

World Journal of *Gastrointestinal Surgery*

World J Gastrointest Surg 2023 August 27; 15(8): 1559-1840



MINIREVIEWS

- 1559 Impact of tumour rupture risk on the oncological rationale for the surgical treatment choice of gastrointestinal stromal tumours
Peparini N
- 1564 Prevention and treatment of hepatic encephalopathy during the perioperative period of transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt
Wang LJ, Yao X, Qi Q, Qin JP
- 1574 Vascular complications of chronic pancreatitis and its management
Walia D, Saraya A, Gunjan D
- 1591 Historical changes in surgical strategy and complication management for hepatic cystic echinococcosis
A JD, Chai JP, Jia SL, A XR

ORIGINAL ARTICLE**Basic Study**

- 1600 High spindle and kinetochore-associated complex subunit-3 expression predicts poor prognosis and correlates with adverse immune infiltration in hepatocellular carcinoma
Zheng LL, Wang YR, Liu ZR, Wang ZH, Tao CC, Xiao YG, Zhang K, Wu AK, Li HY, Wu JX, Xiao T, Rong WQ

Case Control Study

- 1615 Post-transplant biliary complications using liver grafts from deceased donors older than 70 years: Retrospective case-control study
Jimenez-Romero C, Justo-Alonso I, del Pozo-Elso P, Marcacuzco-Quinto A, Martín-Arriscado-Arroba C, Manrique-Municio A, Calvo-Pulido J, García-Sesma A, San Román R, Caso-Maestro O
- 1629 Goldilocks principle of minimally invasive surgery for gastric subepithelial tumors
Chang WJ, Tsao LC, Yen HH, Yang CW, Chang HC, Kor CT, Wu SC, Lin KH

Retrospective Cohort Study

- 1641 Prognosis after splenectomy plus pericardial devascularization *vs* transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt for esophagogastric variceal bleeding
Qi WL, Wen J, Wen TF, Peng W, Zhang XY, Shen JY, Li X, Li C
- 1652 Initial suction drainage decreases severe postoperative complications after pancreatic trauma: A cohort study
Li KW, Wang K, Hu YP, Yang C, Deng YX, Wang XY, Liu YX, Li WQ, Ding WW

Retrospective Study

- 1663** Radiation therapy prior to a pancreaticoduodenectomy for adenocarcinoma is associated with longer operative times and higher blood loss
Aploks K, Kim M, Stroever S, Ostapenko A, Sim YB, Sooriyakumar A, Rahimi-Ardabily A, Seshadri R, Dong XD
- 1673** Prognostic significance of preoperative lymphocyte to monocyte ratio in patients with signet ring gastric cancer
Liu HL, Feng X, Tang MM, Zhou HY, Peng H, Ge J, Liu T
- 1684** Clinical efficacy of total laparoscopic splenectomy for portal hypertension and its influence on hepatic hemodynamics and liver function
Qi RZ, Li ZW, Chang ZY, Chang WH, Zhao WL, Pang C, Zhang Y, Hu XL, Liang F
- 1693** Accurate resection of hilar cholangiocarcinoma using eOrganmap 3D reconstruction and full quantization technique
Cui DP, Fan S, Guo YX, Zhao QW, Qiao YX, Fei JD
- 1703** Regional differences in islet amyloid deposition in the residual pancreas with new-onset diabetes secondary to pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma
Wang R, Liu Y, Liang Y, Zhou L, Chen MJ, Liu XB, Tan CL, Chen YH
- 1712** Risk factors and their interactive effects on severe acute pancreatitis complicated with acute gastrointestinal injury
Chen JH, Zhang MF, Du WC, Zhang YA
- 1719** Effects of ultrasound monitoring of gastric residual volume on feeding complications, caloric intake and prognosis of patients with severe mechanical ventilation
Xu XY, Xue HP, Yuan MJ, Jin YR, Huang CX
- 1728** Enhanced recovery nursing and mental health education on postoperative recovery and mental health of laparoscopic liver resection
Li DX, Ye W, Yang YL, Zhang L, Qian XJ, Jiang PH
- 1739** Changing trends in gastric and colorectal cancer among surgical patients over 85 years old: A multicenter retrospective study, 2001–2021
Chen K, Li M, Xu R, Zheng PP, Chen MD, Zhu L, Wang WB, Wang ZG

Observational Study

- 1751** Knowledge, attitude, and practice of monitoring early gastric cancer after endoscopic submucosal dissection
Yang XY, Wang C, Hong YP, Zhu TT, Qian LJ, Hu YB, Teng LH, Ding J
- 1761** Anti-reflux effects of a novel esophagogastric asymmetric anastomosis technique after laparoscopic proximal gastrectomy
Pang LQ, Zhang J, Shi F, Pang C, Zhang CW, Liu YL, Zhao Y, Qian Y, Li XW, Kong D, Wu SN, Zhou JF, Xie CX, Chen S
- 1774** Prognostic scores in primary biliary cholangitis patients with advanced disease
Feng J, Xu JM, Fu HY, Xie N, Bao WM, Tang YM

SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS

- 1784 Maternal choledochal cysts in pregnancy: A systematic review of case reports and case series
Augustin G, Romic I, Miličić I, Mikuš M, Herman M
- 1799 Intraoperative pancreas stump perfusion assessment during pancreaticoduodenectomy: A systematic scoping review
Robertson FP, Spiers HVM, Lim WB, Loveday B, Roberts K, Pandanaboyana S
- 1808 Comparison between upfront surgery and neoadjuvant chemotherapy in patients with locally advanced gastric cancer: A systematic review
Fiflis S, Papakonstantinou M, Giakoustidis A, Christodoulidis G, Louri E, Papadopoulos VN, Giakoustidis D

CASE REPORT

- 1819 Long-term survival of patients with hepatocellular carcinoma with hepatic, pulmonary, peritoneal and rare colon metastasis: A case report
Gong YQ, Lu TL, Chen CW
- 1825 Donor hepatic artery reconstruction based on human embryology: A case report
Zhang HZ, Lu JH, Shi ZY, Guo YR, Shao WH, Meng FX, Zhang R, Zhang AH, Xu J
- 1831 Outpatient hybrid endoscopic submucosal dissection with SOUTEN for early gastric cancer, followed by endoscopic suturing of the mucosal defect: A case report
Ito R, Miwa K, Matano Y

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

- 1838 Is endoscopic mucosal resection-precutting superior to conventional methods for removing sessile colorectal polyps?
Yang QY, Zhao Q, Hu JW

ABOUT COVER

Editorial Board Member of *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*, Raja Kalayarasan, MS, DNB, MCh, FRCS (Ed), Additional Professor & Head, Department of Surgical Gastroenterology, Jawaharlal Institute of Postgraduate Medical Education and Research (JIPMER), Puducherry 605006, India. kalayarasanraja@yahoo.com

AIMS AND SCOPE

The primary aim of *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery* (*WJGS, World J Gastrointest Surg*) is to provide scholars and readers from various fields of gastrointestinal surgery with a platform to publish high-quality basic and clinical research articles and communicate their research findings online.

