


World Journal of *Gastrointestinal Surgery*

World J Gastrointest Surg 2024 January 27; 16(1): 1-259



Contents

Monthly Volume 16 Number 1 January 27, 2024

EDITORIAL

- 1 Novel prognostic factors after radical resection of hepatocellular carcinoma: Updating an old issue
Bencini L
- 6 Prospects in the application of ultrasensitive chromosomal aneuploidy detection in precancerous lesions of gastric cancer
Qian ST, Xie FF, Zhao HY, Liu QS, Cai DL

MINIREVIEWS

- 13 Prognostic value of ultrasound in early arterial complications post liver transplant
Zhao NB, Chen Y, Xia R, Tang JB, Zhao D

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Case Control Study

- 21 Added value of ratio of cross diameters of the appendix in ultrasound diagnosis of acute appendicitis
Gu FW, Wu SZ

Retrospective Cohort Study

- 29 Oncological features and prognosis of colorectal cancer in human immunodeficiency virus-positive patients: A retrospective study
Yang FY, He F, Chen DF, Tang CL, Woraikat S, Li Y, Qian K

Retrospective Study

- 40 Laparoscopic *vs* open surgery for gastric cancer: Assessing time, recovery, complications, and markers
Lu YY, Li YX, He M, Wang YL
- 49 Single-incision laparoscopic transabdominal preperitoneal repair in the treatment of adult female patients with inguinal hernia
Zhu XJ, Jiao JY, Xue HM, Chen P, Qin CF, Wang P
- 59 Computerized tomography-guided therapeutic percutaneous puncture catheter drainage-combined with somatostatin for severe acute pancreatitis: An analysis of efficacy and safety
Zheng XL, Li WL, Lin YP, Huang TL
- 67 Impact of open hepatectomy on postoperative bile leakage in patients with biliary tract cancer
Wu G, Li WY, Gong YX, Lin F, Sun C
- 76 Clinical observation of gastrointestinal function recovery in patients after hepatobiliary surgery
Zeng HJ, Liu JJ, Yang YC

- 85** Predictive value of machine learning models for lymph node metastasis in gastric cancer: A two-center study
Lu T, Lu M, Wu D, Ding YY, Liu HN, Li TT, Song DQ
- 95** Post-operative morbidity after neoadjuvant chemotherapy and resection for gallbladder cancer: A national surgical quality improvement program analysis
Kim M, Stroeve S, Aploks K, Ostapenko A, Dong XD, Seshadri R
- 103** Risk factors for recurrence of common bile duct stones after surgical treatment and effect of ursodeoxycholic acid intervention
Yuan WH, Zhang Z, Pan Q, Mao BN, Yuan T
- 113** Clinical efficacy of modified Kamikawa anastomosis in patients with laparoscopic proximal gastrectomy
Wu CY, Lin JA, Ye K
- 124** Clinical effect of laparoscopic radical resection of colorectal cancer based on propensity score matching
Liu Y, Wang XX, Li YL, He WT, Li H, Chen H
- 134** Different timing for abdominal paracentesis catheter placement and drainage in severe acute pancreatitis complicated by intra-abdominal fluid accumulation
Chen R, Chen HQ, Li RD, Lu HM
- 143** Comparison of different preoperative objective nutritional indices for evaluating 30-d mortality and complications after liver transplantation
Li C, Chen HX, Lai YH
- 155** Predictive value of NLR, Fib4, and APRI in the occurrence of liver failure after hepatectomy in patients with hepatocellular carcinoma
Kuang TZ, Xiao M, Liu YF
- 166** Practical effect of different teaching modes in teaching gastrointestinal surgery nursing
Rong XJ, Ning Z

Observational Study

- 173** Predictive factors and model validation of post-colon polyp surgery *Helicobacter pylori* infection
Zhang ZS

Randomized Controlled Trial

- 186** Micro-power negative pressure wound technique reduces risk of incision infection following loop ileostomy closure
Xu DY, Bai BJ, Shan L, Wei HY, Lin DF, Wang Y, Wang D
- 196** Paravertebral block's effect on analgesia and inflammation in advanced gastric cancer patients undergoing transarterial chemoembolization and microwave ablation
Xiong YF, Wei BZ, Wang YF, Li XF, Liu C

META-ANALYSIS

- 205 Unraveling the efficacy network: A network meta-analysis of adjuvant external beam radiation therapy methods after hepatectomy
Yang GY, He ZW, Tang YC, Yuan F, Cao MB, Ren YP, Li YX, Su XR, Yao ZC, Deng MH
- 215 Estimation of Physiologic Ability and Surgical Stress scoring system for predicting complications following abdominal surgery: A meta-analysis spanning 2004 to 2022
Pang TS, Cao LP
- 228 Role of Oncostatin M in the prognosis of inflammatory bowel disease: A meta-analysis
Yang Y, Fu KZ, Pan G

CASE REPORT

- 239 Endoscopic treatment of extreme esophageal stenosis complicated with esophagotracheal fistula: A case report
Fang JH, Li WM, He CH, Wu JL, Guo Y, Lai ZC, Li GD
- 248 Intestinal tuberculosis with small bowel stricture and hemorrhage as the predominant manifestation: Three case reports
Huang G, Wu KK, Li XN, Kuai JH, Zhang AJ

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

- 257 Sarcopenia in cirrhotic patients: Does frailty matter while waiting for a liver transplant?
Li XJ, He K

ABOUT COVER

Editorial Board Member of *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*, Renato Pietroletti, PhD, Associate Professor, Professor, Department of Applied Clinical and Biotechnological Sciences, University of L'Aquila, L'Aquila 67100, AQ, Italy. renato.pietroletti@univaq.it

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 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: Zi-Hang Xu, 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

POLICY OF CO-AUTHORS**EDITORIAL BOARD MEMBERS**

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

PUBLICATION DATE

January 27, 2024

COPYRIGHT

© 2024 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>

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/310>

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 Study

Risk factors for recurrence of common bile duct stones after surgical treatment and effect of ursodeoxycholic acid intervention

