

Longterm Outcome of Common Bariatric Surgeries

An essay

Submitted for partial fulfillment of masters degree in
General Surgery

Presented by

Ahmed Magdy Hafez

M.B, B.CH

Faculty of medicine - Ain Shams University

Supervised by

Prof. Dr. Osama Fouad Mohamed

Professor of General Surgery

Faculty of Medicine - Ain Shams University

Prof. Dr. Waleed Mohammed Ebrahim

Assistant Professor of General Surgery

Faculty of Medicine - Ain Shams University

Prof. Dr. Mohammed Abd Elmonem Marzouk

Assistant Professor of General Surgery

Faculty of Medicine - Ain Shams University

Faculty of Medicine

Ain Shams University

2014

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

وَقُلْ اَعْمَلُوا فَسَيَرَى اللَّهُ عَمَلَكُمْ
وَرَسُولُهُ وَالْمُؤْمِنُونَ

()



First, thanks are all due to *Allah* for Blessing this work until it has reached its end, as a part of his generous help throughout our life.

I am deeply grateful to *Prof. Dr. Osama Fouad Mohammed*, Professor of General Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University for adding a lot to this work by his surgical experience and for his keen supervision.

My profound thanks and deep appreciation to *Prof. Dr. Waleed Mohammed Ebrahim*, Assistant Professor of General Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University for his great support and advice, his valuable remarks that gave me the confidence and encouragement to fulfill this work.

I am also thankful to *Dr. Mohamed Abdel Moneim Marzouk*, Assistant professor of General Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University for his valuable supervision, co-operation and direction that extended throughout this work.

I am want also to thank *my family* for supporting me throughout my life.



Ahmed Magdy Hafez

List of Contents

| | Page |
|-----------------------------|------|
| Acknowledgment | -- |
| List of Abbreviations | i |

| | |
|---|-----|
| List of Figures | ii |
| List of Tables | iv |
| Introduction and Aim of The Work | 1 |
| Chapter 1: | |
| Operative techniques | 7 |
| Chapter 2: | |
| Complications of common bariatric surgeries | 23 |
| Chapter 3: | |
| Outcome of common bariatric surgeries..... | 47 |
| Chapter 4: | |
| Obesity and cancer | 112 |
| Chapter 5: | |
| Revisional surgery | 121 |
| Summary | 136 |
| References | 137 |
| Arabic Summary | -- |

List of Abbreviations

| | |
|---------|--|
| ASL | Anastomotic site leak |
| BMI | Body mass index |
| BPD | Bilio pancreatic diversion |
| BPD-DS | Bilio pancreatic diversion with duodenal switch |
| CSG-MGB | Combined sleeve gastrectomy with mini gastric bypass |
| CT | Computed tomography |
| DVT | Deep venous thrombosis |
| ERCP | Endoscopic retrograde cholangio pancreaticography |
| EWL | Excess weight loss |
| GERD | Gastroesophageal reflux disease |
| GGF | Gastro gastric fistula |
| GIT | Gastrointestinal tract |
| GLP 1 | Glucagon like peptide 1. |
| HOMA | Homeostatic model assessment-insulin resistant. |
| HOMA-B | Homeostatic model assessment –B cell. |
| IVC | Inferior vena cava |
| LAGB | Laparoscopic adjustable gastric banding |
| LMGB | Laparoscopic mini gastric bypass |
| LRYGB | Laparoscopic reux en y gastric bypass |
| LSG | Laparoscopic sleeve gastrectomy |
| LTC | Long term complications |
| MGB | Mini gastric bypass |
| N | Number |
| OAGB | One anastomosis gastric bypass |
| PE | Pulmonary embolism |
| Pyy | Peptide YY. |
| RYGB | Reux en y gastric bypass |
| SG | Sleeve gastrectomy |
| SOS | Swedish obese study |
| STC | Short term complications |
| T2DM | Type 2 diabetes mellitus |
| UGH | Upper gastrointestinal hemorrhage |
| VBG | Vertical band gastroplasty |
| WT | Weight |

