medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.12.24308856; this version posted September 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Impact and Assessment of Mechanical Tension in Bowel Anastomosis: a Scoping Review.

Muhammad Usman Khalid, MBBS[1]; Danish Ali, MBBS[2]; Jie Ying Wu, PhD[3]; Aimal Khan, MD, FACS[2]

[1] Department of Neurological Surgery, Kentucky Neuroscience Institute, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY

[2]Section of Surgical Sciences, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, TN

[3]Department of Computer Science, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN

Corresponding Author:

Aimal Khan, MD, FACS

Assistant Professor of Surgery

Colon and Rectal Surgery

Section of Surgical Sciences

Vanderbilt University Medical Center

1161 21st Avenue South Room D5203 MCN

Nashville, TN 37232

Email: aimal.khan@vumc.org

Phone: 615-343-4612

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-2851-8330

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.12.24308856; this version posted September 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Conflict of interest: The authors declare no financial, commercial, personal, political, or academic conflicts of interest.

Word count: Abstract: 368 words; Manuscript (excluding title page): 2775 words.

Author contributions:

DA and MK wrote the original draft, and conducted literature review along with AK. AK, JYW, MK, and DA helped with reviewing, editing, project administration, supervision and validation. All authors helped in conceptualization and resource management

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.12.24308856; this version posted September 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Abstract:

Background: While tension on anastomoses is primarily regarded as a critical factor in anastomotic leaks and failure, assessing this tension is based on subjective surgeon estimation. There is currently no clinically available tool to assess mechanical tension on an anastomosis objectively. Some animal and human studies have previously evaluated anastomotic tension, but no comprehensive review discusses the different methods and types of tension measured.

Objectives: To summarize the current state of the literature regarding the measurement and impact of tension on bowel anastomoses.

Design: This scoping review was conducted with a systematic search of literature in the PubMed, SCOPUS, and EMBASE databases. Key terms used were anastomoses/anastomosis, tension, bowel, surgery, intestine, tissue, small bowel, large bowel, bowel, mucosal tissue, and other corollary terms. Data were synthesized in tables, and summarized paragraphically, with studies assessed using the New-Castle Ottawa scale where possible. Emphasis was placed on method of tension assessment, outcomes, and factors relating to tension.

Results: Anastomotic leak and tension are strongly associated, with the presence of tension making leaks up to 10 times more likely. While freedom from tension has traditionally been measured via the surrogate measure of adequate bowel mobilization, this remains a subjective and imprecise method. The literature describes several techniques to allow adequate mobilization, such as splenic flexure mobilization or division of the omentum. However, basing the estimate of tension on subjective assessment has some inherent drawbacks. Animal and cadaveric studies have been the frontier for objective measurement of wall tension, with the use of scaffolds, suture types, and prostheses to bolster the natural tolerance of the bowel. However, these tend to use tensiometers to measure tension, along with automated machines or pulley and ratcheting systems to increase tension in specified intervals. These are universally

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.12.24308856; this version posted September 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

destructive due to their design of measuring maximal tensile load as well as not being easily adaptable to the operating room.

Conclusions: The current literature does not study objective measurement of bowel tension in live human subjects. Bowel mobilization is a common method to reduce tension, but it relies on subjective judgment, which varies between surgeons. Given the recognized importance of tension, developing an objective, safe, intra-operative method to measure bowel wall tension would be a valuable surgical tool.

Keywords: Anastomosis, Anastomotic tension, Bowel, Surgery.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.12.24308856; this version posted September 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Introduction

Anastomotic leak is a severe complication of gastrointestinal surgery, resulting in significant morbidity, mortality, and increased healthcare costs [1-4]. Occurring in 2-30% of cases (depending on the location), anastomotic leaks increase the risk of mortality tenfold [5-8]. Survivors face extended hospital stays, intensive care unit admissions, poor quality of life, and lasting disabilities [4,9-11]. Additionally, leaks can lead to worse oncologic outcomes of reduced survival and higher recurrence rates [12]. Each instance of leakage imposes a substantial economic burden, ranging from $25,000 to $150,000 per patient in increased hospital expenses. This amount does not consider the potential loss of productivity among survivors [13-15].

The defining principles behind successful anastomoses have traditionally involved patient factors and three vital technical elements: good technique, adequate blood supply, and avoidance of tension [16-21]. Anastomotic leaks, therefore, stem from an interplay of patient-related and technical risk factors, including microcirculation, technique, and tension-free anastomosis [22-24]. Despite significant advances in understanding and mitigating the patient-related risk factors for anastomotic leaks, the role of technical factors, particularly anastomotic tension, in the development of leaks remains poorly understood [16,25-27].

In recent years, significant advances have been made in developing new techniques for assessing blood supply measurement. However, an objective measurement of bowel measurement of bowel tension remains elusive [28,29]. Mechanical tension on bowel anastomosis is among the strongest predictors of anastomotic complications, leading to a tenfold increase in the risk of leaks [30-34]. Anastomotic tension is still measured mainly in the same way as in the last 150 years when Halstead laid out his principles of surgery through subjective surgeon estimation [24,35,36]. This reliance on subjective parameters hinders scientific progress in verifiable assessment and understanding of the impact of tension on leaks [37,38]. The existing *ex vivo*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.12.24308856; this version posted September 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

studies that measured tissue tension in bowel anastomosis tend to be destructive and animal-based [35,39-43].

An objective measurement of mechanical bowel wall tension intra-operatively is needed to allow for scientific data-driven recommendations in human subjects and enable surgeons to improve outcomes. In this scoping review, we summarized the current literature on assessing anastomotic tension and its impact on leaks to highlight the current gaps in research on this crucial topic.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.12.24308856; this version posted September 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Methods

Study design

We designed a scoping review to collate and assess the current state of the literature regarding the measurement and impact of tension on anastomotic outcomes. The study was designed according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) checklist, as denoted in Figure 1[44].