Wei-Hong Yuan, Zheng Zhang, Qi Pan, Bo-Neng Mao, Tao Yuan

Specialty type: Gastroenterology and hepatology

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: Knospe L, Germany; Shimamura Y, Japan

Received: November 3, 2023

Peer-review started: November 3, 2023

First decision: November 16, 2023

Revised: November 29, 2023

Accepted: January 2, 2024

Article in press: January 2, 2024

Published online: January 27, 2024



Wei-Hong Yuan, Zheng Zhang, Qi Pan, Bo-Neng Mao, Tao Yuan, Department of Gastroenterology, Yixing People's Hospital, Yixing 214200, Jiangsu Province, China

Corresponding author: Tao Yuan, MM, Attending Doctor, Department of Gastroenterology, Yixing People's Hospital, No. 1588 Xincheng Road, Yixing 214200, Jiangsu Province, China. staff1848@yxph.com

Abstract

BACKGROUND

Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP) is an accurate diagnostic method for choledocholithiasis and treatment option for stone removal. Additionally, ursodeoxycholic acid (UDCA) can dissolve cholesterol stones and prevent their development and reappearance by lowering the cholesterol concentration in bile. Despite these treatment options, there are still patients who experience stone recurrence.

AIM

To analyze the risk factors for choledocholithiasis recurrence after ERCP retrograde cholangiopancreatography and the effect of UDCA intervention.

METHODS

The clinical data of 100 patients with choledochal stones who were hospitalized at the Yixing People's Hospital and underwent ERCP for successful stone extraction between June 2020 and December 2022 were retrospectively collected. According to the post-ERCP treatment plan, 100 patients were classified into UDCA ($n = 47$) and control ($n = 53$) groups. We aimed to assess the clinical efficacy and rate of relapse in the two patient populations. We then collected information (basic demographic data, clinical characteristics, and serum biochemical indicators) and determined the factors contributing to relapse using logistic regression analysis. Our secondary goal was to determine the effects of UDCA on liver function after ERCP.

RESULTS

Compared to the control group, the UDCA group demonstrated a higher clinical effectiveness rate of 92.45% vs 78.72% ($P < 0.05$). No significant differences were observed in liver function indices, including total bilirubin, direct bilirubin, gamma-glutamyl transpeptidase, alanine aminotransferase, alkaline phosphatase, and aspartate aminotransferase, between the two groups before treatment. After

treatment, all liver function indices were significantly reduced. Comparing the control *vs* UDCA groups, the UDCA group exhibited significantly lower levels of all indices (55.39 ± 6.53 *vs* 77.31 ± 8.52 , 32.10 ± 4.62 *vs* 45.39 ± 5.69 , 142.32 ± 14.21 *vs* 189.63 ± 16.87 , 112.52 ± 14.25 *vs* 149.36 ± 15.36 , 122.61 ± 16.00 *vs* 171.33 ± 22.09 , 96.98 ± 10.44 *vs* 121.35 ± 11.57 , respectively, all $P < 0.05$). The stone recurrence rate was lower in the UDCA group (13.21%) in contrast with the control group (44.68%). Periapillary diverticula (OR: 6.00, 95%CI: 1.69-21.30), maximum stone diameter (OR: 1.69, 95%CI: 1.01-2.85), stone quantity >3 (OR: 4.23, 95%CI: 1.17-15.26), and positive bile culture (OR: 7.61, 95%CI: 2.07-27.91) were independent factors that influenced the relapse of common bile duct stones after ERCP ($P < 0.05$). Furthermore, postoperative UDCA was identified as a preventive factor (OR: 0.07; 95%CI: 0.08-0.09).

CONCLUSION

The intervention effect of UDCA after ERCP for common bile duct stones is adequate, providing new research directions and references for the prevention and treatment of stone recurrence.

Key Words: Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography; Recurrence; Ursodeoxycholic acid; Common bile duct stones; Clinical effective rate; Risk factors

©The Author(s) 2024. Published by Baishideng Publishing Group Inc. All rights reserved.

Core Tip: Choledocholithiasis is a common biliary disorder that can be treated by endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography. However, postoperative recurrence of bile duct stones is a common complication. Ursodeoxycholic acid (UDCA) is used to treat biliary disorders mainly by lowering cholesterol saturation, facilitating bile flow, and reducing inflammation. Through these actions, UDCA improves symptoms, prevents and treats gallstone formation, and promotes biliary health in patients with biliary tract disorders.

Citation: Yuan WH, Zhang Z, Pan Q, Mao BN, Yuan T. Risk factors for recurrence of common bile duct stones after surgical treatment and effect of ursodeoxycholic acid intervention. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2024; 16(1): 103-112

URL: <https://www.wjgnet.com/1948-9366/full/v16/i1/103.htm>

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v16.i1.103>

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the occurrence of choledocholithiasis has increased, causing serious discomfort and health risks for patients. Choledocholithiasis is mainly treated through endoscopic lithotomy or traditional open surgery[1,2]. Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP) for stone extraction is favored by patients due to the lower risk of trauma [3,4]. However, after stone removal *via* ERCP, the postoperative stone recurrence rate is between 4% to 25% [5], which presents difficulties for both clinicians and patients.

