

Mini-Review

Reconstructive Surgery for Esophageal Caustic Stricture - A Brief Review

Abdelkader Boukerrouche

Department of Digestive Surgery, Beni-Messous Hospital, University of Algiers, Algiers, Algeria

***Corresponding Author:** AbdelkaderBoukerrouche, Department of Digestive Surgery, Beni-Messous Hospital, University of Algiers, Algiers, Algeria. Tel :+213661227298 ; Fax: +213 21 931310 ; E-mail: aboukerrouche@yahoo.com.

Citation: Boukerrouche A (2017)Reconstructive Surgery for Esophageal Caustic Stricture - A Brief Review. J Dig Dis Hepatol 2017: JDDH-128.

Received Date: 07 February, 2017; **Accepted Date:** 06 April, 2017; **Published Date:**13 April, 2017

Abstract

Multidisciplinary management, early diagnosis and treatment are the keys of success in patients with digestive severe caustic injury. Endoscopic dilations are the first treatment of esophageal stricture.Reconstructive surgery is an alternative option when the dilatations fail and which the objective is to restore the gut continuity and swallowing function with acceptable mortality and morbidity.Gastric and colon reconstruction are the two most used surgical procedures however the choice of procedure is based on anatomic conditions of patient and the surgeon experience. Substernal route and posterior mediastinum are the most employed approaches.The operative mortality have been increasingly decreased however the morbidity is still slightly higher.In this brief report, we review the preoperative assessment choice of graft organ, route of reconstruction and surgical outcome.

Key words: caustic stricture; reconstructive surgery; surgical outcome

Introduction

Digestive injury and complications resulting from caustic ingestion is the most challenging clinical situations encountered in gastroenterology. The commonest chemicals implicated in gastrointestinal caustic injury are alkaline and acid agents. The caustic ingestion is voluntarily and in suicidal intent in the most situations in adult.In fact, successful management of these patients requires multidisciplinary therapeutic approach including psychiatric support. Early diagnosis and adequate treatment are the keys of success particularly in severe injury which can lead to death resulted from complications [1, 2].Ct scan abdomino-thoracic has an important value to diagnose and precise the transmural character of the esophageal lesion thus reducing excessive esophageal excision and digestive complications.Stricture formation is inevitable in some cases and the first treatment of this stricture is the dilations. Every effort should be made to retain the native esophagus and reconstructive surgery is required for ineffectiveness, complications or lack of the dilations. The objective of surgery is to establish both digestive continuity and swallowing function. Establish the gut continuity needs the use of an abdominal digestive organ.

The time of surgery for caustic stricture is still under controversy. However authors suggest that the most beneficial time for surgery is not less than 3 months for the esophagus and 6 months for the pharynx [3].Despite the reduction inoperative mortality, the morbidity rate is still high.The accuracy of the surgical technique and the experiences of surgeon are the mostimportant factors that may impact outcome in esophageal reconstructive surgery.

Preoperative Evaluation

Preoperative colonoscopy is recommended to explore colon in patient for whom a colonic interposition was planned. Mesenteric angiography is recommended for patient older than 60 years and for patient with prior intestinal resection or peripheral vascular disease. Angiography is very was helpful in outlining the vascular arcade of the intestinal segment to be interposed in patient who had previous colonic resection. Patients candidate for esophageal surgery are at high risk to develop malnutrition. Therefore the preoperative evaluation of the nutritional status of these patients is primordial. Poor nutritional status is associated with high rate of postoperative complications. The nutritional improvement of patientprior to surgery is highly recommended and perioperative introduction of nutritional supports have a direct impact on postoperative results [4 ,5].Both parenteral and enteral nutrition can

be used however the enteral nutrition is the preferred one to treat malnutrition and to improve patient nutritional status. The mechanical bowel preparation is so performed 48 hours before time of surgery.