Literature Search and Study Selection

An initial preliminary literature review was performed to identify subject-specific free-text and Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) terms. Subsequently, a bibliographic search was conducted across three electronic databases, MEDLINE (PubMed), SCOPUS, and EMBASE, using MeSH and free-text terms. All papers in the English language were considered, and there was no restriction on time period. Additionally, there were no restrictions on human, animal, in vivo, or ex vivo studies. References from published articles were also evaluated. Search terms included variations on the combinations of the terms (“anastomoses” OR “anastomosis”) AND “tension” AND “bowel” with optional terms using the operators AND/OR “tissue tension”, “measurement”, “surgery”, “intestine(s)”, “small bowel”, “large bowel”, “esophagus”, “colorectal”, “colonic”, “mucosal tissue”, and “bowel wall”.

Articles were collated and reviewed using the Rayyan.ai study screening tool. After removing 62 duplicates and articles not in English, a preliminary title review was performed by two authors DA and MK to eliminate irrelevant articles, excluding 107 articles. This was followed by an abstract review by the same authors, with 18 conflicts resolved by AK, in which 149 articles were removed as they did not mention anastomosis or tension. Finally, a full-text review was conducted on 52 studies based on relevance, with the results or discussion section

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.12.24308856; this version posted September 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

mentioning anastomosis in the gastrointestinal tracts. Studies discussing bursting tension were excluded due to the inherent difference in the nature of the tension type. Furthermore, for inclusion, the article needed to discuss the presence or importance of anastomotic rupture, leak, or dehiscence. Selected articles were divided into two categories: studies examining the importance of tension in anastomosis in the bowel and studies with experimental techniques to investigate tension on anastomotic strength. Results were summarized in table 2.

Quality Assessment

The quality of the studies included in our review was judged using the Newcastle Ottawa Scale (Table 1). Each study was judged on three broad perspectives: 1. Selection of the study groups, 2. Comparability of the groups, and 3. Ascertainment of the exposure or outcome of interest for case-control or cohort studies.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.12.24308856; this version posted September 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Findings

None of the studies conducted in humans to assess the impact of tension on bowel anastomosis measured tension directly or objectively. The method of tension measurement ranged from intra-operative subjective assessment to using surrogate markers like splenic flexure mobilization [45,46]. The endpoint of tension assessment is usually a clinically apparent discharge from the anastomotic site in the form of gas, pus, or fecal matter, which irritates the peritoneal lining. A radiologic approach to detect a leak uses a hydrophilic compound on a Computed Tomography (CT) scan; however, it is only performed when a symptomatic leak is suspected [8].

Morse et al. found that the odds of intestinal anastomotic leakage were as much as 10.1 (CI: 1.3-76.9) with anastomotic tension, and the leak rate increased from 0.5% in patients with no tension on the anastomosis to 5% in patients with tension on the anastomosis (p=0.027) [30]. Their study defined anastomotic leak by imaging, intra-operative extravasation of intra-luminal contents, and symptom-based findings. However, the study used a subjective assessment of anastomotic tension, based on imaging and surgeon assessment during reoperation for the leak, and had a low sample size of five patients with recorded anastomotic tension [30].

Wu et al. conducted a study to assess the impact of tension on clinical outcomes and quality of life among patients undergoing ileal pouch-anal anastomosis [45]. Like Morse et al., they found that patients with high amounts of tension were more likely to suffer from anastomotic stricture and pouch failure. In the study, the tension on the bowel was an indirect measure of the surgeon's assessment of mesenteric tension using a 10-point tension scale, with "1 being flappy and 10 being 'as tight as a guitar string".

Some studies have used mobilization of the colon as a surrogate for tension-free anastomoses. Splenic flexure mobilization is a routine part of anterior colorectal resection but is done at the expense of increased operating time, splenic injury, or even a splenectomy [47]. A few

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.12.24308856; this version posted September 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

authors seem to accept the trade-off of increased time to achieve adequate mobilization of surrounding structures to achieve a 'tension-free' anastomosis. However, they did not find a difference in complications with these measures [48].

Other surrogates for tension may be found in site selection. Low rectal anastomoses are more challenging to achieve tension-free and have higher rates of dehiscence compared to other rectal anastomoses [49,50]. Generally, low rectal anastomoses are within 7 cm of the anal verge or below the peritoneal reflection [51]. One way to counteract this issue is with a covering stoma, as indicated in many studies [51]. Another region with higher tension anastomoses is the esophagus, having the highest failure rate of all gastrointestinal anastomoses [4]. While other factors, such as delicate vasculature and technique, play a pivotal role in the anastomotic success in this region, the main distinction from other anastomoses is the higher anastomotic tension due to the anatomy, particularly post-operatively [52]. The improved leak rate with load-bearing sutures to alleviate tension has corroborated this theory [53,54]. Previous work with a tensiometer (to measure the tension) at different intervals and time points has demonstrated a linear increase of leak rates with tension on the anastomosis [32,53].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.12.24308856; this version posted September 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Discussion:

Tension, or lack thereof, in live human subjects is assessed intraoperatively by the surgeon. Factors that play a role in this assessment are anastomotic level, obesity, and anastomotic technique[7,10-12,16,55]. For patients with symptomatic anastomotic leaks post-operatively, the cause of tension may be analyzed. These studies tend to focus on demographic, operative, and disease related factors[19,46,48,56-59]. In animals anastomotic breaking strength is the subject investigated in literature, typically using machines to stretch bowel or tissue segments till rupture. This has been done in a variety of animals including rats, pigs, and dogs, generally reported in Newtons[22,33,39,41,43,52-54,60]. The common consensus is that tension plays a large role in anastomotic healing and leak rate, with higher tension causing adverse outcomes.

