot-assisted thoracoscopic plication for diaphragmatic eventration. Journal of Pediatric Surgery 2020;55:2787–90. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpedsurg.2020.06.034.

[14] Lampridis S, Pradeep IHDS, Billè A. Robotic-assisted diaphragmatic plication: Improving safety and effectiveness in the treatment of diaphragmatic paralysis. Int J Med Robot 2022;18:e2368. https://doi.org/10.1002/rcs.2368.

[15] Fujishiro J, Ishimaru T, Sugiyama M, Arai M, Suzuki K, Kawashima H, et al. Minimally invasive surgery for diaphragmatic diseases in neonates and infants. Surg Today 2016;46:757–63. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00595-015-1222-3.

[16] Borruto FA, Ferreira CG, Kaselas C, Schneider A, Lacreuse I, Kauffmann I, et al. Thoracoscopic treatment of congenital diaphragmatic eventration in children: lessons learned after 15 years of experience. Eur J Pediatr Surg 2014;24:328–31. https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0033-1349054.
[17] Lansdale N, Alam S, Losty PD, Jesudason EC. Neonatal endosurgical congenital diaphragmatic hernia repair: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Ann Surg 2010;252:20–6. https://doi.org/10.1097/SLA.0b013e3181dca0e8.
[18] Vijfhuize S, Deden AC, Costerus SA, Sloots CEJ, Wijnen RMH. Minimal access surgery for repair of congenital diaphragmatic hernia: is it advantageous?--An open review. Eur J Pediatr Surg 2012;22:364–73. https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0032-1329532.
[19] Dindo D, Demartines N, Clavien P-A. Classification of surgical complications: a new proposal with evaluation in a cohort of 6336 patients and results of a survey. Ann Surg 2004;240:205–13. https://doi.org/10.1097/01.sla.0000133083.54934.ae.
[20] Lampridis S. Raising the bar, lowering the diaphragm: a new era in diaphragmatic plication. J Thorac Dis 2023;15:3529–32. https://doi.org/10.21037/jtd-23-716.

Figure:



Fig. 1: Flowchart of the cohort of patients operated on for congenital diaphragmatic eventration.

Patients have been grouped according to the surgical approach used.

Tables:

Table 1: Comparison between surgical approaches for diaphragmatic plication

Preoperative data	Abdominal approach (n = 28)	PLT (n = 15)	MITS (n = 69)	*(3-group analysis) p =*
Median age at diagnosis (months)	4.5 [.0-16.9]	5.5 [1.0-9.3]. n=14	9.0 [0.7-17.0]	*0.42*
Late diagnosis (>12 months) (n; %)	9; 32.1%	0 *	25; 36.2% * (0.004)	*0.02*
Side (R/L; %L)	16/13; 46.4% §	15/0; 0% *	42/27; 39.1% * (0.002)	*0.008*
Associated pathologies (n; %)	11; 39.3%	5; 33.3%	19; 27.5%	*0.52*
Median diaphragmatic level on chest radiography	5 [3-6]; n=26 ¥. $	6 [5-7], n=13 $ (0.01)	6 [5-7], n=59 ¥ (0.0004)	*0.12*
Indication for surgery (n; %)				
Respiratory symptoms (n; %)	13; 46.4% $	13; 86.7% $ (0.02)	44; 63.8%	*0.03*
Digestive symptoms (n; %)	7; 25% ¥	0	6; 8.7% ¥ (0.047)	*0.02*
Orthopedic symptoms (n; %)	1; 3.6%	0	1; 1.4%	*0.66*
Level of the diaphragm (n; %)	5; 17.9%	1; 6.7%	20; 29.0%	*0.13*
Median age at surgery (months)	12 [3.0-21.2]; n=28	7.5 [2.8-14.3]; n=14	13 [6.0-25.3]; n=69	*0.24*
First intention surgery (n; %)	21; 75%	10; 66.7%	56; 81.2%	*0.44*

§ including one bilateral diaphragmatic eventration. Two-by-two statistically significant results, represented by "*" for postero-lateral thoracotomy (PLT) vs mini-invasive thoracic surgery (MITS), by "$" for PLT vs abdominal approach, and by "¥" for MITS vs abdominal approach, completed by the p-value in brackets. AN: antenatal diagnosis.