Numerous studies have been conducted on stone recurrence; however, the causes of and risk factors for recurrence have not been well characterized. Ursodeoxycholic acid (UDCA) has been proposed as a treatment for stone recurrence. UDCA is a drug that dissolves cholesterol stones and prevents stone formation and recurrence by lowering the cholesterol concentration in bile[6]. Chen *et al*[7] showed that postoperative application of UDCA after percutaneous hepatic perforation balloon dilatation for choledocholithiasis is a feasible and effective treatment modality. UDCA has been shown to reduce cholesterol levels in the bile and promote the dissolution and elimination of stones. Therefore, we analyzed the effect of UDCA after ERCP in patients with common bile duct stones and screened high-risk individuals for factors that may contribute to relapse in order to alleviate the suffering caused by stone recurrence and improve the prognosis.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Patient characteristics

The clinical records of a cohort comprising 100 patients with choledochal stones who were hospitalized at Yixing People's Hospital and underwent ERCP for successful stone extraction between June 2020 and December 2022 were retrospectively collected. According to the post-ERCP treatment plan, 100 patients were classified into UDCA ($n = 47$) and control ($n = 53$) groups. Inclusion criteria: (1) Those who fulfilled the diagnostic criteria of choledocholithiasis and whose diagnosis was confirmed by computerized tomography (CT) or abdominal ultrasonography; (2) those who had not taken other medications for the treatment of choledocholithiasis in the last month; and (3) those whose age was ≥ 18 years old. Exclusion criteria: (1) People with combined acute cholangitis, biliary pancreatitis, severe cardiopulmonary insufficiency, or other contraindications to surgery without ERCP; (2) people with a previous history of pancreaticoduodenal or

gastrointestinal anastomosis and other surgical procedures to change the normal structure of the bile ducts; (3) people with biliary ductal abnormalities, pancreatic tumors, and duodenal papilloma tumors detected in the ERCP; (4) individuals within the study population who exhibit drug allergies or whose clinical data are incomplete; and (5) pregnant and lactating women.

Concrete method

ERCP: The patients underwent standard fasting protocols that included restriction of solid food and water intake before the operation and a clean enema 2 h in advance on the day of the operation. The day before the operation, the doctor explained in detail to the patients and their families their conditions, the benefits and possible risks of the operation, and relevant precautions during the perioperative period.

First, the patient was given 10% lidocaine for local anesthesia of the oral pharynx. The endoscope was inserted through the mouth and gradually passed through the esophagus and stomach, eventually reaching the duodenum. During this process, physicians observed and evaluated the morphology and lesions in the bile and pancreatic ducts. Subsequently, a fine guidewire was carefully inserted using an endoscope and guided into the bile and pancreatic ducts. Subsequently, a certain dose of muscle relaxant was injected to relax the sphincter. Once the sphincter relaxed, a special contrast agent was injected into the bile and pancreatic ducts. Distribution and flow of the contrast agent in the ducts were recorded using a PHILIPS BV Pulsera C-arm (Royal Philips, Dutch). This helped determine the structure of the ducts and detect any abnormalities. Based on the imaging results, doctors could perform various therapeutic procedures, such as stone removal, duct dilation, and placement of biliary stents. Finally, after confirming the absence of stones through another imaging procedure, the doctor slowly withdrew the endoscope from the intestine and concluded the procedure. Throughout the process, the doctor closely monitored the patient's vital signs and promptly managed potential complications.

Control group: The control group was administered the routine postoperative treatment, including oral anti-inflammatory choleretic tablets, 1.5 g per dose, three times a day. Aspirin tablets (0.5 g) were orally administered three times daily for 4 wk.

UDCA group: The UDCA group received the same treatment as the control group as well as underwent combination therapy, including the use of UDCA capsules. The UDCA capsules were administered orally at a dose of 25 mg once daily for 4 wk.

Observation indicators: Main outcome

Clinical effects: Evaluation criteria: the treatment was considered markedly effective if the imaging examination of the bile duct showed no evident dilation, there were no obvious residual stones, and clinical symptoms such as jaundice, high fever, chills, and upper abdominal colic were noticeably relieved. The treatment was considered effective if the imaging examination showed no dilation of the bile duct, there was a small amount of residual stones, and some improvement in clinical symptoms such as jaundice, high fever, chills, and upper abdominal colic. The treatment was considered ineffective if the imaging examination showed residual stones and clinical symptoms, such as jaundice, high fever, chills, and upper abdominal colic, did not improve after treatment.

Rate of relapse: Postoperative follow-up was conducted on all patients at intervals of 3-6 mo until June 2023. If the following conditions occurred, stone relapse was considered: (1) During the follow-up period, if patients began to experience symptoms of acute biliary disease, such as fever, jaundice, and right upper quadrant pain, and the recurrence of common bile duct stones was confirmed through abdominal ultrasound, CT, Magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography (MRCP), or other imaging examinations; and (2) in patients without typical clinical symptoms but suspected of having small stones, endoscopic ultrasonography was used to determine stone relapse.

Analysis of risk factors: We collected information including age, gender, presence of jaundice, presence of hypertension, diabetes, biliary conditions (history of biliary surgery, common bile duct diameter, periampullary diverticulum), stone characteristics (maximum stone diameter, number of stones), laboratory tests [preoperative white blood cell count (WBC), procalcitonin (PCT), total bilirubin (TBiL), direct bilirubin (DBiL), aspartate aminotransferase (AST), alanine aminotransferase (ALT), gamma-glutamyl transferase (GGT), alkaline phosphatase (ALP), *etc.*], and bile culture results as predictive variables.

Secondary outcome

Recovery of liver function: A 5-milliliter aliquot of venous blood was collected from the patient in the morning while fasting, both before and after treatment. The blood collection tube was centrifuged (speed of 3000 r/min, radius of 10 cm) for 10 min, and the upper layer of serum was taken after centrifugation, and serum TBiL, DBiL, IBiL, AST, ALT, GGT were detected by PUZS-300X automatic analyzer (Nanjing Plan Medical Equipment Co., Ltd., Nanjing, Jiangsu Province, China). The analyzer was used to detect serum TBiL, DBiL, IBiL, AST, ALT, and GGT levels.

Statistical analysis

Data were analyzed using SPSS 23.0. (IBM Corporation, Armonk, New York, NY, United States). The age, common bile duct diameter, maximum stone diameter, and laboratory test results were described using mean $\pm$ SD or median (P_{25} , P_{75}). Subsequently, we used a *t*-test or non-parametric Mann-Whitney *U* test to compare the differences between the two groups for continuous variables. Sex, the presence or absence of jaundice and hypertension, and diabetes were expressed

as constituent ratios. The differences in rates between the two groups were compared using the chi-square test or Fisher's exact test. Logistic regression analysis was used to analyze risk factors. Statistical significance was defined as a two-sided P value of < 0.05 .