The impact of tension on anastomotic leakage

Freedom from tension is achieved by adequate bowel mobilization, whether from the retroperitoneum, omentum, or other surrounding structures, based on the approach and type of surgery [61]. Ileocolic anastomoses generally require mobilization of the colon of the retroperitoneum and possibly a division of the transverse colon omentum. The complexity increases for left-sided anastomoses where total mobilization of the descending colon and splenic flexure is required, leading to an increased risk of lower bowel perfusion. During a laparoscopic anterior resection, mobilization of the splenic flexure is often considered a vital step in achieving tension-free anastomoses. However, this maneuver increases operative time in exchange for a shorter length of stay; it has also not been shown to impact complications [46,48,62]. These complex and time-consuming surgical techniques are intended to reduce tension but can significantly lengthen the procedure and carry risks [63,64]. In a landmark study, Wu et al. investigated the correlation of the surgeon's tension assessment with clinical outcomes in restorative proctocolectomy [31]. Patients with high mesenteric tension were more likely to have anastomotic stricture and pouch failure, and unfavorable anatomy, such as a shorter anal

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.12.24308856; this version posted September 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

transitional zone. Other patient factors, such as high body mass index, lower anastomosis level, longer distance between anastomotic segments, and lack of bowel mobilization, also independently increase the risk of complications [17,34,57,59,65,66]. Conversely, surgical techniques that mitigate tension, such as increased bowel mobilization, splenic flexure mobilization, high arterial ligation, or tension-offloading sutures, yield reductions in leak rates [25,67-69]. In all these approaches, the primary assessment is based on surgeon feedback, with the need for mobilization being an indirect method to alleviate or prevent tension. However, it is subjective and imprecise, based on surgical experience, comfort with the technique, and many other variables that can affect human judgement [36].

Measurement of tension and impact on leaks

The most common objective way to measure tension in literature is using a tensiometer, a device with variability in its application and method. A standard procedure that is destructive and, therefore, commonly used posthumously is the attachment of the anatomy to a fixed and movable point. The displacement of the movable point exerting a counterforce is used to measure tension, as shown in Figure 2. This follows the assumption that the anastomosis is the weakest point of the anatomy and, therefore, the point of maximal tension; as such, the site of anastomotic leakage. However, only a few studies have evaluated these assumptions with material inside the anatomical segment [53,54]. Additionally, most of these studies are focused on maximal tension bearing and rupture rather than a simple leak. Models of tensiometer commonly used include the Instron Mini 44 tensiometer (Canton, MA, USA) [53] and the Zwick material testing machine (Zwick GmbH & Co., Ulm, Germany) [39] A lower-cost model is visualized in Figure 3 and utilized for middle-lower income socioeconomic testing facilities. However, it comes at the cost of decreased sensitivity and more unaccounted variables. Mounting methods also differ, but are not as commonly described in the literature. Another

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.12.24308856; this version posted September 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

variable is the advance rate of the movable portion of the machine, which could affect the tension rate. Some studies have found that where tension is increased in increments with pauses, the strength required to break the anastomosis is higher [39,53].

Suture tension and anastomotic type

Some articles correlate suture tension and variables such as suture length to investigate effects on anastomotic breaking strength. One rodent study investigated different suture tensions; moderate tension sutures gave optimal results [41]. In the porcine esophagus, continuous sutures with short bites were closest to native tissue intolerance when investigating the maximum traction force tolerance in different suturing techniques and bite lengths [52]. In this study, continuous sutures were significantly better than all other modalities – simple interrupted and barbed sutures or stapling [52]. The esophagus, however, typically sustains higher traction forces than the stomach or bowel, which may skew the results [70]. In other studies, similar postoperative complications have been noted in handsewn, stapled, and compression anastomotic techniques in meta-analyses [71]. Another article compared the shearing forces of two common types of suture material, Vicryl (179.9 N) and Polydioxanone (161.5 N); the difference was not statistically significant [42]. Most of the tissue tears were not at the site of the anastomoses but rather at a different site, which is concerning for the viability of the tissue tested [42]. Another study compared a new clipped intestinal non-perforating technique but did not specify the testing parameters [60]. They found that clipped anastomoses were akin healthy normal tissue with maximal bowel wall tensile strength, whereas sutured anastomoses were significantly lower and ruptured at a lower maximal tension [60].

Similarly, one study also investigated the effect of time on anastomotic strength, assessing the tensile breaking strength and location using the Zwick material testing machine [39]. Sheep trachea was anastomosed with different suturing techniques and resection lengths, and their rupture tension was tested at weekly intervals while comparing it to a normal trachea. The

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.12.24308856; this version posted September 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

highest tensile strength seemed to be at four weeks postoperatively, at 273 N, with one week postoperatively being the weakest at 177 N. At six months, the tensile strength was 247 N. Overall, the stability of the trachea under load improved with time from operative intervention [39].

Anastomotic aid devices

Some studies have investigated devices that reinforce the anastomosis, with one such study using a staple line incorporated poly-ε-caprolactone (PCL) scaffold in 17 porcine bowels [43]. Three anastomoses were formed in each bowel, and a tension stretch test on postoperative day 5 revealed a maximal tensile strength of 15.7 N, which was significantly higher than the control of 12.7 N (p=0.01). The scaffold seemed to provide a protective buffer to the anastomotic site, increasing the tensile strength. However, these values are a magnitude lower than values exhibited in other studies and may need further clarity on the methodology of tension testing [43]. Similarly, another group investigated using a soluble intraluminal prosthesis on tensile strength in porcine bowel, using clamps 5 mm apart, with positive results on durability of the anastomosis under tensile load [40]. No conclusive studies discuss suture tension and consequent rates of leakage or complications [41]. Studies have also compared intraluminal prostheses for bowel support during sewing and stapling (in animals) with subsequent reduction in suture tension and ischemia [40,43]. However, leakage rates were not significantly improved with the implement, and laparoscopic techniques made it largely defunct [62]. Additionally, recent publications on different surgical methods to reduce tension, such as Deloyers and retro-ileal techniques, have been shown to have similar (20%) anastomotic leak rates as traditional anastomotic techniques. Previous evidence had demonstrated that the Deloyers procedure had a lower leak rate (3.4-10%) than reported [25,72].