Table 2: Comparison of outcomes between surgical approaches for diaphragmatic plication

Postoperative data	Abdominal approach (n = 28)	PLT (n = 17)**	MITS (n = 67)**	*p* =
Perioperative complications (n; %)	1; 3.6%	0	8; 11.6%	*0.21*
Postoperative complications (n; %)	2; 7.1%	3; 17.6%	17; 25.4%	*0.12*
Infections (n; %)	1; 3.6%	1; 5.9%	8; 11.9%	*0.38*
Pneumothorax (n; %)	0	0	7; 10.4%	*0.08*
Pleural effusion (n; %)	1 (chylothorax)	0	1; 1.5%	*0.57*
Respiratory distress / lobar atelectasis (n; %)	0	1; 5.9%	3; 4.5%	*0.48*
Occlusive syndrome (n; %)	0	0	1; 1.5%	*0.34*
Hemodynamic instability (n; %)	0	0	2; 3.0%	*0.85*
Early diaphragmatic eventration or hernia recurrence (n; %)	0	0	2; 3.0%	*0.85*
Others (n; %)	0	1; 5.9%	3; 4.5%	*0.94*
Persistent respiratory symptoms (n; %)	4; 14.3%	4; 23.5%	7; 10.4%	*0.36*
Median use of IV analgesics (hours)	24 [4.5-84.0] $ (0.023)	96 [72-138] *,$	36 [12-48] * (<0.001)	*0.0003*
Median hospital stay (days)	5 [2-9.5]	8 [4.8-17] *	4 [3-5] * (0.,007)	*<0.0001*
Median follow-up (months)	25 [7-62]	37 [14-73]	30 [11.5-56.5]	*0.55*
Symptoms (n; %)	5; 17.9%	5; 29.4%	15; 22.4%	*0.66*
Respiratory (n; %)	2; 7.1%	4; 23.5%	10; 14.9%	*0.30*
Digestive (n; %)	0	2; 11.8%	2; 3.0%	*0.46*
Orthopedic (n; %)	3; 10.7%	0	6; 9.0%	*0.40*
Overall complication rate (n; %)	5; 17.9%	4; 23.5%	10; 14.9%	*0.69*
Secondary hospital stay (n; %)	2; 7.1%	2; 11.8%	10; 1.5%	*0.58*
Iterative surgery (n; %)	0	1; 5.9%	8; 11.9%	*0.14*
Median diaphragmatic level (back rib) on chest radiography	8 [7-9] $	9.5 [8-10] $ (0.02)	9 [8-9]	*0.046*
Median difference in cupola level (number of ribs)	2 [1.5-3]	3.5 [2-4] *	2 [1-3] * (0.01)	*0.043*
Improvement (n; %)	10; 90.9%	14; 100%	45; 88.2%	*0.40*
Stability (n; %)	1; 9.1%	0	5; 9.8%	*0.48*
Aggravation (n; %)	0	0	1; 2%	*0.78*
Pulmonary abnormalities (n; %)	2; 7.4%	0	3; 4.7%	*0.56*
Orthopedic abnormalities (n; %)	0	0	8; 12.5%	*0.06*
Overall mortality (n; %)	1; 3.6%	3; 17.6%	2; 3.0%	*0.05*

** Integration of the two cases of converted thoracoscopy in the postero-lateral thoracotomy (PLT) group for postoperative surgical results. Two-by-two statistically significant results, represented by "*" for PLT vs mini-invasive thoracic surgery (MITS), by "$" for PLT vs abdominal approach, and by "¥" for MITS vs abdominal approach, completed by the p-value in brackets. The number of data available for analysis has been indicated within the table (n=) when more than 10% of them were lacking.

