Mobile Phone in Stomach—Is Endoscopic Trial Worthwhile?: A Case Report
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Abstract

A 35-year-old male prisoner with a history of mobile phone ingestion was referred to our center for management. Clinical examination was unremarkable. After confirmation on abdominal X-ray, we removed it endoscopically without any complication. To the best of our knowledge, this is only the second case report of successful endoscopic removal of mobile phone.
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Introduction

Gastrointestinal (GI) foreign bodies may result from intentional or unintentional ingestion. It is a relatively common emergency faced by endoscopists. Almost 80% of subgroup belongs to pediatric population and it is almost always unintentional. The most common groups among adults that intentionally ingested foreign bodies are psychiatric patients and prisoners. Often complex foreign bodies found in these groups of patients, especially in the latter group. Most (90%) ingested foreign bodies pass without the need for intervention.1,2 Endoscopic intervention is required in 10 to 20% of patients, and surgical intervention is required in less than 1%.3,4 Most of guidelines talk about common foreign bodies.3,5 Complex foreign bodies ingestions are mostly described in case reports. Approach to these cases is not standardized. Endoscopic removal is uncommonly attempted and rarely successful. Few case reports are there about removal of rare or complex foreign bodies. Here we discuss one of a rare case of mobile phone retrieved endoscopically, very safely and averting need of surgery. Till date, there are only three case reports on mobile phone ingestion as foreign body, out of which only one showed that it could be removed endoscopically.6-8

Case

A 35-year-old male prisoner was referred to our outpatient department with alleged history of ingestion of a mobile phone. An abdominal X-ray was done at the prison hospital which was showing a mobile phone in the stomach (Fig. 1). Patient was hemodynamically stable and had no comorbidities.

Fig. 1 X-ray abdomen showing the mobile phone (red arrow).

After obtaining consent, we did upper GI endoscopy. We found a mobile phone wrapped with polythene in stomach.
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Discussion

Although 80 to 90% foreign bodies spontaneously pass through GI tract without complications, 10 to 15% require endoscopic removal and less than 1% needs surgical intervention. Blunt objects more than 2.5 cm or long objects more than 5 cm are unlikely to pass beyond pylorus. Our case was a similar case scenario where a mobile phone (6.5 cm × 2.5 cm;  Fig. 3 ) was found in stomach after 24 hours as expected. There is a scarcity of data on endoscopic removal of large blunt objects endoscopically. There are only three case reports published till date describing mobile phone as foreign body, two of which described the use of surgery as a definitive therapy. The other case report is the only one till now showing endoscopic removal of mobile phone. We used snare to remove mobile phone, using a technique where phone was removed along the long axis parallel to esophagus, so that there was no injury.

Our case is the second case report of successful endoscopic removal of mobile phone.

Conclusion

Though a single case report cannot make recommendations, but a message can be given to clinicians that endoscopic removal is a safe and can prevent surgery and worth an attempt before surgery.
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