Original article

A propensity score matched study:

Predictive signs of anastomotic leakage after gastric cancer surgery and the role of CT

Sah BK, Zhang Y, Li J, Yan C, Li C, Zhang H, Yan M, Zhu ZG

<u>*Corresponding authors</u>

***Birendra Kumar Sah, MD/Ph D**

Department of General Surgery, Gastrointestinal Surgery Unit

Ruijin Hospital Shanghai Jiao Tong University School of Medicine

Postal add: 197 Ruijin Er Road, Shanghai-200025, China

Contact no. : **Ph: 0086-21-64370045 ext 671302**

Email: byahut@hotmail.com

***Li Chen, MD/Ph D**

Department of General Surgery, Gastrointestinal Surgery Unit,

Ruijin Hospital Shanghai Jiao Tong University School of Medicine

Shanghai, China.

Email: lc10897@rjh.com.cn

***Zhang Huan**

Department of Radiology

Rui Jin Hospital, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, School of medicine

Shanghai, China. Email: zh10765@rjh.com.cn

Authors

Zhang Yang (co-first author)

Department of Radiology, Zhejiang Provincial People' Hospital, People' Hospital of Hangzhou Medical College, Hangzhou, China

Department of Radiology, Ruijin Hospital Shanghai Jiao Tong University School of Medicine. Shanghai, China.

Email: 18701853713@163.com

Li Jian, Ph D

Clinical Research Centre

Ruijin Hospital Shanghai Jiao Tong University School of Medicine

Shanghai, China.

Email:lj12116@rjh.com.cn

Yan Chao, MD/Ph D

Department of General Surgery, Gastrointestinal Surgery Unit

Ruijin Hospital Shanghai Jiao Tong University School of Medicine

Postal add: 197 Ruijin Er Road, Shanghai-200025, China

Contact no. : **Ph: 0086-21-64370045 ext 671302**

Email: yanchaosuper@163.com

Yan Min, MD

Department of General Surgery, Gastrointestinal Surgery Unit,

Ruijin Hospital Shanghai Jiao Tong University School of Medicine

Shanghai, China.

Email: ym10299@rjh.com.cn

Prof. Zhu Zheng Gang, MD/Ph.D., FACS

Department of General Surgery, Gastrointestinal Surgery Unit,

Ruijin Hospital Shanghai Jiao Tong University School of Medicine

Shanghai Key Laboratory of Gastric Neoplasms

Shanghai Institute of Digestive Surgery

Shanghai, China.

Email: zzg@rjh.com.cn

Running title: Importance of postoperative CT after gastric cancer surgery

Abstract

Background: Anastomotic leakage is a life-threatening postoperative complication after gastric cancer surgery. Previous studies have not produced convincing results for the early diagnosis of anastomotic leakage. This study thoroughly investigated the clinical factors and postoperative computed tomography (CT) findings that could facilitate the early diagnosis of anastomotic leak. Methods: Gastric cancer patients who underwent curative gastrectomy and had a CT examination after surgery were included in this study. The authors identified a total of thirty-five cases of anastomotic leakages among 210 gastric cancer patients. Propensity score (PS) matching generated 70 eligible cases (35 cases of anastomotic leakage and 35 cases of no anastomotic leak) on the basis of age, body mass index (BMI), mode of surgery (open or laparoscopic), extent of resection (subtotal or total), and combined resection of adjacent organs. Univariate and multivariate analyses were used to identify the predictive postoperative variables. A nomogram was developed for prospective prediction. Results: Patients with anastomotic leaks were severely complicated by infections, abdominal haemorrhage, and impaired vital organ function ($p<0.05$). The reoperation rate was significantly higher in patients with anastomotic leakage ($p<0.05$). The median length of postoperative hospital stay was significantly longer and the overall expenditure was significantly higher in patients with an anastomotic leakage ($p<0.001$). Four patients died of postoperative complications after developing an anastomotic leakage. There were no deaths among the patients without anastomotic leakages. The logistic regression analysis revealed that the extraluminal gas at the

anastomosis site (on CT examination), neutrophilia (NE≥85.8%) on postoperative day 1-3 (POD 3), fever (T≥38.5 C) on POD 4-7, and neutrophilia (NE ≥78%) on POD 4-7 were the independent predictive factors for an anastomotic leakage ($p<0.05$). The nomogram showed that extraluminal gas at the anastomosis site was the most important sign of the anastomotic leak (100 points). Conclusions: On the postoperative CT examination, the patients with extraluminal gas at the anastomosis site are more likely to have an anastomotic leakage, especially in the patients with fever and neutrophilia during POD 4-7. The authors advocate for the routine use of postoperative CT after gastric cancer surgery.

Keywords: gastric cancer; anastomotic leakage; CT; postoperative complication

Background

Prevalence of postoperative complications and risk factors

Postoperative complications were quite prevalent after gastric cancer surgery, and the complication rate was almost equal between open and laparoscopic surgery [1]. However, severe complications occurred at a lower rate at high-volume centres than in low-volume centres [2]. Generally, the rate of anastomotic leakage has been reported to be below five percent, or even below two percent in the experienced centres of many Asian countries [1, 3].