WJGS mainly publishes articles reporting research results and findings obtained in the field of gastrointestinal surgery and covering a wide range of topics including biliary tract surgical procedures, biliopancreatic diversion, colectomy, esophagectomy, esophagostomy, pancreas transplantation, and pancreatectomy, *etc.*

INDEXING/ABSTRACTING

The *WJGS* is now abstracted and indexed in Science Citation Index Expanded (SCIE, also known as SciSearch®), Current Contents/Clinical Medicine, Journal Citation Reports/Science Edition, PubMed, PubMed Central, Reference Citation Analysis, China National Knowledge Infrastructure, China Science and Technology Journal Database, and Superstar Journals Database. The 2023 Edition of Journal Citation Reports® cites the 2022 impact factor (IF) for *WJGS* as 2.0; IF without journal self cites: 1.9; 5-year IF: 2.2; Journal Citation Indicator: 0.52; Ranking: 113 among 212 journals in surgery; Quartile category: Q3; Ranking: 81 among 93 journals in gastroenterology and hepatology; and Quartile category: Q4.

RESPONSIBLE EDITORS FOR THIS ISSUE

Production Editor: Rui-Rui Wu, Production Department Director: Xiang Li; Editorial Office Director: Jia-Ru Fan.

NAME OF JOURNAL

World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ISSN

ISSN 1948-9366 (online)

LAUNCH DATE

November 30, 2009

FREQUENCY

Monthly

EDITORS-IN-CHIEF

Peter Schemmer

EDITORIAL BOARD MEMBERS

<https://www.wjgnet.com/1948-9366/editorialboard.htm>

PUBLICATION DATE

August 27, 2023

COPYRIGHT

© 2023 Baishideng Publishing Group Inc

INSTRUCTIONS TO AUTHORS

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/204>

GUIDELINES FOR ETHICS DOCUMENTS

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/287>

GUIDELINES FOR NON-NATIVE SPEAKERS OF ENGLISH

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/240>

PUBLICATION ETHICS

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/288>

PUBLICATION MISCONDUCT

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/208>

ARTICLE PROCESSING CHARGE

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/242>

STEPS FOR SUBMITTING MANUSCRIPTS

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/239>

ONLINE SUBMISSION

<https://www.f6publishing.com>

Retrospective Cohort Study

Prognosis after splenectomy plus pericardial devascularization vs transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt for esophagogastric variceal bleeding

Wei-Li Qi, Jun Wen, Tian-Fu Wen, Wei Peng, Xiao-Yun Zhang, Jun-Yi Shen, Xiao Li, Chuan Li

Specialty type: Surgery**Provenance and peer review:**

Unsolicited article; Externally peer reviewed.

Peer-review model: Single blind**Peer-review report's scientific quality classification**

Grade A (Excellent): 0

Grade B (Very good): 0

Grade C (Good): C, C

Grade D (Fair): 0

Grade E (Poor): 0

P-Reviewer: Ali S, Pakistan; Kao JT, Taiwan**Received:** March 20, 2023**Peer-review started:** March 20, 2023**First decision:** May 15, 2023**Revised:** June 4, 2023**Accepted:** June 26, 2023**Article in press:** June 26, 2023**Published online:** August 27, 2023**Wei-Li Qi, Jun Wen, Tian-Fu Wen, Wei Peng, Xiao-Yun Zhang, Jun-Yi Shen, Chuan Li**, Department of Liver Surgery, West China Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu 610041, Sichuan Province, China**Jun Wen**, Section for HepatoPancreatoBiliary Surgery, Department of General Surgery, The Third People's Hospital of Chengdu, Affiliated Hospital of Southwest Jiaotong University & The Second Affiliated Hospital of Chengdu, Chongqing Medical University, Chengdu 610041, Sichuan Province, China**Xiao Li**, Department of Interventional Therapy, West China Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu 610041, Sichuan Province, China**Xiao Li**, Department of Interventional Therapy, National Cancer Center/National Clinical Research Center for Cancer/Cancer Hospital, Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences and Peking Union Medical College, Beijing 100000, China**Corresponding author:** Chuan Li, MD, PhD, Associate Professor, Department of Liver Surgery, West China Hospital, Sichuan University, No. 37 Guoxue Lane, Chengdu 610041, Sichuan Province, China. lichuan@scu.edu.cn**Abstract****BACKGROUND**

Portal hypertension combined with esophagogastric variceal bleeding (EGVB) is a serious complication in patients with hepatitis B virus (HBV)-related cirrhosis in China. Splenectomy plus pericardial devascularization (SPD) and transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt (TIPS) are effective treatments for EGVB. However, a comparison of the effectiveness and safety of those methods is lacking.

AIM

To compare the prognosis after SPD *vs* TIPS for acute EGVB after failure of endoscopic therapy or secondary prophylaxis of variceal rebleeding (VRB) in patients with HBV-related cirrhosis combined with portal hypertension.

METHODS

This retrospective cohort study included 318 patients with HBV-related cirrhosis

and EGVB who underwent SPD or TIPS at West China Hospital of Sichuan University during 2009-2013. Propensity score-matched analysis (PSM), the Kaplan-Meier method, and multivariate Cox regression analysis were used to compare overall survival, VRB rate, liver function abnormality rate, and hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) incidence between the two patient groups.

RESULTS

The median age was 45.0 years ($n = 318$; 226 (71.1%) males). During a median follow-up duration of 43.0 mo, 18 (11.1%) and 33 (21.2%) patients died in the SPD and TIPS groups, respectively. After PSM, SPD was significantly associated with better overall survival (OS) ($P = 0.01$), lower rates of abnormal liver function ($P < 0.001$), and a lower incidence of HCC ($P = 0.02$) than TIPS. The VRB rate did not differ significantly between the two groups ($P = 0.09$).

CONCLUSION

Compared with TIPS, SPD is associated with higher postoperative OS rates, lower rates of abnormal liver function and HCC, and better quality of survival as acute EGVB treatment after failed endoscopic therapy or as secondary prophylaxis of VRB in patients with HBV-related cirrhosis combined with portal hypertension. There is no significant between-group difference in VRB rates.

Key Words: Portal hypertension; Liver cirrhosis; Esophagogastric variceal bleeding; Splenectomy; Pericardial devascularization; Transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt

©The Author(s) 2023. Published by Baishideng Publishing Group Inc. All rights reserved.

Core Tip: The choice between splenectomy plus pericardial devascularization (SPD) and transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt (TIPS) in the treatment of esophagogastric variceal bleeding (EGVB) in cirrhosis with portal hypertension is controversial, and few studies have compared the advantages and disadvantages of the two treatments. We compared the efficacy of the two treatments for acute EGVB that failed endoscopic treatment or secondary prevention of variceal rebleeding (VRB). We found no difference in the VRB rate between the two treatments, but the SPD group had a higher overall survival rate and a lower incidence of abnormal liver function and hepatocellular carcinoma than the TIPS group.

Citation: Qi WL, Wen J, Wen TF, Peng W, Zhang XY, Shen JY, Li X, Li C. Prognosis after splenectomy plus pericardial devascularization vs transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt for esophagogastric variceal bleeding. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2023; 15(8): 1641-1651

URL: <https://www.wjgnet.com/1948-9366/full/v15/i8/1641.htm>

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v15.i8.1641>

INTRODUCTION

Chronic hepatitis B virus (HBV) infection is an important cause of liver cirrhosis in China. Patients with cirrhosis that progresses to the portal hypertension stage will face a series of complications, including esophagogastric variceal bleeding (EGVB), ascites, splenomegaly, hypersplenism, primary bacterial peritonitis, hepatic encephalopathy, and hepatorenal syndrome[1]. EGVB is one of the most serious emergency complications of cirrhosis. The mortality rate for the first bleeding is as high as approximately 20%[2,3]. Moreover, the rate of variceal rebleeding (VRB) within two years is nearly 60%, and the mortality rate is 30%[4].

