

**European Society of ColoProctology
guideline for haemorrhoidal disease**

van Tol, R. R.; Kleijnen, J.; Watson, A. J.M.; Jongen, J.; Altomare, D. F.; Qvist, N.; Higuero, T.; Muris, J. W.M.; Breukink, S. O.

Published in:
Colorectal Disease

DOI:
10.1111/codi.14975

Publication date:
2020

Document version:
Accepted manuscript

Citation for pulished version (APA):
van Tol, R. R., Kleijnen, J., Watson, A. J. M., Jongen, J., Altomare, D. F., Qvist, N., Higuero, T., Muris, J. W. M., & Breukink, S. O. (2020). European Society of ColoProctology: guideline for haemorrhoidal disease. *Colorectal Disease*, 22(6), 650-662. <https://doi.org/10.1111/codi.14975>

Go to publication entry in University of Southern Denmark's Research Portal

Terms of use

This work is brought to you by the University of Southern Denmark.
Unless otherwise specified it has been shared according to the terms for self-archiving.
If no other license is stated, these terms apply:

- You may download this work for personal use only.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying this open access version

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details and we will investigate your claim.
Please direct all enquiries to puresupport@bib.sdu.dk

DR ROBIN ROWAN VAN TOL (Orcid ID : 0000-0003-3055-2116)

Article type : ESCP

CDI-00496-2019.R2

Guidelines

European Society of ColoProctology (ESCP): Guideline for Haemorrhoidal Disease

R.R. van Tol¹, J. Kleijnen², A.J.M. Watson³, J. Jongen⁴, D.F. Altomare⁵, N. Qvist⁶, T. Higuero⁷, J.W.M. Muris⁸, S.O. Breukink¹

¹Department of Surgery, Maastricht University Medical Centre +, 6202 AZ, Maastricht, the Netherlands

² Care and Public Health Research Institute (CAPHRI), Maastricht University Medical Center +, 6202 AZ, Maastricht, The Netherlands

³Department of Surgery Raigmore Hospital, Inverness IV2 3UJ, Scotland, UK

This is the author manuscript accepted for publication and has undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the [Version of Record](#). Please cite this article as [doi: 10.1111/CODI.14975](https://doi.org/10.1111/CODI.14975)

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

⁴Proktologische Praxis Kiel and Department of Surgical Proctology, Park-Klinik, Goethestraße 11, 24116, Germany

⁵Department of Emergency and Organ Transplantation, University of Aldo Moro of Bari, Piazza G. Cesare, 11 - Policlinico 70124 Bari, Italy

⁶Surgical Department A, Odense University Hospital, JB Winsløvsvej 4, 5000 Odense C, Denmark

⁷Clinique Saint Antoine, avenue Durante, Nice, France

⁸Department of Family Medicine/General Practice, Research Institute CAPHRI, Maastricht University, 6200 MD Maastricht, the Netherlands

Funding/support: an unrestricted grant was received from the guidelines committee of the ESCP

Correspondence to: S.O. Breukink, M.D. PhD., Department of Surgery, Maastricht University Medical Centre, PO Box 5800, 6202 AZ Maastricht, the Netherlands, (email: s.breukink@mumc.nl)

Word count: 5212

Abstract

Aim: The goal of this European Society of ColoProctology (ESCP) project was to establish a multidisciplinary, international guideline for haemorrhoidal disease (HD) and to provide guidance on the most effective (surgical) treatment for patients with HD.

Methods: The development process consisted of six phases. In **phase one** we defined the scope of the guideline. The patient population included patients with all stages of haemorrhoids. The target group for the guideline was all practitioners treating patients with haemorrhoids and in addition, healthcare workers and patients who desire information regarding the treatment management of HD. The guideline needed to address both the diagnosis of and the therapeutic modalities for HD t. **Phase two** consisted of the compilation of the guideline development group (GDG). All clinical members needed to have affinity with the diagnosis and treatment of haemorrhoids. Further, attention was paid to geographical distribution of the clinicians. Each GDG member identified at least one patient in their country who could read English to comment on the draft guideline. In **phase three** review questions were formulated, using a reversed process, starting with possible recommendations based on the GDG's knowledge. In **phase four** a literature search was performed in MEDLINE (Ovid), PubMed, EMBASE (Ovid), and the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. The search was focused on existing systematic reviews addressing each review question, supplemented by other studies published after the time frame covered by the systematic reviews. In **phase five** data of the included papers were extracted by the surgical resident (RT) and checked by the methodologist (JK) and the GDG. If needed, meta-analysis of the systematic reviews was updated by the surgical resident and the methodologist using Review Manager (RevMan). During **phase six** the GDG members decided what recommendations could be made based on the evidence found in literature using GRADE.

Results: Six sections: 1) symptoms, diagnosis & classification, 2) basic treatment, 3) outpatient procedures, 4) surgical interventions, 5) special situations, 6) other surgical techniques.³⁴ recommendations were formulated.

Conclusion: This international, multidisciplinary guideline provides an up to date and evidence based summary of the current knowledge of the management of HD and may serve as a useful guide for patients and clinicians.

What does this paper add to the literature?

This is the first international, multidisciplinary guideline that provides an up to date and evidence based summary of the current knowledge of the management of HD and may serve as a useful guide for patients and clinicians.

Introduction

Haemorrhoidal disease (HD) is one of the most frequent anorectal disorders. The prevalence rates vary between 4,4 and 45% (1-4).

Over the past decades, an enormous amount of HD research, including several national guidelines, has been conducted (5-7). The most recently published national guideline is from the German guideline committee published in March 2019 (<https://www.awmf.org/leitlinien/detail/II/081-007.html>). There is a newly updated guideline from the American Society of Colon and Rectal Surgeons (ASCRS) (7). These guidelines could be improved with more robust methodology on how the recommendations were formulated. The AGREE Enterprise developed the first instrument to assess the quality and reporting of guidelines (8). According to the AGREE checklist, existing national HD guidelines do not describe rigorous development methodology. The guidelines often do not report their review questions or the methods used for formulating their recommendations.

The aim of this guideline was to develop an international, multidisciplinary, high quality guideline in collaboration with the European Society of Coloproctology (ESCP) addressing both the diagnosis of and the therapy for HD.

Methodology

The full methodology has been published on the ESCP website <https://www.escp.eu.com/images/guidelines/documents/Development-ESCP-Guideline-Haemorrhoidal-Disease.pdf>. The development process consisted of six phases.

Phase one: setting the scope

In **phase one** we defined the scope of the guideline taking into account the patient, the target group and the different treatment modalities.

We decided that the guideline should apply to patients with all stages of HD in whom (surgical) interventions are being considered. The target audience is all practitioners treating patients with HD (e.g. general practitioners, surgeons, gastroenterologists, dermatologists), healthcare workers and patients who desire information about the management of HD. The guideline needed to address both the diagnosis of and therapy for haemorrhoids..