Nevertheless, anastomotic leaks are still considered severe postoperative complications that aggravate the condition of compromised patients, and the mortality rate of patients with anastomotic leakages is significantly higher than that of patients without anastomotic leakages [4-6]. Several scientific reports have explored predicting the postoperative complications of gastric cancer surgery; however, most of these reports were observational studies, and many risk factors were unavoidable in general practice [7-12]. For instance, surgeons cannot deny surgical treatment to elderly, diabetic or obese patients with gastric cancer. The overall results had a good consensus at high-volume centres in Asian countries [2]; however, these results are also not practical as we cannot restrict gastric cancer treatment to only Asian patients.

Radiological methods

Computed tomography (CT) scans have been used to detect anastomotic leaks in patients after oesophagectomy, but very few studies have reported on gastric cancer surgery, and the routine use of CT has been controversial[13-14]. No definitive

suggestions exist on whether a postoperative CT or abdominal X-ray with an oral contrast agent should be routinely performed for the early detection of anastomotic leakage [15-16]. Furthermore, the interpretation of CT findings is highly subjective; for example, clinicians and radiologists are still unsure whether the presence of free gas in the abdominal cavity is normal after gastrectomy, whether this free gas is common after laparoscopic surgeries, and what the presence of free gas in the abdominal wall after a laparoscopic surgery could indicate.

The authors considered all these issues and carefully analysed the data. Statistical analyse were performed for the potential postoperative signs of anastomotic leak, including patient body temperature, blood test results (neutrophils) and CT findings. The statistical calculations were also used to create a nomogram that can be applied to identify compromised patients with anastomotic failure.

Methods

This is a retrospective study, and the primary inclusion criterion was gastric cancer patients who underwent curative gastrectomy and a CT examination after surgery. These were not the consecutive data of all gastric cancer patients who underwent surgery. The study endpoint was the presence of postoperative complications and any complications within one month of discharge from the hospital. The authors collected all data by comprehensively reviewing the original records of all patients. Altogether, 221 patients were identified, and 11 patients with benign diseases were excluded. Finally, the authors included a total of 210 patients with gastric cancer diseases. All patients underwent curative gastrectomies with

appropriate lymph node dissections between November 2015 and August 2018 and received a postoperative CT scan. Two experienced radiologists with gastrointestinal expertise carefully reviewed all CT scans. Both radiologists were provided with clinical information, including the surgery mode and anastomosis type, but were blinded to the clinical results regarding anastomotic leakage. Any disagreements about the CT findings were settled by discussion between the radiologists for and a final consensus. The authors collected detailed clinical parameters, including vital signs, blood test results, surgery type, and the TNM classification of the tumour. The treating doctors recorded thirty-five cases of anastomotic leakage. The authors suggest using caution while interpreting the anastomotic leakage rate results, as these were not the consecutive data of all gastric cancer patients treat during the specific time interval; hence, these results do not represent the natural complication rates of gastric cancer surgery. Propensity score (PS) matching was applied to include patients without anastomotic leakage. PS matching generated 70 eligible cases (35 cases of anastomotic leakage and 35 cases of no anastomotic leak) on the basis of age, body mass index (BMI), mode of surgery (open or laparoscopic), extent of resection (subtotal or total), and combined resection of adjacent organs (Table 1). Hence, there were no significant differences in the clinical parameters between the two groups. Univariate and multivariate analyses were used to identify the predictive postoperative factors. R language software created a nomogram for future applications.

In addition to the presence of extraluminal gastrointestinal fluid leakage, one of the

following observations was required for the diagnosis of an anastomotic leakage: 1. confirmation by reoperation; 2. presence of digestive content, food debris or methylene blue in the abdominal drainage tube; and 3. clear images of extraluminal contrast leak on the CT scan.

CT scan protocol

The patients were placed in the supine position and underwent multidetector CT (MDCT) scanning with either a 64-detector row or a 128-detector row system (Light Speed VCT; GE Healthcare, Milwaukee, WI, USA or Discovery CT750HD, GE Healthcare, Wisconsin, USA). The scanning parameters were as follows: pitch of 0.6~0.8; tube voltage of 120 kV; automated milliampere technology; and slice thickness of 5 mm.

Statistical analysis

Statistical experts performed the statistical analysis with Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 22.0 for Windows (SPSS, Inc., Chicago, Illinois). Nonparametric methods were used to test data with an abnormal distribution. Statisticians performed PS matching with five variables (age, BMI, mode of surgery, extent of resection, and combined resection) and a match tolerance of 0.02 percent. The receiver operator characteristic curve was used to find an optimal neutrophil count (NE) cut off value to correctly diagnosis anastomotic leakages. A chi-square test was used to compare the differences between the two groups; the statistician used Fisher's exact test where appropriate. Logistic regression was applied to identify the independent predictive factors for an anastomotic leakage. A p-value less than 0.05

was considered statistically significant. The authors developed a nomogram by R software (version 3.5.0; http://www.Rproject.org)