The management strategy for EGVB is oriented toward prevention of the first EGVB (primary prophylaxis), control of acute EGVB, and prevention of VRB (secondary prophylaxis). Endoscopic treatment, including endoscopic variceal ligation and endoscopic injection sclerotherapy, and nonselective beta-blockers are the mainstay of primary and secondary prophylaxis for EGVB[5]. Similarly, endoscopic therapy is also recommended by the major clinical practice guidelines as a first-line treatment option for patients with acute EGVB[6-8]. In China, transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt (TIPS) and splenectomy plus pericardial devascularization (SPD) are recommended as salvage therapies for patients with acute EGVB who failed endoscopic treatment or as secondary prevention of EGVB[9]. TIPS results in rapid control of acute EGVB and a significant reduction in VRB rates. Especially for patients at high risk of EGVB, early TIPS has been shown to significantly reduce VRB rates and improve prognosis in these patients[10,11]. SPD not only has a high hemostasis rate and low VRB rate, but can also improve liver function and has a relatively low incidence of hepatic encephalopathy[12,13]. However, the effectiveness and safety of SPD vs TIPS in the management of acute EGVB and as secondary prophylaxis for VRB are unknown.

The purpose of this study was to compare the prognosis after SPD vs TIPS for acute EGVB after failure of endoscopic therapy or secondary prophylaxis of VRB in patients with HBV-related cirrhosis combined with portal hypertension. We

compared the differences in VRB, abnormal liver function, and incidence of hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) between patients treated with SPD and TIPS.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study population

This was a retrospective cohort study. We retrospectively collected clinical data from 823 consecutive patients with portal hypertension combined with EGVB who received SPD or TIPS as a treatment for bleeding uncontrolled by endoscopic therapy or as secondary prophylaxis for VRB at West China Hospital of Sichuan University from January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2013. According to the inclusion and exclusion criteria, 318 patients were finally included in the analysis. Patients were divided into either an SPD group ($n = 162$) or a TIPS group ($n = 156$) based on treatment modality (Figure 1). All participants were diagnosed with portal hypertension with esophagogastric varices by endoscopy.

The inclusion criteria included the following: (1) Age 18-70 years; (2) clinical diagnosis of HBV-related cirrhosis combined with EGVB; (3) presence of acute EGVB uncontrolled by endoscopic therapy or VRB after secondary prophylaxis; (4) treatment with SPD or TIPS; (5) good liver function (Child-Pugh class A or B); and (6) good other organ function. The exclusion criteria included the following: (1) Cirrhosis due to other etiologies, such as alcoholic cirrhosis, schistosomal cirrhosis, and primary biliary cirrhosis; (2) gastrointestinal bleeding due to other causes, such as peptic ulcer bleeding; (3) coexistence of serious infectious or hematological diseases; (4) coexistence of serious organ impairment, such as cardiopulmonary and renal diseases, thus indicating patients who cannot tolerate surgery; (5) coexistence of malignancy; (6) poor liver function (Child-Pugh class C); (7) no history of EGVB; (8) coexistence of portal vein thrombosis or portal vein cavernous lesions; and (9) history of previous relevant surgical procedures, such as liver transplantation or TIPS.

Baseline patient data were obtained from electronic medical records and included demographic data, degree of esophagogastric varices, length of bleeding history, liver function tests, renal function tests, blood cell counts, coagulation tests, Child-Pugh classification, HBV markers, and HBV-DNA levels.

The study complied with the guidelines of the Declaration of Helsinki and was approved by the Ethics Committee on Biomedical Research, West China Hospital of Sichuan University (No. 2023-354). The ethics committee waived the requirement for informed consent due to the retrospective nature of this research.

Surgical procedures

All procedures were performed by specialists with more than 10 years of experience. The SPD procedure was performed routinely by splenectomy, complete dissection of at least 6 cm of the lower esophagus and all vessels of the upper plasma layer of the stomach, and preservation of the gastric coronary vein and the main trunk of the paraesophageal vein. The surgeon performed the procedure with a common monopolar electric knife, ultrasonic knife, or Ligasure, depending on his personal preference. The splenic hilum was closed with suture ligation, hemo-lock or titanium clips, or off-segment closure with a vascular closure device, depending on the situation. According to the American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases guidelines[14], the TIPS procedure was performed by ultrasound-guided puncture of the right internal jugular vein, insertion of a catheter into a branch of the hepatic vein and venography, and placement of a stent from the hepatic vein through the portal vein to create an artificial shunt. The application of polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE)-covered stents (Viatorr stents) has greatly reduced the rate of stenosis and occlusion of the shunt and the incidence of hepatic encephalopathy[15,16]. The Director of the Interventional Center supervised and controlled the quality of the TIPS procedure.

Outcomes and follow-up evaluation

The primary outcome measure in this study was overall survival (OS), and secondary outcomes were VRB, abnormal liver function, and the occurrence of HCC. All included patients were followed up to the last follow-up date (December 31, 2016) or until they died. The OS, rate of VRB, rate of abnormal liver function, and rate of HCC were calculated for all patients. Abnormal liver function was defined as total bilirubin (TB) $> 28.2 \mu\text{mol/L}$, albumin (ALB) $< 35 \text{ g/L}$, or alanine aminotransferase or aspartate aminotransferase more than twice the reference value for a duration of more than 3 mo.

All patients were followed at months 1, 3, 6, and 12 after surgery and every 6 mo thereafter. The follow-up protocol included physical examination, multiphase enhanced computed tomography (CT), blood cell and differential counts, liver function tests, alpha-fetoprotein (AFP) levels, HBV markers, and HBV-DNA levels. During the follow-up period, patients presenting with VRB underwent endoscopy.

Statistical analysis

Continuous variables were tested by the *t* test, categorical variables by the chi-square test or Fisher's exact probability method, and ordered categorical variables by the rank sum test. Survival analysis was performed using the Kaplan-Meier method with the occurrence of death, VRB, abnormal liver function, and HCC as endpoint events. The log-rank test was used to compare the differences between the two groups for each outcome event. Univariate and multivariate COX regression analyses were used to identify risk factors associated with outcome indicators. Univariate Cox regression analysis was used to assess the significance of the variables to investigate the risk factors associated with outcome indicators. All variables with significant associations with death ($P < 0.1$) were further included in the multivariate COX regression analysis. Nearest neighbor 1:1 propensity score matching (PSM) with a caliper size of 0.02 was used to reduce




Figure 1 Flowchart of the process for patient selection. SPD: Splenectomy plus pericardial devascularization; TIPS: Transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt; HBV: Hepatitis B virus.

the effect of selection bias and potential confounding between the SPD group and the TIPS group.

R, version 4.2.2 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria), was used to conduct all statistical analyses. The threshold for statistical significance was set at 0.05 for all two-sided statistical tests.

RESULTS

Patient characteristics

Baseline data for all patients are shown in [Table 1](#). The median age was 45.0 years, and 226 (71.1%) of patients were male. The median follow-up duration of this study was 43 mo. There were statistically significant differences in the variables of age ($P < 0.001$), ALB ($P < 0.001$), hemoglobin (HGB) ($P < 0.001$), red blood cells ($P < 0.001$), and international normalized ratio ($P = 0.02$) between the two groups of patients.

