# RESEARCH

**BMC** Pediatrics



Investigating colostomy-related morbidity in children following stoma formation and closure in a tertiary hospital, Abha, Saudi Arabia: a retrospective cohort study 2024

Hashim Ali Alghamdi<sup>1</sup>, Meshari Saad M Alqahtani<sup>2</sup>, Hatem Mostafa Mohammed Asiri<sup>2</sup>, Abdulaziz Mohammed M Abudasir<sup>2</sup>, Khalid Talab Salem Alshahrani<sup>2</sup>, Rahaf Ahmed Alamer<sup>2</sup>, Ali Abdullah S Alshahrani<sup>2</sup>, Yasir Abduallah M Alyahya<sup>2</sup>, Anas Mohammed abudasir<sup>2</sup>, Saeed Jarallah S AlQahtani<sup>2</sup> and Ghassan E. Mustafa Ahmed<sup>3\*</sup>

# Abstract

**Background** Overall, stoma-related morbidity affects a reported 20–38% of pediatric patients. However, determining the true incidence of major stoma-related morbidity is challenging due to limited cohort sizes in existing studies. Thus, the aim of this study was to investigate colostomy related morbidity among children both after stoma formation and stoma closure.

**Methodology** This is a retrospective cohort hospital-based study, conducted in an Abha maternity and children hospital, between August 1, 2018, and August 1, 2023, among 126 pediatric patients (aged 0–12 years) who underwent colostomy formation and subsequent closure during the study period. Data were collected from medical records. Data was analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) v.26.

**Results** This study included a total of 126 children who underwent colostomy. (N=37, 29.4%) of cases included in this study were emergency cases, while (N=89, 70.6%) were elective. A variety of antibiotics were used for surgical prophylaxis, metronidazole (77%) and cefuroxime (62.7%) were the most prevalent. Oral feeding was started after 5–6 days in more than one third of cases (39.7%). Wound infection (N=15, 11.9%) was the most reported post-operative complication, followed with bowel obstruction (N=6, 4.8%). Emergency cases had a longer duration of hospital stay than elective cases; this difference was statistically significant (P=.04).

**Conclusions** Majority of patients reported no stoma related complications, while among those who reported complications, wound infection was the most reported complication, followed by bowel obstruction.

Keywords Colostomy, Stoma closure, Children, Abha, Saudi Arabia

\*Correspondence:

Ghassan E. Mustafa Ahmed

nimirghassan@gmail.com

<sup>1</sup>General and Pediatric surgery, Abha maternity and children hospital,

Abha, Saudi Arabia

<sup>2</sup>Faculty of Medicine, King Khalid University, Abha, Saudi Arabia

<sup>3</sup>Faculty of Medicine, University of Khartoum, ElQasr Avenue,

Khartoum 11111, Khartoum state, Sudan



© The Author(s) 2024. **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License, which permits any non-commercial use, sharing, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if you modified the licensed material. You do not have permission under this licence to share adapted material derived from this article or parts of it. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit http:// creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/.

# Introduction

The formation of a stoma may become essential and lifepreserving in infants and toddlers confronted with bowel perforation, necrosis, or obstruction [1, 2]. In such critically unwell pediatric cases, opting for a stoma creation over a primary anastomosis is often preferred to mitigate the potential hazard of anastomotic leakage.

Colostomies are indicated for a variety of reasons, which can either be congenital or acquired anomalies, although congenital conditions appear to be more prevalent [3]. Colostomies may be placed in either the transverse or sigmoid colon and can be fashioned as either loop or defunctioning (divided) colostomies.

The congenital indications predominantly include anorectal malformation (ARM) and Hirschsprung's disease (HD). However, the proportion of each condition as an indication varies across different publications, with some reporting HD as more common [4, 5], while others indicate ARM as more prevalent [6, 7]. The incidence of colostomy for HD is declining in certain countries due to early diagnosis and the increasing use of single-stage transanal pull-through procedures [8–10]. Nevertheless, the initial placement of colostomies remains high in environments like ours and other Low- and Middle-Income Countries where delayed presentations are still common [11–13].

Historically, there were numerous transverse and loop colostomies performed, but current practice appears to favor the creation of defunctioning and sigmoid colostomies [14, 15].

Stoma creation can lead to significant morbidity associated with the stoma itself, such as necrosis, stenosis, prolapse, and the development of incisional or parastomal hernias [16]. Moreover, in cases of ileostomies, excessive fluid loss can result in dehydration and failure to thrive [17, 18]. Overall, stoma-related morbidity affects a reported 20–38% of pediatric patients, encompassing both the initial stoma formation and subsequent closure [16]. However, determining the true incidence of major stoma-related morbidity is challenging due to limited cohort sizes in existing studies [2].

**Table 1** Baseline characteristics of patients, (N = 126)

Variable	Frequency	percentage
Age:		
< 2 years	100	79.4
2–5 years	20	15.9
6–12 years	5	4.0
13–18 years	1	0.8
Gender:		
Male	65	51.6
Female	61	48.4

\*Descriptive statistics in terms of mean

The identification of risk factors associated with significant stoma-related morbidity could facilitate the development of preventive strategies or potentially prompt modifications in surgical approaches. Previous research has highlighted a lower weight at stoma closure as a potential risk factor for postoperative morbidity in individuals treated for necrotizing enterocolitis [16]. However, conflicting findings exist, as some studies have failed to corroborate low weight as a significant risk factor for morbidity following stoma closure [18–20]. Furthermore, prematurity and underlying inflammatory conditions have been linked to stoma morbidity in certain studies [22, 23]. To establish more definitive and reliable risk factors, more cohort studies are warranted. Thus, the aim of this study was to investigate colostomy related morbidity among children both after stoma formation and stoma closure.

# **Methods and materials**

# Study design

A retrospective cohort hospital-based study.