Results

Types of complication

The authors compared the occurrence of other complications between patients with and without anastomotic leakage (Table 2). Some low-incidence postoperative morbidity conditions (e.g., different types of infectious complications) were integrated to facilitate a useful statistical calculation. The reoperation rate was significantly higher in patients with anastomotic leakage than in those without an anastomotic leakage. The clinicians observed more haemorrhagic complications, infectious complications, and impaired vital organ function in patients who had an anastomotic failure than for those without an anastomotic leakage (Table 2). Four patients died of postoperative complications after developing an anastomotic leakage, three of whom had undergone total gastrectomy with a Roux-en-Y anastomosis, and one patient underwent a Billroth I distal gastrectomy. In the distal gastrectomy case, the gastroduodenal anastomosis was the site of leakage; the patient had a severe intra-abdominal infection followed by an abdominal haemorrhage and shock. The patient underwent reoperation but later died 25 days after the first surgery. Among those who underwent total gastrectomy, one patient developed a leakage at the oesophagojejunal anastomosis; the patient underwent reoperation but later died 61 days after the first surgery. The leading cause of death was severe abdominal infection followed by shock, cardiac and respiratory failure and gastrointestinal bleeding. The

second patient developed a leakage at the duodenal stump, which was mainly managed by continuous irrigation of the intra-abdominal drainage tube; the patient died of severe abdominal infection followed by shock, and cardiac and respiratory failure 11 days after surgery. The doctors did not confirm the exact location of the anastomosis failure in the third case; the surgeon managed the leakage by continuous irrigation. The patient had a severe abdominal infection followed by sudden massive bleeding via the abdominal drainage tube and died 7 days after surgery. There were no deaths in the group without anastomotic leakages.

Site of anastomotic leakage and management

Among the 35 patients with leakages, 28.6 percent of the patients underwent reoperation, and the rest of the patients were managed with conservative therapy, mainly by continuous irrigation of the abdominal drainage tube. The clinicians diagnosed sixteen cases of anastomotic leakage among the patients who underwent total gastrectomy; six of these patients had leakages at the oesophagojejunal anastomosis, four had leakages at the duodenal stump, only one had a leakage at the jejunojejunal anastomosis. Three patients underwent reoperation, and the remaining patients were managed by conservative methods, mainly by continuous irrigation of the abdominal drainage tube. The doctors did not find the exact location of the anastomotic leakage in five patients who underwent total gastrectomy. Twelve patients had an anastomotic leakage at the gastroduodenal anastomosis, four of whom needed reoperation. The duodenal stump was the leading site of leakage for patients with Billroth II or other modified types of anastomosis in distal gastrectomy (Table 3).

The surgeons did not find the exact location of the leak in seven patients, even after reoperation for four patients. This finding suggests that these patients potentially had a tiny anastomosis leakage, and severe inflammation at the surgical site created challenging conditions to determine the exact location of the anastomotic leakage. Interestingly, 28 of the 35 cases patients with anastomotic leakage eventually had digestive content in the drainage tube, which suggests that an adequate draining system at the anastomosis site was crucial not only for diagnosis but also for treatment. The doctors mainly treated 22 patients by continuous irrigation and avoided reoperation. The other patients who did not have drainage in situ warranted reoperation or interventional therapy. Drainage was highly important for cases of duodenal stump fistula, as doctors managed all seven of these patients by adequate drainage, none of the patients needed reoperation (Table 3).

Economic burden

The postoperative length of hospital stay was significantly longer for patients with an anastomotic leakage than for those without an anastomotic leakage ($p<0.001$); the median number of postoperative days (PODs) was 18 days for patients with no anastomotic leak, but the length of stay was almost three times longer (50 days) in patients with an anastomotic leakage (Fig 1). The overall expenditure was significantly different between the two groups ($p<0.001$). The median total expenditure for patients with no leakage was only 64193.46 RMB (Chinese currency), but the expenditure was almost double (121167.12 RMB) for patients who had an anastomotic leakage (Fig 2).

Body temperature and blood NE

The univariate analysis of overall factors yielded five statistically significant factors ($p<0.05$, Table 4). Fever during POD 4–7 was significantly associated with an anastomotic leakage ($p<0.05$). Approximately 86 percent of patients who were confirmed to have anastomotic failure had an elevated body temperature >38.5°C during POD 4–7 (Table 4). Similarly, neutrophilia was significantly associated with an anastomotic leakage ($p<0.005$, Table 4); approximately 71 percent of patients who were diagnosed with an anastomotic leakage had neutrophilia (NE≥78%) during POD 4–7. Approximately 86 percent of the patients who had anastomotic leakages had suspicious signs on their CT scans.

Furthermore, the multivariate analysis of overall factors revealed that blood neutrophilia (NE≥85.8%) on POD 3, fever (body temperature (T) ≥38.5°C) on POD 4–7 and suspicious findings on CT were independent predictive factors for an anastomotic leakage ($p<0.005$, Table 5). The Hosmer-Lemeshow goodness-of-fit test demonstrated a good fit ($p>0.05$), and the observed number of anastomotic leakage cases was closely aligned with the expected number predicted by the logistic regression model (Table 6).