To minimize the effect of potential confounders, we generated 90 pairs of patients by PSM. After PSM, there were no significant differences in baseline characteristics between the two groups of patients.

Overall patient survival

During the study period, 18 (11.1%) patients died in the SPD group, and 33 (21.2%) patients died in the TIPS group. Patient survival rates at 1, 3, and 5 years were 98.1%, 90.5%, and 86.5% in the SPD group and 94.8%, 81.0%, and 74.7% in the TIPS group, respectively. The mean survival time was 84.7 mo for patients in the SPD group and 73.6 mo in the TIPS group. In comparison to the TIPS group, the OS was significantly longer in the SPD group ($P = 0.004$; [Figure 2A](#)). After PSM, the SPD group still showed significantly better OS than the TIPS group ($P = 0.01$; [Figure 2B](#)).

Multivariate Cox regression analysis of 318 patients showed that the SPD group had a significantly lower risk of death than the TIPS group [hazard ratio (HR), 0.47; 95% confidence interval (CI): 0.25-0.90; $P = 0.02$; [Table 2](#)], which was independent of other predictors. Other significant factors associated with death were age (HR, 1.03; 95%CI: 1.01-1.06; $P = 0.02$), albumin/globulin ratio (A/G; HR, 0.11; 95%CI: 0.03-0.48; $P = 0.003$), and prothrombin time (PT; HR, 1.09; 95%CI: 1.02-1.16; $P = 0.01$; [Table 2](#)).

Cumulative incidence of variceal rebleeding, abnormal liver function, and hepatocellular carcinoma

For the duration of the study, VRB occurred in 40 (24.7%) patients in the SPD group and 59 (37.8%) patients in the TIPS group. The 1-, 3-, and 5-year cumulative VRB rates were 8.6%, 19.1%, and 24.1% in the SPD group and 20.5%, 34.6%, and 37.8% in the TIPS group, respectively ($P = 0.001$, [Table 3](#)). After PSM, the 1-, 3-, and 5-year cumulative VRB rates were 7.8%, 15.6%, and 23.3% in the SPD group and 11.1%, 27.8%, and 31.1% in the TIPS group, respectively ($P = 0.09$, [Table 3](#)). Multivariate COX regression analysis of 318 patients showed that the independent influential factors associated with VRB were treatment strategy (SPD *vs* TIPS; HR, 0.58; 95%CI: 0.37-0.89; $P = 0.01$), gamma-glutamyl transpeptidase (GGT; HR, 1.005; 95%CI: 1.001-1.008; $P = 0.01$), and HGB (HR, 0.99; 95%CI: 0.98-1.00; $P = 0.01$; [Table 4](#)).

Table 1 Baseline features of the study population

Characteristic	Before PSM			After PSM		
	SPD group	TIPS group	<i>P</i> value	SPD group	TIPS group	<i>P</i> value
Age, yr	44.14 ± 10.64	49.57 ± 11.24	< 0.001	46.41 ± 10.81	47.16 ± 10.95	0.65
Male, <i>n</i> (%)	121 (74.7)	105 (67.3)	0.15	64 (71.1)	60 (66.7)	0.520
Bleeding history, mo	12.70 ± 24.19	12.83 ± 21.95	0.961	13.64 ± 26.76	13.6 ± 22.62	0.99
Spleen length, cm	20.121 ± 4.49	19.27 ± 4.05	0.08	19.86 ± 4.47	18.85 ± 3.57	0.10
Spleen thickness, cm	6.47 ± 1.43	6.20 ± 1.42	0.09	6.31 ± 1.29	6.05 ± 1.07	0.14
TB, μmol/L	22.81 ± 9.93	22.18 ± 10.22	0.58	23.68 ± 10.60	21.99 ± 9.65	0.26
ALT, IU/L	34.561 ± 27.68	32.08 ± 35.49	0.49	29.81 ± 19.33	29.34 ± 15.25	0.86
AST, IU/L	40.651 ± 29.05	41.218 ± 35.80	0.88	36.37 ± 22.78	37.32 ± 18.09	0.76
ALB, g/L	37.71 ± 5.28	33.13 ± 6.19	< 0.001	36.35 ± 4.58	35.46 ± 5.15	0.22
A/G	1.311 ± 0.29	1.52 ± 3.40	0.45	1.31 ± 0.27	1.28 ± 0.29	0.58
ALP, IU/L	87.10 ± 39.98	85.08 ± 52.93	0.70	86.42 ± 37.50	86.93 ± 57.34	0.94
GGT, IU/L	50.13 ± 59.94	49.26 ± 61.59	0.90	53.35 ± 71.03	49.14 ± 63.91	0.68
BUN, mmol/L	6.038 ± 7.87	5.89 ± 2.76	0.82	6.48 ± 10.44	5.56 ± 2.00	0.42
CREA, μmol/L	72.92 ± 17.01	73.02 ± 18.40	0.96	73.20 ± 18.54	69.36 ± 14.59	0.13
HGB, g/L	99.74 ± 27.85	84.38 ± 23.18	< 0.001	94.42 ± 30.02	91.07 ± 23.76	0.41
RBC, × 10 ¹² /L	3.71 ± 0.82	3.06 ± 0.79	< 0.001	3.46 ± 0.81	3.39 ± 0.79	0.54
PLT, × 10 ⁹ /L	51.85 ± 43.11	55.13 ± 37.11	0.47	50.76 ± 45.62	52.86 ± 24.49	0.70
WBC, × 10 ⁹ /L	3.68 ± 3.85	3.59 ± 3.93	0.83	3.10 ± 2.56	3.38 ± 2.26	0.43
PT, s	14.67 ± 3.79	14.76 ± 2.08	0.79	14.38 ± 1.95	14.21 ± 1.75	0.54
INR	1.27 ± 0.17	1.32 ± 0.19	0.02	1.28 ± 0.17	1.27 ± 0.15	0.46
HBV-DNA Positive	80 (49.4)	81 (51.9)	0.65	47 (52.2)	48 (53.3)	0.88
Child-Pugh classification, <i>n</i> (%)			0.17			1.00
A	89 (54.9)	75 (48.1)		49 (54.4)	49 (54.4)	
B	73 (45.1)	81 (51.9)		41 (45.6)	41 (45.6)	
Severe EGV, <i>n</i> (%)	131 (80.9)	124 (79.5)	0.78	73 (81.1)	74 (82.2)	1.00

SPD: Splenectomy plus pericardial devascularization; TIPS: Transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt; TB: Total bilirubin; ALT: Alanine aminotransferase; AST: Aspartate aminotransferase; ALB: Albumin; A/G: Albumin/globulin; ALP: Alkaline phosphatase; GGT: Gamma-glutamyl transpeptidase; HGB: Hemoglobin; RBC: Red blood cell count; WBC: White blood cell count; PLT: Platelets; PT: Prothrombin time; INR: International normalized ratio; HBV: Hepatitis B virus; EGV: Esophagogastric varices; PSM: Propensity score-matched analysis.