Table 3: Pre- and perioperative comparison between video-assisted thoracoscopy and robot-assisted thoracoscopy

	VATS (n=64)	RATS (n=5)	*p* =
Preoperative data			
Mean term of birth (WA)	37.9 +/- 2.9	38.8 +/- 1.5	0.84
Median age at diagnosis (months)	9.0 [1.0-17.0]	4.0 [0.0-22.5]	0.6
Sex (%M)	43; 67.2%	3; 60%	1
Side of CDE (%G)	24; 37.5%	3; 60%	0.37
Symptoms	46; 71.9%	3; 60%	0.62
- respiratory	45; 70.3%	2; 40%	0.32
- digestive	7; 10.9%	40%	0.12
- orthopedic	8; 12.5%	0	1
Diaphragmatic level on chest radiograph (rib)	6 [5-7]	6 [4.5-7]	0.51
CT scan pulmonary abnormalities	15; 23.4%	1; 20%	0.59
Perioperative data			
Median age at surgery (months)	13.0 [6.0-23.3]	29.0 [11.5-76.5]	0.13
Intervention:			
- central plication	49; 76.6%	2; 40%	0.11
- flag plication	13; 20.3%	2; 40%	0.30
- excision-suturing	2; 3.1%	1; 20%	0.20
Suturing material:			
- non absorbable	58; 90.6%	3; 60%	0.10
- absorbable	2; 3.1%	2; 40%	0.02
Perioperative complications	6; 9.4%	2; 40%	0.1
Median length of IV analgesia (hours)	24 [7.5-48]	48 [39-66]	0.17
Median hospital stay (days)	4 [3-5]	5 [4.3-6.5]	0.22
Outcomes			
Median age at the end of follow-up (months)	48 [23-70]	60 [29-91]	0.85
Median follow-up (months)	28.8 [11.3-52.8]	56.0 [10.5-65.0]	0.59
Surgical complications	17; 27.4%	0; 0%	0.32
Recurrence of eventration	6; 9.7%	1; 20%	0.55
Symptomatic patients	11; 17.7%	4; 80%	0.01
- Respiratory tract	8; 12.9%	2; 40%	0.16
- GERD	1; 1.6%	1; 20%	0.14
- Orthopedic	4; 6.5%	2; 40%	0.06
Diaphragmatic level on chest radiograph (rib)	9 [8-9]	9 [8.5-9]	0.71
Radiographic improvement	40; 87%	5; 100%	1

VATS = video-assisted thoracoscopy; RATS = robot-assisted thoracoscopy; WA = weeks of amenorrhea; CDE = congenital diaphragmatic eventration; IV = intra-venous; GERD = gastro-esophageal reflux.

Supplementary material

PedDiaVen - Association analysis through logistic regression

1) Postoperative outcomes associated with an abdominal or a thoracic surgical approach

Included Variables		Wald	p =	Odds ratio	95% CI	
Step 1	Suturing material	.551	.458	2.001	.320	12.496
	Recurrence	.000	.999	.000	.000	.
	End follow-up symptoms	.033	.855	.855	.159	4.610
	Improvement in diaphragmatic level	.112	.738	1.422	.181	11.174
Step 2	Suturing material	.558	.455	2.009	.322	12.531
	Recurrence	.000	.999	.000	.000	.
	Improvement in diaphragmatic level	.101	.751	1.394	.179	10.847
Step 3	Suturing material	.543	.461	1.975	.323	12.069
	Recurrence	.000	.999	.000	.000	.
Step 4	Recurrence	.000	.999	.000	.000	.