### Study settings and period

The study was carried out at a single location, the Abha Maternity and Children Hospital, from August 1, 2018, to August 1, 2023. This hospital, with a capacity of 240 beds, offers a wide range of specialties, including obstetrics and gynecology, pediatric surgery, neonatal ICU, pediatric ICU, and emergency services for women and children. The pediatric surgery department, one of the largest in the region, performs surgeries on children and newborns, as well as pediatric endoscopies. Last year, this department conducted over 1,350 surgeries, including 145 for newborns, addressing conditions such as diaphragmatic hernia, severed esophagus repair, open abdominal hernia, and intestinal obstruction.

# Study population

The study was conducted among pediatric patients (aged 0-12 years) who underwent colostomy formation and subsequent closure during the study period.

# Sampling technique and sample size

- Simple random sampling was implemented in this study, where each member in the selected population was assigned a number and using a random number generator the numbers that were selected were enrolled in the study. Sample size was calculated using the formula:
- The sample size was calculated by the equation of known population:

 $n = N / 1 + N(d^2).$ 

Table 2   Indication of surgery, preoperative management, and						
intraoperative events, (N = 126)						
Variable	Subgroups	Frequency	Percentage			
Indication of surgery	Emergency	37	29.4			
	Elective	89	70.6			
Nutritional support TPN	Yes	82	65.1			
(1 / 2)	No	44	34.9			
Bowel preparation by	Yes	89	70.6			
mechanical protocol (Pico-Salax/Purg-Odan with 150mL (5oz) cold water) 1/ 2	No	37	29.4			
Type of surgery	Closure	74	58.7			
	Creation	52	41.3			
Intraoperative Complications	No	126	100.0			
Operative length in	< 30 min	4	3.2			
minutes	30–60 min	22	17.5			
	61–90 min	32	25.4			
	91–120 min	22	17.5			
	>120 min	45	35.7			
	Unknown	1	0.8			

\*Descriptive statistics in terms of mean

n =sample size. N =population (400). d =level of precision (0.05). n = 196.

• Sample size is 196.

# **Data Collection Tools**

The following information were collected from medical records: Demographic information (age, sex), diagnosis and indication for colostomy ( Emergency or elective ), preoperative management (nutritional support, bowel preparation), details of colostomy formation and closure surgeries (surgical type, intraoperative complications, operative length), postoperative management (antibiotic use, time to oral feeding), complications related to colostomy formation and closure (acute, chronic, stoma-related complications, bowel obstruction, anastomotic leakage, wound infection, etc.), length of hospital stay, readmissions and reoperations.

# Data analysis

Data analysis was performed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 26. Descriptive statistics were employed, with categorical data presented as frequencies (n) and percentages (%). The chi-square test was utilized to examine correlations between variables.

# Results

#### **Baseline characteristics of patients**

This study included a total of 126 children who underwent colostomy, majority of patients were under 2 years (79.4%), males were slightly more than females (51.6% and 48.4%) respectively (Table 1).

### Indications and preoperative management

(N=37, 29.4%) of cases included in this study were emergency cases, while (N=89, 70.6%) were elective. In regard to preoperative management; (65.1%) received nutritional support TPN (1 / 2), (70.6%) underwent bowel preparation by mechanical protocol (Pico-Salax/Purg-Odan with 150mL (5oz) cold water) 1/ 2 (Table 2).

#### Details of colostomy formation and closure surgery

More than half (58.7%) of surgeries were closure, while (41.3%) were creation colostomies.

# Intraoperative complications and operative length

No intraoperative complications reported among patients, almost one third of operations (35.7%) lasted for more than 120 min, (25.4%) lasted for 61-90 min, and (3.2%) lasted for less than 30 min (Table 3).

# Post-operative management

A variety of antibiotics used postoperatively, metronidazole (77%) and cefuroxime (62.7%) were the most prevalent. Oral feeding started after an average of 4.2 days postoperatively ( $\pm 2.3$  SD).

# Complications related to colostomy formation and closure

Wound infection (N=15, 11.9%) was the most reported complication, followed with bowel obstruction (N=6, 4.8%), while no complications reported in (N=100, 79.4%) of patients. More than half of cases (57.9%) stayed at hospital for 8–14 days.

#### **Readmission and reoperation**

(N=13, 10.3%) readmitted to hospital after discharge, intestinal obstruction (33.3%), and wound infection (25%) were the most common causes for readmission. (N=10, 7.9%) re-operated, exploratory laparotomy (40%) was the most reported cause for reoperation, overall (61.5%) of those which were readmitted were re-operated.

# Factors associated with post-operative complications, readmission and reoperation

None of basic characteristics of patients, preoperative or post-operative management was associated with development of post-operative complications (P>.05) (Table 4). Regarding readmission of patients; administration of nutritional support TPN was associated with a higher percent of complications (P=.03), no factors were