A total of 40 (24.7%) patients in the surgical group and 92 (60.9%) patients in the TIPS group experienced persistent abnormal liver function. The rates of abnormal liver function at 1, 3, and 5 years were 13.6%, 19.8%, and 22.8% in the SPD group and 48.7%, 57.7%, and 60.3% in the TIPS group, respectively ($P < 0.001$; Table 3). After PSM, the rates of abnormal liver function at 1, 3, and 5 years were 13.3%, 18.9%, and 20.0% in the SPD group and 46.7%, 53.3%, and 56.7% in the TIPS group, respectively ($P < 0.001$, Table 3). Multivariate COX regression analysis of 318 patients showed that the independent influential factors associated with abnormal liver function were treatment strategy (SPD *vs* TIPS; HR, 0.26; 95%CI: 0.17-0.39; $P < 0.001$), TB (HR, 1.03; 95%CI: 1.02-1.05; $P < 0.001$), alkaline phosphatase (ALP) (HR, 1.004; 95%CI: 1.000-1.007; $P = 0.03$) and PT (HR, 1.06; 95%CI: 1.00-1.13; $P = 0.045$; Table 4).

There were 11 (6.8%) patients in the SPD group and 18 (11.5%) patients in the TIPS group who developed HCC. The proportions of progression to HCC at 1, 3, and 5 years were 2.5%, 3.7%, and 4.9% in the SPD group and 3.8%, 9.0%, and 11.5% in the TIPS group, respectively ($P = 0.03$, Table 3). Following adjustment by PSM, the proportions of progression to HCC at 1, 3, and 5 years were 2.2%, 2.2%, and 2.2% in the SPD group and 4.4%, 10.0%, and 12.2% in the TIPS group, respectively ($P = 0.02$, Table 3). In a multifactorial COX regression analysis of 318 patients, the independent influential factors associated with HCC were treatment strategy (SPD *vs* TIPS; HR, 0.43; 95%CI: 0.20-0.93; $P = 0.03$), TB (HR, 1.03; 95%CI: 1.00-1.07; $P = 0.045$), and ALP (HR, 1.006; 95%CI: 1.000-1.012; $P = 0.043$; Table 4).

Table 2 Univariate and multivariate Cox regression analyses of factors associated with death

Variable	Univariable analysis		Multivariable analysis	
	HR (95%CI)	P value ¹	HR (95%CI)	P value
Treatment strategy (SPD vs TIPS)	0.43 (0.24-0.78)	0.005	0.47 (0.25-0.90)	0.02
Age, per 1-year increase	1.04 (1.02-1.07)	0.001	1.03 (1.01-1.06)	0.02
TB, per 1 μmol/L increase	1.03 (1.01-1.06)	0.01		
ALB, per 1 g/L increase	0.94 (0.91-0.98)	0.004		
A/G, per 1 increase	0.06 (0.02-0.18)	< 0.001	0.11 (0.03-0.48)	0.003
ALP, per 1 IU/L increase	1.01 (1.00-1.01)	< 0.001		
GGT, per 1 IU/L increase	1.003 (1.00-1.01)	0.03		
PT, per 1 s increase	1.07 (1.02-1.12)	0.004	1.09 (1.02-1.16)	0.01
INR, per 1 increase	6.38 (1.68-24.24)	0.006		
HBV-DNA (Positive vs negative)	1.78 (1.00-3.15)	0.05		
Child-Pugh classification (B vs A)	1.83 (1.07-3.15)	0.03		

¹Variables that were found significant at $P < 0.1$ in the univariable analyses were entered into the multivariable analyses. SPD: Splenectomy plus pericardial devascularization; TIPS: Transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt; TB: Total bilirubin; ALB: Albumin; A/G: Albumin/globulin; ALP: Alkaline phosphatase; GGT: Gamma-glutamyl transpeptidase; PT: Prothrombin time; INR: International normalized ratio; HBV: Hepatitis B virus.

Table 3 Proportions of 1-, 3-, and 5-year cumulative variceal rebleeding, abnormal liver function, and hepatocellular carcinoma in the two groups before and after propensity score matching, %

Outcome/Time	Before PSM			After PSM		
	SPD group	TIPS group	P value ¹	SPD group	TIPS group	P value ¹
Variceal rebleeding						
1-yr	8.60	20.50	0.001	7.80	11.10	0.09
3-yr	19.10	34.60		15.65	27.80	
5-yr	24.10	37.80		23.30	31.10	
Abnormal liver function						
1-yr	13.60	48.70	< 0.001	13.30	46.70	< 0.001
3-yr	19.80	57.70		18.90	53.30	
5-yr	22.80	60.30		20.00	56.70	
Hepatocellular carcinoma						
1-yr	2.50	3.80	0.03	2.20	4.40	0.02
3-yr	3.70	9.00		2.20	10.00	
5-yr	4.90	11.50		2.20	12.20	

¹Log-rank test was used to compare the differences between the two groups for each outcome event. SPD: Splenectomy plus pericardial devascularization; TIPS: Transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt; PSM: Propensity score-matched analysis.

Comparison of postoperative hospital days and number of reoperations and adverse events between the two groups

The mean postoperative hospital stay was 9.5 d in the SPD group, which was significantly longer than the 6.6 d in the TIPS group ($P < 0.001$; Table 5). In the SPD group, 162 patients had a total of five reoperations, and in the TIPS group, 156 patients had a total of 92 reoperations. The reoperation rate of patients in the SPD group was significantly lower than that in the TIPS group ($P < 0.001$; Table 5). In the SPD group, one patient died during hospitalization due to abdominal hemorrhage, and in the TIPS group, one patient died during hospitalization due to liver failure. Each group one patient who died during hospitalization, with no significant difference ($P = 0.98$, Table 5). The 90-d mortality was one patient in the SPD group and four patients in the TIPS group, with no statistically significant difference ($P = 0.21$; Table 5). Hepatic encephalopathy occurred in one patient in the SPD group and 25 patients in the TIPS group, which was significantly

Table 4 Multivariate Cox regression analysis of factors associated with variceal rebleeding, abnormal liver function, and hepatocellular carcinoma

Outcome/Variable	HR (95%CI)	P value
Variceal rebleeding		
Treatment strategy (SPD vs TIPS)	0.58 (0.37-0.89)	0.01
GGT, per 1 IU/L increase	1.005 (1.001-1.008)	0.01
HGB, per 1 g/L increase	0.99 (0.98-1.00)	0.01
Abnormal liver function		
Treatment Strategy (SPD vs TIPS)	0.26 (0.17-0.39)	< 0.001
TB, per 1 μ mol/L increase	1.03 (1.02-1.05)	< 0.001
ALP, per 1 IU/L increase	1.004 (1.000-1.007)	0.03
PT, per 1 s increase	1.06 (1.00-1.13)	0.045
Hepatocellular carcinoma		
Treatment Strategy (SPD vs TIPS)	0.43 (0.20-0.93)	0.03
TB, per 1 μ mol/L increase	1.03 (1.00-1.07)	0.045
ALP, per 1 IU/L increase	1.006 (1.000-1.012)	0.043

SPD: Splenectomy plus pericardial devascularization; TIPS: Transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt; TB: Total bilirubin; ALB: albumin; ALP: Alkaline phosphatase; GGT: Gamma-glutamyl transpeptidase; PT: Prothrombin time; HGB: Hemoglobin.