Choice of replacement organs

The Decision of which organ to use for esophageal reconstruction is based on multiple factors:esophagus disease, length of reconstruction, digestive organ available and surgeon experience and preference. Stomach, colon and jejunum are used to restore digestive continuity after esophagectomy or to bypass malignant and benign esophageal stricture.

Jejunal interposition is seldom used because of the difficulty for operation since blood vessels of jejunum are too thin and easier to be affected after anastomosis.Furthermore; the jejunum is fragile to the erosion of acid in a long run, so the jejunum should not be the first choice. Therefore the best indication for free jejunal graft is the reconstruction of the cervical esophageal portion. Some authors considered that gastric interposition was the procedure of choice to establish digestive continuity for patient with both benign and malignant esophageal disease [6-9]. The gastric reconstruction is widely employed because of its simplicity and it requires less time to achieve the procedure as compared to colon reconstruction. However stomach has the disadvantages of long term gastroesophageal reflux which can lead to complications such esophageal ulceration and anastomotic stenosis [10]. In case of diffused injuries with pharyngo-esophageal stenosis, the stomach is not sufficiently long to reach the basis of the tongue in order to perform a pharyngoplasty.In other hand, the stomach is often injured during massive caustic ingestion and its use as an esophageal substitute is often impossible.

The colon is the first digestive organ used to replace diseased esophagus and many authors have suggested that the colon is the best conduit to construct the esophagus and to restore swallowing function because mainly of an increased incidence of aspiration and reflux with gastric conduit [11-19].Preference of authors who the colon reconstruction lies on the anatomic and physiologic features of colon, including its relatively straight mesentery, increased length that can be mobilized on its vascular pedicle, its low incidence of disease, its resistance to chronic gastric reflux and the long-term good functional results of colon reconstruction. However the completion of colon reconstruction requires more time to achieve the procedure as compared to gastric reconstruction. Both right and left colon can be used however the left colon is more preferable and this preference lies on the near-invariability of the left colonic artery (which has been present in all the patients of our series except in one patient,it had too reduced size and unusable) in contrast with the vascular pattern of the right colon and its smaller lumen which matches perfectly with the esophageal lumen. Iso-peristaltic left colonic graft based on the left colic artery is our

first choice in our institution. When performed by experienced surgeons, substernal left isoperistaltic colon reconstruction is the surgical procedure of choice to reconstruct the scarred esophagus with low mortality, acceptable morbidity and good functional results.

The route of reconstruction

During esophageal reconstruction, there are three placement sites of graft namely the posterior mediastinum, the substernal tunnel and the subcutaneous space. The subcutaneous route is the longest and has strong angulation at its cervical and abdominal extremity , so this route is at high risk of graft necrosis . As reported, the high incidence of graft necrosis associated with the subcutaneous route suggests that only when other routes are not available or suitable, the subcutaneous route should be used [20]. The posterior mediastinum and the substernal route are the two most commonly route used in esophageal reconstruction .The posterior mediastinum is the shortest and most direct route, thereby relaxing tension to the cervical anastomosis site and reducing thus the kinking and twisting risk of graft vascular pedicle [21]. The use of the posterior mediastinum needs the ablation of the native esophagus .In some situations, the access to the posterior mediastinum is difficult or technically not possible [22]. This route also has a high rate of mortality if graft necrosis or anastomotic leakage occur, and it is naturally not indicated for palliative cases because the posterior mediastinum is a tumor bed.

The disadvantages of the posterior mediastinal route have prompted some surgeons to advocate the substernal approach [23]. The substernal route has been an alternative for delayed esophageal reconstruction or when access to the posterior mediastinum is difficult or technically not possible [22,23]. It is easy to achieve the substernal route without need to thoracic approach. Substernal route is an ideal indication for esophageal palliative surgery. This route is widely employed in caustic stricture because the scarred esophagus is often left in place and its ablation is associated with high risk of operative complications.The substernal route has a biggest disadvantage of potential risk of compression of the graft at the thoracic inlet leading mechanical graft ischemia. To ensure there is no risk of compression, enlarging the thoracic inlet by inlet by removing the left half of manubrium and internal third of clavicle is highly suggested when the substernal approach is considered [9,14, 24-27].This procedure allows to easy access to the left internal thoracic vessels which can be useful for supercharge of graft by performing microvessel anastomosis.