The existing literature does not seem to provide an objective, reproducible method to measure tension directly or indirectly in bowel anastomoses in live human subjects. Such a critical yet unaccountable variable leads to a lack of predictive accuracy for anastomotic leaks

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.12.24308856; this version posted September 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

[36]. Hence, developing a reliable, clinically usable method to measure anastomotic tension accurately will provide surgeons with a tool to prevent potentially deadly complications of anastomotic leaks.

Limitations

The bowel comprises different structural layers with different tensile properties, subject to normal anatomical variation. The serosa and subserosa play a minimal role in tensile strength, while the muscular and submucosal layers are responsible for most resistance to tension, both longitudinal and circumferential. Only a couple of studies recognize this distinction, and none investigate age, co-morbidity, and other factors that may influence the functioning and decline of these individual layers.

Conclusion

Anastomotic leak following gastrointestinal surgery is a severe complication with devastating morbidity and mortality. Significant progress has been made in understanding and mitigating the risk factors associated with anastomotic leaks. The factors impacting anastomotic leak can be broadly categorized into patient-specific and technical factors. While recent advancements have targeted patient-related factors, much progress has not been made on the front of anastomotic tension. Tension is widely recognized for its importance in the success of bowel anastomoses but has remained subjective in its assessment. Cadaveric and animal studies that have explored maximal tensile loads are destructive in nature. A safe, reliable way to measure tension intra-operatively would be an invaluable tool in the surgical arsenal and provide a solid basis for future scientific study.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.12.24308856; this version posted September 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Acknowledgments: None

Funding: None

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.12.24308856; this version posted September 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

References

1. Boström P, Haapamäki MM, Rutegård J, Matthiessen P, Rutegård M. Population-based cohort study of the impact on postoperative mortality of anastomotic leakage after anterior resection for rectal cancer. *BJS Open*. Feb 2019;3(1):106-111. doi:10.1002/bjs5.50106
2. Predictors for Anastomotic Leak, Postoperative Complications, and Mortality After Right Colectomy for Cancer: Results From an International Snapshot Audit. *Dis Colon Rectum*. May 2020;63(5):606-618. doi:10.1097/dcr.0000000000001590
3. Zarnescu EC, Zarnescu NO, Costea R. Updates of Risk Factors for Anastomotic Leakage after Colorectal Surgery. *Diagnostics (Basel)*. Dec 17 2021;11(12)doi:10.3390/diagnostics11122382
4. Turrentine FE, Denlinger CE, Simpson VB, et al. Morbidity, mortality, cost, and survival estimates of gastrointestinal anastomotic leaks. *J Am Coll Surg*. Feb 2015;220(2):195-206. doi:10.1016/j.jamcollsurg.2014.11.002
5. Evaluation of a quality improvement intervention to reduce anastomotic leak following right colectomy (EAGLE): pragmatic, batched stepped-wedge, cluster-randomized trial in 64 countries. *Br J Surg*. Jan 3 2024;111(1)doi:10.1093/bjs/znad370
6. Ubels S, Klarenbeek B, Verstegen M, et al. Predicting mortality in patients with anastomotic leak after esophagectomy: development of a prediction model using data from the TENTACLE-Esophagus study. *Dis Esophagus*. Apr 29 2023;36(5)doi:10.1093/dote/doac081
7. Kuppusamy MK, Low DE. Evaluation of International Contemporary Operative Outcomes and Management Trends Associated With Esophagectomy: A 4-Year Study of >6000 Patients Using ECCG Definitions and the Online Esodata Database. *Ann Surg*. Mar 1 2022;275(3):515-525. doi:10.1097/sla.0000000000004309
8. Guyton KL, Hyman NH, Alverdy JC. Prevention of Perioperative Anastomotic Healing Complications: Anastomotic Stricture and Anastomotic Leak. *Adv Surg*. Sep 2016;50(1):129-41. doi:10.1016/j.yasu.2016.03.011
9. Hain E, Manceau G, Maggiori L, Mongin C, Prost À la Denise J, Panis Y. Bowel dysfunction after anastomotic leakage in laparoscopic sphincter-saving operative intervention for rectal cancer: A case-matched study in 46 patients using the Low Anterior Resection Score. *Surgery*. Apr 2017;161(4):1028-1039. doi:10.1016/j.surg.2016.09.037
10. Hagens ERC, Reijntjes MA, Anderegg MCJ, Eshuis WJ, van Berge Henegouwen MI, Gisbertz SS. Risk Factors and Consequences of Anastomotic Leakage After Esophagectomy for Cancer. *Ann Thorac Surg*. Jul 2021;112(1):255-263. doi:10.1016/j.athoracsur.2020.08.022
11. Artus A, Tabchouri N, Iskander O, et al. Long term outcome of anastomotic leakage in patients undergoing low anterior resection for rectal cancer. *BMC Cancer*. Aug 20 2020;20(1):780. doi:10.1186/s12885-020-07109-4
12. Koedam TWA, Bootsma BT, Deijen CL, et al. Oncological Outcomes After Anastomotic Leakage After Surgery for Colon or Rectal Cancer: Increased Risk of Local Recurrence. *Ann Surg*. Feb 1 2022;275(2):e420-e427. doi:10.1097/sla.0000000000003889
13. Hammond J, Lim S, Wan Y, Gao X, Patkar A. The burden of gastrointestinal anastomotic leaks: an evaluation of clinical and economic outcomes. *J Gastrointest Surg*. Jun 2014;18(6):1176-85. doi:10.1007/s11605-014-2506-4
14. Agzarian J, Visscher SL, Knight AW, et al. The cost burden of clinically significant esophageal anastomotic leaks-a steep price to pay. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*. May 2019;157(5):2086-2092. doi:10.1016/j.jtcvs.2018.10.137

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.12.24308856; this version posted September 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