Length of hospital stay 1-3 days 8 6.3   stay 4-7 days 23 18.3   8-14 days 73 57.9   > 14 days 22 17.5   Post-operative antibiotics Ceftriaxone 16 12.7%   No 13 10.3%   Cefuroxime 79 62.7%   Metronidazole 97 77.0%   Cefazolin 8 6.3%   Ampicillin 9 7.1%   Others 10 7.9%   Were there any complications? No 100 79.4   Bowel obstruction 15 11.9   Bowel obstruction 6 4.8   Leakage 2 1.6   Stoma prolapse 2 1.6   Stoma prolapse 1 0.8   syndrome 13 10.3   Readmission(n=13) Yes 13 10.3   No 113 89.7 2.0 1.6   readmission Yes 13 10.3 2.0   readmission Yes	Statement	Answer	Frequency	Percentage	
stay 4–7 days 23 18.3   8–14 days 73 57.9   > 14 days 22 17.5   Post-operative antibiotics Ceftriaxone 16 12.7%   Matcomycin 13 10.3%   Cefuroxime 79 62.7%   Metronidazole 97 77.0%   Cefazolin 8 6.3%   Ampicillin 9 7.1%   Others 10 7.9%   Were there any complications? No 100 79.4   Wound infection 15 11.9   Bowel obstruction 6 4.8   Leakage 2 1.6   Storma prolapse 2 1.6   Storma prolapse 1 0.8   syndrome No 113 89.7   Causes of readmission(n=13) Yes 13 10.3   No 113 89.7 10 7.9   Causes of readmission Yes 13 10.3   No 116 92.1 10.7   Causes of readmission	Length of hospital 1–3 days		8	6.3	
8-14 days 73 57.9   > 14 days 22 17.5   Post-operative antibiotics Ceftriaxone 16 12.7%   Vancomycin 13 10.3%   Cefuroxime 79 62.7%   Metronidazole 97 77.0%   Cefazolin 8 6.3%   Ampicillin 9 7.1%   Others 10 7.9%   Were there any complications? No 100 79.4   Wound infection 15 11.9 10.4   Bowel obstruction 6 4.8 10.4   Leakage 2 1.6 5   Stoma prolapse 2 1.6 5   Short bowel 1 0.8 3   volund infection 3 25.0 10 7.9   Readmission(n=13) Yes 10 7.9 10 7.9   Reoperation(n=10) Yes 10 7.9 10 7.9   No 116 92.1 10.7 10 10   Readmission Intestinal	stay	4–7 days	23	18.3	
> 14 days2217.5Post-operative antibioticsCeftriaxone1612.7%Automycin1310.3%Cefuroxime7962.7%Metronidazole9777.0%Cefazolin86.3%Ampicillin97.1%Others107.9%Were there any complications?No100Mo10079.4Wound infection1511.9Bowel obstruction64.8Leakage21.6Stoma prolapse21.6Short bowel10.8syndrome1310.3Readmission(n=13)Yes1310.3Readmission(n=14)Yes1310.3No11389.720.0Causes of readmissionYes1310.3Reoperation(n=10)Yes107.9No11692.116.7protrusion25.010.7.9No11692.1Causes of reoperation10.07.9No11692.1Causes of reoperation10.0Modul dehiscence110.0Anastomotic leak110.0Anastomotic leak110.0Anastomotic leak110.0Anastomotic leak110.0Anastomotic leak110.0Anastomotic leak110.0Anastomotic leak110.0Anastom		8–14 days	73	57.9	
Post-operative antibioticsCeftriaxone1612.7%antibioticsVancomycin1310.3%Cefuroxime7962.7%Metronidazole9777.0%Cefazolin86.3%Ampicillin97.1%Others107.9%Were there any complications?No100Metronidazole21.6Stoma prolapse21.6Stoma prolapse21.6Short bowel10.8syndrome11389.7Causes of readmission(n=13)Yes13No11389.7Causes of readmissionWound infection3No11389.7Causes of readmissionYes10No11692.1Causes of reoperationIntestinal4No11692.1Causes of reoperationIntestinal4Mo11692.1Causes of reoperationIntestinal4Mo11692.1Causes of reoperationIntestinal4Mo11692.1Causes of 		>14 days	22	17.5	
antibiotics   Vancomycin   13   10.3%     Cefuroxime   79   62.7%     Metronidazole   97   77.0%     Cefazolin   8   6.3%     Ampicillin   9   7.1%     Others   10   7.9%     Were there any complications?   No   100   79.4     Wound infection   15   11.9     Bowel obstruction   6   4.8     Leakage   2   1.6     Stoma prolapse   2   1.6     Short bowel   1   0.8     syndrome   13   89.7     Causes of   Wound infection   3   25.0     readmission(n=13)   Yes   13   10.3     No   113   89.7   13     Causes of   Wound infection   3   25.0     readmission   Intestinal   4   33.3     obstruction   Stoma prolapse   2   16.7     Protrusion   Other causes   3   25.0	Post-operative	Ceftriaxone	16	12.7%	
Cefuroxime   79   62.7%     Metronidazole   97   77.0%     Cefazolin   8   6.3%     Ampicillin   9   7.1%     Others   10   7.9%     Were there any complications?   No   100   79.4     Wound infection   15   11.9     Bowel obstruction   6   4.8     Leakage   2   1.6     Stoma prolapse   2   1.6     Short bowel   1   0.8     syndrome   2   1.6     Readmission(n=13)   Yes   13   10.3     No   113   89.7   2.0     Causes of readmission   Mound infection   3   25.0     readmission   Intestinal   4   33.3     obstruction   3   25.0     readmission   Yes   10   7.9     No   116   92.1   2     Causes of readmission   Yes   10   7.9     No   116 <td>antibiotics</td> <td>Vancomycin</td> <td>13</td> <td>10.3%</td>	antibiotics	Vancomycin	13	10.3%	
Metronidazole   97   77.0%     Cefazolin   8   6.3%     Ampicillin   9   7.1%     Others   10   7.9%     Were there any complications?   No   100   79.4     Wound infection   15   11.9     Bowel obstruction   6   4.8     Leakage   2   1.6     Stoma prolapse   2   1.6     Short bowel   1   0.8     syndrome   13   10.3     Readmission(n=13)   Yes   13   10.3     No   113   89.7   13     Causes of readmission   Mound infection   3   25.0     readmission   Intestinal   4   33.3     obstruction   3   25.0     readmission   Yes   10   7.9     No   116   92.1   16.7     protrusion   2   16.7   10.0     No   116   92.1   10.10     reoperation(n=10)		Cefuroxime	79	62.7%	