The posterior mediastinal and retrosternal routes are associated with similar rates of immediate postoperative complications [28]. Compared to posterior mediastinum, the substernal route is associated with a slightly higher rate of cervical anastomotic leak related partially to the compression of the graft at the level of thoracic inlet. However , the opening of the thoracic inlet may reduce the incidence of cervical leak [29] and its enlargement is

suggested by many surgeons performing esophageal substernal reconstruction [9,24-27,29-31]. Regarding to functional results, both posterior mediastinal and retrosternal routes are associated with similar long-term outcomes [28].The posterior mediastinum is preferred for immediate reconstruction after esophagectomy and the substernal route for delayed reconstruction .However the selection of the pull-up route should be based on the nature of disease, benign or malignant and the functional aspect. Regardless of the route used for reconstruction, it is important to take care of checking constantly the position of the graft vessels to ensure there is no mechanical compression that may impair the vascular supply of the graft, and to select a graft with sufficient length avoiding thus tension at the anastomotic site.

In our institution, we use the substernal approach for esophageal malignant conditions considering the possibility of médiastinal recurrence and for caustic stricture when the diseased esophagus is left in place. However, when using the substernal approach, we feel it is essential to enlarge the thoracic inlet by removing the left half of the manubrium and the sternal head of the left clavicle to ensure there is no compression on the interposed grafted . Although and when necessary the excision should be extended to the medial end of the first and second rib in order to perform a vascular supercharge of the graft.

Mortality and Morbidity

The mortality for esophageal reconstructive surgery was increasingly improved over time and the decrease of mortality rate was related to operative technique improvement and anaesthetic progress.The main cause of death was graft necrosis, followed by sepsis and adult respiratory distress syndrome [21,32-35]. Regarding to pulmonary complications, the incidence has been recently decreased by improvements in perioperative management. The most severe complication is the graft necrosis which is associated with high rate of death in absence of early diagnosis and adequate management. This disastrous complication is more frequent after colon interposition and the incidence of necrosis in gastric and colonic reconstructions was 1% and 2.4 respectively [17,20, 36-50]. Compared to gastric interposition, colon reconstruction is surgical procedure with slightly high risk of graft necrosis. The difficulty is how to complete further digestive re-reconstruction which requires a panel of complex surgical procedures. The precautions are the rule to prevent graft necrosis, so meticulous dissection, selection of an optimal graft and avoiding twist by checking the position of the graft vessels are highly recommended.In other hand, cervical leakage is the most common complication encountered in esophageal reconstruction surgery and is comparable in both gastric and colon reconstruction [11-17,36-50].Its incidence varied largely in published reports [36-51]. The leakage heals spontaneously and surgery is exceptionally needed.Many factors influence the occurrence of leakage however the most important factor is the poor nutritional

status of patient which impacts negatively the anastomotic healing process.Therefore improving nutritional conditions may reduce the risk to develop anastomotic leakage.Anastomotic stricture was less observed than leakage and high percentage of stricture resulted of healed leakage[15,21, 32,33,36,39,40,42,44,48-50,52-54]. The anastomotic stricture should be treated conservatively and the first treatment is endoscopic balloon dilatation. Therefore the surgery is indicated after lack of dilatation.The main late complication of colonic interposition is the redundancy of the interposed colon graft [9,32,36,39,44,48,50].Redundancy leads to retention of food and liquid in the graft, causing dysphagia, regurgitation and nocturnal aspiration and surgery is frequently needed to treat redundancy.