2) Postoperative factors associated with postero-lateral thoracotomy (as compared to abdominal + mini-invasive thoracic surgery)

Included Variables		Wald	p =	Odds ratio	95% CI	
Step 1	Suturing material	.018	.894	1.106	.252	4.855
	Recurrence	.000	.999	467175883.699	.000	.
	End follow-up symptoms	.911	.340	.512	.129	2.024
	Improvement in diaphragmatic level	1.019	.313	3.573	.302	42.313
Step 2	Recurrence	.000	.999	462390933.676	.000	.
	End follow-up symptoms	.916	.338	.511	.129	2.020
	Improvement in diaphragmatic level	1.019	.313	3.573	.302	42.346
Step 3	Recurrence	.000	.999	400698028.893	.000	.
	Improvement in diaphragmatic level	.854	.355	3.147	.277	35.777
Step 4	Recurrence	.000	.999	381839441.316	.000	.

3) Postoperative factors associated with mini-invasive thoracoscopic surgery (as compared to thoracotomy + abdominal approach)

Included Variables		Wald	p =	Odds ratio	95% CI	
Step 1	Suturing material	.183	.669	1.327	.363	4.858
	Recurrence	.000	.999	.000	.000	.
	End follow-up symptoms	.417	.518	1.484	.448	4.912
	Improvement in diaphragmatic level	.384	.536	.578	.102	3.274
Step 2	Recurrence	.000	.999	.000	.000	.
	End follow-up symptoms	.405	.525	1.474	.446	4.868
	Improvement in diaphragmatic level	.388	.533	.576	.102	3.260
Step 3	Recurrence	.000	.999	.000	.000	.
	Improvement in diaphragmatic level	.317	.574	.611	.110	3.395
Step 4	Recurrence	.000	.999	.000	.000	.

4) Predisposing factors for an abdominal or a thoracic surgical approach

Included Variables		Wald	p =	Odds ratio	95% CI	
Step 1	Late diagnosis	.003	.958	1.028	.373	2.834
	Sex	.040	.841	1.103	.421	2.888
	Side	.615	.433	1.479	.556	3.937
	Associated abnormality	.491	.483	1.410	.539	3.689
	Respiratory symptoms	.955	.329	.624	.243	1.606
	Digestive symptoms	.366	.545	1.479	.417	5.249
Step 2	Sex	.045	.832	1.108	.429	2.861
	Side	.683	.408	1.490	.579	3.832
	Associated abnormality	.492	.483	1.411	.539	3.690
	Respiratory symptoms	.965	.326	.627	.247	1.591
	Digestive symptoms	.379	.538	1.485	.422	5.222
Step 3	Side	.660	.416	1.477	.576	3.785
	Associated abnormality	.513	.474	1.420	.544	3.706
	Respiratory symptoms	.955	.328	.629	.248	1.594
	Digestive symptoms	.388	.533	1.491	.424	5.245
Step 4	Side	.975	.323	1.583	.636	3.938
	Associated abnormality	.721	.396	1.502	.587	3.842
	Respiratory symptoms	.924	.337	.635	.251	1.604
Step 5	Side	.806	.369	1.512	.613	3.730
	Respiratory symptoms	1.146	.284	.605	.241	1.518
Step 6	Respiratory symptoms	1.505	.220	.567	.229	1.404

5) Preoperative factors associated with postero-lateral thoracotomy (as compared to abdominal + mini-invasive thoracic surgery)