Cefazolin   8   6.3%     Ampicillin   9   7.1%     Others   10   7.9%     Were there any complications?   No   100   79.4     Wound infection   15   11.9     Bowel obstruction   6   4.8     Leakage   2   1.6     Stoma prolapse   2   1.6     Short bowel   1   0.8     syndrome   1   0.8     Readmission(n=13)   Yes   13   10.3     No   113   89.7   10     Causes of   Wound infection   3   25.0     Intestinal   4   33.3   obstruction     Stoma prolapse\   2   16.7     protrusion   0   10.0   10.0     Reoperation(n=10)   Yes   10   7.9     No   116   92.1   10.0     causes of   Intestinal   4   40.0     reoperation   obstruction   10.0   10.0		Metronidazole	97	77.0%	
Ampicillin97.1%Others107.9%Were there any complications?No10079.4Wound infection1511.9Bowel obstruction64.8Leakage21.6Stoma prolapse21.6Stoma prolapse21.6Short bowel10.8syndrome10.8Readmission(n=13)Yes1310.3No11389.7Causes of readmissionWound infection325.0Intestinal433.3obstruction3Other causes325.016.7protrusionOther causes325.0Reoperation(n=10)Yes107.9No11692.110.0Causes of reoperationIntestinal440.0obstruction110.000Wound dehiscence110.010.0Wound dehiscence110.020.1Reperation110.020.110.0Reperation0110.020.1Causes of 		Cefazolin	8	6.3%	
Were there any complications?Others107.9%Wound infection1511.9Bowel obstruction64.8Leakage21.6Stoma prolapse21.6Short bowel10.8syndrome10.8Readmission(n=13)Yes1310.3No11389.7Causes of readmissionWound infection325.0Intestinal obstruction433.3Other causes325.0Reoperation(n=10)Yes107.9No11692.1Causes of reoperationIntestinal obstruction440.0Other causes325.0Reoperation(n=10)Yes107.9No11692.12.1Causes of reoperationIntestinal obstruction440.0Obstruction10.07.910.0No11692.110.010.0Anastomotic leak110.010.0Anastomotic leak110.010.0Anastomotic leak110.010.0Anastomotic leak110.010.0Anastomotic leak110.010.0Anastomotic leak110.010.0Anastomotic leak110.010.0Anastomotic leak110.010.0Anastomotic leak110.010.0Anastomotic leak1 <td< td=""><td></td><td>Ampicillin</td><td>9</td><td>7.1%</td></td<>		Ampicillin	9	7.1%	
Were there any complications?No10079.4Wound infection1511.9Bowel obstruction64.8Leakage21.6Stoma prolapse21.6Short bowel10.8syndrome10.8Readmission(n=13)Yes1310.3No11389.7Causes of readmissionWound infection325.0Intestinal433.3obstructionStoma prolapse\216.7protrusion07.9No11692.1Causes of reoperationIntestinal4Mo11692.1Causes of reoperationIntestinal4Approx107.9No11692.1Causes of reoperationIntestinal4Approx10.07.9No11692.1Causes of reoperationIntestinal4Approx10.07.9No11692.1Causes of reoperation10.0Approx10.0Approx10.0Approx10.0Approx10.0Approx10.0Approx10.0Approx10.0Approx10.0Approx2Approx10.0Approx2Approx10.0Approx2Approx10.0Approx2<		Others	10	7.9%	
complications?Wound infection1511.9Bowel obstruction64.8Leakage21.6Stoma prolapse21.6Short bowel10.8syndrome11389.7Causes ofWound infection325.0readmissionIntestinal433.3obstruction325.0readmissionIntestinal433.3obstruction325.0readmissionIntestinal432.0No11692.1Causes of (vomiting\rupture)107.9No11692.1Causes of reoperationIntestinal440.00bstruction100Stoma prolapse110.0Wound dehiscence110.0Rupture of110.0Anastomotic leak110.0Other causes (cen-220.0tral line insertion220.0	Were there any	No	100	79.4	
Bowel obstruction64.8Leakage21.6Stoma prolapse21.6Short bowel10.8syndrome10.8Readmission(n=13)Yes1310.3No11389.7Causes of readmissionWound infection325.0Intestinal433.3obstruction3Stoma prolapse\216.7protrusionOther causes325.02Reoperation(n=10)Yes107.9No11692.12Causes of reoperationIntestinal440.0obstruction5107.9No11692.1210Causes of reoperationIntestinal440.0obstruction5110.0No11692.110Causes of reoperationIntestinal440.0obstruction5110.0Rupture of110.010.0Anastomosis and peritonitis9110.0Anastomotic leak110.010.0Other causes (cen-220.01	complications?	Wound infection	15	11.9	
Leakage21.6Stoma prolapse21.6Short bowel10.8syndrome1310.3Readmission(n=13)Yes1310.3No11389.7Causes of readmissionWound infection325.0Intestinal433.3obstructionStoma prolapse\216.7protrusion07.9Other causes325.0(vomiting\rupture)107.9Reoperation(n=10)Yes10Yes107.9No11692.1Causes of reoperationIntestinal440.0obstruction5Stoma prolapse110.0Wound dehiscence110.0Rupture of110.0Anastomosis and peritonitis10.0Other causes (cen-220.0		Bowel obstruction	6	4.8	
Stoma prolapse21.6Short bowel10.8syndrome10.8Readmission(n=13)Yes1310.3No11389.7Causes of readmissionWound infection325.0Intestinal433.3 obstruction3Stoma prolapse\216.7 protrusionOther causes325.0(vomiting\rupture)07.9Reoperation(n=10)Yes107.9No11692.1Causes of reoperationIntestinal440.0Vound dehiscence110.010.0Wound dehiscence110.0anastomosis and peritonitis10.0Anastomotic leak110.00Other causes (cen-220.0tralling insertion		Leakage	2	1.6	
Short bowel syndrome10.8Readmission(n=13)Yes1310.3No11389.7Causes of readmissionWound infection325.0Intestinal obstruction433.3 obstruction16.7 protrusionReoperation(n=10) reoperationYes107.9 PNo11692.1Causes of reoperationIntestinal obstruction440.0 PReoperation(n=10) reoperationYes107.9 PNo11692.1Causes of reoperationIntestinal obstruction440.0 PKender of reoperation10.0 P10.0 P10.0 PAnastomotic leak110.0 P10.0 PRupture of other causes (cen- 2110.0 PRupture of other causes (cen- 2220.0 P		Stoma prolapse	2	1.6	