List of Figures

| Fig. | Title | Page |
|-------------|---|-------------|
| 1 | Laparoscopic sleeve gastrectomy. | 7 |
| 2 | Port site locations for LSG. | 9 |
| 3 | a. Separating the stomach by Stapling near the Angle of Hiss. b. Judging the size of a Sleeve Gastrectomy. c. Sleeve gastrectomy demonstrating divided stomach. | 11 |
| 4 | Roux-EN-Y Gastric Bypass. | 12 |
| 5 | Position and port placement for performing a LRYGB. | 13 |
| 6 | Mini gastric bypass. | 15 |
| 7 | Port positions for LMGB. | 17 |
| 8 | Creation the proximal gastric pouch. | 18 |
| 9 | Gastrojejunostomy creation with a GIA stapler. | 19 |
| 10 | (1, 2) Gastric resection lines (3) part of the stomach prepared for extraction. | 22 |
| 11 | Antecolic, isoperistaltic termino-lateral gastroentero anastomosis. | 22 |
| 12 | CT scan showing pathognomonic internal hernia findings. | 26 |
| 13 | The three mesenteric defects FOUND DURING RYGB. | 27 |
| 14 | Potential sites of hemorrhage in RYGB. | 28 |
| 15 | Methylene blue leaking through gastrojejunal anastomosis intraoperatively . | 30 |
| 16 | Endoscopic view of a gastrogastic fistula. | 37 |
| 17 | Comparisons at baseline 2-5 years post LSG. | 51 |
| 18 | Body mass index after gastric bypass. | 55 |
| 19 | Changes in percentage of excess weight loss after surgery. | 57 |
| 20 | Weight changes among subjects participating in the Swedish Obese Subjects study. | 59 |

List of Figures (Cont.)

| Fig. | Title | Page |
|-------------|---|-------------|
| 21 | Percentage excess weight loss (% EWL) following LMGB. | 61 |
| 22 | Change of BMI after LMGB . | 62 |
| 23 | Percentage of excess weight loss after MGB. | 64 |
| 24 | Weight loss (in percent) after LRYGB and LMGB. | 65 |
| 25 | Change of BMI after LRYGB and LMGB. | 65 |
| 26 | Neofundus formation. | 70 |
| 27 | Time course of weight loss over a 5 year period in patients underwent RYGBP or SG. | 72 |
| 28 | Time course of weight loss over a 5 year period after RYGB. | 88 |
| 29 | Recovery from comorbidities after bariatric surgery. | 89 |
| 30 | Changes in HOMA-IR and HOMA-B. | 90 |
| 31 | Conversion from minigastric to SG and RYGB. | 124 |
| 32 | Progression of BMI with time after laparoscopic reconstruction of the bypass. | 129 |
| 33 | Progression of BMI with time after laparoscopic revision for weight issues after laparoscopic Roux en Y gastric bypass. | 129 |
| 34 | Mean age for successful SG. | 135 |
| 35 | Efficacy of SG and of MGB on the percentage loss of excess BMI. | 135 |

List of Tables

| Table | Title | Page |
|-------|--|------|
| 1 | Complications after LRYGB. | 38 |
| 2 | Most common causes of reoperation after LRYGB. | 43 |
| 3 | Most common causes of reoperation after LSG. | 44 |
| 4 | Complications after LMGB. | 45 |
| 5 | Follow up complication rate after MGB. | 46 |
| 6 | Results at 2 and 5 years after SG. | 50 |
| 7 | Comparison of effect of SG on weight loss. | 51 |
| 8 | Weight loss at different follow up points after LSG. | 52 |
| 9 | Series with >5 years of follow up after LSG. | 52 |
| 10 | The mean wt loss, mean BMI, percentage of excess wt loss, and the patient follow up rate after LRYGB. | 55 |
| 11 | Weight and body mass index before and 5 years after gastric bypass. | 56 |
| 12 | Long term effect of bariatric surgery on weight loss maintenance, comorbidities, and major end points. | 57 |
| 13 | BMI evolution and % EWL after MGB. | 61 |
| 14 | Series of outcome of MGB. | 63 |
| 15 | Comparison of clinical characteristics of patients 5 years after laparoscopic Roux-en-Y vs. mini-gastric bypass. | 64 |
| 16 | Failure Rate after SG. | 67 |
| 17 | Summary of Studies Comparing Weight Loss Associated With Various Surgical Procedures. | 71 |
| 18 | Gastro esophageal Complaints at 6 yr pos SG . | 75 |
| 19 | Summary of studies showing increased GERD after sleeve gastrectomy. | 76 |
| 20 | Summary of studies showing reduced GERD after sleeve gastrectomy. | 77 |

