

# World Journal of *Gastrointestinal Surgery*

*World J Gastrointest Surg* 2024 March 27; 16(3): 635-973



**EDITORIAL**

- 635 *Ex vivo* liver resection and auto-transplantation and special systemic therapy in perihilar cholangiocarcinoma treatment  
*Tchilikidi KY*
- 641 Indocyanine green: The guide to safer and more effective surgery  
*Fransvea P, Chiarello MM, Fico V, Cariati M, Brisinda G*

**MINIREVIEWS**

- 650 Alcohol associated liver disease and bariatric surgery: Current perspectives and future directions  
*Cooper KM, Colletta A, Hebda N, Devuni D*
- 658 Applications of gastric peroral endoscopic myotomy in the treatment of upper gastrointestinal tract disease  
*Chang SY, Jin GH, Sun HB, Yang D, Tang TY*

**ORIGINAL ARTICLE****Retrospective Cohort Study**

- 670 Evaluation of bacterial contamination and medium-term oncological outcomes of intracorporeal anastomosis for colon cancer: A propensity score matching analysis  
*Kayano H, Mamuro N, Kamei Y, Ogimi T, Miyakita H, Nakagohri T, Koyanagi K, Mori M, Yamamoto S*
- 681 Rescue from complications after pancreaticoduodenectomies at a low-volume Caribbean center: Value of tailored peri-pancreatectomy protocols  
*Cawich SO, Dixon E, Shukla PJ, Shrikhande SV, Deshpande RR, Mohammed F, Pearce NW, Francis W, Johnson S, Bujhawan J*
- 689 Comparison of prognosis and postoperative morbidities between standard pancreaticoduodenectomy and the TRIANGLE technique for resectable pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma  
*Hang HX, Cai ZH, Yang YF, Fu X, Qiu YD, Cheng H*
- 700 Analysis of the impact of immunotherapy efficacy and safety in patients with gastric cancer and liver metastasis  
*Liu K, Wu CX, Liang H, Wang T, Zhang JY, Wang XT*

**Retrospective Study**

- 710 Clinical observation of extraction-site incisional hernia after laparoscopic colorectal surgery  
*Fan BH, Zhong KL, Zhu LJ, Chen Z, Li F, Wu WF*
- 717 Predicting short-term major postoperative complications in intestinal resection for Crohn's disease: A machine learning-based study  
*Wang FT, Lin Y, Yuan XQ, Gao RY, Wu XC, Xu WW, Wu TQ, Xia K, Jiao YR, Yin L, Chen CQ*

- 731 Analysis of factors impacting postoperative pain and quality of life in patients with mixed hemorrhoids: A retrospective study  
*Sun XW, Xu JY, Zhu CZ, Li SJ, Jin LJ, Zhu ZD*
- 740 Pre-operative visceral adipose tissue radiodensity is a potentially novel prognostic biomarker for early endoscopic post-operative recurrence in Crohn's disease  
*Gu P, Dube S, Gellada N, Choi SY, Win S, Lee YJ, Yang S, Haritunians T, Melmed GY, Vasiliauskas EA, Bonthala N, Syal G, Yarur AJ, Ziring D, Rabizadeh S, Fleshner P, Kallman C, Devkota S, Targan SR, Li D, McGovern DP*
- 751 Clinical study on the relationship between liver cirrhosis, ascites, and hyponatremia  
*Li XJ, Meng HH*
- 759 Comparison of the clinical effects of dual-modality endoscopy and traditional laparotomy for the treatment of intra- and extrahepatic bile duct stones  
*Wang W, Xia H, Dai B*
- 768 Role of ablation therapy in conjunction with surgical resection for neuroendocrine tumors involving the liver  
*Ostapenko A, Stroever S, Eyasu L, Kim M, Aploks K, Dong XD, Seshadri R*
- 777 Feasibility and safety of minimally invasive multivisceral resection for T4b rectal cancer: A 9-year review  
*Chan KS, Liu B, Tan MNA, How KY, Wong KY*
- 790 MH-STRALP: A scoring system for prognostication in patients with upper gastrointestinal bleeding  
*Hu JN, Xu F, Hao YR, Sun CY, Wu KM, Lin Y, Zhong L, Zeng X*
- Clinical Trials Study**
- 807 Early postoperative complications after transverse colostomy closure, a retrospective study  
*Liu F, Luo XJ, Li ZW, Liu XY, Liu XR, Lv Q, Shu XP, Zhang W, Peng D*
- 816 Clinical study of enhanced recovery after surgery in laparoscopic appendectomy for acute appendicitis  
*Li ZL, Ma HC, Yang Y, Chen JJ, Wang ZJ*
- Observational Study**
- 823 Reinforced tissue matrix to strengthen the abdominal wall following reversal of temporary ostomies or to treat incisional hernias  
*Lake SP, Deeken CR, Agarwal AK*
- Randomized Controlled Trial**
- 833 Whole-process case management effects on mental state and self-care ability in patients with liver cancer  
*Ju MD, Qin Q, Li M*
- Clinical and Translational Research**
- 842 Construction and validation of somatic mutation-derived long non-coding RNAs signatures of genomic instability to predict prognosis of hepatocellular carcinoma  
*Duan BT, Zhao XK, Cui YY, Liu DZ, Wang L, Zhou L, Zhang XY*