Included Variables		Wald	p =	Odds ratio	95% CI	
Step 1	Late diagnosis	.000	.998	345258340.173	.000	.
	Sex	1.117	.291	2.200	.510	9.494
	Side	1.544	.214	2.899	.541	15.529
	Associated abnormality	.088	.767	1.230	.313	4.831
	Respiratory symptoms	1.128	.288	.458	.108	1.937
	Digestive symptoms	.054	.817	1.315	.129	13.400
	Neonatal surgery	.182	.669	1.462	.256	8.368
Step 2	Late diagnosis	.000	.998	347414180.063	.000	.
	Sex	1.167	.280	2.232	.520	9.578
	Side	1.582	.208	2.933	.549	15.678
	Associated abnormality	.127	.722	1.275	.335	4.855
	Respiratory symptoms	1.146	.284	.455	.108	1.924
	Neonatal surgery	.158	.691	1.421	.252	8.012
Step 3	Late diagnosis	.000	.998	347848774.883	.000	.
	Sex	1.139	.286	2.202	.517	9.386
	Side	1.497	.221	2.810	.537	14.702
	Respiratory symptoms	1.279	.258	.439	.105	1.829
	Neonatal surgery	.203	.652	1.483	.267	8.237
Step 4	Late diagnosis	.000	.998	324570840.350	.000	.
	Sex	1.024	.312	2.098	.500	8.806
	Side	1.643	.200	2.932	.566	15.196
	Respiratory symptoms	1.174	.279	.457	.111	1.883
Step 5	Late diagnosis	.000	.998	355411695.750	.000	.
	Side	1.250	.263	2.533	.497	12.921
	Respiratory symptoms	1.029	.310	.482	.117	1.975
Step 6	Late diagnosis	.000	.998	324692018.869	.000	.
	Side	1.942	.163	3.088	.632	15.075
Step 7	Late diagnosis	.000	.998	410713908.205	.000	.

6) Preoperative factors associated with mini-invasive thoracoscopic surgery (as compared to thoracotomy + abdominal approach)

Included Variables		Wald	p =	Odds ratio	95% CI	
Step 1	Late diagnosis	2.342	.126	.468	.177	1.238
	Sex	.068	.794	.889	.367	2.153
	Side	.048	.827	.904	.364	2.245
	Associated abnormality	.261	.610	1.260	.519	3.060
	Respiratory symptoms	.010	.919	.955	.396	2.303
	Digestive symptoms	.355	.551	1.459	.421	5.057
	Neonatal surgery	.195	.659	1.335	.370	4.817
Step 2	Late diagnosis	2.467	.116	.464	.178	1.210
	Sex	.069	.793	.888	.367	2.152
	Side	.040	.841	.913	.376	2.218
	Associated abnormality	.282	.595	1.269	.527	3.052
	Digestive symptoms	.353	.553	1.457	.421	5.044
	Neonatal surgery	.187	.665	1.325	.371	4.738
Step 3	Late diagnosis	2.778	.096	.453	.179	1.149
	Sex	.057	.811	.898	.374	2.161
	Associated abnormality	.313	.576	1.282	.537	3.063
	Digestive symptoms	.319	.572	1.417	.423	4.744
	Neonatal surgery	.170	.680	1.305	.369	4.618
Step 4	Late diagnosis	2.881	.090	.448	.177	1.132
	Associated abnormality	.304	.581	1.277	.535	3.047
	Digestive symptoms	.320	.572	1.417	.423	4.747
	Neonatal surgery	.207	.649	1.336	.383	4.660
Step 5	Late diagnosis	3.342	.068	.429	.173	1.063
	Associated abnormality	.330	.566	1.290	.542	3.071
	Digestive symptoms	.266	.606	1.372	.412	4.566
Step 6	Late diagnosis	3.151	.076	.446	.183	1.088
	Associated abnormality	.457	.499	1.342	.572	3.150
Step 7	Late diagnosis	3.146	.076	.447	.184	1.088

7) Risk factors for congenital diaphragmatic eventration recurrence

Included Variables	Wald	p =	Odds ratio	95% CI	
Late diagnosis	.209	.648	.509	.028	9.213
Sex	.000	.998	309291785.373	.000	.
Side	.497	.481	2.630	.179	38.660
Associated abnormality	.209	.647	2.136	.083	55.040
Type of surgical approach	2.381	.123	7.648	.577	101.368
Neonatal surgery	.000	.999	60292654.945	.000	.
Suturing material	.724	.395	2.002	.405	9.909
End follow-up symptoms	.137	.711	.610	.045	8.358
Improvement in diaphragmatic level	.243	.622	2.796	.047	166.119