List of Tables (Cont.)

| Table | Title | Page |
|--------------|--|-------------|
| 21 | Proposed mechanisms for an increase in prevalence of GERD symptoms after SG. | 78 |
| 22 | Proposed mechanisms for a decrease in prevalence of GERD symptoms after SG. | 80 |
| 23 | Summary of effects of LSG on GERD. | 80 |
| 24 | Effect of different types of bariatric surgery on gastroesophageal reflux disease. | 81 |
| 25 | Diabetes outcome after different types of operations. | 90 |
| 26 | Outcome of comorbidities after MGB. | 94 |
| 27 | Outcome of co-morbidities after RYGB. | 96 |
| 28 | 5 years outcome after SG. | 96 |
| 29 | Maternal risks associated with obesity. | 98 |
| 30 | Nutrient deficiency prevalence post LSG and LRYGB. | 112 |
| 31 | Reason for revision surgery after LRYGB and LMBG. | 126 |
| 32 | Objective success at 5 years after SG. | 134 |

Introduction

Global awareness of obesity as a disease process that results in significant morbidity and mortality is growing. In addition, obesity rates continue to increase to now pandemic levels (**Center for Disease Control et al., 2011**).

Obesity is a leading preventable cause of death with high prevalence in adults and children and one of the most serious worldwide problems (**Buchwald et al., 2007**).

Obesity is now considered to be the second leading cause of preventable death behind cigarette smoking (**Schauer and Schirmer, 2005**).

Obesity, generally defined as a body mass index (BMI) greater than 30 kg/m², increases the risk of all-cause death (**Wandell et al., 2009**).

BMI is the commonly used measure of obesity, represents weight in Kilograms divided by height in meters squared (kg/m²). It is easy to identify patients who are underweight (BMI <18.5kg/m²) normal weight (BMI 18.5 to 24.9 kg/m²), overweight (BMI 25 to 29.9 kg/m²), obese (BMI ≥ 30 kg/m²), or extremely obese (BMI ≥ 40 kg/m²), BMI 60 kg/m² are considered morbidly super-obese persons (**U.S. Preventive Services Task Force, 2003**).

Obesity is associated with a variety of diseases that together account for a very large fraction of morbidity and mortality in the Western world.¹ Coronary heart disease, cerebrovascular disease and stroke, hypertension, dyslipoproteinemia, diabetes mellitus and cholelithiasis constitute a partial list of diseases common- place among the obese (**Bray et al., 1976**).

Bariatric surgical techniques can be divided into restrictive, malabsorptive or combined restrictive/malabsorptive procedures (**Herron et al., 2011**).

Restrictive procedures include:

- 1) Laparoscopic Adjustable Gastric Band (LAGB).
- 2) Laparoscopic Sleeve Gastrectomy (LSG).
- 3) Vertical Banded Gastroplasty (VBG).

Malabsorptive procedures include:

- 1) Bilio Pancreatic Diversion (BPD).
- 2) Bilio Pancreatic Diversion with Duodenal Switch (BPD-DS).
- 3) Jejunioileal Bypass.

Combined restrictive /malabsorptive:

- 1) Laparoscopic Roux-en-Y Gastric Bypass (LRYGB).
- 2) Laparoscopic Mini Gastric Bypass (MGB).
- 3) Combined Sleeve Gastrectomy and Mini Gastric Bypass (Novel technique).

Laparoscopic Roux-en-Y gastric bypass (LRYGBP):

Considered the ‘gold standard’ procedure, resulting in 65–80 % excess bodyweight loss, decreased appetite, and rapid weight- independent amelioration of type-2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) (**Buchwald et al., 2009**).

LRYGBP is cost effective, but technically challenging

with associated mortality albeit low ~0.09 % and

micronutrient deficiencies risks, necessitating lifelong follow-up (**Gould et al., 2011**).

RYGBP reduces stomach volume and bypasses the majority of the stomach, duodenum and proximal jejunum, with direct nutrient delivery to the distal gut (**Scott et al., 2011**).