syndrome     Readmission(n=13)   Yes   13   10.3     No   113   89.7     Causes of readmission   Wound infection   3   25.0     Intestinal obstruction   4   33.3     Stoma prolapse\ protrusion   2   16.7     Other causes (vomiting\rupture)   3   25.0     Reoperation(n=10)   Yes   10   7.9     No   116   92.1     Causes of reoperation   Intestinal   4   40.0     Stoma prolapse   1   10.0   92.1     Causes of reoperation   Intestinal   4   40.0     Stoma prolapse   1   10.0   92.1     Causes of reoperation   Intestinal   4   40.0     Wound dehiscence   1   10.0   10.0     Anastomotic leak   1   10.0   10.0     Anastomotic leak   1   10.0   10.0     Causes (cen-   2   20.0   20.0		Short bowel	1	0.8	
Readmission( $n=13$ )Yes1310.3No11389.7Causes of readmissionWound infection325.0Intestinal obstruction433.3obstruction5toma prolapse\ protrusion216.7Other causes (vomiting\rupture)325.0Reoperation( $n=10$ )Yes107.9No11692.1Causes of reoperationIntestinal440.0Vound dehiscence110.0Wound dehiscence110.0Rupture of anastomosis and peritonitis110.0Other causes (cen- 220.010.0		syndrome			
No11389.7Causes of readmissionWound infection325.0Intestinal obstruction433.3Stoma prolapse\ protrusion216.7Other causes (vomiting\rupture)325.0Reoperation(n=10)Yes107.9No11692.1Causes of reoperationIntestinal obstruction440.0011692.1Causes of reoperationIntestinal obstruction440.0011010.0Rupture of anastomosis and peritonitis110.0Other causes (cen- 220.010.0	Readmission(n = 13)	Yes	13	10.3	
Causes of readmissionWound infection325.0Intestinal obstruction433.3obstruction310Stoma prolapse\ protrusion216.7Other causes (vomiting\rupture)325.0Reoperation(n=10)Yes107.9No11692.1Causes of reoperationIntestinal obstruction4Mo11692.1Causes of reoperationIntestinal obstruction4Mo11692.1Causes of reoperationIntestinal obstruction4Mo11010.0Mound dehiscence peritonitis10.0Anastomosis and peritonitis10.0Other causes (cen- 220.0tral ling insertion2		No	113	89.7	
readmission Intestinal obstruction 33.3   obstruction Stoma prolapse\ 2 16.7   protrusion Other causes 3 25.0   (vomiting\rupture) 10 7.9   No 116 92.1   Causes of intestinal obstruction 40.0   reoperation Stoma prolapse 1   Obstruction Stoma prolapse 1   Stoma prolapse 1 10.0   Wound dehiscence 1 10.0   Rupture of intis 1 10.0   Anastomotic leak 1 10.0   Other causes (cen- 2 20.0	Causes of	Wound infection	3	25.0	
Stoma prolapse\ 2 16.7   protrusion Other causes 3 25.0   Other causes 3 25.0   (vomiting\rupture) Yes 10 7.9   No 116 92.1   Causes of Intestinal 4 40.0   reoperation obstruction 5 10.0   Wound dehiscence 1 10.0   Rupture of 1 10.0   anastomosis and peritonitis   Anastomotic leak 1 10.0   Other causes (cen- 2 20.0	readmission	Intestinal	4	33.3	
Protrusion   Other causes 3 25.0   (vomiting\rupture) Yes 10 7.9   No 116 92.1   Causes of Intestinal 4 40.0   reoperation obstruction 5 10 7.9   No 116 92.1 10 10   Causes of Intestinal 4 40.0   reoperation obstruction 10.0 10.0   Wound dehiscence 1 10.0 10.0   Rupture of 1 10.0 10.0   Anastomotic leak 1 10.0 0   Other causes (cen- 2 20.0 1		Stoma prolapse\	2	16.7	
Reoperation(n=10) Yes 10 7.9   No 116 92.1   Causes of Intestinal 4 40.0   reoperation obstruction 5 5   Stoma prolapse 1 10.0 10.0   Wound dehiscence 1 10.0 10.0   Rupture of 1 10.0 10.0   Anastomosis and peritonitis 10.0   Other causes (cen- 2 20.0   trail ling insortion 2 20.0		protrusion	2	25.0	
Reoperation(n=10) Yes 10 7.9   No 116 92.1   Causes of Intestinal 4 40.0   reoperation obstruction 10.0   Stoma prolapse 1 10.0   Wound dehiscence 1 10.0   Rupture of 1 10.0   anastomosis and peritonitis   Anastomotic leak 1 10.0   Other causes (cen- 2 20.0   trail ling insortion 2 20.0		(vomiting)runture)	2	25.0	
No 116 92.1   Causes of Intestinal 4 40.0   reoperation obstruction 10.0   Wound dehiscence 1 10.0   Rupture of 1 10.0   anastomosis and peritonitis 1   Anastomotic leak 1 10.0   Other causes (cen- 2 20.0   trail ling insertion) 1 10.0	Reoperation $(n = 10)$	Yes	10	79	
Causes of Intestinal 4 40.0 reoperation Stoma prolapse 1 10.0 Wound dehiscence 1 10.0 Rupture of 1 10.0 anastomosis and peritonitis Anastomotic leak 1 10.0 Other causes (cen- 2 20.0 tral line insertion)	neoperation( <i>n</i> = 10)	No	116	92.1	
reoperation obstruction Stoma prolapse 1 10.0 Wound dehiscence 1 10.0 Rupture of 1 10.0 anastomosis and peritonitis Anastomotic leak 1 10.0 Other causes (cen- 2 20.0 tral line insortion)	Causes of	Intestinal	4	40.0	
Stoma prolapse110.0Wound dehiscence110.0Rupture of110.0anastomosis and peritonitis110.0Anastomotic leak110.0Other causes (cen- 2220.0tral line insertion)110.0	reoperation	obstruction	I	10.0	
Wound dehiscence110.0Rupture of110.0anastomosis and peritonitis110.0Anastomotic leak110.0Other causes (cen-220.0tral line insertion)220.0	•	Stoma prolapse	1	10.0	
Rupture of110.0anastomosis and peritonitis110.0Anastomotic leak110.0Other causes (cen-220.0tralling insortion)220.0		Wound dehiscence	1	10.0	
anastomosis and peritonitis Anastomotic leak 1 10.0 Other causes (cen- 2 20.0 tral line insertion)		Rupture of	1	10.0	
, Anastomotic leak 1 10.0 Other causes (cen- 2 20.0 tral ling insertion)		anastomosis and peritonitis			
Other causes (cen- 2 20.0		Anastomotic leak	1	10.0	
		Other causes (cen- tral line insertion)	2	20.0	

