### **ORIGINAL ARTICLE: Clinical Endoscopy**

# Management and risk factor of stenosis after endoscopic submucosal dissection for colorectal neoplasms



Takemasa Hayashi, MD, Shin-ei Kudo, MD, PhD, Hideyuki Miyachi, MD, PhD, Tatsuya Sakurai, MD, Tomoyuki Ishigaki, MD, Yusuke Yagawa, MD, Naoya Toyoshima, MD, PhD, Yuichi Mori, MD, PhD, Masashi Misawa, MD, PhD, Toyoki Kudo, MD, PhD, Kunihiko Wakamura, MD, PhD, Atushi Katagiri, MD, PhD, Toshiyuki Baba, MD, PhD, Fumio Ishida, MD, PhD

Yokohama, Japan

**Background and Aim:** Although endoscopic submucosal dissection (ESD) enables en bloc removal of large colorectal neoplasms, the incidence of stenosis after ESD and its risk factors have not been well described. This study aimed to determine the risk factors of stenosis and verify the surveillance and treatment of stenosis.

**Methods:** This retrospective study included 822 patients, with a total of 912 consecutive colorectal lesions, who underwent ESD from September 2003 to May 2015. The main outcome measures were incidence of stenosis and its relationship with the clinicopathologic factors in surveillance.

**Results:** Surveillance endoscopy was performed 6 months after ESD. Four of the 822 patients (0.49%) developed stenosis and required unanticipated endoscopy. The other 908 cases in 818 patients showed no symptoms or only slight abdominal discomfort (that was controlled with medication) and did not require any dilation or steroid therapies. Post-ESD stenosis was observed in 11.1% (2/18) of patients with circumferential resection between  $\geq$ 90% and <100% and in 50% (2/4) of patients with circumferential resection of 100%. Among the 50 cases with a circumferential mucosal defect  $\geq$ 75%, a circumferential mucosal defect  $\geq$ 90% was a significant risk factor (P = .005). Four patients with stenosis were treated successfully by endoscopic dilation.

**Conclusions:** Circumferential mucosal defect of more than 90% is a significant risk factor for stenosis after colorectal ESD. Surveillance endoscopy 6 months after ESD is recommended to assess for development of stenosis. Defects smaller than 90% do not require close endoscopic follow-up or prophylactic measures for prevention of post-ESD stenosis. (UMIN clinical trial registration number: UMIN000015754.) (Gastrointest Endosc 2017;86:358-69.)

#### INTRODUCTION

Stenosis after endoscopic submucosal dissection (ESD) for lesions of the stomach and esophagus is the main

Abbreviations: EBD, endoscopic balloon dilation; ESD, endoscopic submucosal dissection; LST-NG, laterally spreading tumor–nongranular; LST-G, laterally spreading tumor–granular; TEM, trans-anal endoscopic microsurgery.

DISCLOSURE: All authors disclosed no financial relationships relevant to this publication.



Use your mobile device to scan this QR code and watch the author interview. Download a free QR code scanner by searching "QR Scanner" in your mobile device's app store.

delayed adverse event, <sup>1-8</sup> excluding bleeding and perforation, and resection of more than 75% of the circumference is a significant factor related to stenosis. <sup>3,5</sup> Endoscopic balloon dilation (EBD) is required multiple times

Copyright © 2017 by the American Society for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy 0016-5107/\$36.00

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gie.2016.11.032

Received May 29, 2016. Accepted November 21, 2016.

Current affiliation: Digestive Disease Center, Showa University Northern Yokohama Hospital, Yokohama, Japan.

Reprint requests: Shin-ei Kudo, MD, PhD, Digestive Disease Center, Showa University Northern Yokohama Hospital, 35-1 Chigasaki Chuo, Tsuzuki-ku, Yokohama City, Kanagawa 224-8503, Japan.

If you would like to chat with an author of this article, you may contact Dr Kudo at kudos@med.showa-u.ac.jp.

TABLE 1. Comparison of characteristics of patients and lesions and the presence and absence of stenosis after endoscopic submucosal resection

No. of patients	Presence of stenosis 4	Absence of stenosis 818	P value*
No. of males/females	3/1	487/331	.651
Concomitant disease, n			
Diabetes mellitus	0	68	1
Liver cirrhosis	0	7	1
Chronic heart failure	0	18	1
Autoimmune disease	0	5	1
Chronic renal failure	0	10	1
Medication (aspirin)	0	66	1
No. of lesions	4	908	
Location of mucosal defect (center), n			.735
Rectum	3	165	
Colon	1	743	
Morphology			.236
Flat			
LST-NG (IIa)	0	445	
LST-G (lla, lla + ls)	4	385	
Depressed (IIc, lic + IIa, II a + IIc)	0	16	
Protruded (Is)	0	23	
Recurrence	0	39	
ongitudinal diameter (mm), median (range)	95 (57-134)	33 (8-185)	.001
Circumferential diameter (mm), median (range)	92.5 (78-187)	40 (7-130)	<.001
Circumferential extent of the mucosal defect			<.001
<75%	0	862	
≥75% to <90%	0	28	
≥90% to <100%	2	16	
100%	2	2	
Depth of invasion			.311
m	3	747	
	0	95	
sm2 or more	1	66	
Procedure time (minutes), median (range)	295 (165-420)	82 (5-540)	.001
En bloc resection, n (%)	3 (75)	891 (98.1)	.768
Curative resection, n (%)	3 (75)	798 (87.8)	.405
Noncurative resection, n	1	110	.405
Deep invasion	1	101	.378
Positive vertical margins	0	11	1
Poorly differentiated/mucinous adenocarcinoma	0	10	1
Lymphatic permeation	0	29	1
Venous permeation	0	28	1
Budding grade 2/3	0	22	1
Adverse events, n			
Perforation	0	22	1
Muscle injury	1	125	.449
Postoperative bleeding	0	11	1

LST-NG, laterally spreading tumor–nongranular; LST-G, laterally spreading tumor–granular.

<sup>\*</sup>The Mann-Whitney U test was used to compare continuous variables, and the Fisher exact probability test was used to compare categorical variables.

## Download English Version:

# https://daneshyari.com/en/article/5659429

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/5659429

<u>Daneshyari.com</u>