RESEARCH JOURNAL OF TRAUMA AND DISABILITY STUDIES

Volume: 5 Issue: 05 | May–2026 ISSN: 2720-6866
http://journals.academiczone.net/index.php/rjtds

Modern State Of Adhesion Disease In Gynecology: Achievements, Limitations, And Future Directions

Kudrat Atabayevich Jumaniyazov
PhD, Associate Professor of the Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology,
Urgench branch of Tashkent Medical Academy, Uzbekistan,
Email: kudratulla@mail.ru,
ORCID : https ://orcid.org/0000-0001-5668-3144

Aybek Sharipboyevich Yuldashev
Doctor, "OK MED" LLC, "SARVINOZ-MEDSERVICE" LLC, Uzbekistan

Jamshid Ikromovich Reymberganov
Student of the Urgench branch of Tashkent Medical Academy, Uzbekistan,
Email: jamshidreymberganov64@gmail.com,
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0515-1161

Abstrack : Adhesion disease in gynecology remains one of the most complex and incompletely resolved problems in modern pelvic surgery. This is due to its high incidence, significant clinical impact, and the lack of fully effective approaches to diagnosis, treatment, and prevention. While previous discussions have emphasized the relevance of this pathology, it is now essential to critically evaluate its current scientific and clinical status—what has been achieved, what remains limited, and which directions are most promising.

Postoperative adhesions should not be viewed merely as a morphological consequence of surgical trauma. Their clinical significance is far broader: they affect fertility, are associated with chronic pelvic pain, contribute to bowel obstruction, and increase the complexity of repeat surgical interventions. In gynecology, even localized adhesions in the adnexal region can disrupt tubo-ovarian relationships and impair reproductive outcomes. Given that infertility affects approximately one in six individuals of reproductive age, the clinical burden of adhesion-related tuboperitoneal dysfunction is substantial.

Although considerable progress has been made in understanding adhesion pathogenesis and prevention strategies, the available evidence remains heterogeneous. Advances include improved imaging techniques, laparoscopic innovations, and the development of anti-adhesion barriers. However, these have not yet translated into a definitive clinical breakthrough. Preoperative diagnosis remains limited, preventive measures often demonstrate morphological rather than clinical benefits, and surgical treatment does not consistently improve long-term outcomes such as pain relief or fertility.

Keywords: intra-abdominal pressure, pelvic surgery, chronic pelvic pain

Introduction

A particularly important area of recent interest is the role of the laparoscopic environment itself. Factors such as intra-abdominal pressure, insufflation gas properties, and peritoneal conditions are increasingly recognized as contributors to adhesion formation. Low-pressure pneumoperitoneum, for example, is physiologically appealing, but current evidence is limited by small sample sizes and heterogeneous study designs [1].

Volume: 5 Issue: 05 | May–2026 ISSN: 2720-6866
http://journals.academiczone.net/index.php/rjtds

Overall, the modern state of adhesion disease research is characterized not by a lack of methods, but by insufficient clinical validation. The key challenge is not simply generating new data, but critically reassessing existing approaches to identify those capable of meaningfully improving clinical practice [2], [3].

Modern Approaches to Diagnosis of Adhesion Disease

Diagnosis begins with clinical evaluation, but this stage reveals a fundamental limitation. Symptoms such as chronic pelvic pain, infertility, and intermittent bowel disturbances, along with a history of surgery, pelvic inflammatory disease, or endometriosis, may suggest adhesions [4]. However, these features are nonspecific and do not allow reliable assessment of location, extent, or severity.

Thus, clinical evaluation provides only a probabilistic model rather than definitive preoperative diagnosis. This creates uncertainty in surgical planning, including access strategy and anticipated complexity.

Ultrasound assessment of **visceral sliding** is currently the most practical non-invasive method. Its main advantage lies in identifying fixation of bowel loops to the abdominal wall, thereby improving the safety of laparoscopic entry rather than providing full adhesion mapping [5], [6], [7].

Studies demonstrate that this technique is particularly useful for assessing the periumbilical region, though its diagnostic performance varies widely. Sensitivity may be low, while specificity is generally high. Overall, ultrasound is effective for targeted assessment but insufficient for comprehensive evaluation of pelvic adhesions.

Cine-MRI is considered the most promising non-invasive modality, as it allows dynamic assessment of organ movement and detection of deeper visceral adhesions. Reported diagnostic accuracy is moderate to high, but variability between studies remains significant [8].

A major limitation is poor reproducibility. Inter-observer agreement is often low and heavily dependent on operator experience. As a result, despite its potential, cine-MRI has not yet become a standardized diagnostic tool.

Due to the limitations of non-invasive methods, laparoscopy remains the gold standard for adhesion diagnosis. Direct visualization during surgery is currently the only reliable way to assess adhesions accurately [9].

Thus, modern preoperative diagnostics remain incomplete: clinical assessment suggests risk, ultrasound supports safe access, MRI offers deeper insight, but definitive evaluation often occurs intraoperatively.