15. Vonlanthen R, Slankamenac K, Breitenstein S, et al. The impact of complications on costs of major surgical procedures: a cost analysis of 1200 patients. *Ann Surg*. Dec 2011;254(6):907-13. doi:10.1097/SLA.0b013e31821d4a43
16. Alverdy JC, Schardey HM. Anastomotic Leak: Toward an Understanding of Its Root Causes. *J Gastrointest Surg*. Nov 2021;25(11):2966-2975. doi:10.1007/s11605-021-05048-4
17. Kingham TP, Pachter HL. Colonic anastomotic leak: risk factors, diagnosis, and treatment. *J Am Coll Surg*. Feb 2009;208(2):269-78. doi:10.1016/j.jamcollsurg.2008.10.015
18. Lam A, Fleischer B, Alverdy J. The Biology of Anastomotic Healing-the Unknown Overwhelms the Known. *J Gastrointest Surg*. Sep 2020;24(9):2160-2166. doi:10.1007/s11605-020-04680-w
19. Rullier E, Laurent C, Garrelon JL, Michel P, Saric J, Parneix M. Risk factors for anastomotic leakage after resection of rectal cancer. *Br J Surg*. Mar 1998;85(3):355-8. doi:10.1046/j.1365-2168.1998.00615.x
20. Kang CY, Halabi WJ, Chaudhry OO, et al. Risk factors for anastomotic leakage after anterior resection for rectal cancer. *JAMA Surg*. Jan 2013;148(1):65-71. doi:10.1001/2013.jamasurg.2
21. Kamarajah SK, Lin A, Tharmaraja T, et al. Risk factors and outcomes associated with anastomotic leaks following esophagectomy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Dis Esophagus*. Mar 16 2020;33(3)doi:10.1093/dote/doz089
22. Mun SP, Kim SH, Song CH, Min YD. The effect of anchoring suture on the anastomotic blood flow in a rat model of human esophagojejunostomy. *J Surg Res*. Aug 2006;134(2):163-7. doi:10.1016/j.jss.2006.02.034
23. Ong SY, Tan ZZX, Teo NZ, Ngu JCY. Surgical considerations for the "perfect" colorectal anastomosis. *J Gastrointest Oncol*. Oct 31 2023;14(5):2243-2248. doi:10.21037/jgo-23-41
24. Vargas HD. Gaining Mesenteric Length following Colorectal Resection: Essential Maneuvers to Avoid Anastomotic Tension. *Clin Colon Rectal Surg*. Jan 2023;36(1):37-46. doi:10.1055/s-0042-1758776
25. Dalmau M, Marti-Gallostra M, Pellino G, Espin-Basany E, Armengol M. The colon does not reach! A technical note with tricks to avoid colorectal anastomoses under tension. *Colorectal Disease*. 2024;26(3):564-569. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/codi.16865
26. Ito R, Matsubara H, Shimizu R, et al. Anastomotic tension “Bridging”: a risk factor for anastomotic leakage following low anterior resection. *Surgical Endoscopy*. 2024/07/08 2024;doi:10.1007/s00464-024-11008-1
27. Man J, Hrabe J. Anastomotic Technique-How to Optimize Success and Minimize Leak Rates. *Clin Colon Rectal Surg*. Nov 2021;34(6):371-378. doi:10.1055/s-0041-1735267
28. Renna MS, Grzeda MT, Bailey J, et al. Intraoperative bowel perfusion assessment methods and their effects on anastomotic leak rates: meta-analysis. *British Journal of Surgery*. 2023;110(9):1131-1142. doi:10.1093/bjs/znad154
29. Urbanavičius L, Pattyn P, de Putte DV, Venskutonis D. How to assess intestinal viability during surgery: A review of techniques. *World J Gastrointest Surg*. May 27 2011;3(5):59-69. doi:10.4240/wjgs.v3.i5.59
30. Morse BC, Simpson JP, Jones YR, Johnson BL, Knott BM, Kotrady JA. Determination of independent predictive factors for anastomotic leak: analysis of 682 intestinal anastomoses. *Am J Surg*. Dec 2013;206(6):950-5; discussion 955-6. doi:10.1016/j.amjsurg.2013.07.017
31. Wu X-R, Kirat HT, Xhaja X, Hammel JP, Kiran RP, Church JM. The impact of mesenteric tension on pouch outcome and quality of life in patients undergoing restorative proctocolectomy. *Colorectal Disease*. 2014;16(12):986-994. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/codi.12748
32. Campos J, Tan Tanny SP, Kuyruk S, et al. The burden of esophageal dilatations following repair of esophageal atresia. *J Pediatr Surg*. Nov 2020;55(11):2329-2334. doi:10.1016/j.jpedsurg.2020.02.018

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.12.24308856; this version posted September 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

