

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم



HOSSAM MAGHRABY



شبكة المعلومات الجامعية التوثيق الالكتروني والميكرو فيلم



HOSSAM MAGHRABY

جامعة عين شمس

التوثيق الإلكتروني والميكروفيلم

قسم

نقسم بالله العظيم أن المادة التي تم توثيقها وتسجيلها
على هذه الأقراص المدمجة قد أعدت دون أية تغيرات



يجب أن

تحفظ هذه الأقراص المدمجة بعيدا عن الغبار



HOSSAM MAGHRABY



Analysis of Outcome in Recipients with Different Graft-Recipient-Weight- Ratio (GRWR) Post Adult to Adult Living Donor Liver Transplant (LDLT)

Thesis

*Submitted for Partial Fulfillment of Master Degree in
General Surgery*

By

Marolla Maher Iskander

(M B BcH) Cairo University

Under supervision of

Prof. Dr. Amr Ahmed Abd ElAal

Professor of General Surgery

Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University

Prof. Dr. Ahmed AbdElRazek

Assistant Professor of General Surgery

Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University

Dr. Mahmoud Talaat

Lecturer of General Surgery

Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University

Faculty of Medicine

Ain Shams University

2021

Acknowledgment

*First and foremost, I feel always indebted to **God**, the Most Kind and Most Merciful.*

*I'd like to express my respectful thanks and profound gratitude to **Prof. Dr. Amr Ahmed Abd ElAal**, Professor of General Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University for his keen guidance, kind supervision, valuable advice and continuous encouragement, which made possible the completion of this work.*

*I am also delighted to express my deepest gratitude and thanks to **Prof. Dr. Ahmed AbdElRazek**, Assistant Professor of General Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, for his kind care, continuous supervision, valuable instructions, constant help and great assistance throughout this work.*

*I am deeply thankful to **Dr. Mahmoud Falaat**, Lecturer of General Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, for his great help, active participation and guidance.*

Marolla Maher

List of Contents

Title	Page No.
List of Tables	i
List of Figures	iii
List of Abbreviations.....	vi
Introduction	1
Aim of the Work.....	5
Review of Literature	
Anatomy.....	6
Liver Transplantation	21
Preoperative Assessment of the Recepients and Donor Selection.....	28
Post Operative Care and LT Complications.....	38
Small For Size Syndrome	44
Patients and Methods.....	60
Results	79
Discussion	111
Summery	121
Conclusion	124
References	125
Arabic Summary	—

List of Tables

Table No.	Title	Page No.
Table (1):	Indications for liver transplant	24
Table (2):	Show MELD exceptions	30
Table (3):	Show the preoperative workup for patients pre LDLTx.....	32
Table (4):	Evaluation protocol for potential living liver donors at the University of Essen, Germany	36
Table (5):	The definition of small-for-size syndrome* reported by various authors.....	45
Table (6):	Show the causes of SFSS and the strategies to prevent SFSS.....	59
Table (7):	Descriptive for demographic data of the recipient.....	80
Table (8):	Showing intraoperative details of the recipient.....	83
Table (9):	Comparison between patients with $GRWR \leq 0.8$ and those with $GRWR > 0.8$ regarding donors demographic data	85
Table (10):	Comparison between patients with $GRWR \leq 0.8$ and those with $GRWR > 0.8$ regarding recipient demographic data and hepatopathy	86
Table (11):	Comparison between patients with $GRWR \leq 0.8$ and those with $GRWR > 0.8$ regarding recipient preoperative assessment	88
Table (12):	Comparison between patients with $GRWR \leq 0.8$ and those with $GRWR > 0.8$ regarding Intra-operative assessment.	89

List of Tables Cont...

Table No.	Title	Page No.
Table (13):	Showing Comparison between patients with GRWR ≤ 0.8 & > 0.8 regarding small for size syndrome manifestations, incidence and early post operative mortality.....	92
Table (14):	Comparison between cases with GRWR ≤ 0.8 and those with GRWR > 0.8 regarding overall survival (months).....	94
Table (15):	Showing comparison between demographic data of Donors For patients who developed small for size and those who didn't.....	97
Table (16):	Showing comparison between demographic data & different characteristics of patient with SFSS and those without.....	98
Table (17):	Comparing between patients who had small for size syndrome & those who didn't have with regard to SFSS manifestations.....	100
Table (18):	Showing comparison between patients with small for size syndrome & those without regarding intraoperative assessment.....	102
Table (19):	Comparing between patients who had small for size syndrome & those who didn't have with regard to SFSS manifestations.....	105
Table (20):	Comparison between the two studied groups regarding overall survival (months).....	110