Phase two: compilation of guideline development group (GDG)

In **phase two** we created the guideline development group (GDG). All clinical members of the GDG had to have an affinity with the diagnosis and treatment of patients with haemorrhoids. In addition, a geographical spread of clinicians from Europe was wished for, as the guideline is aimed at an international audience. We asked all international representatives of the ESCP to participate. Most representatives replied that they did not treat HD or they felt that they were not experienced enough to provide input. Following their recommendations, healthcare professionals with an in-depth understanding of HD and/or development of guidelines were invited using the so-called "snowball method". The guideline development group (GDG) included members from six European countries (Denmark, Italy, France, Germany, the Netherlands and the UK) and it consisted of five colorectal surgeons (SB, DA, JJ, NQ, AW), one gastroenterologist (TH), one general practitioner (JM), one surgical resident (RT) and one methodologist (JK) with extensive experience in guideline development. One dermatologist (CH) commented on the guideline drafts, but was not a member of the GDG. Each GDG member identified at least one patient in their country who could read English to comment on the draft guideline.

The GDG members were assisted by a team of methodologists (staff at Kleijnen Systematic Reviews Ltd).

Phase three: formulating review questions

In **phase three** we developed the first set of review questions. The review questions were built up using a reverse process, starting with possible recommendations based on the GDG's knowledge of practice. Budgetary constraints necessitated an efficient and pragmatic process. The review questions functioned as a framework for the design of the literature searches, informed the planning and process of the evidence review, and acted as a guide for the development of recommendations by the GDG. Review questions were altered and clustered into the following 6 sections: 1) symptoms, diagnosis & classification, 2) basic treatment, 3) outpatient procedures, 4) surgical interventions, 5) special situations (e.g. thrombosed haemorrhoids, coagulation defect, immunodeficiency and pregnant women) and 6) other surgical techniques

Phase four: literature searches

In phase four, we performed literature searches based on the review questions in MEDLINE, PubMed, EMBASE, and the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. There were no restrictions concerning publication format or language. The search was limited by date (<25 years) and conducted in August 2017. See appendix X for the complete search.

Titles and abstracts were screened for inclusion by the surgical resident (RT). All GDG members added relevant studies from their own knowledge, to the search.

Inclusion focused on the available systematic reviews addressing each review question, supplemented by further studies published after the time frame covered by the systematic reviews. We used a hierarchy of best available evidence for study selection, i.e. well performed systematic reviews with or without meta-analyses, randomized trials, controlled observational studies, case series and expert opinion. If evidence of a higher level was available, no lower level of evidence was sought or included.

Phase five: reviewing evidence of literature

In **phase five**, data of the included papers were extracted by the surgical resident (RT) and checked by the methodologist (JK) and the GDG.

If needed, we updated high-quality systematic reviews, or included the primary studies of the review, to create a new review. Meta-analysis from the systematic reviews were updated by the surgical resident and the methodologist using Review Manager (RevMan) [Computer program] version 5.3 software.

Quality assessment of the included papers consisted of a systematic process using the ROBIS tool to assess bias by considering the appropriateness of the study design and the methods of the study. The full ROBIS tool and guidance documents are available on the ROBIS website (www.robis-tool.info) or using the link www.jclinepi.com. We used the Cochrane checklist for assessing risk of bias of randomized trials.

Phase six: developing and wording recommendations

In phase six, the GDG members decided what recommendations could be made based on the evidence found in literature using GRADE (9). In case of high evidence, the term 'must', was implemented in the guideline. Concerning moderate evidence, we used the wording 'should or could'. For low graded evidence we used 'could or may', and for very low evidence 'can be considered'. No Delphi process was conducted, GDG reached consensus on all recommendations. In case of minority dissent, we planned to explicitly report this; however, full consensus was reached on all recommendations. This process is also stated in the development paper (<https://www.escp.eu.com/images/guidelines/documents/Development-ESCP-Guideline-Haemorrhoidal-Disease.pdf>).

The draft version of the guideline was posted on the ESCP website for one month for consultation. In addition, Dutch, British, German, Italian and French patients were asked to read the guideline in its final form and were asked to give feedback.

The ESCP Guideline for the management of HD will be updated on an annual basis starting in 2020. This will involve an update of searches and consideration whether recommendations need to be adapted or changed. The guideline group plans to reconvene at annual ESCP conferences to discuss an updated version of the guideline.

Results

This guideline includes the following 6 sections: 1) symptoms, diagnosis & classification, 2) basic treatment, 3) outpatient procedures, 4) surgical interventions, 5) special situations (e.g. thrombosed haemorrhoids, coagulation defect, immunodeficiency and pregnant women) and 6) other surgical techniques. For the extended version of the guideline we want to refer to:

<https://www.escp.eu.com/images/guidelines/documents/ESCP-Guidelines-Haemorrhoidal-Disease-2019-02.pdf>.

This guideline includes 34 recommendations which provide guidance of the most effective management of patients having HD.

1. Evaluation: symptoms, diagnosis and classification

We found little useful evidence for this chapter and the recommendations were predominantly based on expert opinion. The strongest wording used in the recommendations was “should”.

1.1 Healthcare providers should make a provisional diagnosis of HD based on the clinical history whilst also thinking about the presence of other diseases like colorectal cancer and IBD.

Expert opinion, upgraded by guideline development group.

1.2 Inspection and physical examination of the anorectal region should be performed to exclude other anorectal pathology.

Expert opinion, upgraded by guideline development group.

1.3 A procedure (e.g. rigid anoscope, proctoscope or rectoscope) to visualize the entire anal canal must be performed in order to diagnose and to classify the severity of haemorrhoidal disease and to exclude other anal pathology.

Expert opinion, upgraded by guideline development group.

1.4 If there are any indications found during history taking or physical examination of colorectal cancer or IBD, the relevant (inter)national guidelines for these conditions should be applied.

Expert opinion, upgraded by guideline development group.

1.5 Physical examination should be performed in a position that facilitates reliable diagnosis and comfort for the patient; i.e. the left lateral position. Lithotomy and knee-chest position may be alternatives.

Expert opinion, upgraded by guideline development group.

1.6 If a provisional diagnosis of haemorrhoidal disease has been made, basic treatment (i.e. toilet training, laxatives, local anaesthetics and phlebotonics) can be started. Patients with refractory symptoms should be referred.

Expert opinion, upgraded by guideline development group.

See the following chapter 'basic treatment' for evidence regarding toilet training, dietary changes (specifically high fiber diet), topical and pharmacological treatments which may include phlebotonics such as flavonoids.

1.7 For documentation and classification, the Goligher classification has been used most widely and could be used in order to help healthcare providers choose the best therapeutic option for each patient.

Expert opinion, upgraded by guideline development group.

Other recently developed classifications include PATE, the Single Pile Classification (SPC) and a classification by Lunniss et al.(10-12). These classifications might be interesting, but clinically less usable than the Goligher classification. Altogether, we found no evidence favoring one classification over another.

2. Basic treatment

When a patient visits the outpatient clinic with anorectal symptoms which may include bleeding, pain, prolapse, itching and/or soiling and the healthcare provider

has diagnosed haemorrhoids and excluded the presence of colorectal cancer or inflammatory bowel disease, patients can be first reassured that surgical treatment is not mandatory. Indeed, the first management step should consist of basic treatments and advice for all grades of haemorrhoidal disease.

Basic treatments could be used for symptom relief and to prevent prolapse and includes toilet training, dietary changes (specifically high fiber diet), topical and pharmacological treatments which may include phlebotonics such as flavonoids. In addition, it will be important to manage the patients' expectations about symptom control.

These interventions are given in addition to advice about adequate water intake, healthy diet and encouraging physical activity.

2.1 Healthy life style measures, like sufficient water intake, a healthy diet and physical activity should be encouraged.