RYGB is a safe and effective bariatric procedure with excellent long-term results regarding weight loss and resolution of obesity-related comorbidities (**Buchwald et al., 2009**).

Mini-gastric bypass (MGB):

The mini gastric bypass procedure was first developed by Dr Robert Rutledge from the USA in 1997, as a modification of the standard Billroth II procedure. A mini gastric bypass creates a long narrow tube of the stomach along its right border (the lesser curvature). A loop of the small gut is brought up and hooked to this tube at about 180 cms from the start of the intestine. Laparoscopic mini gastric bypass is a technically simple and safe procedure and has the advantages of being a single stage procedure, being easily reversible and revisable in a laparoscopic procedure and does not sacrifice portions of the stomach or implant foreign materials (**Peraglie et al., 2008**).

The MGB has been suggested as an alternative to the Roux en-Y procedure due to the simplicity of its construction, and is becoming more and more popular because of low risk of complications and good sustained weight loss (**Lomanto et al., 2009**).

Sleeve gastrectomy:

Laparoscopic sleeve gastrectomy was first described in the 1990s by Marceau et al (**Marceau et al., 1993**) and Hess and Hess (**Hess et al., 1998**) as part of the duodenal switch operation, then introduced as a first step of a two-stage

operation for high-risk super obese patients (**Regan et al., 2003**).

Laparoscopic sleeve gastrectomy is a straightforward procedure compared with LRYGBP and BPD-DS, it does not involve any digestive anastomosis, and no mesenteric defects are created, eliminating the risk of internal herniation. The whole digestive tract remains accessible for endoscopic evaluation, and no dumping syndrome occurs (**Himpens et al., 2006**).

Sleeve gastrectomy is perceived less invasive, technically simpler and easier to perform compared with RYGB. SG could thus become the procedure of choice in treating morbid obesity provided that the long-term results of SG are comparable with RYGB regarding weight loss, the resolution of comorbidities, and improvement in the quality of life (**Regan et al., 2003**).

The promising short term results of SG have somewhat altered the paradigm for SG from a two stage procedure to a stand-alone definitive bariatric procedure. In light of reports of comparable weight loss and metabolic outcomes to LRYGBP, LSG is increasingly undertaken as a stand-alone procedure (**Bohdjalian et al., 2010**).

SG also has possible long-term advantages over RYGB such as preservation of endoscopic access to the upper gastrointestinal tract, prevention of the dumping syndrome by pylorus preservation, normal intestinal absorption, and avoiding the risk of internal herniation associated with RYGB anastomosis (**Buchwald et al., 2009**).

However, its long term efficacy for weight loss and metabolic benefit remains unclear (**Chambers et al., 2013**).

Body weight loss after different types of bariatric surgery is associated with a high rate for resolution of type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM), with resolution more common after the predominantly malabsorptive and mixed malabsorptive-restrictive procedures than after the purely restrictive operations.

Only bariatric surgery leads to permanent weight loss and reduction in comorbidities in the majority of morbidly obese patients **(Buchwald et al., 2004)**.

Despite routine supplementation of vitamins and minerals after bariatric surgery, a number of patients suffer from deficiencies in vitamin or trace elements **(Cummings et al., 2004)**.

Purely restrictive operations, such as laparoscopic adjustable gastric banding (LAGB) and vertical banded gastroplasty, tend to cause fewer deficiencies than do malabsorptive procedures, such as laparoscopic Roux-Y- gastric bypass (LRYGB) (mal absorption of micronutrients) **(Cummings et al., 2004)**.

Pregnancy outcome of obese women in general has been shown to be worse than that of women of normal BMI, including an increased incidence of the following complications: gestational diabetes, gestational hypertension and preeclampsia, fetal macrosomia, cesarean deliveries and anesthesia related complications **(Yogev et al., 2009)**.

Pregnancy after bariatric surgery appears to be safe, providers should take extra care to properly monitor their patients for appropriate weight gain and nourishment **(Weintraub et al., 2008)**.

Aim of The Work

The aim of this essay to review the outcome of common bariatric surgeries (roux en y gastric bypass, minibypass, and sleeve gastrectomy (as regard weight loss, nutritional status, and related comorbidities from 5 to 10 years.