RESULTS

Clinical characteristics

The 100 patients included were 39-73 years old with a median (P_{25} , P_{75}) of 53.00 (48.00, 60.00) years old, and included 44 males (44.0%) and 56 females (56.0%). The descriptive characteristics of the participants are presented in [Table 1](#).

Clinical effect analysis

In comparison to the control group, the UDCA group demonstrated a higher clinical effectiveness rate of 92.45%, with statistically significant differences ($P < 0.05$; [Table 2](#)).

Liver function index analysis

No significant differences were observed in the liver function indices and Tbil, DBil, GGT, ALT, ALP, and AST levels between the two patient populations before treatment ($P > 0.05$). After treatment, all liver function indices significantly reduced. Moreover, the UDCA group exhibited significantly lower levels of these indices than the control group ($P < 0.05$) ([Table 3](#)).

Rate of relapse stones

There were 7 cases (13.21%) of recurrence in the UDCA group and 21 cases (44.68%) in the control group, with statistically significant differences in the recurrence rate between the two groups ($P < 0.05$; [Figure 1](#)).

Univariate analysis

The non-recurrent and recurrent groups included parapancreatic diverticulum, number of stones, positive bile culture, postoperative treatment, common bile duct diameter, and maximum stone diameter, with statistically significant differences ($P < 0.05$; [Table 4](#)).

Multivariate logistic regression analysis

The characteristics in [Table 5](#) with $P < 0.05$ were used as independent variables, and recurrence (no *vs* yes) after ERCP was the dependent variable. Peripapillary diverticula (OR: 6.00, 95%CI: 1.69-21.30), maximum stone diameter (OR: 1.69, 95%CI: 1.01-2.85), stone quantity > 3 (OR: 4.23, 95%CI: 1.17-15.26), and positive bile culture (OR: 7.61, 95%CI: 2.07-27.91) were independent factors that influenced the relapse of common bile duct stones after ERCP ($P < 0.05$). Furthermore, postoperative UDCA was identified as a preventive factor (OR: 0.07; 95%CI: 0.08-0.09). The results of the logistic regression analysis are presented in [Table 6](#).

DISCUSSION

The incidence of common bile duct stones has gradually increased in recent years, rising from 8% to 20%[8]. Since its introduction, ERCP, a minimally invasive procedure with low risk, fast recovery, high success rate, and lower cost than traditional surgery, has gradually replaced traditional open surgery for the treatment of choledocholithiasis[9]. However, ERCP may damage liver function and slow its recovery of liver function after surgery, leading to cholestasis and stone recurrence. Routine postoperative liver protection and anti-infection treatments can reduce harm caused by surgery; however, their effect on preventing stone recurrence is not obvious. Therefore, the use of drugs to prevent stone recurrence during the postoperative period may have good long-term efficacy.

In this study, the prophylactic use of UDCA after ERCP achieved an ideal therapeutic effect with a clinical efficacy rate of 92.45%, and Tbil, DBil, GGT, ALT, ALP, and AST levels were reduced, demonstrating an adequate hepatoprotective effect. UDCA is a dihydroxy bile acid extracted from bear-bile powder. It has the ability to enhance liver detoxification, improve liver function, protect liver cells, inhibit liver cell apoptosis, and regulate immune response in the body[10,11]. UDCA also promotes bile secretion, reduces cholesterol synthase activity, inhibits hepatic synthesis of cholesterol, reduces the amount of cholesterol in bile, and depolymerizes free cholesterol crystals in bile to a microcolloid state that is dissolved in bile[12]. UDCA inhibits the binding of lipids to hydrophobic bile acids on the granular membrane of hepatocytes, thus preventing bile acids from attacking the liver, reducing cytochrome release from mitochondria, and decreasing the permeability of mitochondrial cells, which protect hepatocytes and prevent apoptosis[11,13]. Choi *et al*[14] and Mulliri *et al*[15] found that prophylactic UDCA in patients undergoing gastric or bariatric surgery prevented gallstone formation and ensured clinical benefits while reducing the burden of late cholecystectomy. Lee *et al*[1] recommended the postoperative use of UDCA to prevent recurrence in children with small or large numbers of gallstones treated with cholecystectomy. Thus, UDCA may be a new treatment strategy for reducing the likelihood of recurrence. This is reflected in the results of this study. However, there is insufficient evidence regarding the improvement in liver function.

Table 1 Patient characteristics

Variable		Total (n = 100)	Control (n = 47)	UDCA (n = 53)
Age (yr), median (P ₂₅ , P ₇₅)		53.00 (48, 60)	51 (47, 60)	54 (48.5, 60)
Gender, n (%)	Male	44 (44)	21 (44.68)	23 (23.40)
	Female	56 (56)	26 (55.32)	30 (56.60)
Jaundice, n (%)	Yes	27 (27)	12 (25.53)	15 (28.30)
	No	73 (73)	35 (74.47)	38 (71.70)
Hypertension, n (%)	Yes	25 (25)	12 (25.53)	14 (26.42)
	No	75 (75)	35 (74.47)	39 (73.58)
Diabetes, n (%)	Yes	32 (32)	14 (29.79)	18 (33.96)
	No	68 (68)	33 (70.21)	35 (66.04)
History of biliary tract surgery, n (%)	Yes	14 (14)	6 (12.77)	8 (15.09)
	No	86 (86)	41 (87.23)	45 (84.91)
Parapillary diverticulum, n (%)	Yes	36 (36)	23 (48.94)	13 (24.53)
	No	64 (64)	24 (51.06)	40 (75.47)
No. of stones, n (%)	≤ 3	49 (49)	25 (53.19)	24 (45.28)
	> 3	51 (51)	22 (46.81)	29 (54.72)
Bile culture positive, n (%)		37 (37)	20 (42.55)	17 (32.08)
Common bile duct diameter (mm), median (P ₂₅ , P ₇₅)		14.00 (13.00, 16.00)	15.0 (13.0, 16.0)	14.0 (12.0, 16.0)
Maximum stone diameter (mm), median (P ₂₅ , P ₇₅)		13.00 (12.00, 15.00)	13.0 (12.0, 15.0)	13.0 (11.5, 14.5)
ERCP time (min), median (P ₂₅ , P ₇₅)		64.00 (61.00, 68.00)	63 (61, 67)	64 (61, 71)
WBC (10 ⁹ /L, mean ± SD)		6.60 ± 0.96	6.24 ± 1.24	6.60 ± 0.97
PCT (ng/mL), median (P ₂₅ , P ₇₅)		0.18 (0.12, 0.27)	0.17 (0.12, 0.25)	0.18 (0.13, 0.28)

UDCA: Ursodeoxycholic acid; ERCP: Endoscopic retro-grade cholangiopancreatography; WBC: White blood cell; PCT: Procalcitonin.

