We present a case of endometriosis at a 10 mm supra-pubic trocar scar, which, to our knowledge, has previously been described in literature only once. Another rarity involved in this case is that the scar endometriosis developed after the removal of ovarian endometrioma.

Clinical experience has demonstrated that gynecologic operative procedures carry the risk of triggering the appearance of endometrial tissue in operative scar tissue, causing endometriomas of the scar tissue. This has been shown for laparotomy/cesarean section and episiotomy scars in a number of reports.1,2 The number of the reported cases of laparoscopic scar endometriosis is lower compared with laparotomy scars. Besides already known benefits of laparoscopy, this is another reason to avoid laparotomy in patients with endometriosis.

Our patient was a 24-year old nulliparous patient, who was referred to us with an 8-month history of intense cyclic pain at the suprapubic trocar scar region. Two years earlier, the patient underwent operative laparoscopy during which a 7 cm endometrioma of the left ovary was removed by stripping out the capsule. After the removal of the suprapubic 10 mm trocar, the cyst was extracted through the anterior abdominal wall.

Deep beneath the skin at the suprapubic trocar site a painful tumefaction approximately 2x2 cm in size was palpated. A three-centimeter incision was made over the palpable lesion, and sharp dissection of the palpable bluish mass was performed. The underlying fascia and the muscle that contained palpable tumefactions were also excised. The histopathologic report for the mass revealed mature fat tissue, muscle and connecting tissue with scattered areas of stromal and glandular endometrial tissues.

In previously published case reports, the development of endometriosis at the laparoscopic trocar site was described (Table 1). Only two of the seven patients mentioned in the reports had primary laparoscopy for pelvic endometriosis (one with an ovarian endometrioma,1 the other with peritoneal implants.3 In our case, primary laparoscopy showed that our patient had an ovarian endometrioma. Similarly, in reports published for laparotomy scar endometriosis, patients with the preexisting disease appeared to have low incidence of scar endometriosis, yet this incidence was never established. Bianco et al.4 described 12 cases of abdominal wall endometriomas with only one having preexisting endometriosis, while in another series of 17 patients5 associated pelvic endometriosis was present in as much as 24% of the cases. It is worth noticing that in only two described cases of endometriosis following laparoscopic surgery for ovarian endometrioma, scar endometriosis appeared at suprapubic 5-mm sites. Our patient had scar endometriosis at the suprapubic midline 10-mm port incision.

We believe that separate mechanisms cause the development of scar endometriosis, and that the mentioned reports could be divided in two groups accordingly. The first group would be scar endometriosis developing after the laparoscopic procedure for primary endometriosis. Since only two reports of scar endometriosis following laparoscopy were published in 16 years (the first
report being published sixteen years before the second one), and there was a small number of reports in the laparotomy case series, scar endometriosis seems to be a very rare occurrence. This may be explained by the presence of already highly differentiated cells in an established case of endometriosis, which makes it unlikely to implant at distant sites, thus ruling out the implantation theory. However, our case clearly supports the implantation theory, as the cyst was extracted directly through the tissue.

The other mechanism of scar endometriosis developing after the laparoscopic procedure seems to be encountered more often. Endometriosis develops here following a laparoscopic surgery for an unrelated condition, preferentially at the 10-mm umbilical scar region, in a previously healthy woman. Since the umbilicus is a preferential site for the development of primary extra-genital endometriosis, explained by physiologic scarring, a laparoscopic surgery may additionally change the umbilical scar to become a locus minoris resistitiae for the development of abdominal wall endometriosis. Evidently, regardless of numerous reports published in the literature, a lot of uncertainties about endometriosis are still present, and thorough research is needed to unveil the basic etiology of this disease.

Presented case of endometriosis in suprapubic scar following laparoscopic removal of endometrioma, strongly suggests use of an endo-bag, a surgical glove or a similar retrieval device. In prevention of sport sites endometriosis, sport sites malignant metastasis, implantation of trophoblastic tissue or sport sites inflammatory infiltrate, the use of endo-bag is effective. Our opinion is that the use of the endo-bag should be obligatory for extraction of tissue from the abdominal cavity.

References

Address for correspondence: Mihajlo Strelec, MD, PhD., E-mail: mihajlo.strelec@zg.hnet.hr