Investigation of the postoperative CT parameters

For a more scientific presentation, the authors further analysed different CT parameters. In the univariate analysis, the authors observed a significant association between anastomotic leakage and five CT variables, including pneumoperitoneum, pneumoseroperitoneum (intra-abdominal accumulation of mixed gas and fluid),

accumulation of extraluminal gas at the anastomosis site, seroperitoneum and extraluminal fluid collection at the anastomosis site ($p<0.05$, Table 7). The multivariate analysis of the CT parameters revealed that the accumulation of extraluminal gas at the anastomosis site and seroperitoneum were independent diagnostic parameters of a postoperative anastomotic leakage ($p<0.05$, Table 8). Typical images of accumulation of extraluminal gas at different types of anastomosis sites were visible in CT scan (Fig.3, 4, 5). After logistic regression of all significant factors, the R language software created a nomogram with four independent factors, e.g., Extraluminal gas at the anastomosis site, POD 3 Neutrophilia (NE≥85.8%), POD 4-7 Fever (T≥38.5° C), and POD 4-7 Neutrophilia (NE ≥78%). The presence of extraluminal gas at the anastomosis site was clearly the most critical CT finding (Fig 6). This nomogram can be used to identify suspicious patients who need further investigations.

Discussion

Complications

The authors did not calculate the overall complication rate, as this study did not use the consecutive data of all gastric cancer patients. Hence, the results would not represent the natural complication rates of gastric cancer surgery. The occurrence of thirty-five cases of anastomotic leakage among 210 cases is too high for gastric cancer surgery. Nevertheless, many of the postoperative complications were significantly different between the two groups. Hence, these data suggest that once a patient develops anastomotic dehiscence, he or she is likely to experience more severe

complications.

PS matching

For the analysis of any clinical condition with a low prevalence rate, a major hurdle is the statistical calculation. The analysis needs a substantial cohort to obtain statistically significant results. An anastomotic leakage rate of two percent corresponds to 98 out of 100 patients having a satisfactory recovery, regardless of the scenario. Therefore, PS matching is beneficial not only to standardize retrospective data as prospective data but also to facilitate a better comparison of clinical conditions with low occurrences. Many previous conventional studies have suggested that postoperative complications might be related to age, obesity, mode of surgery, and the extent of resection [7, 9, 10]. Therefore, the authors incorporated all these factors for PS matching. The authors did not find any other similar studies in previously published literature.

Predictive factors

The early diagnosis of anastomotic failure is crucial for preventing life-threatening postoperative complications of gastrectomy, but clinicians still do not have efficient standard techniques. In this study, univariate and multivariate logistic regression analyses identified simple but useful elements (body temperature, blood neutrophil count) that can detect anastomotic leakages and can be applied at any hospital with minimum resources. A nomogram could help clinicians identify an anastomotic leakage and subsequently decrease the overall burden of patients and hospital.

Problems with CT

Many authors have advocated for barium swallow tests to diagnose suspicious cases of anastomotic leakages after gastrointestinal (GI) surgeries. Nevertheless, the generalized use of this examination is debatable [17-19]. Few studies have suggested postoperative CT after gastric cancer surgery, and there are different opinions on the use of oral contrast agents [20-21]. The authors of this study also found there was no apparent benefit of using oral contrast agents to detect anastomotic leakages, as none of the 27 patients who ingested an oral contrast agent 6 hours before the CT scan had an extraluminal contrast leak. This simple comparison showed a better diagnosis rate in patients who received oral contrast agents than in patients who received oral contrast agents (90% vs. 78% of true positive incidence).

However, there are still many unanswered questions, for instance, how much oral contrast agent is needed, what is the optimal concentration, what is the optimal timing to orally ingest the contrast agent? These negative results warrant further investigations about whether the timing of the contrast agent administration and CT examination was inappropriate, or if the concentration was simply too high or too low to be visible on the CT scan. These questions warrant a well-controlled future study regarding whether oral contrast agents are beneficial for diagnosing anastomotic leakages.

Similarly, assessing the discontinuity of an anastomosis was difficult on a CT scan with a slice of 5 mm. A complete circumferential scan of a circular stapled anastomosis was almost impossible to view in a single CT slice; additionally, many types of anastomosis use a linear stapler. Overall, finding a hand-sewn anastomosis

site is almost impossible.

In this study, the univariate analysis found that five CT variables (pneumoperitoneum, pneumoseroperitoneum, extraluminal gas at the anastomosis site, seroperitoneum, and extraluminal fluid collection at the anastomosis site) were significantly correlated with an anastomotic leak. These variables were created to minimize the subjective nature of having radiologists and surgeons judge the scans so that objective analyses can be applied in future clinical work. Moreover, these variables are quite anticipated after anastomotic failure, especially localized gas or fluid collection, which may be the result of anastomotic dehiscence and localized inflammation. However, doctors still do not know whether specific types of infection could be radiologically visualized; additionally, researchers need a large cohort to quantify the correlations of such presentations with anastomotic leakages. Whether doctors can fully depend on CT examinations remains unclear, as the authors did not find any CT signs with a specificity of 100 percent. Approximately 39 percent of patients with intra-abdominal free gas had no anastomotic leakage. Even the accumulation of gas at the anastomotic site led to an approximately 21 percent false-positive rate. In addition, a number of patients were not clinically confirmed to have an anastomotic leakage despite having positive findings on the CT scan, which might be due to tiny anastomotic leakages have would resolved by itself or because the presence of gas at the anastomosis site was normal for some patients. For instance, the passage of air through a large-bore drainage tube would have created the same scenario. Therefore, the clinical presentation, such as consistent pyrexia and neutrophilia, still has an essential role in

the detection of compromised patients. Nevertheless, the results of this study identified some significant findings from the postoperative CT examinations, which were either unknown or not well-described in previous publications.