Table 5 Comparison of postoperative hospital days and number of reoperations and adverse events between the two groups

Variable	SPD group	TIPS group	P value
Postoperative hospital stay, days	9.5 \pm 3.4	6.6 \pm 3.9	< 0.001
Reoperation, times	5	92	< 0.001
In-hospital mortality	1	1	0.98
The 90-d mortality	1	4	0.21
The 30-d readmission	1	22	< 0.001
Occurrence of hepatic encephalopathy	1	25	< 0.001

SPD: Splenectomy plus pericardial devascularization; TIPS: Transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt.

lower in the SPD group than in the TIPS group ($P < 0.001$; Table 5). Within 30 d, one patient was readmitted in the SPD group and 22 patients in the TIPS group, and the 30-d readmission was significantly lower in the SPD group than in the TIPS group ($P < 0.001$; Table 5).

DISCUSSION

Cirrhotic portal hypertension is very common in China due to the high prevalence of HBV infection. SPD and TIPS are commonly used to treat portal hypertension combined with EGVB. This study compared the two treatment modalities in terms of long-term survival, postoperative VRB rate, postoperative liver function status, HCC incidence, quality of life, and safety. It can provide a reference for clinicians in the selection of the protocol for the treatment of EGVB.

In this study, we found that the SPD group had higher long-term survival rate, sustained normal liver function rate, and no-HCC rate than the TIPS group. Moreover, compared to the TIPS group, the SPD group also showed a noninferiority trend before and after PSM in terms of VRB. In addition, the incidence of hepatic encephalopathy, 30-d readmission rate, and reoperation rate were significantly lower in the SPD group than in the TIPS group, and there was no significant difference between the two groups in terms of in-hospital mortality and 90-d mortality. These results suggest that SPD treatment is no less safe and effective than TIPS treatment and that SPD treatment is even better than TIPS treatment in some aspects.




Figure 2 Overall patient survival. A: Kaplan-Meier analysis of overall survival (OS) in the splenectomy plus pericardial devascularization (SPD) group and transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt (TIPS) group before propensity score-matched analysis (PSM); B: Kaplan-Meier analysis of OS in the SPD group and TIPS group after PSM. SPD: Splenectomy plus pericardial devascularization; TIPS: Transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt.

High portal vein pressure is the direct cause of EGVB; therefore, reducing portal vein pressure plays a critical role in the treatment of EGVB[17,18]. TIPS significantly reduces portal vein resistance by creating a direct shunt between the hepatic and portal veins[19,20]. However, decreased portal perfusion after TIPS can lead to deterioration of liver function [21]. Moreover, shunts can allow portal blood flow to bypass hepatocytes and enter the circulation directly, resulting in the failure to metabolize toxic substances such as ammonia and γ -aminobutyric acid, which can lead to hepatic encephalopathy[22-24]. SPD is also effective in reducing portal vein pressure. Several studies have shown that the loss of splenic vein blood flow after splenectomy subsequently leads to a reduction in portal flow and thus a reduction in portal pressure[25,26]. However, blood flow in the hepatic artery increased after splenectomy and thus facilitated hepatocyte regeneration and improved liver function[25,27].

Whether to perform splenectomy is a controversial aspect of SPD. First, proponents of preserving the spleen argue that splenectomy increases the risk of thrombosis and infection. However, many previous studies have found that TGF- β 1 endothelin and platelet-derived growth factors produced by splenic macrophages exacerbate liver fibrosis and inhibit liver regeneration in cirrhotic conditions[28,29]. A recent study by Zhang *et al*[30] showed that CD11b(+)/CD43(high)/Ly6C-(low) splenic monocytes migrating to the liver and transforming into macrophages can aggravate the liver fibrosis process. This further suggests that splenectomy may slow the process of liver fibrosis and promote liver regeneration. In addition, the traditional view is that splenectomy may impair the immunity of the body and may have a detrimental effect on resistance to tumorigenesis. However, Wang *et al*[31] reported that patients with cirrhosis secondary to hypersplenism and HCC who underwent simultaneous splenectomy and hepatectomy improved their tumor immunity in the long term. McKenna *et al*[32] reported that splenectomy promotes intraocular tumor elimination by affecting tumor-associated cell subsets. Nomura *et al*[33] reported that splenectomy not only improved liver fibrosis but also increased the CD8+ cell percentage and decreased the CD4+/CD8+ ratio, which helped to improve antitumor immunity. Stöth *et al*[34] found that splenectomy reduced the number of tumor-associated macrophages (TAMs), tumor-associated neutrophils (TANs), and tumor-infiltrating dendritic cells (TIDCs), which in turn affected tumor growth and metastasis. This suggests that splenectomy not only does not decrease the immunity of the body but also may improve the potential antitumor ability. Finally, splenectomy is also effective in improving hypersplenism in patients with cirrhosis. Takahashi *et al*[35] reported that in ten patients with biliary atresia combined with hypersplenism who underwent splenectomy prior to liver transplantation, the patients' hematocrit recovered to normal levels 1 mo after surgery, and the mean Model for End-stage Liver Disease (MELD) score improved significantly.

There are some limitations to this study. First, although we applied PSM to reduce selection bias and potential confounding, unmeasured bias and confounding in this retrospective study might still exist. Second, due to the retrospective nature of this study, hepatic venous pressure gradient testing was not performed in both groups to more accurately assess portal vein pressure between the two groups of patients. Third, this study failed to collect data related to the occurrence of postoperative venous thrombosis in both groups of patients for analysis. Fourth, the medications (including nonselective beta-blockers and antiviral therapy) and endoscopic treatment of patients were not studied in detail in this study.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, compared with TIPS, SPD is associated with higher postoperative OS rates, lower rates of abnormal liver function and HCC, and better quality of survival as acute EGVB treatment after failed endoscopic therapy or as secondary prophylaxis of VRB in patients with HBV-related cirrhosis combined with portal hypertension. There is no significant difference in the VRB rates between the two groups.

ARTICLE HIGHLIGHTS

Research background

The primary goals of the portal hypertension management program are prevention of first esophagogastric variceal bleeding (EGVB), control of acute EGVB, and prevention of variceal rebleeding (VRB). Splenectomy combined with pericardial devascularization (SPD) and transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt (TIPS) are suggested in China as salvage therapies for patients with acute EGVB who have failed endoscopic treatment or as secondary prophylaxis of VRB. However, it is unclear whether SPD or TIPS is more effective and safe in the treatment of acute EGVB and as secondary prevention of VRB.

Research motivation

Both SPD and TIPS are effective treatments for EGVB, but the effectiveness and safety of both methods are currently controversial.

Research objectives

To compare the prognosis after SPD *vs* TIPS for acute EGVB after failure of endoscopic therapy or secondary prophylaxis of VRB in patients with HBV-related cirrhosis combined with portal hypertension.

Research methods

This was a retrospective study. We used propensity score matching analysis (PSM), Kaplan-Meier method, and multivariate Cox regression analysis to compare the effectiveness and safety of the two treatment modalities for comparative analysis.

Research results

We found that SPD was significantly associated with better overall survival (OS) ($P = 0.01$), lower rates of liver function abnormalities ($P < 0.001$), and a lower incidence of HCC ($P = 0.02$) than TIPS. There was no significant difference in VRB rates between the two groups ($P = 0.09$).