Conclusion

The most severe caustic injuries are caused by Strong acid or alkali ingestion especially in suicide attempts. The early endoscopic evaluation of patients provides accurate diagnosis and permit to define an appropriate therapeutic strategy to prevent complications (early operation).The dilations constitute the first treatment of esophageal stricture. Esophageal reconstructive surgery is indicated when stricture is so severe and after failure of dilations. The goal of this surgery is to restore digestive continuity and good swallowing function with acceptable mortality and morbidity. Both gastric and colon reconstruction procedures can be used to establish digestive continuity after esophagectomy or to bypass diseased esophagus.The selection of the surgical procedure essentially depends on the anatomic conditions of patient and the surgeon preference.

References

1. Ertekin C, Alimoglu O, Akyildiz H, Guloglu R, Taviloglu K (2004) The results of caustic ingestions. *Hepatogastroenterology* 51: 1397-1400.
2. Zhou JH, Jiang YG, Wang RW, Lin YD, Gong TQ, et al. (2005) Management of corrosive esophageal burns in 149 cases. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 130: 449-455.
3. AbdelkaderBoukerrouche (2016) 15-year Personal Experience of Esophageal Reconstruction by Left Colic Artery- dependent Colic Graft for Caustic Stricture: Surgical Technique and Postoperative Results. *Journal of GHR* 5: 1931-1937.
4. AbdelkaderBoukerrouche (2015) Complications Associated with Enteral Nutrition Using Tube Jejunostomy after Esophageal Reconstruction. *J Gastrointest Dig Syst*5:1
5. Kight CE (2008) Nutrition considerations in esophagectomy patients. *NutrClinPract* 23: 521-528.
6. Schilling MK, Mettler D, Redaelli C, Büchler MW (1997) Circulatory and anatomic differences among experimental gastric tubes as esophageal replacement. *World J Surg* 21: 992-997.
7. Collard JM, Tinton N, Malaise J, Romagnoli R, Otte JB, et al. (1995) Esophageal replacement: gastric tube or whole stomach? *Ann Thorac Surg* 60: 261-266.