Blood routine and fever

Elevated white blood cell (WBC) and neutrophil (NE) counts are well-known laboratory findings for inflammation after surgery. However, to the best of our knowledge, no previous studies have focused on these simple parameters, probably due to these factors having a high sensitivity but low specificity for a particular type of complication, especially for low-incidence postoperative complications such as anastomotic leakages. Standardizing the timing of these findings was difficult in this retrospective analysis. The authors tried to overcome this challenge by creating a time range and noting which findings occurred the most on POD 1 to 3 and POD 4 to 7. This time range was subjectively determined, and further research with a more reliable cut off should be conducted, which demands a large cohort.

Similarly, regarding body temperature, the authors did not find any previous studies that described whether the presence of a fever was associated with a specific postoperative complication of gastric cancer surgery. Doctors need concrete answers in terms of whether a specific body temperature at a specific time is a determinant for a particular postoperative complication, such as an anastomotic leakage. To perform an objective calculation, the authors divided the patients' body temperatures into two categories (e.g., T ≥38 and ≥38.5°C) and recorded the presence of these two levels of body temperature in two different intervals of time, e.g., during POD 1 to 3 and POD

4 to 7. The statistical calculation showed that a postoperative temperate ≥38.5°C was independently correlated with an anastomotic leak. However, these cut off values were subjectively set by the authors, and the authors are unsure of whether other cut off values would have a better correlation. Future studies with a large cohort could investigate this relationship in more depth.

In addition, statistical significance should always be cautiously interpreted due to the limitations and heterogeneity of individual patient conditions. Any type of probability is only true for a certain group of patients and is not generalizable to an individual patient. For an individual patient, the probability can only suggest a yes or no. Nonetheless, the findings of this study are still beneficial for identifying the group of patients who are compromised by an anastomotic leakage. CT examinations are worthwhile for correctly diagnosing anastomotic leakages in approximately eight percent of patients. Further CT examinations are necessary for patients with consistent fever and neutrophilia, and patients should be red-flagged if there are suspicious findings.

Other findings

There is still debate about whether abdominal drainage is necessary for patients undergoing gastric cancer surgery. The routine use of an abdominal drainage tube has not been suggested in general practice [22], and some researchers advocate for modified drainage procedures [23]. The authors observed that most patients were diagnosed with an anastomotic leakage through the presence of digestive content in the drainage tube and were mainly treated by continuous irrigation; other patients

required reoperation or interventional therapy.

This finding suggests that a simple difference in the incidence of anastomotic leakage between patients with and without an abdominal drainage tube does not accurately describe the vital role of drainage in treating patients with anastomotic failure. The rate of reoperation and the occurrence of other severe complications should be analysed if the patient does not have primary drainage in situ. In addition, the placement of the drainage tube is another topic that should be addressed. A well-controlled prospective study is necessary to obtain reliable results.

Similarly, the opinions on using abdominal drain amylase to detect early anastomotic leakage in upper GI surgeries are mixed [24-26]. The authors noted elevated drain amylase in patients with anastomotic leak, especially for those with duodenal stump fistulas and leakages at the gastroduodenal anastomosis. Due to the absence of this test in many patients, the authors do not have a definitive answer about advocating for routine tests to evaluate drain amylase, A large-scale study is necessary to determine a better cut off drain amylase value for the diagnosis of anastomotic leakages, and perhaps different cut off values are needed for different types of anastomotic leakages. For example, a much higher drainage amylase level is anticipated for leakages at the duodenal stump than at the oesophagojejunal anastomosis. The author also observed that a low level of postoperative serum albumin was more prevalent in patients with an anastomotic leakage than in patients without an anastomotic leakage, which was consistent with previous reports for lower GI surgeries [27]. Perhaps the combination of drain amylase and serum albumin levels along with the independent factors of this

study may predict the anastomotic leakage more accurately than each of the factors alone. A well-controlled prospective study is also necessary to investigate this hypothesis.

Conclusion

The occurrence of an anastomotic leakage significantly increases the treatment burden of patients and the hospital. The preoperative risk factors were not of great value in general practice, as the surgeons cannot avoid treating patients with these risk factors, especially in the setting of referral centres. Early diagnosis is vital for avoiding the catastrophic consequences of an anastomotic leakage. The predictive postoperative factors of this study provide a simple method to screen for at-risk patients. The authors suggest of the routine use of postoperative CT, especially for patients with consistent fever and neutrophilia. Moreover, further prospective studies are warranted to validate these findings.