Methodology

Modern Surgical Approaches

Laparoscopic adhesiolysis is the primary minimally invasive treatment when adhesions are clinically significant. Its advantages include direct visualization and simultaneous treatment of associated pathology.

However, its effectiveness depends heavily on patient selection and outcome measures. Evidence is particularly weak in chronic pain: observational studies suggest benefit, but randomized trials do not confirm a significant advantage over diagnostic laparoscopy alone.

Volume: 5 Issue: 05 | May–2026 ISSN: 2720-6866
http://journals.academiczone.net/index.php/rjtds

In infertility, outcomes are more encouraging but still variable. Success depends on factors such as adhesion severity and coexisting conditions. Thus, adhesiolysis should be considered a selective rather than universal intervention.

Open surgery remains relevant in complex cases, such as dense adhesions, bowel involvement, or "frozen abdomen." While laparoscopy offers better recovery outcomes in selected patients, conversion rates remain significant, emphasizing the importance of careful patient selection.

A major limitation of surgical treatment is recurrence. Adhesiolysis itself induces peritoneal injury, triggering the same mechanisms responsible for adhesion formation. Studies show that new adhesions frequently develop even after technically successful procedures.

Therefore, surgery addresses the anatomical problem but does not eliminate the underlying biological process.

Result and Discussion

Prevention Strategies

Meticulous surgical technique is the cornerstone of prevention. This includes gentle tissue handling, precise hemostasis, minimizing ischemia, and reducing peritoneal trauma.

However, even optimal technique cannot fully prevent adhesion formation due to the inherent biological response to injury.

Anti-adhesion barriers are the most developed preventive strategy. They physically separate injured surfaces during healing [10], [11]. Evidence suggests they may reduce adhesion formation morphologically, but clinical benefits—such as improved fertility or reduced pain—remain insufficiently proven.

Various pharmacological agents and peritoneal instillates have been studied, targeting inflammation and fibrinolysis. However, their clinical effectiveness remains unproven, and they are not widely recommended [12].

A critical issue is the reliance on morphological outcomes rather than clinically meaningful endpoints. Reduction in adhesion scores does not necessarily translate into improved patient outcomes, highlighting a major gap in research.

The Role of Laparoscopic Environment

The laparoscopic environment itself plays a significant role in adhesion formation. Factors include insufflation pressure, gas composition, temperature, humidity, and duration of exposure. These influence peritoneal stress, inflammation, and tissue repair [13], [14], [15].

Low-pressure pneumoperitoneum is physiologically attractive and may reduce postoperative pain and tissue stress. However, current evidence is limited and inconsistent, particularly in gynecology.

Carbon dioxide remains the standard insufflation gas due to safety and physiological compatibility [16]. However, it contributes to peritoneal acidosis, desiccation, and hypoxia, which may promote adhesion formation.

Alternative gases and modified environments are under investigation but remain experimental. Current evidence is insufficient to support routine clinical use, making this an important area for future research [17], [18], [19].

Volume: 5 Issue: 05 | May–2026 ISSN: 2720-6866
http://journals.academiczone.net/index.php/rjtds

Contradictions and Evidence Gaps

Despite significant progress, major gaps remain:

- Lack of reliable preoperative diagnostic tools
- Poor standardization of adhesion assessment
- Disconnect between morphological and clinical outcomes
- Uncertainty in patient selection for adhesiolysis
- Limited evidence on optimal laparoscopic conditions

Additionally, much of the evidence is derived from general surgery, limiting its applicability to gynecology [20].

Conclusion

Modern management of adhesion disease in gynecology reflects substantial progress but remains incomplete. While surgical and preventive strategies have improved, none provide a definitive solution. Adhesion formation is not only a technical issue but also a biological process that is not yet fully controlled.

Future research must focus on:

- Standardized diagnostic methods
- Clinically meaningful outcomes
- Optimization of surgical environment
- Integration of prevention strategies

Only through this shift can meaningful improvements in patient outcomes be achieved.

References

[1] Practice Committee of the American Society for Reproductive Medicine and Society of Reproductive Surgeons, “Postoperative Adhesions in Gynecologic Surgery: A Committee Opinion,” *Fertility and Sterility*, vol. 112, no. 3, pp. 458–463, 2019.

[2] World Health Organization, *Infertility*. Geneva, Switzerland: WHO, 2025.

[3] S. D. Schaefer, I. Alkatout, N. Dornhoefer, J. Herrmann, R. Klapdor, I. Meinhold-Heerlein *et al.*, “Prevention of Peritoneal Adhesions After Gynecological Surgery: A Systematic Review,” *Archives of Gynecology and Obstetrics*, vol. 310, pp. 655–672, 2024.

[4] G. Ahmad, K. Kim, M. Thompson, P. Agarwal, H. O’Flynn, A. Hindocha, and A. Watson, “Barrier Agents for Adhesion Prevention After Gynaecological Surgery,” *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, no. 3, Art. no. CD000475, 2020.

