Original article

Early diagnosis of anastomotic leakage after gastric cancer surgery

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

Running title: anastomotic leakage 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. Propensity score (PS) matching generated 70 cases (35 cases of anastomotic leakage and 35 cases of no anastomotic leak) among 210 eligible cases. Univariate and multivariate analyses were used to identify the predictive postoperative variables. A nomogram was developed for prospective prediction. Results: The logistic regression analysis revealed that the neutrophilia (NE ≥85.8%) on postoperative day 1st to day 3rd (POD 1-3), fever (body temperature (T) ≥38.5°C) on postoperative day 4th to day 7th (POD 4-7), and extraluminal gas at the anastomosis site (on CT examination), 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. Conclusions: Postoperative CT examination is beneficial for the early diagnosis of anastomotic leakage in patients with consistent neutrophilia and fever(T≥38.5°C) during the postoperative day 4th to day 7th. Extraluminal gas at the anastomosis site on postoperative CT examination is highly suggestive of anastomotic leakage.

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

Background

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 centers than in low-volume centers [2]. Generally, the rate of anastomotic leakage has been reported to be below five percent, or even below two percent in the experienced centers 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].

Computed tomography (CT) scans have been used to detect anastomotic leaks in patients after esophagectomy, 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 or the abdominal wall is normal after gastrectomy, whether this free gas is common after laparoscopic surgeries. The main purpose of

this study to explore the objective signs of the anastomotic leakage after gastric cancer surgery.

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. The study endpoint was the presence of postoperative complications and any complications within one month of discharge from the hospital. Altogether, 221 patients were identified, 11 patients with benign diseases were excluded. Finally, a total of 210 patients were included in the study. All patients underwent curative gastrectomies between November 2015 and August 2018.

Two experienced radiologists with gastrointestinal expertise 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. We collected detailed clinical parameters, including vital signs, blood test results, surgery type, and the TNM classification of the tumor. One of the following observations was required as the standard 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.

Statistical analysis

The Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 22.0 for Windows (SPSS, Inc., Chicago, Illinois) was applied for the statistical analysis. Nonparametric methods

were used to test data with an abnormal distribution. PS matching was performed with five variables (age, BMI, mode of surgery, the 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 or Fisher's exact test was used to compare the differences between the two groups. Logistic regression was applied to identify the independent predictive factors for anastomotic leakage. A p-value of less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant. We developed a nomogram by R software (version 3.5.0; http://www.Rproject.org)

Results

PS matching generated 70 eligible cases (35 cases of anastomotic leakage and 35 cases of no anastomotic leak). There was no difference in the basic clinical parameters between the two groups (Table 1). The reoperation rate was significantly higher in patients with anastomotic leakage than in those without an anastomotic leakage. More hemorrhagic, infectious complications and impaired vital organ function were observed in patients who had an anastomotic failure than those without anastomotic leakage (Table 2). Four patients died of postoperative complications after developing an anastomotic leakage. The leading cause of death was severe abdominal infection followed by shock and cardiac and respiratory failure. There were no deaths in the group without anastomotic leakages.

The multivariate analysis of overall factors revealed that blood neutrophilia (NE≥85.8%) on postoperative day 1st to day 3rd (POD 1-3), fever (body temperature

(T) ≥38.5°C) on postoperative day 4th to day 7th(POD 4–7) and suspicious findings on CT were independent predictive factors for an anastomotic leakage ($p<0.05$, Table 3).

Postoperative CT parameters

In the univariate analysis, there was a significant association between anastomotic leakage and five CT variables, i.e. 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 ($p<0.05$). 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 4). Typical images of accumulation of extraluminal gas at different types of anastomosis sites were visible in CT scan (Fig.1, 2, 3). 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 1-3 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 the most critical CT finding (Fig 4). This nomogram can be used to identify suspicious patients who need further investigations.

Discussion

For the analysis of any clinical condition with a low prevalence rate, a major hurdle is a statistical calculation. The analysis needs a substantial cohort to obtain

statistically significant results. 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, we incorporated all these factors for PS matching.

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, we identified simple but useful elements with specific abnormal range (body temperature, blood neutrophil count) that can detect anastomotic leakages and can be applied at any hospital with basic resources. These factors were very sensitive but with lower specificity, if interpreted alone. Therefore, a combination of three factors, i.e. body temperature, blood WBC, and CT findings, would increase the specificity for the diagnosis of anastomotic leakage. A nomogram could increase the early diagnosis rate of anastomotic leakage.

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]. In this study, we 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 heterogeneity in observation. However, it was still difficult to diagnose an early anastomotic leakage by CT examination only, because our study showed that approximately 21 percent of patients with intra-abdominal free gas had no anastomotic leakage. Therefore, the clinical presentation, such as consistent pyrexia and neutrophilia, still has an essential role in the detection of compromised patients.

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. We tried to overcome this challenge by creating a time range and noting which findings occurred the most on POD 1st to 3rd and POD 4th to 7th. Similarly, regarding body temperature, the authors did not find any previous studies that described whether the presence of fever was associated with a specific postoperative complication of gastric cancer surgery. To perform an objective calculation, we 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 1st to 3rd and POD 4th to 7th. We found that a postoperative temperate ≥38.5°C was independently correlated with an

anastomotic leak. However, these cut off values were set empirically. Nonetheless, the findings of this study are still beneficial for identifying the group of patients who are compromised by an anastomotic leakage.

Conclusion

Postoperative CT examination is beneficial for the early diagnosis of anastomotic leakage in patients with consistent neutrophilia and fever(T≥38.5°C) during the postoperative day 4th to day 7th. Extraluminal gas at the anastomosis site on postoperative CT examination is highly suggestive of anastomotic leakage.

List of all abbreviations

CT: Computed Tomography

POD: Postoperative day

PS: Propensity score

NE: Neutrophilia

Declaration

Ethics approval and consent to participate

This study is a retrospective analysis; it was extensively discussed at the relevant department and agreed unanimously for publication. According to the regulations of the Board of Ethics Committee, Ruijin Hospital, an ethical 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 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.

Acknowledgments

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. Eur

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.

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	
Hemorrhage	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 Multivariate analysis of overall factors

Variable		Odds ratio	95% CI	p-value
NE POD 1-3	<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 4 Multivariate analysis of the CT findings

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

Fig. 1 Extraluminal gas at gastroduodenal anastomosis

Fig. 2 Extraluminal gas at duodenal stump

Fig. 3 Extraluminal gas at esophagojejunal anastomosis



Fig. 4 Nomogram for the prediction of anastomotic leakage