Research conclusions

Compared with TIPS, SPD is associated with higher postoperative OS rates, lower rates of abnormal liver function and HCC, and better quality of survival as acute EGVB treatment after failed endoscopic therapy or as secondary prophylaxis of VRB in patients with HBV-related cirrhosis combined with portal hypertension. There is no significant between-group difference in VRB rates.

Research perspectives

This study may provide a clinical basis for the treatment of patients with portal hypertension combined with EGVB.

FOOTNOTES

Author contributions: Wen TF, Li X, and Li C conceptualized and designed the study, and provided the study materials or patients; Wen TF provided administrative support; Qi WL, Wen J, Li C, Peng W, and Zhang XY collected and assembled the data; Qi WL, Wen J, and Shen JY performed data analysis and interpretation; all authors participated in manuscript writing and approved the final manuscript. Qi WL and Wen J contributed equally to this work.

Supported by the National Key R&D Program of China, No. 2022YFC2503701; the Science and Technological Supports Project of Sichuan Province, No. 2022YFS0255; and the National Natural Science Foundation of China, No. 81800449.

Institutional review board statement: The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki (as revised in 2013). The study protocol was approved by the Ethics Committee on Biomedical Research, West China Hospital of Sichuan University (No. 2023-354).

Informed consent statement: The ethics committee approved the waiver of informed consent because the study was retrospective in nature.

Conflict-of-interest statement: The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

Data sharing statement: No additional data are available.

STROBE statement: The authors have read the STROBE Statement – checklist of items, and the manuscript was prepared and revised according to the STROBE Statement – checklist of items.

Open-Access: This article is an open-access article that was selected by an in-house editor and fully peer-reviewed by external reviewers. It is distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution NonCommercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to

distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited and the use is non-commercial. See: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Country/Territory of origin: China

ORCID number: Wei-Li Qi 0000-0001-8899-4836; Jun Wen 0000-0002-5553-8890; Tianfu Wen 0000-0002-8260-7601; Wei Peng 0000-0002-5780-2157; Xiao Li 0000-0001-9420-9558; Chuan Li 0000-0001-5450-6961.

S-Editor: Liu JH

L-Editor: Wang TQ

P-Editor: Ji MX

REFERENCES

- 1 **Simonetto DA**, Liu M, Kamath PS. Portal Hypertension and Related Complications: Diagnosis and Management. *Mayo Clin Proc* 2019; **94**: 714-726 [PMID: 30947834 DOI: 10.1016/j.mayocp.2018.12.020]
- 2 **de Franchis R**. Baveno VI Faculty. Expanding consensus in portal hypertension: Report of the Baveno VI Consensus Workshop: Stratifying risk and individualizing care for portal hypertension. *J Hepatol* 2015; **63**: 743-752 [PMID: 26047908 DOI: 10.1016/j.jhep.2015.05.022]
- 3 **Magaz M**, Baiges A, Hernández-Gea V. Precision medicine in variceal bleeding: Are we there yet? *J Hepatol* 2020; **72**: 774-784 [PMID: 31981725 DOI: 10.1016/j.jhep.2020.01.008]
- 4 **Bosch J**, García-Pagán JC. Prevention of variceal rebleeding. *Lancet* 2003; **361**: 952-954 [PMID: 12648985 DOI: 10.1016/s0140-6736(03)12778-x]
- 5 **Lesmana CRA**, Raharjo M, Gani RA. Managing liver cirrhotic complications: Overview of esophageal and gastric varices. *Clin Mol Hepatol* 2020; **26**: 444-460 [PMID: 33053928 DOI: 10.3350/cmh.2020.0022]
- 6 **Garcia-Tsao G**, Abraldes JG, Berzigotti A, Bosch J. Portal hypertensive bleeding in cirrhosis: Risk stratification, diagnosis, and management: 2016 practice guidance by the American Association for the study of liver diseases. *Hepatology* 2017; **65**: 310-335 [PMID: 27786365 DOI: 10.1002/hep.28906]
- 7 **European Association for the Study of the Liver**. EASL Clinical Practice Guidelines for the management of patients with decompensated cirrhosis. *J Hepatol* 2018; **69**: 406-460 [PMID: 29653741 DOI: 10.1016/j.jhep.2018.03.024]
- 8 **Sarin SK**, Kumar A, Angus PW, Baijal SS, Baik SK, Bayraktar Y, Chawla YK, Choudhuri G, Chung JW, de Franchis R, de Silva HJ, Garg H, Garg PK, Helmy A, Hou MC, Jafri W, Jia JD, Lau GK, Li CZ, Lui HF, Maruyama H, Pandey CM, Puri AS, Rerknimitr R, Sahni P, Saraya A, Sharma BC, Sharma P, Shiha G, Sollano JD, Wu J, Xu RY, Yachha SK, Zhang C; Asian Pacific Association for the Study of the Liver (APASL) Working Party on Portal Hypertension. Diagnosis and management of acute variceal bleeding: Asian Pacific Association for Study of the Liver recommendations. *Hepatol Int* 2011; **5**: 607-624 [PMID: 21484145 DOI: 10.1007/s12072-010-9236-9]
- 9 **Chinese Society of Hepatology**; Chinese Society of Gastroenterology; Chinese Society of Digestive Endoscopy of Chinese Medical Association. [Guidelines on the management of esophago-gastric variceal bleeding in cirrhotic portal hypertension]. *Zhonghua Nei Ke Za Zhi* 2023; **62**: 7-22 [DOI: 10.3760/cma.j.cn501113-20220824-00436]
- 10 **Mauro E**, Gadano A. What's new in portal hypertension? *Liver Int* 2020; **40** Suppl 1: 122-127 [PMID: 32077610 DOI: 10.1111/liv.14366]
- 11 **Li S**, Zhang C, Lin LL, Wang Q, Zuo HX, Zhan AL, Luo J, Niu YM, Zhong GQ. Early-TIPS Versus Current Standard Therapy for Acute Variceal Bleeding in Cirrhosis Patients: A Systemic Review With Meta-analysis. *Front Pharmacol* 2020; **11**: 603 [PMID: 32581776 DOI: 10.3389/fphar.2020.00603]
- 12 **Jiang XZ**, Zhao SY, Luo H, Huang B, Wang CS, Chen L, Tao YJ. Laparoscopic and open splenectomy and azygoportal disconnection for portal hypertension. *World J Gastroenterol* 2009; **15**: 3421-3425 [PMID: 19610145 DOI: 10.3748/wjg.15.3421]
- 13 **Chen XD**, He FQ, Yang L, Yu YY, Zhou ZG. Laparoscopic splenectomy with or without devascularization of the stomach for liver cirrhosis and portal hypertension: a systematic review. *ANZ J Surg* 2013; **83**: 122-128 [PMID: 23170929 DOI: 10.1111/ans.12003]
- 14 **Boyer TD**, Haskal ZJ; American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases. The role of transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt in the management of portal hypertension. *Hepatology* 2005; **41**: 386-400 [PMID: 15660434 DOI: 10.1002/hep.20559]
- 15 **Angermayr B**, Cejna M, Koenig F, Karmel F, Hackl F, Gangl A, Peck-Radosavljevic M; Vienna TIPS Study Group. Survival in patients undergoing transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt: ePTFE-covered stentgrafts versus bare stents. *Hepatology* 2003; **38**: 1043-1050 [PMID: 14512892 DOI: 10.1053/jhep.2003.50423]
- 16 **Bureau C**, Garcia-Pagan JC, Otal P, Pomier-Layrargues G, Chabbert V, Cortez C, Perreault P, Péron JM, Abraldes JG, Bouchard L, Bilbao JI, Bosch J, Rousseau H, Vinel JP. Improved clinical outcome using polytetrafluoroethylene-coated stents for TIPS: results of a randomized study. *Gastroenterology* 2004; **126**: 469-475 [PMID: 14762784 DOI: 10.1053/j.gastro.2003.11.016]
- 17 **Groszmann RJ**, Garcia-Tsao G, Bosch J, Grace ND, Burroughs AK, Planas R, Escorsell A, Garcia-Pagan JC, Patch D, Matloff DS, Gao H, Makuch R; Portal Hypertension Collaborative Group. Beta-blockers to prevent gastroesophageal varices in patients with cirrhosis. *N Engl J Med* 2005; **353**: 2254-2261 [PMID: 16306522 DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa044456]
- 18 **Garbuzenko DV**, Arefyev NO. Primary prevention of bleeding from esophageal varices in patients with liver cirrhosis: An update and review of the literature. *J Evid Based Med* 2020; **13**: 313-324 [PMID: 33037792 DOI: 10.1111/jebm.12407]
- 19 **Strunk H**, Marinova M. Transjugular Intrahepatic Portosystemic Shunt (TIPS): Pathophysiologic Basics, Actual Indications and Results with Review of the Literature. *Rofo* 2018; **190**: 701-711 [PMID: 30045395 DOI: 10.1055/a-0628-7347]
- 20 **Vizzutti F**, Schepis F, Arena U, Fanelli F, Gitto S, Aspite S, Turco L, Dragoni G, Laffi G, Marra F. Transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt (TIPS): current indications and strategies to improve the outcomes. *Intern Emerg Med* 2020; **15**: 37-48 [PMID: 31919780 DOI: 10.1007/s11739-019-02252-8]
- 21 **Luca A**, Miraglia R, Maruzzelli L, D'Amico M, Tuzzolino F. Early Liver Failure after Transjugular Intrahepatic Portosystemic Shunt in Patients with Cirrhosis with Model for End-Stage Liver Disease Score of 12 or Less: Incidence, Outcome, and Prognostic Factors. *Radiology* 2016; **280**: 622-629 [PMID: 26982564 DOI: 10.1148/radiol.2016151625]