8. Urschel JD, Blewett CJ, Bennett WF, Miller JD, Young JE (2001) Hand-sewn or stapled esophagogastric anastomoses after esophagectomy for cancer: meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Dis Esophagus* 14: 212-217.
9. Orringer MB and Sloan H (1975) Substernal gastric bypass of the excluded thoracic esophagus for palliation of esophageal carcinoma. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 70: 836-851.
10. Neville WE, Najem AZ (1983) Colon replacement of the esophagus for congenital and benign disease. *Ann ThoracSurg* 36: 626-633.
11. Hamai Y, Hihara J, Emi M, Aoki Y, Okada M (2012) Esophageal reconstruction using the terminal ileum and right colon in esophageal cancer surgery. *Surg Today* 42: 342-350.
12. Cerfolio RJ, Allen MS, Deschamps C, Trastek VF, Pairolero PC (1995) Esophageal replacement by colon interposition. *Ann ThoracSurg* 59: 1382-1384.
13. Wain JC, Wright CD, Kuo EY, Moncure AC, Wilkins EW Jr, et al. (1999) Long-segment colon interposition for acquired esophageal disease. *Ann ThoracSurg* 67: 313-317.
14. DeMeester TR, Johansson KE, Franze I, Eypasch E, Lu CT, et al. (1988) Indications, surgical technique, and long-term functional results of colon interposition or bypass. *Ann Surg* 208: 460-474.
15. Popovici Z (2003) A new philosophy in esophageal reconstruction with colon. Thirty-years experience. *Dis Esophagus* 16: 323-327.
16. Katsoulis IE, Robotis I, Kouraklis G, Yannopoulos P (2005) Duodenogastric reflux after esophagectomy and gastric pull-up: the effect of the route of reconstruction. *World J Surg* 29: 174-181.
17. Lerut T, Coosemans W, Decker G, De Leyn P, Nafteux P, et al. (2002) Anastomotic complications after esophagectomy. *Dig Surg* 19: 92-98.
18. Akiyama H, Miyazono H, Tsurumaru M, Hashimoto C, Kawamura T (1978) Use of the stomach as an esophageal substitute. *Ann Surg* 188: 606-610.
19. Imada T, Ozawa Y, Minamide J, Rino Y, Takahashi M, et al. (1998) Gastric emptying after gastric interposition for esophageal carcinoma: comparison between the anterior and posterior mediastinal approaches. *Hepatogastroenterology* 45: 2224-2227.
20. Moorehead RJ and Wong J (1990) Gangrene in esophageal substitutes after resection and bypass procedures for carcinoma of the esophagus. *Hepatogastroenterology* 37: 364-367.
21. Koh P, Turnbull G, Attia E, LeBrun P, Casson AG (2004) Functional assessment of the cervical esophagus after gastric transposition and cervical esophagogastronomy. *Eur J CardiothoracSurg* 25: 480-485.
22. Wu MH and Lai WW (1992) Esophageal reconstruction for esophageal strictures or resection after corrosive injury. *Ann ThoracSurg* 53: 798-802.
23. DALE WA and SHERMAN CD Jr (1955) Late reconstruction of congenital esophageal atresia by intrathoracic colon transplantation. *J ThoracSurg* 29: 344-356.
24. DeMeester SR (2001) Colon interposition following esophagectomy. *Dis Esophagus* 14: 169-172.
25. Abo S (1975) Special issue on 'my surgery.' Sternal manubrium resection and anterior mediastinum esophageal reconstruction in cases of cancer of thoracic esophagus (in Japanese). *Gekashinryo (Surg Therapy)* 171102-4.
26. Coral RP, Constant-Neto M, Silva IS, Kalil AN, Boose R, et al. (2003) Comparative anatomical study of the anterior and posterior mediastinum as access routes after esophagectomy. *Dis Esophagus* 16: 236-238.
27. Urschel JD, Urschel DM, Miller JD, Bennett WF, Young JE (2001) A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials of route of reconstruction after esophagectomy for cancer. *Am J Surg* 182: 470-475.
28. van Lanschot JJ, van Blankenstein M, Oei HY, Tilanus HW (1999) Randomized comparison of prevertebral and retrosternal gastric tube reconstruction after resection of oesophageal carcinoma. *Br J Surg* 86: 102-108.
29. Boukerrouche A Colonic Esophageal Reconstruction by Substernal Approach for Caustic Stricture: What is the Impact of the Enlargement of the Thoracic Inlet on Cervical Anastomotic Complications?
30. Boukerrouche A (2014) Isoperistaltic left colic graft interposition via a retrosternal approach for esophageal reconstruction in patients with a caustic stricture: mortality, morbidity, and functional results. *Surg Today* 44: 827-833.
31. Yasuda T and Shiozaki H (2011) Esophageal reconstruction with colon tissue. *Surg Today* 41: 745-753.
32. Orringer MB, Marshall B, Iannettoni MD (2000) Eliminating the cervical esophagogastric anastomotic leak with a side-to-side stapled anastomosis. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 119: 277-288.
33. Mansour KA, Bryan FC, Carlson GW (1997) Bowel interposition for esophageal replacement: twenty-five-year experience. *Ann ThoracSurg* 64: 752-756.
34. Thomas P, Fuentes P, Giudicelli R, Reboud E (1997) Colon interposition for esophageal replacement: current indications and long-term function. *Ann ThoracSurg* 64: 757-764.
35. Postlethwait RW (1983) Colonic interposition for esophageal substitution. See comment in PubMed Commons below *SurgGynecolObstet* 156: 377-383.
36. Davis PA, Law S, Wong J (2003) Colonic interposition after esophagectomy for cancer. *Arch Surg* 138: 303-308.
37. O'Rourke IC Threlfall GN (1986) Colonic interposition for oesophageal reconstruction with special reference to microvascular reinforcement of graft circulation. *Aust N Z J Surg* 56: 767-771.
38. Wilkins EW Jr (1980) Long-segment colon substitution for the esophagus. *Ann Surg* 192: 722-725.
39. Curet-Scott MJ, Ferguson MK, Little AG, Skinner DB (1987) Colon interposition for benign esophageal disease. *Surgery* 102: 568-574.
40. Isolauri J, Markkula H, Autio V (1987) Colon interposition in the treatment of carcinoma of the esophagus and gastric cardia. *Ann ThoracSurg* 43: 420-424.
41. Kato H, Tachimori Y, Watanabe H (1992) Surgical treatment for thoracic esophageal carcinoma in patients after gastrectomy. *J SurgOncol* 51: 94-99.
42. Fujita H, Yamana H, Sueyoshi S, Shima I, Fujii T, et al. (1997) Impact on outcome of additional microvascular anastomosis--supercharge--on colon interposition for esophageal replacement: comparative and multivariate analysis. *World J Surg* 21: 998-1003.