List of Figures

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure (1):	Couinaud 8-segment (I–VIII) anatomic division of the liver.(N).	10
Figure (2):	Common variations of hepatic vasculature	13
Figure (3):	Maximal intensity projection view of the portal vein bifurcation.....	14
Figure (4):	Ct scan showing the common opening of all three hepatic viens and inferior accessory hepatic vien(N).	16
Figure (5):	Hjortsjo's crook.	18
Figure (6):	Extra hepatic and intra hepatic biliary system	19
Figure (7):	Anatomical variations of the intra hepatic biliary system	20
Figure (8):	Three dimensions reconstruction imaging of the liver and its vascularity	37
Figure (9):	Intraoperative cholangiogram before resection to assure adequate length of the bile duct with good stump.	70
Figure (10):	Liver after completing formal parenchymal resection.	70
Figure (11):	Irrigation of the graft with HTK solution and assesmt of the veins to be anastomosed.	71
Figure (12):	Reconstruction of V5 using natural PV graft of the explanted liver on the back table.....	72
Figure (13):	The explanted liver.	74

List of Figures Cont...

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure (14):	Rt lobe graft showing reconstruction of V5 into the confluence of MHV and LHV of the recipient using synthetic graft.....	75
Figure (15):	The left lobe graft	76
Figure (16):	Hepatopathy types of recipient group	81
Figure (17):	CHILD grade among recipient group	81
Figure (18):	The percentage of GRWR ≤ 0.8 & > 0.8	84
Figure (19):	Showing different types of grafts used	84
Figure (20):	Comparison between patients with GRWR ≤ 0.8 & > 0.8 regarding different types of grafts.....	91
Figure (21):	Comparison between patients with GRWR ≤ 0.8 & > 0.8 regarding MHV reconstruction.	91
Figure (22):	Comparison between patients with GRWR ≤ 0.8 & > 0.8 regarding early post operative mortality.	93
Figure (23):	Overall survival for all the studied patients.....	95
Figure (24):	Kaplan–Meier curves for graft survival in the first year after living donor liver transplantation for the 2 groups of patients.....	96
Figure (25):	Comparison between patients with small for size syndrome & those who didn't have with regard to autoimmune hepatitis.....	99

List of Figures Cont...

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure (26):	Comparison between patients who had small for size syndrome & those who didn't have with regard to resistive index of hepatic artery.	104
Figure (27):	Comparison between patients who had small for size syndrome & those who didn't have with regard to GRWR.	104
Figure (28):	Comparison between patients with SFSS and those with no SFSS with regard to Day of INR normalization.	107
Figure (29):	Comparison between patients with SFSS and those with no SFSS with regard to day of normalization of bilirubin	107
Figure (30):	Comparison between patients with SFSS with and those with no SFSS with regard to day of normalization of platelets.	108
Figure (31):	Comparison between patients with SFSS with and those with no SFSS with regard to manifestations of SfSS	109
Figure (32):	Kaplan–Meier curves regarding overall survival (in months) between the two groups.	110

List of Abbreviations

Abb.	Full term
ATP.....	Adenosine Triphosphate
BMI.....	Body mass index
BUN.....	Blood urea nitrogen
CBC	Complete Blood Count
CCA	Cholangiocarcinoma
CMV.....	Cytomegalovirus
CRP.....	C-reactive protein
CT	Computed tomography
DDLT.....	Deceased donor liver transplantation
EBV	Epstein-Barr virus
ECG	Electrocardiography
ESR.....	Erythrocyte sedimentation rate
GIM	Graft Inflow Modulation
GRWR.....	Graft to recipient weight ratio
GV/SLV	Graft volume standard liver volume ratio
HABR	Hepatic arterial buffer response
HAT	Hepatic artery thrombosis
HCC	Hepatocellular carcinoma
HCV	Hepatitis C virus
HGF	Hepatocyte growth factor
HGFA	Hepatocyte growth factor activator
HIV	Human immunodeficiency virus
HPCS.....	Hemi-portocaval shunt
HTK.....	Histidine–tryptophan–ketoglutarate solution
IHPBA.....	International hepato-pancreaticobiliary association
INR	International normalized ratio
IVC.....	Inferior vena cava
LDLT	Living donor liver transplantation

List of Abbreviations Cont...