Table 3 Length of hospital stay, post-operative manageme readmission and reoperation, (N = 126)

#### \*Descriptive statistics in terms of mean

found to be significantly associated with reoperations of patients (P>.05) (Table 5).

# Factors associated with length of hospital stay

Emergency cases had a longer duration of hospital stay than elective cases; (29.7% stayed more than 14 days in compare to 12.4%) this difference was statistically significant (P=.04), patients who received nutritional support, and patients who didn't undergo bowel preparation by mechanical protocol had a significantly longer duration of stay (Table 6).

Factors	Subgroups	Complications	No	Р
			complications	value
Age	< 2 years	19	81	0.6
	2–5 years	6	14	
	6–12 years	1	4	
	13–18 years	0	1	
Gender	Male	14	51	0.8
	Female	12	49	
Indications	Emergency	6	31	0.4
	Elective	20	69	
Nutritional	Yes	17	65	0.9
support TPN (1	No	9	35	
7 Z) Rowel	Yes	19	70	0.8
prepara- tion by me- chanical	No	7	30	0.0
Surgical	Closure	18	56	0.2
type	Creation	8	44	
Ceftriax-	No	21	89	0.3
one	Yes	5	11	
Cefurox-	No	9	38	0.8
ime	Yes	17	62	
Metroni-	No	6	23	0.9
dazole	Yes	20	77	
Cefazolin	No	23	95	0.2
	Yes	3	5	
Ampicillin	No	25	92	0.5
	Yes	1	8	
Vancomy-	No	23	90	0.9

nt,	Table 4 Factors associated with post-operative complications,
	(N - 126)

Yes \*Chi-square test for correlation

3

# Discussion

cin

This study aimed to investigate colostomy related morbidity among children both after stoma formation and stoma closure. A total of 126 children who underwent colostomy were enrolled in this study, out of which, the majority were under 2 years (79.4%), and males were slightly more than females (51.6% and 48.4%) respectively. The study found that the majority of patients reported no stoma related complications, while among those who reported complications, wound infection was the most reported complication, followed by bowel obstruction.

10

Analysis revealed that more than half (65.1%) received nutritional support TPN, (70.6%) underwent bowel preparation by mechanical protocol. TPN is critical for patients with stomas, as it provides essential nutrients and fluids that may be lost due to the stoma. The mechanical bowel preparation is also important to ensure

Factors	Subgroups Readmission		P value	Reoperation		P value	
		Yes	No		Yes	No	
Age	< 2 years	9	91	0.4	7	93	0.5
	2–5 years	4	16		3	17	
	6–12 years	0	5		0	5	
	13–18 years	0	1		0	1	
Gender	Male	6	59	0.7	4	61	0.4
	Female	7	54		6	55	
Indications	Emergency	1	36	0.07	1	36	0.2
	Elective	12	77		9	80	
Nutritional support TPN (1 / 2)	Yes	12	70	0.03	9	73	0.09
	No	1	43		1	43	
Bowel preparation by mechanical protocol	Yes	11	78	0.2	8	81	0.5
	No	2	35		2	35	
Surgical type	Closure	9	65	0.4	7	67	0.5
	Creation	4	48		3	49	
Ceftriaxone	No	13	97	0.1	10	100	0.2
	Yes	0	16		0	16	
Cefuroxime	No	3	44	0.3	1	46	0.06
	Yes	10	69		9	70	
Metronidazole	No	2	27	0.5	1	28	0.3
	Yes	11	86		9	88	
Cefazolin	No	12	106	0.8	10	108	0.4
	Yes	1	7		0	8	
Ampicillin	No	13	104	0.3	10	107	0.4
	Yes	0	9		0	9	
Vancomycin	No	11	102	0.5	9	104	0.9
	Yes	2	11		1	12	

# **Table 5** Factors associated with readmission and reoperation, (N = 126)

\*Chi-square test for correlation

### **Table 6** Factors associated with length of hospital stay, (N = 126)

Factors	Subgroups	1–3 days	4–7 days	8–14 days	>14 days	P value
Age	< 2 years	7	18	56	19	0.8
	2–5 years	1	5	11	3	
	6–12 years	0	0	5	0	
	13–18 years	0	0	1	0	
Indications	Emergency	0	5	21	11	0.04
	Elective	8	18	52	11	
Nutritional support TPN (1 / 2)	Yes	8	13	43	18	0.03
	No	0	10	30	4	
Bowel preparation by mechanical protocol	Yes	8	18	53	10	0.01
	No	0	5	20	12	
Surgical type	Closure	8	12	44	10	0.05
	Creation	0	11	29	12	

\*Chi-square test for correlation

a clean surgical field and reduce the risk of infection. Malnutrition resulting from the loss of nutrients and fluids through a stoma can have detrimental effects on both growth and cognitive development [24, 25]. Reports indicate that as many as 90% of young children with stomas experience a decline in their growth chart, prompting some experts to recommend early closure of the stoma [26, 27]. This recommendation is bolstered by evidence demonstrating that the majority of young children show improved growth following stoma closure, regardless of any associated morbidity, weight concerns, or underlying conditions [26].