33. Guo W, Fonkalsrud EW, Swaniker F, Kodner A. Relationship of esophageal anastomotic tension to the development of gastroesophageal reflux. *J Pediatr Surg*. Sep 1997;32(9):1337-40. doi:10.1016/s0022-3468(97)90316-x
34. Castilloux J, Noble AJ, Faure C. Risk factors for short- and long-term morbidity in children with esophageal atresia. *J Pediatr*. May 2010;156(5):755-60. doi:10.1016/j.jpeds.2009.11.038
35. Urschel JD. Esophagogastrostomy anastomotic leaks complicating esophagectomy: A review. *The American Journal of Surgery*. 1995/06/01/ 1995;169(6):634-640. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/S0002-9610(99)80238-4
36. Karliczek A, Harlaar NJ, Zeebregts CJ, Wiggers T, Baas PC, van Dam GM. Surgeons lack predictive accuracy for anastomotic leakage in gastrointestinal surgery. *Int J Colorectal Dis*. May 2009;24(5):569-76. doi:10.1007/s00384-009-0658-6
37. Groenier M, Brummer L, Bunting BP, Gallagher AG. Reliability of Observational Assessment Methods for Outcome-based Assessment of Surgical Skill: Systematic Review and Meta-analyses. *Journal of Surgical Education*. 2020/01/01/ 2020;77(1):189-201. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsurg.2019.07.007
38. Smith N, Harnett J, Furey A. Evaluating the reliability of surgical assessment methods in an orthopedic residency program. *Can J Surg*. Oct 2015;58(5):299-304. doi:10.1503/cjs.010614
39. Behrend M, Kluge E, Schüttler W, Klempnauer J. The mechanical stability under load of tracheal anastomoses after various phases in vivo. *Laryngoscope*. Feb 2002;112(2):364-9. doi:10.1097/00005537-200202000-00029
40. Buch N, Glad H, Svendsen P, Oxlund HR, Gottrup F, Hovendal CP. An intraluminal prosthesis may improve healing of a one-layer colonic anastomosis: an experimental study in pigs. *Eur J Surg*. 2002;168(3):165-71. doi:10.1080/110241502320127784
41. Waninger J, Kauffmann GW, Shah IA, Farthmann EH. Influence of the distance between interrupted sutures and the tension of sutures on the healing of experimental colonic anastomoses. *Am J Surg*. Mar 1992;163(3):319-23. doi:10.1016/0002-9610(92)90013-h
42. Schilt PN, McRae BR, Akkus O, Cordes SR, Halum SL. An experimental model to investigate initial tracheal anastomosis strength. *The Laryngoscope*. 2010;120(6):1125-1128. doi:https://doi.org/10.1002/lary.20908
43. Larsen KD, Westerholt M, Madsen GI, Le DQS, Qvist N, Ellebæk MB. Poly-ε-caprolactone scaffold for the reinforcement of stapled small intestinal anastomoses: a randomized experimental study. *Langenbecks Arch Surg*. Dec 2019;404(8):1009-1016. doi:10.1007/s00423-019-01843-5
44. PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Annals of Internal Medicine*. 2018;169(7):467-473. doi:10.7326/m18-0850 %m 30178033
45. Wu XR, Kirat HT, Xhaja X, Hammel JP, Kiran RP, Church JM. The impact of mesenteric tension on pouch outcome and quality of life in patients undergoing restorative proctocolectomy. *Colorectal Dis*. Dec 2014;16(12):986-94. doi:10.1111/codi.12748
46. Brennan DJ, Moynagh M, Brannigan AE, Gleeson F, Rowland M, O'Connell PR. Routine mobilization of the splenic flexure is not necessary during anterior resection for rectal cancer. *Dis Colon Rectum*. Mar 2007;50(3):302-7; discussion 307. doi:10.1007/10350-006-0811-z
47. Ignjatovic D, Djuric B, Zivanovic V. Is splenic lobe/segment dearterialization feasible for inferior pole trauma during left hemicolectomy? *Tech Coloproctol*. Apr 2001;5(1):23-5. doi:10.1007/s101510100004
48. Katory M, Tang CL, Koh WL, et al. A 6-year review of surgical morbidity and oncological outcome after high anterior resection for colorectal malignancy with and without splenic flexure mobilization. *Colorectal Dis*. Feb 2008;10(2):165-9. doi:10.1111/j.1463-1318.2007.01265.x
49. Trencheva K, Morrissey KP, Wells M, et al. Identifying important predictors for anastomotic leak after colon and rectal resection: prospective study on 616 patients. *Ann Surg*. Jan 2013;257(1):108-13. doi:10.1097/SLA.0b013e318262a6cd

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.12.24308856; this version posted September 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

50. Reyaz I, Reyaz N, Salah QM, et al. Comparison of High Ligation Versus Low Ligation of the Inferior Mesenteric Artery (IMA) on Short-Term and Long-Term Outcomes in Sigmoid Colon and Rectal Cancer Surgery: A Meta-analysis. *Cureus*. May 2023;15(5):e39406. doi:10.7759/cureus.39406
51. Platell C, Barwood N, Dorfmann G, Makin G. The incidence of anastomotic leaks in patients undergoing colorectal surgery. *Colorectal Disease*. 2007;9(1):71-79. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1463-1318.2006.01002.x
52. Oetzmann von Sochaczewski C, Tagkalos E, Lindner A, et al. Esophageal Biomechanics Revisited: A Tale of Tenacity, Anastomoses, and Suture Bite Lengths in Swine. *Ann Thorac Surg*. Jun 2019;107(6):1670-1677. doi:10.1016/j.athoracsur.2018.12.009
53. Cui Y, Chen H. The effect of tension on esophagogastric anastomotic wound healing in rats. *J Cardiovasc Surg (Torino)*. Dec 2003;44(6):775-8.
54. Kovács T, Köves I, Orosz Z, Németh T, Pandi E, Kralovanszky J. Healing of esophageal anastomoses performed with the biofragmentable anastomosis ring versus the end-to-end anastomosis stapler: comparative experimental study in dogs. *World J Surg*. Apr 2003;27(4):465-72. doi:10.1007/s00268-002-6723-8
55. Zhao Y, Li B, Sun Y, et al. Risk Factors and Preventive Measures for Anastomotic Leak in Colorectal Cancer. *Technol Cancer Res Treat*. Jan-Dec 2022;21:15330338221118983. doi:10.1177/15330338221118983
56. Hyman N, Manchester TL, Osler T, Burns B, Cataldo PA. Anastomotic leaks after intestinal anastomosis: it's later than you think. *Ann Surg*. Feb 2007;245(2):254-8. doi:10.1097/01.sla.0000225083.27182.85
57. Choi HK, Law WL, Ho JW. Leakage after resection and intraperitoneal anastomosis for colorectal malignancy: analysis of risk factors. *Dis Colon Rectum*. Nov 2006;49(11):1719-25. doi:10.1007/s10350-006-0703-2
58. Testini M, Margari A, Amoruso M, Lissidini G, Bonomo GM. [The dehiscence of colorectal anastomoses: the risk factors]. *Ann Ital Chir*. Jul-Aug 2000;71(4):433-40. Le deiscenze nelle anastomosi colo-rettali: fattori di rischio.
59. Vignali A, Fazio VW, Lavery IC, et al. Factors associated with the occurrence of leaks in stapled rectal anastomoses: a review of 1,014 patients. *J Am Coll Surg*. Aug 1997;185(2):105-13. doi:10.1016/s1072-7515(97)00018-5
60. Holland-Cunz S, Chmelnik M, Roll M, Günther P, Schäfer KH. The clipped intestinal non-perforating anastomosis of small bowel: a new technique. *Pediatr Surg Int*. Jan 2007;23(1):87-93. doi:10.1007/s00383-006-1803-8
61. Slieker JC, Daams F, Mulder IM, Jeekel J, Lange JF. Systematic review of the technique of colorectal anastomosis. *JAMA Surg*. Feb 2013;148(2):190-201. doi:10.1001/2013.jamasurg.33
62. Fang AH, Chao W, Ecker M. Review of Colonic Anastomotic Leakage and Prevention Methods. *J Clin Med*. Dec 16 2020;9(12)doi:10.3390/jcm9124061
63. Jamali FR, Soweid AM, Dimassi H, Bailey C, Leroy J, Marescaux J. Evaluating the degree of difficulty of laparoscopic colorectal surgery. *Arch Surg*. Aug 2008;143(8):762-7; discussion 768. doi:10.1001/archsurg.143.8.762
64. Gouvas N, Gogos-Pappas G, Tsimogiannis K, et al. Impact of splenic flexure mobilization on short-term outcomes after laparoscopic left colectomy for colorectal cancer. *Surg Laparosc Endosc Percutan Tech*. Oct 2014;24(5):470-4. doi:10.1097/SLE.0b013e31829ce62a
65. Bagolan P, Iacobelli Bd B, De Angelis P, et al. Long gap esophageal atresia and esophageal replacement: moving toward a separation? *J Pediatr Surg*. Jul 2004;39(7):1084-90. doi:10.1016/j.jpedsurg.2004.03.048