Table 2 Comparison of clinical efficacy between control and ursodeoxycholic acid groups

Group	Efficacious	Effective	Ineffective	χ^2 value	P value
Control, n (%)	16 (34.04)	21 (44.68)	10 (21.28)	3.990	0.048
UDCA, n (%)	22 (41.51)	27 (50.94)	4 (7.55)		


UDCA: Ursodeoxycholic acid.

The rate of relapse stones was lower in the UDCA group (13.21%) in contrast with the control group (44.68%) after ERCP. This finding supports the observations made in previous studies. In our study, parapapillary diverticulum was significantly associated with the recurrence of choledocholithiasis which is consistent with previous studies[16,17]. It is possible that the papilla located within the diverticulum interferes with the normal functioning of the duodenal papilla. As a result, compression occurs in the lower segment of the common bile duct and dilation occurs in the upper segment, which may lead to increased biliary pressure or biliary spasm and consequent obstruction of bile outflow, increasing the risk of stone recurrence. The presence of large stones causes dilatation of the common bile duct and reduces smooth muscle fiber retraction. Thus, bile excretion is difficult, and bile is prone to cholestasis and bacterial infections[18], inducing stone formation. Deng *et al*[16] found that the risk of common bile duct stone recurrence after ERCP was 1.599 times higher for patients with stone diameter ≥ 10 mm compared to those with stone diameter < 10 mm. A study involving 1148 patients found that stone diameter > 12 mm was more likely to recur[19]. Although multiple studies have established that common bile duct diameter increases the risk of common bile duct stone recurrence, predictive cut-offs are controversial. In our study, we observed that mean maximum stone diameter was a significant risk factor for stone recurrence after ERCP. Unfortunately, the cutoff value was not analyzed further. In addition, stones > 3 in diameter were a risk factor for choledochal stone recurrence after ERCP. Multiple stones are not easily removed, and recurrent choledocholithiasis can eventually develop due to negligence of the surgeon or the inability to detect small residual

Table 3 Comparison of liver function indexes between control and ursodeoxycholic acid groups

Group	n	TbIL ($\mu\text{mol/L}$, mean $\pm$ SD)		DBiL ($\mu\text{mol/L}$, mean $\pm$ SD)		GGT (U/L, mean $\pm$ SD)	
		Pre-treatment	Post-treatment	Pre-treatment	Post-treatment	Pre-treatment	Post-treatment
Control	47	96.65 $\pm$ 11.24	77.31 $\pm$ 8.52	63.74 $\pm$ 7.45	45.39 $\pm$ 5.69	328.65 $\pm$ 20.45	189.63 $\pm$ 16.87
UDCA	53	98.63 $\pm$ 11.42	55.39 $\pm$ 6.53	63.36 $\pm$ 7.96	32.10 $\pm$ 4.62	330.25 $\pm$ 20.64	142.32 $\pm$ 14.21
t value		0.872	-14.532	-0.251	-12.896	0.388	-15.217
P value		0.385	< 0.001	0.803	< 0.001	0.699	< 0.001
		ALT (U/L, mean $\pm$ SD)		ALP (U/L, mean $\pm$ SD)		AST (U/L, mean $\pm$ SD)	
		Pre-treatment	Post-treatment	Pre-treatment	Post-treatment	Pre-treatment	Post-treatment
Control	47	274.63 $\pm$ 25.41	149.36 $\pm$ 15.36	256.66 $\pm$ 24.12	171.33 $\pm$ 22.09	201.32 $\pm$ 16.35	121.35 $\pm$ 11.57
UDCA	53	268.54 $\pm$ 21.23	112.52 $\pm$ 14.25	262.36 $\pm$ 25.78	122.61 $\pm$ 16.00	201.11 $\pm$ 15.47	96.98 $\pm$ 10.44
t value		-1.306	-12.440	1.139	-12.733	-0.066	-11.072
P value		0.195	< 0.001	0.257	< 0.001	0.947	< 0.001

TbIL: Total bilirubin; DBiL: Direct bilirubin; GGT: Gamma-glutamyl transferase; ALT: Alanine aminotransferase; ALP: Alkaline phosphatase; AST: Aspartate aminotransferase; UDCA: Ursodeoxycholic acid.



DOI: 10.4240/wjgs.v16.i1.103 Copyright ©The Author(s) 2024.

Figure 1 Recurrence of stones in the two groups. ^aP < 0.05. UDCA: Ursodeoxycholic acid.

stones *via* CT. However, results from Akay *et al*[20] differ from ours. Akay *et al*[20] reported that the recurrence rate after endoscopic treatment of common bile duct stones is associated with a wide common bile duct (≥ 10 mm), but not with the number of stones. Therefore, the findings are inconclusive and require further investigation.

In this study, positive bile bacterial culture was found to be a significant risk factor. The specific mechanism is not yet clear, but we speculate that it may be related to the biological activity of intestinal microecology. Biliary tract bacteria may induce an inflammatory response and promote stone formation through changes in KEGG metabolic pathway activity. Alternatively, biliary tract bacteria synthesize many enzymes that participate in bile metabolism, increasing free bilirubin, fatty acids, and other organic components and inducing stone formation[21]. However, there have been few studies on biliary bacterial microorganisms and stone recurrence, which can be supplemented in the future.