List of all abbreviations

CT: Computed Tomography

POD: Postoperative day

PS: Propensity score

NE: Neutrophilia

Table 1 Demographic data of the PS-matched patients

Parameter		Without leakage	leakage
Sex	Male	27	25
	Female	8	10
Age group (years)	41–50	2	2
	51–60	7	8
	61–70	11	9
	71–80	10	11
	81–90	5	5
BMI	<25	24	27
	25–<30	11	7
	≥30	0	1
Mode of surgery	Open	33	33
	Laparoscopic	2	2
Type of resection	Subtotal	19	19
	Total	16	16
Combined resection	No	28	29
	Yes	7	6
TNM Stage	I	13	8
	II	4	3
	III	15	21

Table 2 Postoperative complications between the two groups

Complication		Number of patients		p value
		Without leakage	With leakage	
Haemorrhage	Intra-abdominal	0	6	0.025
	Anastomosis site	0	2	NS
Wound dehiscence		2	6	NS
Multiple infections		2	13	0.003
Overall infection		17	25	0.051
Impaired renal function		4	14	0.006
Cardiac/respiratory failure		2	10	0.023
Overall gastrointestinal obstruction		8	13	NS
Pancreatic fistula		1	0	NS
Readmission		1	3	NS
Reoperation		2	10	0.023
Death		0	4	NS

Table 3 Sites of anastomotic leakage and management strategies

Anastomosis	Site of anastomosis leak	No.	Method of diagnosis	Main treatment
Total Roux-en-Y	Oesophagojejunal	6	DCD 6+MBD2+Reoperation 1	Irrigation 4+Reoperation 1+ Stent 1
	Duodenal stump	4	DCD 4	Irrigation 4
	Jejunojejunal	1	DCD 1	Interventional stent 1
	Unknown	5	DCD 5+ Reoperation 2	Irrigation 3 + Reoperation 2
Billroth I	Gastro-duodenal	12	DCD 7+ Reoperation 2+FDD1+Gastroscopy 1	Irrigation8+ Reoperation 4
Billroth II	Gastric lesser curvature	1	DCD 1 +FCT1	Interventional drainage 1
	Duodenal stump	1	DCD 1	Irrigation 1
	Unknown	2	Reoperation 2+ DCD 1	Reoperation 2
Billroth II+ Braun	Duodenal stump	1	FCT1	Irrigation 1
Distal Roux-en-Y	Duodenal stump	1	DCD 1	Irrigation 1
Uncut Roux-en-Y	Gastric lesser curvature	1	Reoperation 1	Reoperation 1

DCD: Digestive content in drainage tube, MBD: Methylene blue in drainage tube, FDD: Food debris in drainage tube, FCT: Fistulography/CT

Table 4 Univariate analysis of the overall factors

Factor		Without leakage	With leakage	p value
T POD 3	< 38°C	23 (59.0)	16 (41.0)	NS
	≥38°C	12 (38.7)	19 (61.3)	
T POD 3	< 38.5°C	27 (52.9)	24 (47.1)	NS
	≥38.5°C	8 (42.1)	11 (57.9)	
T POD 4–7	< 38°C	26 (59.1)	18 (40.9)	0.048
	≥38°C	9 (34.6)	17 (65.4)	
T POD 4–7	< 38.5°C	33 (58.9)	23 (41.1)	0.006
	≥38.5°C	2 (14.3)	12 (85.7)	
WBC POD 3	<10.45	19 (54.3)	16 (45.7)	NS
	≥10.45	16 (45.7)	19 (54.3)	
WBC POD 4–7	<8.77	20 (60.6)	13 (39.4)	NS
	≥8.77	15 (40.5)	22 (59.5)	
NE POD 3	<85.8%	22 (71)	9 (29)	0.002
	≥85.8%	13 (33.3)	26 (66.7)	
NE POD 4–7	<78	25 (69.4)	11 (30.6)	0.001
	≥78	10 (29.4)	24 (70.6)	
CT	Normal	31 (75.6)	10 (24.4)	0.000
	Suspicious	4 (13.8)	25 (86.2)	

T: Body temperature, POD: Postoperative day at the hospital, NE: Blood neutrophil

Table 5 Multivariate analysis of overall factors

Variable		Odds ratio	95% CI	p value
NE POD 3	<85.8%	1		
	≥85.8%	12.14	2.04–72.01	0.006
T POD 4–7	<38.5°C	1		
	≥38.5°C	18.85	2.22–159.89	0.007
CT	Normal	1		
	Suspicious	49.55	7.71–318.27	0.000

T: Body temperature, POD: Postoperative day at the hospital, NE: Blood neutrophil

Table 6 Hosmer-Lemeshow test for goodness-of-fit

Step	With leakage		Without leakage	
	Expected	Observed	Expected	Observed
1	17.463	17	0.537	1
2	11.649	12	4.351	4
3	4.436	5	5.564	5
4	0.622	1	4.378	4
5	0.718	0	13.282	14
6	0.112	0	6.888	7