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.12.24308856; this version posted September 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

66. Upadhyaya VD, Gangopadhyaya AN, Gupta DK, et al. Prognosis of congenital tracheoesophageal fistula with esophageal atresia on the basis of gap length. *Pediatr Surg Int*. Aug 2007;23(8):767-71. doi:10.1007/s00383-007-1964-0

67. Walsh TN. The Esophagogastric Anastomosis: The Importance of Anchoring Sutures in Reducing Anastomotic Leak Rates. *Ann Surg Open*. Mar 2023;4(1):e231. doi:10.1097/as9.0000000000000231

68. Hiranyakas A, Da Silva G, Denoya P, Shawki S, Wexner SD. Colorectal anastomotic stricture: is it associated with inadequate colonic mobilization? *Tech Coloproctol*. Aug 2013;17(4):371-5. doi:10.1007/s10151-012-0929-z

69. Nagaya M, Kato J, Niimi N, Tanaka S, Iio K. Proposal of a novel method to evaluate anastomotic tension in esophageal atresia with a distal tracheoesophageal fistula. *Pediatr Surg Int*. Oct 2005;21(10):780-5. doi:10.1007/s00383-005-1540-4

70. Egorov VI, Schastlivtsev IV, Prut EV, Baranov AO, Turusov RA. Mechanical properties of the human gastrointestinal tract. Article. *Journal of Biomechanics*. 2002;35(10):1417-1425. doi:10.1016/S0021-9290(02)00084-2

71. Oliveira A, Faria S, Gonçalves N, Martins A, Leão P. Surgical approaches to colonic and rectal anastomosis: systematic review and meta-analysis. Review. *International Journal of Colorectal Disease*. 2023;38(1)52. doi:10.1007/s00384-023-04328-6

72. Dux J, Katz E, Adileh M, Segev L, Hazzan D. Restoring Intestinal Continuity in a Hostile Abdomen: The Deloyers Procedure. *Jsls*. Apr-Jun 2021;25(2)doi:10.4293/jsls.2021.00004

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.12.24308856; this version posted September 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 1: Newcastle-Ottawa Scale for the studies included in this systematic review that met the study type qualifying criteria.

Author	Representativeness of the exposed cohort	Selection of the nonexposed cohort	Ascertainment of exposure	Demonstration that Outcome of Interest was Not Present at the Start of Study	Comparability of Cohorts 1) Main Factor 2) Additional Factor	Assessment of Outcome	Sufficient Follow-Up	Adequacy of Follow-Up	Total 9/9
Katory et al.[48]	*	*	*		*	*		*	6/9
Brennan et al.[46]	*		*			*	*	*	5/9
Oetzmann et al.[52]		*	*	*	**	*			5/9
Egorov et al.[70]	*		*	*		*			4/9
Schilt et al.[42]	*	*	*	*	**	*		*	8/9
Behrend et al.[39]		*	*	*	**	*		*	7/9
Larsen et al.[43]			*	*	**	*		*	6/9
Holland-Cunz et al.[60]		*	*	*	**	*	*	*	8/9
Buch et al.[40]		*	*	*	**	*		*	7/9
Waninger et al.[41]		*	*	*	**	*			6/9
Morse et al.[30]	*		*		**	*	*	*	7/9

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.12.24308856; this version posted September 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 2: Summary of included studies, their year of publication, species studied, sample size, and significant findings.