Results showed that a variety of antibiotics were used postoperatively, with metronidazole (77%) and cefuroxime (62.7%) being the most prevalent, and oral feeding was initiated after 5–6 days in more than one third

of cases (39.7%). A previous prospective, randomized clinical trial was conducted to compare the outcomes of administering prophylactic antibiotics for one day versus seven days to 30 consecutive patients undergoing colostomy closure. The antibiotics utilized were cotrimoxazole (8 mg/kg per day trimethoprim) and ornidazole (20 mg/ kg per day). The use of prophylactic antibiotics is standard practice to prevent postoperative infections, especially in patients undergoing procedures involving the bowel. The choice of antibiotics reflects common protocols aimed at covering a broad spectrum of potential pathogens. Mechanical bowel cleansing and operative procedures were standardized for all patients. Wound infections limited to the subcutaneous tissue were observed in two patients, one in each group (6.6%). No instances of intraperitoneal infection, anastomotic leakage/dehiscence, or wound dehiscence were encountered [28].

Majority of patients reported no complications (79.4%), while on those who reported complications, wound infection (11.9%) was the most reported complication, followed by bowel obstruction (4.8%). A similar study reported that following stoma formation/closure, 27% of the young children experienced complications, mainly consisting of high output stoma, prolapse, stoma stenosis or adhesive obstructions [29]. Another case-control study found that complications following colostomy closure occurred in 17 children and include wound infection (11 cases), stitch granuloma (5 cases), and 2 cases each of small bowel obstruction and incisional hernia. These were not related to the duration of the colostomy [30]. This high rate of no complications is encouraging and suggests effective surgical techniques and postoperative care. However, the reported complications, particularly wound infections, highlight the need for ongoing monitoring and management.

(10.3%) were readmitted to hospital after discharge, and (7.9%) were re-operated. Intestinal obstruction (33.3%), and wound infection (25%) were the most common causes for readmission, while exploratory laparotomy (20%) and intestinal obstruction (20%) were the most reported causes for reoperation. Readmission rates are an important quality metric in postoperative care. The identified causes of readmission highlight areas where preventive measures could be implemented, such as better management of wound care and monitoring for signs of obstruction. Regarding readmission of patients; administration of nutritional support TPN was associated with a higher percent of complications (P=.03). This finding is intriguing, as it suggests that while TPN is necessary for managing malnutrition, it may also be linked to increased complications. This could be due to factors such as the underlying conditions necessitating TPN, or potential complications arising from the TPN itself, such as infections related to central venous catheters.

Limited number of Saudi studies were published in this scope; hence this study is considered a valuable base for evidence. Another strength of this study is that it included participants from variable demographical background and socio-economic status, which would aid the authorities in dealing with the issue from all aspects. Furthermore, this study is to pave the way as the base for further studies in this aspect. The study was not without limitations. The fact that it was done within a specific setting may have determined a highly selected group of cases. It may therefore be difficult to generalize the findings to the total community of children who underwent colostomy in the kingdom, larger numbers of respondents would have improved the statistical significance of the results. In addition, the retrospective design might have led to underreporting of morbidity.

# Conclusion

Majority of patients reported no stoma related complications, while among those who reported complications, wound infection was the most reported complication, followed by bowel obstruction. Regarding readmission of patients; administration of nutritional support TPN was associated with a higher percent of complications (P=.03). Serial and frequent studies on the issue should be conducted and funded to generate more evidence and data regarding this topic. Webinars, medical workshops and conferences should be held to discuss these morbidities and arrange measures to decrease their incidence.

#### Abbreviations

- ARM Anorectal malformation
- HD Hirschsprung's disease
- SPSS Statistical Package for Social Sciences
- TPN Total parenteral nutrition

#### **Supplementary Information**

The online version contains supplementary material available at https://doi. org/10.1186/s12887-024-05089-z.

Supplementary Material 1

#### Author contributions

Idea conception and study design: HAA, MSMA. Questionnaire design: HAA, MSMA, AASA, YAMA. Data collection and entry: HMMA, AMMA, KTSA, RAA, AMA, SJSQ. Analysis planning, data analysis and interpretation: GEMA. Manuscript writing and drafting: HAA, MSMA, GEMA.

### Funding

This study received no funding.

#### Data availability

The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request. The data are not publicly available due to issues of privacy.

#### Declarations

#### Ethics approval and consent to participate

Ethical approval was obtained from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) – Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia. The participants were assured of the confidentiality and anonymity of the information they provide. No financial benefit was offered to participants.

#### **Consent for publication**

No personal data were collected from the participants.

#### **Competing interests**

The authors declare no competing interests.

#### Consent to participate

An informed consent was obtained from legal guardians of each individual participant in this study.