Table 7 Univariate analysis of the postoperative CT findings

Factor		Without leakage	With leakage	p value
Pneumoperitoneum	Absent	17 (70.8)	7 (29.2)	0.012
	Present	18 (39.1)	28 (60.9)	
Anastomosis site gas	Absent	29 (69.0)	13 (31.0)	0.000
	Present	6 (21.4)	22 (78.6)	
Seroperitoneum	Absent	15 (83.3)	3 (16.7)	0.002
	Present	20 (38.5)	32 (61.5)	
Anastomosis site fluid	Absent	26 (59.1)	18 (40.9)	0.048
	Present	9 (34.6)	17 (65.4)	
Abdominal gas and fluid	Absent	29 (65.9)	15 (34.1)	0.001
	Present	6 (23.1)	20 (76.9)	
Abdominal wall gas	Absent	29 (51.8)	27 (48.2)	NS
	Present	6 (42.9)	8 (57.1)	

Table 8 Multivariate analysis of the CT findings

Variable		Odds ratio	95% CI	p value
Seroperitoneum	Absent	1		
	Present	4.88	1.15–20.70	0.031
Anastomosis site gas	Absent	1		
	Present	5.88	1.84–18.83	0.003

Fig. 1 Postoperative stay at hospital



Fig. 2 Difference of expenditure between two groups



Fig. 3 Gatroduodenal anastomosis



Fig. 4 Duodenal stump

Fig. 5 Oesophagojejunal anastomosis



Fig. 6 Nomogram for the prediction of anastomotic leakage



Declaration

Ethics approval and consent to participate

This study is a retrospective analysis; it was extensively discussed at relevant department and agreed unanimously for publication. According to regulations of the Board of Ethics Committee, Ruijin Hospital, ethics approval letter is not mandatory for retrospective analysis and publication of the existing data. Hence, this study met the criteria for publication.

Consent for publication

The manuscript does not contain any individual person's data.

Availability of data and materials

The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding

The overall costs of publication will be funded by grants from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 91529302 (BY Liu), No.81772509 (Liu BY), No. 81572798 (Su LP), No.81871902 (Su LP), and No. 81871904 (Zhu ZG)

Author contributions

BKS designed the study, collected the patient data, and drafted the manuscript. YZ and HZ reviewed all of the postoperative CT data. CL, CY, MY, and ZGZ participated in the design of the study and critically revised drafts of the manuscript. JL checked

all the statistical calculations and revised drafts of the manuscript. All authors meet the criteria for publication; all authors have read and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank the Department of Information & Statistics of Ruijin Hospital for providing access to all available data, with special thanks to Mr. Wu Jia Yin for excellent assistance in data interpretation.

References

1. Hu Y, Huang C, Sun Y, Su X, Cao H, Hu J, et al. Morbidity and Mortality of Laparoscopic Versus Open D2 Distal Gastrectomy for Advanced Gastric Cancer: A Randomized Controlled Trial. J Clin Oncol. 2016 Apr 20; 34(12):1350-7.
2. Sah BK, Zhu ZG, Chen MM, Xiang M, Chen J, Yan M, et al. Effect of surgical work volume on postoperative complication: superiority of specialized center in gastric cancer treatment. Langenbecks Arch Surg. 2009 Jan; 394(1):41-7.
3. Shi Y, Xu X, Zhao Y, Qian F, Tang B, Hao Y, et al. Short-term surgical outcomes of a randomized controlled trial comparing laparoscopic versus open gastrectomy with D2 lymph node dissection for advanced gastric cancer. Surg Endosc. 2018; 32 (5):2427-2433.
4. Tu RH, Lin JX, Zheng CH, Li P, Xie JW, Wang JB, et al. Complications and failure to rescue following laparoscopic or open gastrectomy for gastric cancer: a propensity-matched analysis. Surg Endosc. 2017; 31 (5):2325-2337.
5. Zizzo M, Ugoletti L, Manzini L, Castro Ruiz C, Nita GE, Zanelli M, et al. Management of duodenal stump fistula after gastrectomy for malignant disease: a systematic review of the literature. BMC Surg. 2019; 19(1):55.
6. Zakrison T, Nascimento BA Jr, Tremblay LN, Kiss A, Rizoli SB. Perioperative vasopressors are associated with an increased risk of gastrointestinal anastomotic leakage. World J Surg. 2007; 31(8):1627-34.
7. Ciesielski M, Kruszewski WJ, Walczak J, Szajewski M, Szefel J, Wydra J, et al. Analysis of postoperative morbidity and mortality following surgery for gastric

cancer. Surgeon volume as the most significant prognostic factor. Prz Gastroenterol. 2017; 12(3):215-221.