[5] J. Gerner-Rasmussen, A. M. Donatsky, and F. Bjerrum, “The Role of Non-Invasive Imaging Techniques in Detecting Intra-Abdominal Adhesions: A Systematic Review,” *Langenbeck’s Archives of Surgery*, vol. 404, no. 6, pp. 653–661, 2019.

[6] E. B. Kyle, S. Maheux-Lacroix, A. Boutin, P. Y. Laberge, and M. Lemyre, “Low vs Standard Pressures in Gynecologic Laparoscopy: A Systematic Review,” *JSLS*, vol. 20, no. 1, Art. no. e2015.00113, 2016.

[7] D. M. D. Özdemir-van Brunschot, K. C. J. H. M. van Laarhoven, G.-J. Scheffer, S. Pouwels, K. E. Wever, and M. C. Warlé, “What is the Evidence for the Use of Low-Pressure Pneumoperitoneum? A Systematic Review,” *Surgical Endoscopy*, vol. 30, no. 5, pp. 2049–2065, 2016.

Volume: 5 Issue: 05 | May–2026 ISSN: 2720-6866
http://journals.academiczone.net/index.php/rjtds

[8] W.-C. Hsu, W.-C. Chang, S.-C. Huang, P.-L. Torng, and D.-Y. Chang, "Visceral Sliding Technique is Useful for Detecting Abdominal Adhesion and Preventing Laparoscopic Surgical Complications," *Gynecologic and Obstetric Investigation*, vol. 62, no. 2, pp. 75–78, 2006.

[9] N. B. Zinther, A. Zeuten, E. Marinovskij, M. Haislund, H. Friis-Andersen, and J. Rosenberg, "Detection of Abdominal Wall Adhesions Using Visceral Slide," *Surgical Endoscopy*, vol. 24, no. 12, pp. 3161–3166, 2010.

[10] Y. Altıntaş, M. Bayrak, and O. Alabaz, "Assessment of the Diagnostic Efficacy of Abdominal Ultrasonography and Cine Magnetic Resonance Imaging in Detecting Abdominal Adhesions," *European Journal of Radiology*, vol. 126, Art. no. 108922, 2020.

[11] B. de Wilde, F. Joosten, W. Venderink, M. E. J. Davidse, J. Geurts, H. Kruijt *et al.*, "Inter- and Intra-Observer Variability and the Effect of Experience in Cine-MRI for Adhesion Detection," *Journal of Imaging*, vol. 9, no. 3, Art. no. 55, 2023.

[12] M. Wang, X. Guo, Y. Guo *et al.*, "Laparoscopic Adhesiolysis for Adhesion-Related Chronic Abdominal and Pelvic Pain After Gynaecological and General Surgery: An Updated Meta-Analysis and Systematic Review," *BMC Surgery*, vol. 26, Art. no. 274, 2026.

[13] D. E. Luciano, G. Roy, and A. A. Luciano, "Adhesion Reformation After Laparoscopic Adhesiolysis: Where, What Type, and in Whom They Are Most Likely to Recur," *Journal of Minimally Invasive Gynecology*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 44–48, 2008.

[14] H. G. Saravelos, T. C. Li, and I. D. Cooke, "An Analysis of the Outcome of Microsurgical and Laparoscopic Adhesiolysis for Infertility," *Human Reproduction*, vol. 10, no. 11, pp. 2887–2894, 1995.

[15] R. P. G. ten Broek, P. Krielen, S. Di Saverio, F. Coccolini, W. L. Biffl, L. Ansaloni *et al.*, "Bologna Guidelines for Diagnosis and Management of Adhesive Small Bowel Obstruction (ASBO): 2017 Update," *World Journal of Emergency Surgery*, vol. 13, Art. no. 24, 2018.

[16] E. Sebastian-Valverde, I. Poves, E. Membrilla-Fernández, M. J. Pons-Fragero, and L. Grande, "The Role of the Laparoscopic Approach in the Surgical Management of Acute Adhesive Small Bowel Obstruction," *BMC Surgery*, vol. 19, Art. no. 40, 2019.

[17] D. B. O'Connor and D. C. Winter, "The Role of Laparoscopy in the Management of Acute Small-Bowel Obstruction: A Review of Over 2,000 Cases," *Surgical Endoscopy*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 12–17, 2012.

[18] R. L. De Wilde and G. Trew, "Postoperative Abdominal Adhesions and Their Prevention in Gynaecological Surgery: Expert Consensus Position," *Gynecological Surgery*, vol. 4, pp. 161–168, 2007.

[19] R. L. De Wilde and G. Trew, "Postoperative Abdominal Adhesions and Their Prevention in Gynaecological Surgery. Part 2 — Steps to Reduce Adhesions," *Gynecological Surgery*, vol. 4, pp. 243–253, 2007.

[20] F. L. Mackie, S. Dias, A. Watson, and G. Ahmad, "A Meta-Analysis of the Use of 4% Icodextrin Solution to Prevent Adhesion Formation After Gynaecological Surgery," *Gynecological Surgery*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 5–10, 2013.