Expert opinion, upgraded by guideline development group.

No systematic reviews or (randomised) trials were found regarding healthy life style measures.

2.2 Toilet training, including adopting the correct body position during defecation should be advised. Straining and prolonged defecation sessions should be avoided.

Expert opinion, upgraded by guideline development group.

No systematic reviews or (randomised) trials were found regarding toilet training.

2.3 The use of laxatives could be considered for symptom relief and to reduce bleeding.

Low level of evidence.

Analysis of the literature revealed only one systematic review evaluating the use of laxatives (fiber: high fiber diet or bulking agents such as bran, ispaghula, psyllium, stimulant laxatives: senna and bisacodyl, faecal softeners: liquid paraffin, seed oils,

osmotic agents: lactulose, magnesium hydroxide, sorbitol and lactitol) (13). In this systematic review seven RCTs and a total of 378 patients were evaluated.

2.4 Phlebotonics could contribute to symptom reduction.

Low level of evidence.

The analysis of the literature revealed 2 systematic reviews regarding the use of phlebotonics (14, 15). The first systematic review (Alonso-Coello 2006) included 14 trials (of which 4 trials are not reported in the review of Perera Nirmal) with a total of 1,514 patients. The other systematic review (Perera Nirmal 2012) included 24 RCTs with a total of 2,344 patients.

2.5 NSAIDs and non-opioids analgesics could be prescribed for pain.

Expert opinion.

There are no scientific data evaluating NSAIDs, cortisone and its derivatives for the treatment of haemorrhoids.

3. Outpatient procedures

In patients where basic treatment has not resulted in acceptable symptom reduction, further procedures should be considered. As some treatments are less invasive, have fewer and/or less serious reported complications and are quicker and cheaper than others, we propose that clinicians first consider outpatient procedures (i.e. Rubber Band Ligation (RBL), Sclerotherapy (SCL) or Infrared Coagulation (IRC)). Nevertheless, patients with circular prolapsing grade III and especially grade IV haemorrhoidal disease (HD) may be treated with primary surgical interventions like Haemorrhoidectomy, Stapled Haemorrhoidopexy (SH) or Doppler Guided-Haemorrhoidal Artery Ligation + mucopexy (DG-HAL). However, it seems justifiable to use repeat RBL for grade III prolapsing haemorrhoids, recognizing that surgical procedures will be necessary for patients whose symptoms are not relieved with RBL and [those] with circular prolapse. Equally, outpatient procedures could be performed in patients with grade III and IV HD when primary surgery is contra-indicated or the patient refuses primary surgery. This is represented in the figure 1.

3.1 Choice of the outpatient procedure (i.e. rubber band ligation, injection sclerotherapy and infrared coagulation) should be informed by shared-decision making, taking into account patient preferences, availability of procedures and fitness for further procedures.

Expert opinion, upgraded by guideline development group.

3.2 Rubber band ligation should be performed in grade I-III haemorrhoidal disease. Repeat banding may be necessary.

Moderate level of evidence.

The analysis of the literature revealed one meta-analysis (McRae 1995) comparing RBL, IRC and SCL and included 18 RCTs and observational studies. The following comparisons were made: RBL versus surgical haemorrhoidectomy (3 observational studies), Lord-procedure (e.g. manual dilatation) versus surgical haemorrhoidectomy (6 observational studies), sclerotherapy versus infrared coagulation (one RCT and one observational study), sclerotherapy versus RBL (3 observational studies and one RCT) and RBL versus infrared coagulation (3 RCTs) (16).

The meta-analysis (Shanmugam 2005), including three trials (Murie 1980, Cheng 1981 and Lewis 1983) and 216 patients, compared RBL with haemorrhoidectomy (17).

Two RCTs (Shanmugam 2010 and Peng 2003) including a total of 105 patients compared RBL with the SH (18, 19).

One RCT (Brown 2016), including 372 patients, compared RBL with DG-HAL (20).

3.3 Infrared coagulation could be used as the first option in bleeding grade I haemorrhoids.

Low level of evidence.

The analysis of literature revealed five RCTs comparing RBL and IRC. These RCTs included a total of 680 patients (21-25).

3.4 Injection sclerotherapy could be used in patients with grade I-II haemorrhoidal disease.

Low level of evidence.

The analysis of the literature revealed three RCTs comparing RBL versus SCL. These RCTs included a total of 606 patients (26-28).

4 Surgical treatment

In patients where basic treatment and/or outpatient procedures have not resulted in acceptable outcomes or in grade III and IV haemorrhoidal disease, surgical procedures could be considered. These include Haemorrhoidectomy, Stapled Haemorrhoidopexy (SH) and/or a mucopexy with or without Doppler-Guided Haemorrhoidal Artery ligation (DG-HAL).

4.1 Choice of surgical treatment should be informed by shared-decision making, taking into account patient preferences, availability of procedures and fitness for surgical procedures.

Expert opinion, upgraded by guideline development group.

4.2 Doppler - guided haemorrhoidal artery ligation +/- mucopexy could be used in patients with grade II-III haemorrhoids and/or in patients who are refractory to outpatient procedures (*low level of evidence*). However, because the effectiveness of using a Doppler is currently questioned, mucopexy alone could be considered.

Very low level of evidence, upgraded by the guideline development group.

The analysis of the literature revealed two RCTs that assessed the efficacy of the Doppler transducer, the addition of a mucopexy and ligation under visual control followed by a mucopexy (29, 30).

Two systematic reviews compared DG-HAL and SH. The first systematic review (Pucher 2013) included 28 trials and 2904 patients (6 trials were RCTs). Another systematic review (Sajid 2012) included three randomised trials (two of these were also reported in the review mentioned above) and 150 patients (31-33).

One meta-analysis (Xu 2016), including four RCTs and 316 patients, and one RCT (Bursics 2004) including 60 patients, compared DG-HAL + mucopexy with the haemorrhoidectomy (34, 35).

4.3 Stapled haemorrhoidopexy could be used in patients with grade II-III haemorrhoids and/or in patients who are refractory to outpatient procedures.

Low level of evidence.

4.4 Haemorrhoidectomy could be used in patients with grade II-III haemorrhoids and/or should be used in patients who are refractory to outpatient procedures.

Moderate level of evidence.

4.5 Haemorrhoidectomy should be used for grade IV haemorrhoids.

Moderate level of evidence.

Three meta-analyses, four systematic reviews and one RCT were found comparing haemorrhoidectomy with SH (36-43).

5. Special situations

Thrombosed haemorrhoids

In the anocutaneous junction there is a venous plexus (anatomically called “plexus haemorrhoidalis externa”) and here perianal thromboses or perianal haematomata may develop, which can cause severe pain and swelling. In these cases, the thrombosed vessels are covered by skin and there is no prolapsed mucosa. We suggest this phenomenon is called “perianal thrombosis” to make it distinguishable from thrombosed haemorrhoids since it is also possible for haemorrhoids to become

incarcerated/ thrombosed. This may happen with grade II, III and /or IV haemorrhoids. In this guideline, we focus on thrombosed haemorrhoids.

5.1 In patients with thrombosed haemorrhoids, treatment should be informed by shared-decision making, taking into account patient preferences, availability of procedures and fitness for further procedures.

Expert opinion, upgraded by guideline development group.

There is a remarkable paucity of studies reporting on thrombosed haemorrhoids and even fewer studies provided high level of evidence. No systematic reviews were found regarding this subject.