8. Kikuchi H, Miyata H, Konno H, Kamiya K, Tomotaki A, Gotoh M, et al. Development and external validation of preoperative risk models for operative morbidities after total gastrectomy using a Japanese web-based nationwide registry. Gastric Cancer. 2017; 20(6):987-997.
9. Tu RH, Lin JX, Zheng CH, Li P, Xie JW, Wang JB, et al. Development of a nomogram for predicting the risk of anastomotic leakage after a gastrectomy for gastric cancer. EJSO 2017; 43: 485-492
10. Deguchi Y, Fukagawa T, Morita S, Ohashi M, Saka M, Katai H. Identification of Risk Factors for Esophagojejunal Anastomotic Leakage after Gastric Surgery. World J Surg 2012; 36:1617–1622
11. Kim SH, Son SY, Park YS, Ahn SH, Park DJ, Kim HH. Risk Factors for Anastomotic Leakage: A Retrospective Cohort Study in a Single Gastric Surgical Unit. J Gastric Cancer. 2015;15(3):167-75
12. Migita K, Takayama T, Matsumoto S, Wakatsuki K, Enomoto K, Tanaka T, et al. Risk Factors for Esophagojejunal Anastomotic Leakage After Elective Gastrectomy for Gastric Cancer. J Gastrointest Surg 2012; 16:1659–1665
13. Hu ZW, Wang XW, An XS, Li WJ, Feng Y, You ZB. The Diagnostic Value of Routine Contrast Esophagramin Anastomotic Leaks After Esophagectomy. World J Surg 2017; 41:2062–2067
14. Strauss C, Mal F, Perniceni T, Bouzar N, Lenoir St, Gayet B, et al. Computed

Tomography Versus Water-Soluble Contrast Swallow in the Detection of Intrathoracic Anastomotic Leak Complicating Esophagogastrectomy (Ivor Lewis). Ann Surg 2010;251: 647–651

15. Aday U, Gündeş E, Çiyiltepe H, Çetin DA, Gülmez S, Senger AS, et al. Examination of anastomotic leak with aqueous contrast swallow after total gastrectomy: Should it be carried out routinely? Contemp Oncol (Pozn). 2017; 21(3):224-227

16. Kim YE, Lim JS, Hyung WJ, Lee SK, Choi JY, Noh SH,et al. Clinical implication of positive oral contrast computed tomography for the evaluation of postoperative leakage after gastrectomy for gastric cancer. J Comput Assist Tomogr. 2010 Jul; 34(4):537-42.

17. Lamb PJ, Griffin SM, Chandrashekar MV, Richardson DL, Karat D, Hayes N.. Prospective study of routine contrast radiology after total gastrectomy. Br J Surg. 2004 Aug; 91(8):1015-9.

18. Igor J, Poluksht N, Siegelmann-Danieli N, Lavy R, Wassermann I, Halpern Z, et al. The role of upper gastrointestinal swallow study in patients undergoing proximal or total gastrectomy. Isr Med Assoc J. 2010 Sep; 12(9):560-2.

19. Tonouchi H, Mohri Y, Tanaka K, Ohi M, Kobayashi M, Yamakado K, et al. Diagnostic sensitivity of contrast swallow for leakage after gastric resection. World J Surg. 2007 Jan; 31(1):128-31.

20. Kim TH, Kim JH, Shin CI, Kim SH, Han JK, Choi BI. CT findings suggesting anastomotic leak and predicting the recovery period following gastric surgery.

Radiol. 2015 Jul; 25(7):1958-66.

21. Kim YE, Lim JS, Hyung WJ, Lee SK, Choi JY, Noh SH, et al. Clinical implication of positive oral contrast computed tomography for the evaluation of postoperative leakage after gastrectomy for gastric cancer. J Comput Assist Tomogr. 2010 Jul; 34(4):537-42.

22. Dann GC, Squires MH 3rd, Postlewait LM, Kooby DA, Poultsides GA, Weber SM, et al. Value of Peritoneal Drain Placement After Total Gastrectomy for Gastric Adenocarcinoma: A Multi-institutional Analysis from the US Gastric Cancer Collaborative. Ann Surg Oncol 2015; 22:S888–S897

23. Wang F, Ren J, Wang G, Ren H, Hong Z, Wu X. Early Active Drainage by Fine Tube Bundles Improves the Clinical Outcome of Anastomotic Leak after Abdominal Surgery: A Pilot Randomized, Controlled Trial in Two Tertiary Hospitals in China. Surg Infect (Larchmt). 2019 Apr; 20(3):208-214.

24. Schots JPM, Luyer MDP, Nieuwenhuijzen GAP. Abdominal Drainage and Amylase Measurement for Detection of Leakage After Gastrectomy for Gastric Cancer. J Gastrointest Surg. 2018; 22(7):1163-1170.

25. Perry Y, Towe CW, Kwong J, Ho VP, Linden PA. Serial Drain Amylase Can Accurately Detect Anastomotic Leak After Esophagectomy and May Facilitate Early Discharge. Ann Thorac Surg. 2015; 100(6):2041-7.

26. Berkelmans GH, Kouwenhoven EA, Smeets BJ, Weijs TJ, Silva Corten LC, van Det MJ, et al. Diagnostic value of drain amylase for detecting intrathoracic leakage after esophagectomy. World J Gastroenterol. 2015 Aug 14;

21(30):9118-25.

27. Shimura T, Toiyama Y, Hiro J, Imaoka H, Fujikawa H, Kobayashi M, et al. Monitoring perioperative serum albumin can identify anastomotic leakage in colorectal cancer patients with curative intent. Asian J Surg. 2018 Jan; 41(1):30-38.