Although the risk factors for stone relapse have been extensively studied, we also evaluated UDCA as a preventive factor. The main cause of stone formation is an imbalance in bile composition, resulting in increased cholesterol and decreased bile acid concentrations. Correcting the imbalance in bile composition is a key measure in preventing stone recurrence. UDCA has high solubility, cytoprotective effects, and membrane stability without biotransformation, and can inhibit the absorption of cholesterol in the intestinal tract and reduce cholesterol levels[12,22]. In addition, UDCA can act as a bile transporter that promotes bile acid secretion and reabsorption by increasing hydrophilic bile acids, thus improving endogenous bile acid excretion[23,24]. In conclusion, UDCA can correct the bile composition, effectively alleviate the indications for postoperative cholestasis, and reduce the stone recurrence rate.

This study has some limitations, such as a potentially small sample size, which limits the generalizability of the results. The study may not have accounted for all the possible confounding factors, which could impact the results. The limited follow-up duration may affect the assessment of long-term recurrence rates and intervention effects. Further research with larger sample sizes and rigorous study designs is needed to confirm and expand upon these findings.

Table 4 Univariate analysis of recurrence of common bile duct stones after endoscopic retro-grade cholangiopancreatography

Variables		Non-recurrent group (n = 72)	Recurrent group (n = 28)	χ^2 value	P value
Age (yr, mean $\pm$ SD)		54.64 $\pm$ 6.62	51.43 $\pm$ 8.74	-1.983	0.050
Gender, n (%)	Male	31 (43.06)	13 (46.43)	0.093	0.760
	Female	41 (56.94)	15 (53.57)		
Jaundice, n (%)	Yes	19 (26.39)	8 (28.57)	0.049	0.825
	No	53 (73.61)	20 (71.43)		
Hypertension, n (%)	Yes	18 (25.00)	8 (28.57)	0.134	0.715
	No	54 (75.00)	20 (71.43)		
Diabetes, n (%)	Yes	27 (37.50)	5 (17.86)	3.575	0.059
	No	45 (62.50)	23 (82.14)		
History of biliary tract surgery, n (%)	Yes	12 (16.67)	2 (7.14)	1.519	0.218
	No	60 (83.33)	26 (92.86)		
Parapillary diverticulum, n (%)	Yes	18 (25.00)	18 (64.29)	13.504	< 0.001
	No	54 (75.00)	10 (35.71)		
No. of stones, n (%)	≤ 3	46 (63.89)	11 (39.29)	4.979	0.026
	> 3	26 (36.11)	17 (60.71)		
Bile culture positive, n (%)		19 (26.39)	18 (64.29)	12.421	< 0.001
Postoperative treatment, n (%)	Control	26 (36.11)	21 (75.00)	12.240	< 0.001
	UDCA	46 (63.89)	7 (25.00)		
Common bile duct diameter(mm), median (P ₂₅ , P ₇₅)		14.00 (12.00, 15.00)	16.00 (14.00, 17.00)	-3.265	0.001
Maximum stone diameter(mm), median (P ₂₅ , P ₇₅)		12.00 (11.25, 13.75)	15.00 (12.00, 16.00)	-3.599	< 0.001
ERCP time (min, mean $\pm$ SD)		63.93 $\pm$ 5.12	65.82 $\pm$ 5.33	1.640	0.140
WBC ($\times 10^9$ /L, mean $\pm$ SD)		6.45 $\pm$ 1.05	6.38 $\pm$ 1.27	-0.290	0.772
PCT (ng/mL), median (P ₂₅ , P ₇₅)		0.18 (0.12, 0.27)	0.18 (0.12, 0.28)	-0.088	0.930
TBiL (μ mol/L, mean $\pm$ SD)		97.85 $\pm$ 10.95	97.32 $\pm$ 12.43	-0.211	0.833
DBiL (μ mol/L, mean $\pm$ SD)		64.13 $\pm$ 7.64	62.02 $\pm$ 7.76	-1.234	0.220
GGT (U/L, mean $\pm$ SD)		330.90 $\pm$ 19.82	325.88 $\pm$ 21.99	-1.102	0.273
ALT (U/L, mean $\pm$ SD)		272.31 $\pm$ 22.87	269.09 $\pm$ 24.88	-0.617	0.538
ALP (U/L, mean $\pm$ SD)		259.81 $\pm$ 25.79	259.36 $\pm$ 23.50	-0.079	0.937
AST (U/L, mean $\pm$ SD)		201.12 $\pm$ 16.02	201.44 $\pm$ 15.55	0.089	0.929

ERCP: Endoscopic retro-grade cholangiopancreatography; UDCA: Ursodeoxycholic acid; WBC: White blood cell; PCT: Procalcitonin; TBiL: Total bilirubin; DBiL: Direct bilirubin; GGT: Gamma-glutamyl transferase; ALT: Alanine aminotransferase; ALP: Alkaline phosphatase; AST: Aspartate aminotransferase.

CONCLUSION

We retrospectively studied patients who underwent ERCP for choledocholithiasis, with a special emphasis on the use of UDCA. The main findings of this study were as follows: (1) Prophylactic use of UDCA after ERCP helps reduce intrahepatic bile stasis, promotes hepatic function recovery, and effectively reduces the rate of stone recurrence; and (2) Parapapillary diverticulum, number of stones > 3, positive bile culture, and maximum stone diameter are independent correlates of increased recurrence rates after ERCP in patients with choledochal stones. Postoperative UDCA level was found to be a preventive factor.

Future research directions could include the following aspects: (1) Further exploration of other potential factors that may influence the recurrence of common bile duct stones (CBDS), such as the patients' lifestyles, genetic factors, *etc.*; (2) Investigation of new intervention measures to reduce the recurrence rate after endoscopic treatment of CBDS, such as the

Table 5 Variable assignment description

Variables	Assignment
Parapillary diverticulum	0 = no, 1 = yes
No. of stones	0 = ≤ 2, 1 = > 3
Bile culture positive	0 = no, 1 = yes
Postoperative treatment	0 = UDCA, 1 = control
Common bile duct diameter	Original value
Maximum stone diameter	Original value

UDCA: Ursodeoxycholic acid.