5.2 Primarily, basic treatment (i.e. toilet training, laxatives, NSAIDS and non-opioid analgesics) can be considered in patients with thrombosed haemorrhoids (expert opinion). Phlebotonics could be considered in patients with thrombosed haemorrhoids (low level of evidence). In selected cases, surgical options may be discussed with the patient.

Very low level of evidence.

There were no scientific data evaluating NSAIDs for the treatment of thrombosed haemorrhoids. However, analgesics could be prescribed for pain.

The analysis of the literature revealed one RCT (Giannini 2015), including 134 patients, assessing the efficacy of the oral intake of flavonoids versus placebo in patients with acute 'haemorrhoidal crisis' (44).

5.3 Surgical procedures (i.e. stapled haemorrhoidopexy and haemorrhoidectomy) can be considered in patients with thrombosed haemorrhoids.

Very low level of evidence.

Three RCT's compared SH with haemorrhoidectomy. The first RCT (Lai 2007) included 80 patients (45). Another RCT (Brown 2001) included 35 patients (46). Another RCT (Wong 2008) included 41 patients (47).

Immunodeficiency

Immunocompromised patients have an increased risk of anorectal sepsis and poor tissue healing after any intervention. Therefore an operation should be avoided, or should be performed only after careful consideration (48). Also, antibiotic prophylaxis should be given before performing any intervention.

5.4 Outpatient procedures (including rubber band ligation and sclerotherapy) in immunocompromised patients seem to be safe, but very limited data are available.

Very low level of evidence.

The analysis of the literature revealed that two studies assessed if SCL can be safely performed in patients with acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (HIV). One observational study included 22 patients with HIV who underwent SCL. Another observational study included a total of 76 patients with haemorrhoids (36 positive HIV and 40 negative HIV) (Scaglia 2001)(49).

One observational study assessed if RBL can be safely performed in select HIV-positive patients (50).

Pregnant women

(Thrombosed) haemorrhoids are a common condition in pregnant women due to an increased endopelvic pressure. The exact prevalence is unknown. One study reported that 8% of women during the last trimester pregnancy and 20% of women immediately after delivery develop thrombosed haemorrhoids (51, 52). A survey, including 165 obstetricians, showed that only 42% of obstetricians refer these females to the consultant for HD treatment (53). For many women, symptoms will resolve spontaneously soon after birth, and so the primary goal of treatment is to relieve acute symptoms mostly by means of dietary and lifestyle modification (Abramowitz 2011).

5.5 In pregnant and postpartum women basic treatment (i.e. laxatives, topical treatments, phlebotonics and analgesics) should be used.

Expert opinion, upgraded by the guideline development group.

The analysis of the literature revealed one review, including 2 trials and 150 pregnant females, that compared oral hydroxyl ethylrutosides, a flavonoid drug given to improve the microcirculation in venous insufficiency, with placebo (54).

Two studies evaluated the effectiveness of Proctofoam-HC^R, a combination of corticosteroid and a local anaesthetic in 292 pregnant females (55, 56).

One observational study, including 495 pregnant females, compared three times per day salty warm Sitz bath (using 20g of commercial salt) (n=284) with topical cream (containing corticoid and anaesthetic) twice daily (57).

5.6 In pregnant and postpartum women with thrombosed haemorrhoids unresponsive to basic treatment, surgical procedures to treat thrombosis can be considered.

Expert opinion.

One cohort study assessed the efficacy of haemorrhoidectomy among 25 pregnant women with HD (58).

Inflammatory Bowel Disease (IBD)

Haemorrhoids are relatively uncommon in Inflammatory Bowel Disease (IBD) patients (59). However, this anal problem could be underestimated, because of a bias due to the higher attention paid to the other clinical features of IBD.

5.7 In patients with Inflammatory Bowel Disease (IBD), outpatient procedures and/or surgical procedures can only be considered when there is no sign of active disease.

Expert opinion, upgraded by the guideline development group.

The analysis of literature revealed one prospective study (D'Ugo 2013) which included 86 patients with Crohn's disease and compared outpatient and surgical procedures (60). Another retrospective study (Cracco 2014) included eleven retrospective studies including 135 patients with IBD (61).

Irradiation

Radiation therapy has a major role in the treatment of a number of malignancies arising in the pelvis (i.e. carcinoma of the prostate, bladder, rectum and gynecological malignancies).

5.8 Outpatient/ and or surgical procedures in patients who have undergone pelvic radiotherapy can generally not be considered.

Expert opinion.

In the literature, there is no evidence regarding the outcome of haemorrhoidal treatment in irradiated patients. However, there are some papers indicating that surgical treatment in patients who have undergone pelvic radiotherapy can have catastrophic sequelae. The study of Hayne et al. showed that more than three-quarters of patients receiving pelvic radiotherapy, experience acute anorectal symptoms and up to one-fifth suffer from late phase radiation proctitis (62).

Coagulation disorder

Conservative measures are the mainstay of treatment for patients with a coagulation disorder.

5.9 If an outpatient procedure and/or surgical procedure is scheduled, appropriate cessation of anticoagulant therapy should be followed according to national guidance.

Very low level of evidence, upgraded by guideline development group.

One retrospective review identified 364 patients undergoing RBL while on antithrombotic therapy (AT) (63).

One controlled study, including 37 patients having HD, compared patients undergoing SCL while on AT versus patients who were not on AT (64).

One retrospective cohort study compared AT patients (n=36) versus non-AT patients (n=70) with symptomatic haemorrhoids who underwent DG-HAL (65).

6. Other surgical techniques (closed/open haemorrhoidectomy, Ligasure^R etc)

6.1 Both the closed and open haemorrhoidectomy (not using energy devices) could be used (*low level of evidence*). The closed haemorrhoidectomy is associated with less pain and bleeding.

Low level of evidence.

One meta-analysis (Xu 2015), including 5 RCTs and 318 patients, compared the Ligasure^R with the Ferguson (closed) haemorrhoidectomy (66).

6.2 Surgical energy devices (Ligasure^R and Harmonic scalpel^R) could be used for haemorrhoidectomy.

Low level of evidence.

The analysis of the literature revealed one meta-analysis (Mushaya 2014), including 8 studies and 468 patients, that compared the Harmonic scalpel^R haemorrhoidectomy with the Haemorrhoidectomy (67).

6.3 Alternative procedures (Laser and Radiofrequency ablation procedures) could be used/can be considered.

Low level of evidence.

Three RCTs (Naderan 2017, Maluku 2014 and Giamundo 2011), including a total of 160 patients, compared the outcomes of intra-haemorrhoidal coagulation with 980-nanometer (nm) diode laser with the Haemorrhoidectomy (68-70).

6.4 Rectal resection using a stapler device (including STARR^R) should not be used to treat haemorrhoids.

Low level of evidence, downgraded by the experts.

Three RCTs (Corsale 2014, Zanella 2014 and Boccasanta 2006), including a total of 691 patients, compared stapled haemorrhoidopexy (SH) with the STARR procedure (71-73) .

One RCT (Renzi 2011), including 425 patients, compared the clinical and functional results of STARR performed with 2 staplers (PPH-01 vs. PPH-03) (74).