- 22 **Bosoi CR**, Rose CF. Oxidative stress: a systemic factor implicated in the pathogenesis of hepatic encephalopathy. *Metab Brain Dis* 2013; **28**: 175-178 [PMID: [23124921](#) DOI: [10.1007/s11011-012-9351-5](#)]
- 23 **Amodio P**. Hepatic encephalopathy: Diagnosis and management. *Liver Int* 2018; **38**: 966-975 [PMID: [29624860](#) DOI: [10.1111/liv.13752](#)]
- 24 **Gairing SJ**, Müller L, Kloeckner R, Galle PR, Labenz C. Review article: post-TIPSS hepatic encephalopathy-current knowledge and future perspectives. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2022; **55**: 1265-1276 [PMID: [35181894](#) DOI: [10.1111/apt.16825](#)]
- 25 **El Masri SH**, Boulos PB, Ibrahim OH, Hassan MA. Haemodynamic effects of splenectomy and vasoligation in bilharzial hepatic fibrosis. *Br J Surg* 1980; **67**: 111-114 [PMID: [7362938](#) DOI: [10.1002/bjs.1800670212](#)]
- 26 **Schwabl P**, Seeland BA, Riedl F, Schubert TL, Königshofer P, Brusilovskaya K, Petrenko O, Hofer B, Schiefer AI, Trauner M, Peck-Radosavljevic M, Reiberger T. Splenectomy ameliorates portal pressure and anemia in animal models of cirrhotic and non-cirrhotic portal hypertension. *Adv Med Sci* 2022; **67**: 154-162 [PMID: [35272246](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.advms.2022.02.005](#)]
- 27 **Eipel C**, Abshagen K, Ritter J, Cantré D, Menger MD, Vollmar B. Splenectomy improves survival by increasing arterial blood supply in a rat model of reduced-size liver. *Transpl Int* 2010; **23**: 998-1007 [PMID: [20302595](#) DOI: [10.1111/j.1432-2277.2010.01079.x](#)]
- 28 **Cho JJ**, Hocher B, Herbst H, Jia JD, Ruehl M, Hahn EG, Riecken EO, Schuppan D. An oral endothelin-A receptor antagonist blocks collagen synthesis and deposition in advanced rat liver fibrosis. *Gastroenterology* 2000; **118**: 1169-1178 [PMID: [10833492](#) DOI: [10.1016/s0016-5085\(00\)70370-2](#)]
- 29 **Ueda S**, Yamanoi A, Hishikawa Y, Dhar DK, Tachibana M, Nagasue N. Transforming growth factor-beta1 released from the spleen exerts a growth inhibitory effect on liver regeneration in rats. *Lab Invest* 2003; **83**: 1595-1603 [PMID: [14615413](#) DOI: [10.1097/01.Lab.0000095686.10639.c8](#)]
- 30 **Zhang S**, Wan D, Zhu M, Wang G, Zhang X, Huang N, Zhang J, Zhang C, Shang Q, Liu X, Liang F, Kong G, Geng J, Yao L, Lu S, Chen Y, Li Z. CD11b + CD43 hi Ly6C lo splenocyte-derived macrophages exacerbate liver fibrosis via spleen-liver axis. *Hepatology* 2023; **77**: 1612-1629 [PMID: [36098707](#) DOI: [10.1002/hep.32782](#)]
- 31 **Wang Q**, Sun K, Li XH, Peng BG, Liang LJ. Surgical treatment for hepatocellular carcinoma and secondary hypersplenism. *Hepatobiliary Pancreat Dis Int* 2006; **5**: 396-400 [PMID: [16911938](#)]
- 32 **McKenna KC**. Splenectomy restores tumoricidal activity to promote elimination of intraocular tumors. *Oncoimmunology* 2015; **4**: e1011516 [PMID: [26140233](#) DOI: [10.1080/2162402x.2015.1011516](#)]
- 33 **Nomura Y**, Kage M, Ogata T, Kondou R, Kinoshita H, Ohshima K, Yano H. Influence of splenectomy in patients with liver cirrhosis and hypersplenism. *Hepatol Res* 2014; **44**: E100-E109 [PMID: [24033833](#) DOI: [10.1111/hepr.12234](#)]
- 34 **Stöth M**, Freire Valls A, Chen M, Hidding S, Knipper K, Shen Y, Klose J, Ulrich A, Ruiz de Almodovar C, Schneider M, Schmidt T. Splenectomy reduces lung metastases and tumoral and metastatic niche inflammation. *Int J Cancer* 2019; **145**: 2509-2520 [PMID: [31034094](#) DOI: [10.1002/ijc.32378](#)]
- 35 **Takahashi Y**, Matsuura T, Yanagi Y, Yoshimaru K, Taguchi T. The role of splenectomy before liver transplantation in biliary atresia patients. *J Pediatr Surg* 2016; **51**: 2095-2098 [PMID: [27720430](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.jpedsurg.2016.09.048](#)]



Published by **Baishideng Publishing Group Inc**
7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-3991568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
Help Desk: <https://www.f6publishing.com/helpdesk>
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