Table 6 Multivariate logistic regression analysis comparing the non-recurrent group vs recurrent groups

Variables	β	SE	Wald χ^2	P value	OR (95%CI)
Parapillary diverticulum	1.792	0.646	7.692	0.006	6.003 (1.692-21.303)
No. of stones > 3	1.443	0.654	4.863	0.027	4.233 (1.174-15.263)
Bile culture positive	2.029	0.663	9.357	0.002	47.606 (2.073-27.910)
Postoperative UDCA	-1.287	0.628	4.199	0.040	0.072 (0.080-0.094)
Maximum stone diameter	0.527	0.265	3.957	0.047	1.694 (1.008-2.847)
Constant	-8.895	2.360	14.211	< 0.001	-

UDCA: Ursodeoxycholic acid.

use of UDCA for intervention; (3) Study the optimal retreatment strategies for patients with recurrent CBDS to improve treatment outcomes and reduce recurrence rates; (4) Comparison of the effectiveness of different treatment methods, such as endoscopic treatment and surgical treatment, in terms of recurrence rates and complications; and (5) Further research on the pathogenesis of common bile duct stones is needed to better prevent and treat this disease.

ARTICLE HIGHLIGHTS

Research background

Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP) is a commonly used modality for the treatment of choledocholithiasis, with a stone clearance rate of up to 95%; however, the recurrence rate has not decreased. Ursodeoxycholic acid (UDCA) is a postoperative drug used to prevent stone recurrence; however, its effectiveness is yet to be explored. Therefore, this study focused on biliopancreatic surgery to investigate the interventional effect of UDCA after ERCP for choledocholithiasis and analyze the risk factors for recurrence.

Research motivation

Recurrence of choledocholithiasis after ERCP brings pain to patients; therefore, this paper retrospectively analyzes the intervention effect of UDCA after ERCP for choledocholithiasis and the risk factors of recurrence, in order to provide a new research direction and reference for the prevention and treatment of stone recurrence.

Research objectives

To analyze the intervention effect of the prophylactic use of UDCA after ERCP and the influencing factors of postoperative recurrence, and to explain the mechanism of action.

Research methods

The clinical records of 100 cases after ERCP were retrospectively selected, the therapeutic effects of non-UDCA and UDCA after ERCP and their effects on liver function were evaluated, and the rate of relapse within the two patient populations was compared. The risk factors for relapse were determined.

Research results

The clinical efficacy rates were 92.45% in UDCA group and 78.72% in control groups. The factors associated with recurrence after ERCP for choledochal stones included parapapillary diverticulum, number of stones > 3, positive bile culture, postoperative UDCA, and maximum stone diameter.

Research conclusions

The administration of UDCA to patients with common bile duct stones following ERCP can enhance liver function recovery and effectively decrease relapse.

Research perspectives

Future studies should explore the relevant mechanisms of action of UDCA treatment and construct a risk prediction model to evaluate its clinical benefits.

FOOTNOTES

Author contributions: Yuan WH designed and wrote the paper; Yuan T designed the research and supervised the report; Zhang Z, Pan Q and Mao BN designed the research and contributed to the analysis; all authors have approved the manuscript.

Institutional review board statement: The study was reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board of Yixing People's Hospital.

Informed consent statement: Patients were not required to give informed consent to the study because the analysis used anonymous clinical data that were obtained after each patient agreed to treatment by written consent.

Conflict-of-interest statement: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Data sharing statement: The clinical data used in this study can be obtained from the corresponding author upon request.

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-Hong Yuan 0009-0007-2772-5692; Zheng Zhang 0009-0003-4679-9364; Qi Pan 0009-0000-9517-8511; Bo-Neng Mao 0000-0002-6680-236X; Tao Yuan 0009-0001-3051-2176.

S-Editor: Yan JP

L-Editor: A

P-Editor: Chen YX

REFERENCES

- Lee YJ, Park YS, Park JH. Cholecystectomy is Feasible in Children with Small-Sized or Large Numbers of Gallstones and in Those with Persistent Symptoms Despite Medical Treatment. *Pediatr Gastroenterol Hepatol Nutr* 2020; **23**: 430-438 [PMID: 32953638 DOI: 10.5223/pghn.2020.23.5.430]
- Akmal AM, Putra BP, Darmaningrat CIAA, Nariswari IGARC, Srigede LD, Budyono C. Management of Cholelithiasis with Concomitant Choledocholithiasis. *Acta Med Indones* 2022; **54**: 151-157 [PMID: 35398838]
- Troncone E, Mossa M, De Vico P, Monteleone G, Del Vecchio Blanco G. Difficult Biliary Stones: A Comprehensive Review of New and Old Lithotripsy Techniques. *Medicina (Kaunas)* 2022; **58** [PMID: 35056428 DOI: 10.3390/medicina58010120]
- Cianci P, Restini E. Management of cholelithiasis with choledocholithiasis: Endoscopic and surgical approaches. *World J Gastroenterol* 2021; **27**: 4536-4554 [PMID: 34366622 DOI: 10.3748/wjg.v27.i28.4536]
- Wu Y, Xu CJ, Xu SF. Advances in Risk Factors for Recurrence of Common Bile Duct Stones. *Int J Med Sci* 2021; **18**: 1067-1074 [PMID: 33456365 DOI: 10.7150/ijms.52974]
- Chang HY, Wang CJ, Liu B, Wang YZ, Wang WJ, Wang W, Li D, Li YL. Ursodeoxycholic acid combined with percutaneous transhepatic balloon dilation for management of gallstones after elimination of common bile duct stones. *World J Gastroenterol* 2018; **24**: 4489-4498 [PMID: 30356997 DOI: 10.3748/wjg.v24.i39.4489]
- Chen X, Yan XR, Zhang LP. Ursodeoxycholic acid after common bile duct stones removal for prevention of recurrence: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Medicine (Baltimore)* 2018; **97**: e13086 [PMID: 30407311 DOI: 10.1097/MD.00000000000013086]
- Cai JS, Qiang S, Bao-Bing Y. Advances of recurrent risk factors and management of choledocholithiasis. *Scand J Gastroenterol* 2017; **52**: 34-43 [PMID: 27610642 DOI: 10.1080/00365521.2016.1224382]
- Manes G, Paspatis G, Aabakken L, Anderloni A, Arvanitakis M, Ah-Soune P, Barthet M, Domagk D, Dumonceau JM, Gigot JF, Hritz I,