Discussion

This is a first high-quality, multidisciplinary, international guideline for the management of HD. According to this guideline, for grade I and II haemorrhoids, RBL appears to be the treatment of choice, because patients who undergo RBL showed a significantly better response compared to patients treated with SCL and/or IRC. In addition, patients treated by RBL have significantly less recurrence compared to patients treated with SCL or IRC. IRC may be the first treatment option in bleeding grade I haemorrhoids because it causes less pain and complications (25). Complication rates were similar between RBL, IRC and SCL (75-77). For grade III and IV haemorrhoids, haemorrhoidectomy remains the treatment of choice. Comparing SH and haemorrhoidectomy, the efficacy of SH is generally lower than haemorrhoidectomy (78), especially in grade IV HD (78). The DG-HAL + mucopexy may be considered in patients with grade II-III HD. However, more research regarding this technique is necessary. The additional effect of the Doppler is currently being questioned since two studies showed that significantly more complications and unscheduled postoperative events were reported in the DG-HAL + mucopexy group compared to the mucopexy alone group (29, 30).

To date, several national guidelines have been published, including the American Society of Colon and Rectal Surgeons guideline (7) and the Italian (79)- and French HD guideline (6). The overall methodological quality of these guidelines for HD is suboptimal. In most guidelines, the review questions and methods for formulating their recommendations are not reported. The AGREE Enterprise is the first initiative which developed an instrument diminishing variability in practice guideline quality [21]. The extensive processes following the AGREE II instrument and using GRADE are the main strengths of this guideline (80-82).

However, several limitations remain present. The first limitation of this guideline was that patients were only partially involved in the development of this guideline. We invited two patients to be GDG members, but they were unable to attend any of the meetings. Besides, we have asked, Dutch, British, German, Italian and French patients to read the guideline in its final concept and asked them for feedback. The patients did not have substantial comments which resulted in a change of the guideline. For the coming update, which is planned in 2020, a patient will be member of the guideline development group. A separate patient information chapter describing the different techniques, was added to the current guideline. Further, we asked all international representatives of the ESCP to participate. Most representatives replied that they did not treat HD or they felt that they were not experienced enough to provide input. Following their recommendations, healthcare professionals with an in-depth understanding of HD and/or development of guidelines were invited using the so-called “snowball method”. This strategy resulted in a dedicated group of experts with knowledge of the field, but smaller in size than initially planned, which may be a limitation of the study. The third limitation of this guideline was the minimal guidance regarding economic data. The financial reimbursement for HD is different for each country. Therefore, it is difficult to indicate what the best economic option is per country. The guideline development group chose to give an overview of the published economic data, so that these data can inform local decisions. The fourth limitation was that debate regarding the best treatment option for each grade of HD remains as high level of evidence is lacking. Despite the large volume of HD research that has been conducted over the past decade, only a few studies are of high quality. New procedures emerge with often the same low quality evidence. For future guidelines to have more robust recommendations, new interventions need to be evaluated with more rigorous methodologies.

In addition, the lack of uniform outcome, measurement and reporting in HD research data hampers the ability to compare studies and the creation of optimal treatment guidelines (17, 83, 84). A Core Outcome Set (COS) was recently developed in cooperation with the European Society of Coloproctology (ESCP) (85).

Furthermore, since the evaluation of patient experiences can be very useful in several decision-making contexts, there is a growing chorus of support from

clinicians and researchers to embrace patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs) in clinical care (86-88). In a clinical setting, it can provide a more complete understanding of the impact of a therapy on a patient's life and aid treatment choices (89). In addition, it could also provide scientific evidence for guideline development that incorporates the patient's perspective (90-92). Attempts have been made to develop such a tool. Examples include the Symptom-based Severity Score of Pucher et al. (93), the Haemorrhoid Severity Score (HSS) introduced by Nystrom (94), the Haemorrhoid Symptom Score recently used in the eTHoS trial (95) and the Hemorrhoidal Disease Symptom Score (HDSS) and Short Health Scale HD (SHS) by Rørvik et al. (96). However, these scoring systems have not gained wide acceptance in the clinical and research setting which may be due to a lack of robust validation and or the extensive length of the instrument.

We plan to update the guideline on a regular basis starting in 2020. This will involve update of all searches and assessment of any relevant research found in relation to the current recommendations.

Declarations

Collaborators

Dr. C.J.M. Henquet, Department of Dermatology, Maastricht University Medical Centre (MUMC+), 6202 AZ Maastricht, the Netherlands

Ethics approval

Since this study does not use health data of individuals, ethics approval was not required according to the Dutch federal act on research involving human beings.

Conflicts of interest

All GDG members including Dr. Henquet declared that they had no conflicts of interest. Jos Kleijnen (Kleijnen Systematic Reviews Ltd) has cooperated in the development and is co-author of the ROBIS, PRISMA, QUADAS, STARD and PROBAST tools.

Financial disclosure

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Jan Jongen – received money for a nomination at a satellite conference from Ethicon Endosurgery.

Funding

An unrestricted grant was received from the guideline committee of the ESCP, enabling GDG members to meet and a surgical resident (RT) to work with the methodologist (JK). The GDG had full control over the wording of the guideline and there was no influence from the funding body.

Availability of data and materials

All data generated are available in the guideline document and the appendices.

References

1. Lohsiriwat V. Hemorrhoids: from basic pathophysiology to clinical management. *World J Gastroenterol.* 2012;18(17):2009-17.
2. Riss S, Weiser FA, Schwameis K, Riss T, Mittlbock M, Steiner G, et al. The prevalence of hemorrhoids in adults. *Int J Colorectal Dis.* 2012;27(2):215-20.
3. Haas PA, Haas GP. The prevalence of hemorrhoids and chronic constipation. *Gastroenterology.* 1990;99(6):1856-7.
4. Johanson JF, Sonnenberg A. The prevalence of hemorrhoids and chronic constipation. An epidemiologic study. *Gastroenterology.* 1990;98(2):380-6.
5. Trompetto M, Clerico G, Cocorullo GF, Giordano P, Marino F, Martellucci J, et al. Evaluation and management of hemorrhoids: Italian society of colorectal surgery (SICCR) consensus statement. *Tech Coloproctol.* 2015;19(10):567-75.