Received: 10 June 2024 / Accepted: 18 September 2024 Published online: 03 October 2024

# References

- Hunter CJ, Chokshi N, Ford HR. Evidence vs experience in the surgical management of necrotizing enterocolitis and focal intestinal perforation. J Perinatol. 2008;28(Suppl 1):S14–17.
- Steinau G, et al. Enterostomy complications in infancy and childhood. Langenbecks Arch Surg. 2001;386(5):346–9.
- Massenga A, Chibwae A, Nuri AA, Bugimbi M, Munisi YK, Mfinanga R, et al. Indications for and complications of intestinal stomas in the children and adults at a tertiary care hospital in a resource-limited setting: a Tanzanian experience. BMC Gastroenterol. 2019;19(1):157. https://doi.org/10.1186/ s12876-019-1070-5.
- Ameh EA, Mshelbwala PM, Sabiu L, Chirdan LB. Colostomy in children–an evaluation of acceptance among mothers and caregivers in a developing country. S Afr J Surg. 2006;44(4):138–9.
- Nour S, Beck J, Stringer MD. Colostomy complications in infants and children. Ann R Coll Surg Engl. 1996;78(6):526–30.
- Muzira A, Kakembo N, Kisa P, et al. The socioeconomic impact of a pediatric ostomy in Uganda: a pilot study. Pediatr Surg Int. 2018;34(4):457–66. https:// doi.org/10.1007/s00383-018-4230-8.
- Soomro BA, Solangi RA, Siddiqui MA. Colostomy in children: indications and complications. Pak J Med Sci. 2010;26(4):883–6.
- Giuliani S, Honeyford K, Chang CY, et al. Outcomes of primary versus multiple-staged repair in Hirschsprung's Disease in England. Eur J Pediatr Surg. 2020;30(1):104–10. https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0039-3402712.
- Nouira F, Ben Ahmed Y, Sarrai N, et al. Surgical management of recto-sigmoid Hirschsprung's disease. Acta Chir Belg. 2012;112(2):126–30. https://doi.org/10. 1080/00015458.2012.11680810.
- Sulkowski JP, Cooper JN, Congeni A, et al. J Pediatr Surg. 2014;49(11):1619–25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpedsurg.2014.06.002.
- Ekenze SO, Ngaikedi C, Obasi AA. Problems and outcome of Hirschsprung's disease presenting after 1 year of age in a developing country. World J Surg. 2011;35(1):22–6. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00268-010-0828-2.
- Mabula JB, Kayange NM, Manyama M, Chandika AB, et al. Hirschsprung's disease in children: a five-year experience at a university teaching hospital in north-western Tanzania. BMC Res Notes. 2014;7:410. https://doi. org/10.1186/1756-0500-7-410.

- Sharma S, Gupta DK. Hirschsprung's disease presenting beyond infancy: surgical options and postoperative outcome. Pediatr Surg Int. 2012;28(1):5–8. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00383-011-3002-5.
- Bandré E, Kaboré RA, Ouedraogo I, Soré O, et al. Hirschsprung's disease: management problem in a developing country. Afr J Paediatr Surg. 2010;7(3):166– 8. https://doi.org/10.4103/0189-6725.70418.
- Lukong CS, Ameh EA, Mshelbwala PM, et al. Management of anorectal malformation: changing trend over two decades in Zaria, Nigeria. Afr J Paediatr Surg. 2011;8(1):19–22. https://doi.org/10.4103/0189-6725.78663.
- Eeftinck Schattenkerk LD et al. Incisional hernia after abdominal surgery in young children: a retrospective analysis of incidence and risk factors. J Pediatr Surg 2021.
- Zani A et al. The Timing of Stoma Closure in Young children with Necrotizing Enterocolitis: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Eur J Pediatr Surg. 2017;27(1):7–11.
- Bradnock TJ. The use of stomas in the early management of Hirschsprung disease: Findings of a national, prospective cohort study. J Pediatr Surg 2017;52(9):1451–7.
- O'Connor A, Sawin RS. High morbidity of enterostomy and its closure in premature young children with necrotizing enterocolitis. Arch Surg. 1998;133(8):875–80.
- 20. Aguayo P, et al. Stomal complications in the newborn with necrotizing enterocolitis. J Surg Res. 2009;157(2):275–8.
- Mattioli G et al. Risk management in pediatric surgery. Pediatr Surg Int. 2009;25(8):683–90. Bælum JK, Enterostomy complications in necrotizing enterocolitis (NEC) surgery, a retrospective chart review at Odense University Hospital. BMC Pediatr 2019;19(1):110.
- 22. Lee J, et al. Enterostomy closure timing for minimizing postoperative complications in premature young children. Pediatr Neonatol. 2014;55(5):363–8.
- Mochizuki K, et al. Timing and outcome of stoma closure in very low birth weight young children with surgical intestinal disorders. Surg Today. 2017;47(8):1001–6.
- 24. Homan GJ. Failure to thrive: a practical guide. Am Fam Physician. 2016;94:295–9.
- Corbett SS, Drewett RF. To what extent is failure to thrive in infancy associated with poorer cognitive development? A review and meta-analysis. J Child Psychol Psychiatry. 2004;45:641–54.
- Bethell G, Kenny S, Corbett H. Enterostomy-related complications and growth following reversal in young children. Arch Dis Child Fetal Neonatal Ed. 2017;102:F230–4.
- Chong C, et al. Neonates living with enterostomy following necrotising enterocolitis are at high risk of becoming severely underweight. Eur J Pediatr. 2019;178:1875–81.
- Akgür FM, Cahit Tanyel F, Büyükpamukçu N, et al. Prophylactic antibiotics for colostomy closure in children: short versus long course. Pediatr Surg Int. 1992;7:279–81. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00183980.
- Vogel I, Eeftinck Schattenkerk LD, Venema E, et al. Major stoma related morbidity in young children following stoma formation and closure: a retrospective cohort study. J Pediatr Surg. 2022;57(10):402–6. Epub 2021 Nov 27. PMID: 34949444.
- Kim MS, Kim HK, Kim DY, Ju JK. The influence of nutritional assessment on the outcome of ostomy takedown. J Korean Soc Coloproctol. 2012;28(3):145–51. https://doi.org/10.3393/jksc.2012.28.3.145. Epub 2012 Jun 30. PMID: 22816058; PMCID: PMC3398110.

#### Publisher's note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.