- Karamanolis G, Laghi A, Mariani A, Paraskeva K, Pohl J, Ponchon T, Swahn F, Ter Steege RWF, Tringali A, Vezakis A, Williams EJ, van Hooft JE. Endoscopic management of common bile duct stones: European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ESGE) guideline. *Endoscopy* 2019; **51**: 472-491 [PMID: 30943551 DOI: 10.1055/a-0862-0346]
- 10 Wang L, Rui X, He HW, Zhou X, Long Y. Ursodeoxycholic Acid (UDCA) Reduces Hepatocyte Apoptosis by Inhibiting Farnesoid X Receptor (FXR) in Hemorrhagic Shock (HS). *Curr Mol Med* 2023; **23**: 550-558 [PMID: 35619282 DOI: 10.2174/1566524022666220525152811]
 - 11 Buryova H, Chalupsky K, Zbodakova O, Kanchev I, Jirouskova M, Gregor M, Sedlacek R. Liver protective effect of ursodeoxycholic acid includes regulation of ADAM17 activity. *BMC Gastroenterol* 2013; **13**: 155 [PMID: 24172289 DOI: 10.1186/1471-230X-13-155]
 - 12 Zhang Y, Jiang R, Zheng X, Lei S, Huang F, Xie G, Kwee S, Yu H, Farrar C, Sun B, Zhao A, Jia W. Ursodeoxycholic acid accelerates bile acid enterohepatic circulation. *Br J Pharmacol* 2019; **176**: 2848-2863 [PMID: 31077342 DOI: 10.1111/bph.14705]
 - 13 Beuers U, Trampert DC. [Ursodeoxycholic acid: history and clinical implications]. *Ned Tijdschr Geneesk* 2022; **166** [PMID: 36300467]
 - 14 Choi JH, Lee SH, Cho IR, Paik WH, Ryu JK, Kim YT. Ursodeoxycholic acid for the prevention of gallstone and subsequent cholecystectomy following gastric surgery: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Hepatobiliary Pancreat Sci* 2021; **28**: 409-418 [PMID: 33768730 DOI: 10.1002/jhbp.946]
 - 15 Mulliri A, Menahem B, Alves A, Dupont B. Ursodeoxycholic acid for the prevention of gallstones and subsequent cholecystectomy after bariatric surgery: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *J Gastroenterol* 2022; **57**: 529-539 [PMID: 35704084 DOI: 10.1007/s00535-022-01886-4]
 - 16 Deng F, Zhou M, Liu PP, Hong JB, Li GH, Zhou XJ, Chen YX. Causes associated with recurrent choledocholithiasis following therapeutic endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography: A large sample sized retrospective study. *World J Clin Cases* 2019; **7**: 1028-1037 [PMID: 31123675 DOI: 10.12998/wjcc.v7.i9.1028]
 - 17 Tantau M, Mercea V, Crisan D, Tantau A, Mester G, Vesa S, Sparchez Z. ERCP on a cohort of 2,986 patients with cholelithiasis: a 10-year experience of a single center. *J Gastrointest Liver Dis* 2013; **22**: 141-147 [PMID: 23799212]
 - 18 Mu H, Gao J, Kong Q, Jiang K, Wang C, Wang A, Zeng X, Li Y. Prognostic Factors and Postoperative Recurrence of Calculus Following Small-Incision Sphincterotomy with Papillary Balloon Dilation for the Treatment of Intractable Choledocholithiasis: A 72-Month Follow-Up Study. *Dig Dis Sci* 2015; **60**: 2144-2149 [PMID: 25875753 DOI: 10.1007/s10620-015-3559-2]
 - 19 Nzenza TC, Al-Habbal Y, Guerra GR, Manolas S, Yong T, McQuillan T. Recurrent common bile duct stones as a late complication of endoscopic sphincterotomy. *BMC Gastroenterol* 2018; **18**: 39 [PMID: 29544453 DOI: 10.1186/s12876-018-0765-3]
 - 20 Akay T, Sari E. Identification of risk factors involved in recurrence after common bile duct stone removal with ERCP: A retrospective observational study. *Medicine (Baltimore)* 2022; **101**: e29037 [PMID: 35244085 DOI: 10.1097/MD.00000000000029037]
 - 21 Wu SD, Uchiyama K, Fan Y. The role and mechanism of fatty acids in gallstones. *Hepatobiliary Pancreat Dis Int* 2007; **6**: 399-401 [PMID: 17690037]
 - 22 Roma MG, Toledo FD, Boaglio AC, Basiglio CL, Crocenzi FA, Sánchez Pozzi EJ. Ursodeoxycholic acid in cholestasis: linking action mechanisms to therapeutic applications. *Clin Sci (Lond)* 2011; **121**: 523-544 [PMID: 21854363 DOI: 10.1042/CS20110184]
 - 23 Huang L, Li S, Chen J, Zhu Y, Lan K, Zeng L, Jiang X, Zhang L. Efficacy and safety of ursodeoxycholic acid in children with cholestasis: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One* 2023; **18**: e0280691 [PMID: 36719881 DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0280691]
 - 24 Halilbasic E, Steinacher D, Trauner M. Nor-Ursodeoxycholic Acid as a Novel Therapeutic Approach for Cholestatic and Metabolic Liver Diseases. *Dig Dis* 2017; **35**: 288-292 [PMID: 28249255 DOI: 10.1159/000454904]



Published by **Baishideng Publishing Group Inc**
7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

Telephone: +1-925-3991568

E-mail: office@baishideng.com

Help Desk: <https://www.f6publishing.com/helpdesk>

<https://www.wjgnet.com>