6. Higuero T, Abramowitz L, Castinel A, Fathallah N, Hemery P, Laclotte Duhoux C, et al. Guidelines for the treatment of hemorrhoids (short report). *J Visc Surg*. 2016;153(3):213-8.
7. Davis BR, Lee-Kong SA, Migaly J, Feingold DL, Steele SR. The American Society of Colon and Rectal Surgeons Clinical Practice Guidelines for the Management of Hemorrhoids. *Dis Colon Rectum*. 2018;61(3):284-92.
8. Cartabellotta A. [AGREE II: assessing the quality of practice guidelines]. *Recenti Prog Med*. 2011;102(5):217-9.
9. Neumann I, Pantoja T, Penaloza B, Cifuentes L, Rada G. [The GRADE system: a change in the way of assessing the quality of evidence and the strength of recommendations]. *Rev Med Chil*. 2014;142(5):630-5.
10. Gaj F, Trecca A. [New "PATE 2006" system for classifying hemorrhoidal disease: advantages resulting from revision of "PATE 2000 Sorrento"]. *Chir Ital*. 2007;59(4):521-6.
11. Elbetti C, Giani I, Novelli E, Fucini C, Martellucci J. The single pile classification: a new tool for the classification of haemorrhoidal disease and the comparison of treatment results. *Updates Surg*. 2015;67(4):421-6.
12. Lunniss PJ, Mann CV. Classification of internal haemorrhoids: a discussion paper. *Colorectal Dis*. 2004;6(4):226-32.
13. Alonso-Coello P, Guyatt G, Heels-Ansdell D, Johanson JF, Lopez-Yarto M, Mills E, et al. Laxatives for the treatment of hemorrhoids. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2005(4):CD004649.
14. Perera N, Liolitsa D, Iype S, Croxford A, Yassin M, Lang P, et al. Phlebotonics for haemorrhoids. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2012(8):CD004322.
15. Alonso-Coello P, Zhou Q, Martinez-Zapata MJ, Mills E, Heels-Ansdell D, Johanson JF, et al. Meta-analysis of flavonoids for the treatment of haemorrhoids. *Br J Surg*. 2006;93(8):909-20.
16. MacRae HM, McLeod RS. Comparison of hemorrhoidal treatments: a meta-analysis. *Can J Surg*. 1997;40(1):14-7.
17. Shanmugam V, Thaha MA, Rabindranath KS, Campbell KL, Steele RJ, Loudon MA. Systematic review of randomized trials comparing rubber band ligation with excisional haemorrhoidectomy. *Br J Surg*. 2005;92(12):1481-7.
18. Shanmugam V, Muthukumarasamy G, Cook JA, Vale L, Watson AJ, Loudon MA. Randomized controlled trial comparing rubber band ligation with stapled

haemorrhoidopexy for Grade II circumferential haemorrhoids: long-term results. *Colorectal Dis.* 2010;12(6):579-86.

19. Peng BC, Jayne DG, Ho YH. Randomized trial of rubber band ligation vs. stapled hemorrhoidectomy for prolapsed piles. *Dis Colon Rectum.* 2003;46(3):291-7; discussion 6-7.
20. Brown SR, Tiernan JP, Watson AJM, Biggs K, Shephard N, Wailoo AJ, et al. Haemorrhoidal artery ligation versus rubber band ligation for the management of symptomatic second-degree and third-degree haemorrhoids (HubBLE): a multicentre, open-label, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet.* 2016;388(10042):356-64.
21. Ricci MP, Matos D, Saad SS. Rubber band ligation and infrared photocoagulation for the outpatient treatment of hemorrhoidal disease. *Acta Cir Bras.* 2008;23(1):102-6.
22. Marques CF, Nahas SC, Nahas CS, Sobrado CW, Jr., Habr-Gama A, Kiss DR. Early results of the treatment of internal hemorrhoid disease by infrared coagulation and elastic banding: a prospective randomized cross-over trial. *Tech Coloproctol.* 2006;10(4):312-7.
23. Poen AC, Felt-Bersma RJ, Cuesta MA, Deville W, Meuwissen SG. A randomized controlled trial of rubber band ligation versus infra-red coagulation in the treatment of internal haemorrhoids. *Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol.* 2000;12(5):535-9.
24. Templeton JL, Spence RA, Kennedy TL, Parks TG, Mackenzie G, Hanna WA. Comparison of infrared coagulation and rubber band ligation for first and second degree haemorrhoids: a randomised prospective clinical trial. *Br Med J (Clin Res Ed).* 1983;286(6375):1387-9.
25. Ambrose NS, Hares MM, Alexander-Williams J, Keighley MR. Prospective randomised comparison of photocoagulation and rubber band ligation in treatment of haemorrhoids. *Br Med J (Clin Res Ed).* 1983;286(6375):1389-91.
26. Kanellos I, Goulimaris I, Christoforidis E, Kelpis T, Betsis D. A comparison of the simultaneous application of sclerotherapy and rubber band ligation, with sclerotherapy and rubber band ligation applied separately, for the treatment of haemorrhoids: a prospective randomized trial. *Colorectal Dis.* 2003;5(2):133-8.
27. Gartell PC, Sheridan RJ, McGinn FP. Out-patient treatment of haemorrhoids: a randomized clinical trial to compare rubber band ligation with phenol injection. *Br J Surg.* 1985;72(6):478-9.

28. Greca F, Hares MM, Nevah E, Alexander-Williams J, Keighley MR. A randomized trial to compare rubber band ligation with phenol injection for treatment of haemorrhoids. *Br J Surg.* 1981;68(4):250-2.
29. Aigner F, Kronberger I, Oberwalder M, Loizides A, Ulmer H, Gruber L, et al. Doppler-guided haemorrhoidal artery ligation with suture mucopexy compared with suture mucopexy alone for the treatment of Grade III haemorrhoids: a prospective randomized controlled trial. *Colorectal Dis.* 2016;18(7):710-6.
30. Gupta PJ, Kalaskar S, Taori S, Heda PS. Doppler-guided hemorrhoidal artery ligation does not offer any advantage over suture ligation of grade 3 symptomatic hemorrhoids. *Tech Coloproctol.* 2011;15(4):439-44.
31. Pucher PH, Sodergren MH, Lord AC, Darzi A, Ziprin P. Clinical outcome following Doppler-guided haemorrhoidal artery ligation: a systematic review. *Colorectal Dis.* 2013;15(6):e284-94.
32. Sajid MS, Parampalli U, Whitehouse P, Sains P, McFall MR, Baig MK. A systematic review comparing transanal haemorrhoidal de-arterialisation to stapled haemorrhoidopexy in the management of haemorrhoidal disease. *Tech Coloproctol.* 2012;16(1):1-8.
33. Lehur PA, Didnee AS, Faucheron JL, Meurette G, Zerbib P, Siproudhis L, et al. Cost-effectiveness of New Surgical Treatments for Hemorrhoidal Disease: A Multicentre Randomized Controlled Trial Comparing Transanal Doppler-guided Hemorrhoidal Artery Ligation With Mucopexy and Circular Stapled Hemorrhoidopexy. *Ann Surg.* 2016;264(5):710-6.
34. Xu L, Chen H, Lin G, Ge Q, Qi H, He X. Transanal hemorrhoidal dearterialization with mucopexy versus open hemorrhoidectomy in the treatment of hemorrhoids: a meta-analysis of randomized control trials. *Tech Coloproctol.* 2016;20(12):825-33.
35. Bursics A, Morvay K, Kupcsulik P, Flautner L. Comparison of early and 1-year follow-up results of conventional hemorrhoidectomy and hemorrhoid artery ligation: a randomized study. *Int J Colorectal Dis.* 2004;19(2):176-80.
36. Nisar PJ, Acheson AG, Neal KR, Scholefield JH. Stapled hemorrhoidopexy compared with conventional hemorrhoidectomy: systematic review of randomized, controlled trials. *Dis Colon Rectum.* 2004;47(11):1837-45.
37. Jayaraman S, Colquhoun PH, Malthaner RA. Stapled hemorrhoidopexy is associated with a higher long-term recurrence rate of internal hemorrhoids compared

with conventional excisional hemorrhoid surgery. *Dis Colon Rectum*.

2007;50(9):1297-305.