Abb.	Full term
LTx	Liver transplantation
MELD	Model of end-stage liver disease
MHV	Middle hepatic vein
MHV	Middle hepatic vein
OPSS	Overwhelming post-splenectomy sepsis
PNF	Primary non-function
PSS	Porto-systemic shunts
PT	Prothrombin time
PTT	Partial thromboplastin time
PVF	Portal venous flow
PVP	Portal vein pressure
PVT	Portal vein thrombosis
RPR	Rapid plasma reagin
SAL	Splenic artery ligation
SFSG	Small-for-size graft
SFSS	Small-for-size syndrome
SMV	Splanchnic venous inflow
VEGF	Vascular endothelial growth factor

ABSTRACT

Background: The problem of graft size is one of the critical factors limiting the expansion of adult-to-adult living donor liver transplantation (LDLT). Graft-to-recipient weight ratio (GRWR) $> 0.8\%$ is perceived as the critical graft size to meet the metabolic demand of the recipient. Small-for-size graft (SFSG) is the graft with GRWR < 0.8 and when its unable to meet the recipients metabolic demands, small-for-size syndrome (SFSS) occurs which is a life-threatening condition with rapidly progressive liver failure. This lower limit of GRWR (0.8%) has been challenged over the last decade perhaps due to better understanding of the pathophysiology, coupled with technical refinements, particularly related to venous outflow reconstruction.

Aim of Work: Our aim was to analyse the different outcomes of patients undergoing Living donor liver transplantation using grafts with GRWR $\leq 0.8\%$ with those $>0.8\%$ to evaluate the factors that affect the post-operative outcome and the overall one year Graft survival.

Methods: This is a retrospective cohort study on 100 adult patients with ESLD or HCC (mean age 54.16 ± 10.53 years old) who underwent adult LDLT in the period between 2018 and 2020 and follow up the patients for one year post transplant, Patients were divided into two groups, patients who received Graft with GRWR ≤ 0.8 (N= 22 patients with lower limit of GRWR = 0.58 and there is 7 patients with GRWR ≤ 0.7) and those with GRWR >0.8 (N= 78 patients). We compared the the Donor factors, preoperative patient factors, intraoperative factors, development of small for size syndrome and graft survival in patients received small-for-size grafts (GRWR ≤ 0.8) with patients received GRWR <0.8 .

Results: We retrospectively evaluated the donor factors, recipient factors and operative factors through the medical records. Small-for-size syndrome (SFSS) occurred in 2 of 22 patients (9.1%) in patients with GRWR ≤ 0.8 and in 1 of 78 patients (1.3%) in patients with GRWR >0.8 which was statistically insignificant between two groups. There was No significant difference in the Donor age, Preoperative MELD, CHILD, Portal hypertension, cold and warm ischemia, operative time, presence of PVT and HCC in patients who received GRWR ≤ 0.8 and patients with GRWR >0.8 . the mean overall survival for all the studied cases was found 43.35 months and the overall survival at 6 months and 1 year was 96.0% but there was statistically significant increase in the overall survival of cases with GRWR >0.8 than those with GRWR ≤ 0.8 with p-value = 0.009, as the overall 6 months and 1 year survival for patients with GRWR >0.8 was 98% and 98 % compared to 86 % and 86 % in thoses with GRWR ≤ 0.8

Conclusion: There is no difference in the outcome in form of development of Small for size syndrome when we use Grafts with GRWR >0.8 or with GRWR ≤ 0.8 , However the venous Outflow of SFSG (GRWR < 0.8) is very critical to maintain good graft function in the recipient.

Keywords: Living donor liver transplantation, graft-to-recipient weight ratio

INTRODUCTION

Egypt is a heavily populated country, with a strikingly high prevalence of hepatitis C virus (HCV) infection, 26%. That has led to increasing numbers of Egyptian patients suffering from end-stage liver disease (*El-Elmi and El-Gazzaz, 2010*). Thus, liver diseases are amongst the national health problems that have a great impact on health insurance programs, national human and financial resources. Hence, the remarkable continuous growth of liver transplantation programs and the increase of the number of transplanted patients (*Sholkamy, 2014*).

Indications for liver transplantation can be classified into end-stage liver disease, acute liver failure and certain benign and malignant liver tumors. LT should be considered for any patient in whom anticipated overall survival exceeds life expectancy of the underlying disease or where significant increase in quality of life can be achieved (*Hackl et al., 2014*).

Living donor liver transplantation (LDLT) has been a well-recognized alternative to whole graft transplantation from deceased donor in face of organ shortage in the past two decades. Since the first successful LDLT from adult to child reported by Strong *et al.* in 1989 in Australia, the operation has been rapidly taken up by various centers (*Miyagawa et al., 2001*).