Author	Year	Subject	Cohort Size	Type of Study	Method tension was assessed	Impact
Testini et al.[58]	2000	Human	200	Cohort	Subjectively assessed by the operating surgeon, clinical follow-up and anastomotic level were used as a surrogate.	• Mortality rate was 1% • Leakage rate was 6% • Anastomotic level surrogate for tension due to anatomical susceptibility and bowel length
Slieker et al.[61]	2013	Humans, dogs, swine	117 studies	Systematic review	The anastomotic level was used as a surrogate.	• Height of the suture from the anal verge and anastomotic leak rate was inversely related • No significant difference in anastomotic blood flow after rectal resection in pigs
Katory et al.[48]	2008	Human	707	Case-control	The anastomotic level was used as a surrogate.	• High anterior resection with and without splenic flexure mobilization have similar rates of anastomotic leakage • Overall leak rate was 0.4% • Longer operating time and resection length with splenic flexure mobilization, with similar outcomes • Anastomotic complications (4%) • Perioperative morbidity (32%) • Mortality (2%)
Brennan et al.[46]	2007	Human	100	Cohort	Subjectively assessed by the operating surgeon.	
Oetzmann et al.[52]	2019	Swine	91	Cohort	Objectively measured using an electronic tensiometer (PCE DFG-500)	• Continuous suture anastomoses are closest in strength to native esophagi. • The suture bite length correlates with breaking strength. • Incrementally increasing constant traction resulted in higher breaking strengths (Δ = 13.36 N, 95% CI: 9.93 to 16.79 N, $p < 0.0001$)
Egorov et al.[70]	2002	Cadaveric	50	Cohort	Objectively measured using Instron 1122 tensiometer	• Resistance to tension: ○ Esophagus: 1.2 MPa

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.12.24308856; this version posted September 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

		human			with pneumatic clamps	(most resistant to tension), o Small and large bowel: 0.9 MPa, o Stomach: 0.7MPa, o Rectum: 0.5MPa.
Oliveira et al.[71]	2023	Human	7259	Meta-analysis	Subjectively assessed by operating surgeon and clinically followed up.	• No significant difference in the dehiscence rate between handsewn, stapled, and compression anastomoses • The handsewn technique had the highest reoperation rate • Compression technique had the lowest reoperation rate
Schilt et al.[42]	2010	Cadaveric human	12	Cohort	Objectively measured using a pulley system with two equidistant weights. The weight was increased to account for increased longitudinal tension on the anastomotic site.	• Mean anastomotic rupture point: 179.9±19.9 N for Vicryl, 161.5±22.1 N for PDS • Tracheal circumference was strongly linearly associated with anastomotic strength (P = 0.0004).
Behrend et al.[39]	2002	Sheep	24	Cohort	Objectively measured using Zwick material testing machine (Zwick GmbH & Co., Ulm, Germany)	• Within 2 weeks, the tracheal anastomoses had a breaking strength similar to or greater than native tracheal tissue • Operated tracheas were more stable (p=0.015) than non-operated trachea • Operated trachea had greater longitudinal elasticity (p=0.004) • Type of suturing technique had did not impact anastomotic leak rate
Larsen et al. [43]	2019	Swine	17	Cohort	Objectively measured using LF Plus; Lloyds Instruments, Fareham, UK) equipped with an XLC 100 N loadcell (Lloyds Instruments, Fareham, UK).	• Breaking strength 15.1 N in piglets with anastomotic breakage vs 15.7 N in piglets overall • 5/17 piglets had extra-anastomotic breakage
Holland-Cunz et al.[60]	2007	Rats	32	Case-control	N/A, although lengthening tension was limited to 500g.	• The clipped group showed minimal difference in breaking strength versus healthy tissue • Sutured anastomoses ruptured at lower tension forces
Buch et al.[40]	2002	Swine	16	Case-control	Objectively measured using Modified Alweltron TCT5,	• No significant difference in the use of an intraluminal

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.12.24308856; this version posted September 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

					Lorenzen og Wettre AB, Stockholm, Sweden. Mounted between two clamps 7 mm apart and stretched at 100mm/minute till breaking point.	SBS tube compared to regular anastomosis • Oxygen tissue tension was better in the group with the SBS tube • May have implications for microcirculation
Waninger et al.[41]	1992	Rats	432	Cohort	Objectively measured using a spring balance	• Moderate suture tension with a small inter-suture distance improves healing compared to low or high tension on the suture.
Morse et al.[30]	2013	Human	682	Cohort	Subjectively assessed by the operating surgeon and clinical follow-up.	• Tension was noted in 5 of 682 connections • Increase in leak rate from 0.5% to 5%. • May be due to tissue ischemia secondary to microvasculature compromise at the anastomotic site
Cui et al.[53]	2003	Rats	80	Cohort	Objectively measured using Instronmini-44 Tension meter with 10 mm distraction	• Breaking strength varied significantly between three-day blocks • Lowest on day 3 • Highest on day 14 • Anastomotic leak rate increased linearly with increase in tension
Ito et al.[26]	2020	Human	102	Cohort	Subjective assessment by three surgeons using intra-operative vidoes	• Voting system was utilized for visual tension determination. No inter-rater reliability or conflicts of opinion reported. • Proximal extension of colon above pelvic floor is an independent factor for anastomotic leaks • Main limitation is cited as inability to measure tension directly

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.12.24308856; this version posted September 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure 1. P Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) flowchart



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.12.24308856; this version posted September 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure 2. Electronic tensiometer with a horizontal clamping device presented by Oetzamann et al. Several key features are highlighted in Figures 2B, C, and D to reflect the tensiometer resolution, control over displacement speed, and anastomosis displacement measurement, respectively [52]. *Reprinted with permission from Esophageal Biomechanics Revisited: A Tale of Tenacity, Anastomoses, and Suture Bite Lengths in Swine (1670-1677), by C. Oetzmann von Sochaczewski, 2019, The Annals of Thoracic Surgery. [2019] by Elsevier.*



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.12.24308856; this version posted September 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure 3. Low-cost pulley system as an alternative to tensiometers and mechanically operated displacement devices to increase and measure tension on the anastomosis presented by Schilt et al.[42]. *Reprinted with permission from An experimental model to investigate initial tracheal anastomosis strength (1125-1128), by P. N. Schilt, 2010, The Laryngoscope. [2010] by John Wiley and Sons.*