38. Jayaraman S, Colquhoun PH, Malthaner RA. Stapled versus conventional surgery for hemorrhoids. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2006(4):CD005393.
39. Tjandra JJ, Chan MK. Systematic review on the procedure for prolapse and hemorrhoids (stapled hemorrhoidopexy). *Dis Colon Rectum*. 2007;50(6):878-92.
40. Burch J, Epstein D, Sari AB, Weatherly H, Jayne D, Fox D, et al. Stapled haemorrhoidopexy for the treatment of haemorrhoids: a systematic review. *Colorectal Dis*. 2009;11(3):233-43; discussion 43.
41. Giordano P, Gravante G, Sorge R, Ovens L, Nastro P. Long-term outcomes of stapled hemorrhoidopexy vs conventional hemorrhoidectomy: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Arch Surg*. 2009;144(3):266-72.
42. Yang J, Cui PJ, Han HZ, Tong DN. Meta-analysis of stapled hemorrhoidopexy vs LigaSure hemorrhoidectomy. *World J Gastroenterol*. 2013;19(29):4799-807.
43. Lee KC, Chen HH, Chung KC, Hu WH, Chang CL, Lin SE, et al. Meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials comparing outcomes for stapled hemorrhoidopexy versus LigaSure hemorrhoidectomy for symptomatic hemorrhoids in adults. *Int J Surg*. 2013;11(9):914-8.
44. Giannini I, Amato A, Basso L, Tricomi N, Marranci M, Pecorella G, et al. Flavonoids mixture (diosmin, troxerutin, hesperidin) in the treatment of acute hemorrhoidal disease: a prospective, randomized, triple-blind, controlled trial. *Tech Coloproctol*. 2015;19(6):339-45.
45. Lai HJ, Jao SW, Su CC, Lee MC, Kang JC. Stapled hemorrhoidectomy versus conventional excision hemorrhoidectomy for acute hemorrhoidal crisis. *J Gastrointest Surg*. 2007;11(12):1654-61.
46. Brown SR, Ballan K, Ho E, Ho Fams YH, Seow-Choen F. Stapled mucosectomy for acute thrombosed circumferentially prolapsed piles: a prospective randomized comparison with conventional haemorrhoidectomy. *Colorectal Dis*. 2001;3(3):175-8.
47. Wong JC, Chung CC, Yau KK, Cheung HY, Wong DC, Chan OC, et al. Stapled technique for acute thrombosed hemorrhoids: a randomized, controlled trial with long-term results. *Dis Colon Rectum*. 2008;51(4):397-403.
48. Morandi E, Merlini D, Salvaggio A, Foschi D, Trabucchi E. Prospective study of healing time after hemorrhoidectomy: influence of HIV infection, acquired

- immunodeficiency syndrome, and anal wound infection. *Dis Colon Rectum*. 1999;42(9):1140-4.
49. Wei G, Hua X, Zhao Y, Hu M, Gou F, Liu L, et al. [Clinical study of Ruiyun procedure for hemorrhoids combined with Xiaozhiling injections in treatment of hemorrhoids complicated with human immunodeficiency virus infection]. *Zhonghua Wei Chang Wai Ke Za Zhi*. 2014;17(12):1201-4.
50. Moore BA, Fleshner PR. Rubber band ligation for hemorrhoidal disease can be safely performed in select HIV-positive patients. *Dis Colon Rectum*. 2001;44(8):1079-82.
51. Abramowitz L. [Management of hemorrhoid disease in the pregnant woman]. *Gastroenterol Clin Biol*. 2008;32(5 Pt 2):S210-4.
52. Abramowitz L, Batallan A. [Epidemiology of anal lesions (fissure and thrombosed external hemorrhoid) during pregnancy and post-partum]. *Gynecol Obstet Fertil*. 2003;31(6):546-9.
53. Gaj F, Trecca A. [Thoughts on hemorrhoid disease in pregnancy and the postpartum period]. *Chir Ital*. 2006;58(3):407.
54. Quijano CE, Abalos E. Conservative management of symptomatic and/or complicated haemorrhoids in pregnancy and the puerperium. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2005(3):CD004077.
55. Ebrahimi N, Vohra S, Gedeon C, Akoury H, Bernstein P, Paireudeau N, et al. The fetal safety of hydrocortisone-pramoxine (Proctofoam-HC) for the treatment of hemorrhoids in late pregnancy. *J Obstet Gynaecol Can*. 2011;33(2):153-8.
56. Vohra S, Akoury H, Bernstein P, Einarson TR, Paireudeau N, Taddio A, et al. The effectiveness of Proctofoam-HC for treatment of hemorrhoids in late pregnancy. *J Obstet Gynaecol Can*. 2009;31(7):654-9.
57. Shirah BH, Shirah HA, Fallata AH, Alobidy SN, Hawsawi MMA. Hemorrhoids during pregnancy: Sitz bath vs. ano-rectal cream: A comparative prospective study of two conservative treatment protocols. *Women Birth*. 2017.
58. Saleeby RG, Jr., Rosen L, Stasik JJ, Riether RD, Sheets J, Khubchandani IT. Hemorrhoidectomy during pregnancy: risk or relief? *Dis Colon Rectum*. 1991;34(3):260-1.
59. Lewis RT, Maron DJ. Anorectal Crohn's disease. *Surg Clin North Am*. 2010;90(1):83-97, Table of Contents.


60. D'Ugo S, Franceschilli L, Cadeddu F, Leccesi L, Blanco Gdel V, Calabrese E, et al. Medical and surgical treatment of haemorrhoids and anal fissure in Crohn's disease: a critical appraisal. *BMC Gastroenterol.* 2013;13:47.
61. Cracco N, Zinicola R. Is haemorrhoidectomy in inflammatory bowel disease harmful? An old dogma re-examined. *Colorectal Dis.* 2014;16(7):516-9.
62. Hayne D, Vaizey CJ, Boulos PB. Anorectal injury following pelvic radiotherapy. *Br J Surg.* 2001;88(8):1037-48.
63. Nelson RS, Thorson AG. Risk of bleeding following hemorrhoidal banding in patients on antithrombotic therapy. *Gastroenterol Clin Biol.* 2009;33(6-7):463-5.
64. Yano T, Nogaki T, Asano M, Tanaka S, Kawakami K, Matsuda Y. Outcomes of case-matched injection sclerotherapy with a new agent for hemorrhoids in patients treated with or without blood thinners. *Surg Today.* 2013;43(8):854-8.
65. Atallah S, Maharaja GK, Martin-Perez B, Burke JP, Albert MR, Larach SW. Transanal hemorrhoidal dearterialization (THD): a safe procedure for the anticoagulated patient? *Tech Coloproctol.* 2016;20(7):461-6.
66. Xu L, Chen H, Lin G, Ge Q. Ligasure versus Ferguson hemorrhoidectomy in the treatment of hemorrhoids: a meta-analysis of randomized control trials. *Surg Laparosc Endosc Percutan Tech.* 2015;25(2):106-10.
67. Mushaya CD, Caleo PJ, Bartlett L, Buettner PG, Ho YH. Harmonic scalpel compared with conventional excisional haemorrhoidectomy: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Tech Coloproctol.* 2014;18(11):1009-16.
68. Naderan M, Shoar S, Nazari M, Elsayed A, Mahmoodzadeh H, Khorgami Z. A Randomized Controlled Trial Comparing Laser Intra-Hemorrhoidal Coagulation and Milligan-Morgan Hemorrhoidectomy. *J Invest Surg.* 2017;30(5):325-31.
69. Maluku H, Gashi Z, Lazovic R, Islami H, Juniku-Shkololli A. Laser Hemorrhoidoplasty Procedure vs Open Surgical Hemorrhoidectomy: a Trial Comparing 2 Treatments for Hemorrhoids of Third and Fourth Degree. *Acta Inform Med.* 2014;22(6):365-7.
70. Giamundo P, Salfi R, Geraci M, Tibaldi L, Murru L, Valente M. The hemorrhoid laser procedure technique vs rubber band ligation: a randomized trial comparing 2 mini-invasive treatments for second- and third-degree hemorrhoids. *Dis Colon Rectum.* 2011;54(6):693-8.