43. Metzger J, Degen L, Beglinger C, von Flüe M, Harder F (1999) Clinical outcome and quality of life after gastric and distal esophagus replacement with an ileocolon interposition. *J GastrointestSurg* 3: 383-388.
44. Dowson HM, Strauss D, Ng R, Mason R (2007) The acute management and surgical reconstruction following failed esophagectomy in malignant disease of the esophagus. *Dis Esophagus* 20: 135-140.
45. Kolh P, Honore P, Degauque C, Gielen J, Gerard P, et al. (2000) Early stage results after oesophageal resection for malignancy - colon interposition vs. gastric pull-up. *Eur J CardiothoracSurg* 18: 293-300.
46. Hagen JA, DeMeester SR, Peters JH, Chandrasoma P, DeMeester TR (2001) Curative resection for esophageal adenocarcinoma: analysis of 100 en bloc esophagectomies. *Ann Surg* 234: 520-530.
47. Fürst H, Hüttl TP, Löhe F, Schildberg FW (2001) German experience with colon interposition grafting as an esophageal substitute. *Dis Esophagus* 14: 131-134.
48. Ueo H, Abe R, Takeuchi H, Arinaga S, Akiyoshi T (1993) A reliable operative procedure for preparing a sufficiently nourished gastric tube for esophageal reconstruction. *Am J Surg* 165: 273-276.
49. Shirakawa Y, Naomoto Y, Noma K, Sakurama K, Nishikawa T, et al. (2006) Colonic interposition and supercharge for esophageal reconstruction. *Langenbecks Arch Surg* 391: 19-23.
50. Motoyama S, Kitamura M, Saito R, Maruyama K, Sato Y, et al. (2007) Surgical outcome of colon interposition by the posterior mediastinal route for thoracic esophageal cancer. *Ann ThoracSurg* 83: 1273-1278.
51. BECK AR and BARONOFSKY ID (1960) A study of the left colon as a replacement for the resected esophagus. *Surgery* 48: 499-509.
52. Postlethwait RW (1986) Resection and reconstruction of the esophagus. In: Postlethwait RW, editor. *Surgery of the esophagus*. 2nd ed. Norwalk, CT: Appleton-Century-Crofts p. 469-524.
53. Mine S, Udagawa H, Tsutsumi K, Kinoshita Y, Ueno M, et al. (2009) Colon interposition after esophagectomy with extended lymphadenectomy for esophageal cancer. *Ann ThoracSurg* 88: 1647-1653.
54. Klink CD, Binnebösel M, Schneider M, Ophoff K, Schumpelick V, et al. (2010) Operative outcome of colon interposition in the treatment of esophageal cancer: a 20-year experience. *Surgery* 147: 491-496.