71. Corsale I, Rigutini M, Francioli N, Panicucci S, Mori PA, Aloise F. Stapled anopexy and STARR in surgical treatment of haemorrhoidal disease. *Updates Surg.* 2014;66(3):217-22.
72. Zanella S, Spirch S, Scarpa M, Ricci F, Lumachi F. Long-term outcome of stapled transanal rectal resection (STARR) versus stapled hemorrhoidopexys (STH) for grade III-IV hemorrhoids: preliminary results. *In Vivo.* 2014;28(6):1171-4.
73. Boccasanta P, Venturi M, Roviario G. Stapled transanal rectal resection versus stapled anopexy in the cure of hemorrhoids associated with rectal prolapse. A randomized controlled trial. *Int J Colorectal Dis.* 2007;22(3):245-51.
74. Renzi A, Brillantino A, Di Sarno G, D'Aniello F, Giordano A, Stefanuto A, et al. PPH-01 versus PPH-03 to perform STARR for the treatment of hemorrhoids associated with large internal rectal prolapse: a prospective multicenter randomized trial. *Surg Innov.* 2011;18(3):241-7.
75. Walker AJ, Leicester RJ, Nicholls RJ, Mann CV. A prospective study of infrared coagulation, injection and rubber band ligation in the treatment of haemorrhoids. *Int J Colorectal Dis.* 1990;5(2):113-6.
76. Johanson JF, Rimm A. Optimal nonsurgical treatment of hemorrhoids: a comparative analysis of infrared coagulation, rubber band ligation, and injection sclerotherapy. *Am J Gastroenterol.* 1992;87(11):1600-6.
77. Charua Guindic L, Chirino Perez AE, Navarrete Cruces T, Osorio Hernandez RM, Avendano Espinosa O. [Non-surgical alternative management of hemorrhoidal disease]. *Rev Gastroenterol Mex.* 2005;70(3):284-90.
78. Watson AJ, Hudson J, Wood J, Kilonzo M, Brown SR, McDonald A, et al. Comparison of stapled haemorrhoidopexy with traditional excisional surgery for haemorrhoidal disease (eTHoS): a pragmatic, multicentre, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet.* 2016;388(10058):2375-85.
79. Altomare DF, Roveran A, Pecorella G, Gaj F, Stortini E. The treatment of hemorrhoids: guidelines of the Italian Society of Colorectal Surgery. *Tech Coloproctol.* 2006;10(3):181-6.
80. Collaboration A. Development and validation of an international appraisal instrument for assessing the quality of clinical practice guidelines: the AGREE project. *Qual Saf Health Care.* 2003;12(1):18-23.

81. Levin RF, Ferrara L. Using the Appraisal of Guidelines for Research and Evaluation II to assess clinical practice guidelines. *Res Theory Nurs Pract*. 2011;25(3):160-2.
82. Andrews J, Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Alderson P, Dahm P, Falck-Ytter Y, et al. GRADE guidelines: 14. Going from evidence to recommendations: the significance and presentation of recommendations. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2013;66(7):719-25.
83. Shao WJ, Li GC, Zhang ZH, Yang BL, Sun GD, Chen YQ. Systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials comparing stapled haemorrhoidopexy with conventional haemorrhoidectomy. *Br J Surg*. 2008;95(2):147-60.
84. Simillis C, Thoukididou SN, Slessor AA, Rasheed S, Tan E, Tekkis PP. Systematic review and network meta-analysis comparing clinical outcomes and effectiveness of surgical treatments for haemorrhoids. *Br J Surg*. 2015;102(13):1603-18.
85. van Tol RR, Kimman ML, Melenhorst J, Stassen LPS, Dirksen CD, Breukink SO, et al. European Society of Coloproctology Core Outcome Set for haemorrhoidal disease: an international Delphi study among healthcare professionals. *Colorectal Dis*. 2019;21(5):570-80.
86. Bredart A, Marrel A, Abetz-Webb L, Lasch K, Acquadro C. Interviewing to develop Patient-Reported Outcome (PRO) measures for clinical research: eliciting patients' experience. *Health Qual Life Outcomes*. 2014;12:15.
87. Black N. Patient reported outcome measures could help transform healthcare. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)*. 2013;346:f167.
88. Marshall S, Haywood K, Fitzpatrick R. Impact of patient-reported outcome measures on routine practice: a structured review. *Journal of evaluation in clinical practice*. 2006;12(5):559-68.
89. Wijzenbeek M, van Manen M, Bonella F. New insights on patient-reported outcome measures in idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis: only PROMises? *Curr Opin Pulm Med*. 2016;22(5):434-41.
90. Dirksen CD. The use of research evidence on patient preferences in health care decision-making: issues, controversies and moving forward. *Expert Rev Pharmacoecon Outcomes Res*. 2014;14(6):785-94.

91. Barry CA, Bradley CP, Britten N, Stevenson FA, Barber N. Patients' unvoiced agendas in general practice consultations: qualitative study. *BMJ*. 2000;320(7244):1246-50.
92. Kinnersley P, Stott N, Peters TJ, Harvey I. The patient-centredness of consultations and outcome in primary care. *Br J Gen Pract*. 1999;49(446):711-6.
93. Pucher PH, Qurashi M, Howell AM, Faiz O, Ziprin P, Darzi A, et al. Development and validation of a symptom-based severity score for haemorrhoidal disease: the Sodergren score. *Colorectal Dis*. 2015;17(7):612-8.
94. Brown S, Tiernan J, Biggs K, Hind D, Shephard N, Bradburn M, et al. The HubBLE Trial: haemorrhoidal artery ligation (HAL) versus rubber band ligation (RBL) for symptomatic second- and third-degree haemorrhoids: a multicentre randomised controlled trial and health-economic evaluation. *Health Technol Assess*. 2016;20(88):1-150.
95. Watson AJ, Cook J, Hudson J, Kilonzo M, Wood J, Bruhn H, et al. A pragmatic multicentre randomised controlled trial comparing stapled haemorrhoidopexy with traditional excisional surgery for haemorrhoidal disease: the eTHoS study. *Health Technol Assess*. 2017;21(70):1-224.
96. Rorvik HD, Styr K, Illum L, McKinstry GL, Dragesund T, Campos AH, et al. Hemorrhoidal Disease Symptom Score and Short Health ScaleHD: New Tools to Evaluate Symptoms and Health-Related Quality of Life in Hemorrhoidal Disease. *Dis Colon Rectum*. 2019;62(3):333-42.

Evidence based treatment algorithm for haemorrhoids



¹Toilet training, dietary changes (fiber) and topical treatment.

²Repeat banding.

³Doppler-Guided Haemorrhoidal Artery Ligation (DG-HAL).

⁴In grade III and IV there is a possibility to perform RBL when surgery is contra- indicated.

⁵ Shared-decision making, taking into account patient preferences, availability of procedures and fitness for further procedures.

Author Manuscript