**Basic Study**

- 860 Influence of different magnetic forces on the effect of colonic anastomosis in rats  
*Tian BY, Zhang MM, Ma J, Lyu Y, Yan XP*
- 871 Inflammatory responses in esophageal mucosa before and after laparoscopic antireflux surgery  
*Ergun P, Kipcak S, Selvi Gunel N, Yildirim Sozmen E, Bor S*
- 882 Etanercept-synthesizing adipose-derived stem cell secretome: A promising therapeutic option for inflammatory bowel disease  
*Kim SJ, Kim OH, Hong HE, Ju JH, Lee DS*

**SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS**

- 893 Impact of frailty on short-term postoperative outcomes in patients undergoing colorectal cancer surgery: A systematic review and meta-analysis  
*Zhou Y, Zhang XL, Ni HX, Shao TJ, Wang P*

**META-ANALYSIS**

- 907 Endoscopic-ultrasound-guided biliary drainage with placement of electrocautery-enhanced lumen-apposing metal stent for palliation of malignant biliary obstruction: Updated meta-analysis  
*Peng ZX, Chen FF, Tang W, Zeng X, Du HJ, Pi RX, Liu HM, Lu XX*
- 921 Clinical efficacy and safety of erlotinib combined with chemotherapy in the treatment of advanced pancreatic cancer: A meta-analysis  
*Liu XY, Pan HN, Yu Y*

**CASE REPORT**

- 932 Link between mutations in *ACVRL1* and *PLA2G4A* genes and chronic intestinal ulcers: A case report and review of literature  
*Tang YJ, Zhang J, Wang J, Tian RD, Zhong WW, Yao BS, Hou BY, Chen YH, He W, He YH*
- 944 Mucinous neoplasm of the appendix: A case report and review of literature  
*Chang HC, Kang JC, Pu TW, Su RY, Chen CY, Hu JM*
- 955 Abdominal cocoon syndrome-a rare culprit behind small bowel ischemia and obstruction: Three case reports  
*Vipudhamorn W, Juthasilaparut T, Sutharat P, Sanmee S, Supatrakul E*
- 966 Endoscopic ultrasound-guided lauromacrogol injection for treatment of colorectal cavernous hemangioma: Two case reports  
*Zhu HT, Chen WG, Wang JJ, Guo JN, Zhang FM, Xu GQ, Chen HT*

**ABOUT COVER**

Editorial Board Member of *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*, Jia-Gang Han, MD, Professor, Department of General Surgery, Beijing Chaoyang Hospital, Capital Medical University, Beijing 100020, China. [hjg211@163.com](mailto:hjg211@163.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 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

**EDITORIAL BOARD MEMBERS**

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

**PUBLICATION DATE**

March 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>

**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>

## Basic Study

## Influence of different magnetic forces on the effect of colonic anastomosis in rats

Bo-Yan Tian, Miao-Miao Zhang, Jia Ma, Yi Lyu, Xiao-Peng Yan

**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): B  
Grade C (Good): 0  
Grade D (Fair): 0  
Grade E (Poor): 0**P-Reviewer:** Trébol J, Spain**Received:** October 16, 2023**Peer-review started:** October 16, 2023**First decision:** January 12, 2024**Revised:** January 18, 2024**Accepted:** February 6, 2024**Article in press:** February 6, 2024**Published online:** March 27, 2024**Bo-Yan Tian, Miao-Miao Zhang, Yi Lyu, Xiao-Peng Yan**, Department of Hepatobiliary Surgery, The First Affiliated Hospital of Xi'an Jiaotong University, Xi'an 710061, Shaanxi Province, China**Miao-Miao Zhang, Yi Lyu, Xiao-Peng Yan**, National Local Joint Engineering Research Center for Precision Surgery & Regenerative Medicine, The First Affiliated Hospital of Xi'an Jiaotong University, Xi'an 710061, Shaanxi Province, China**Jia Ma**, Department of Surgical Oncology, Shaanxi Provincial People's Hospital, Xi'an 710068, Shaanxi Province, China**Corresponding author:** Xiao-Peng Yan, MD, PhD, Associate Research Scientist, Department of Hepatobiliary Surgery, The First Affiliated Hospital of Xi'an Jiaotong University, No. 277 West Yanta Road, Xi'an 710061, Shaanxi Province, China. [yanxiaopeng9966@163.com](mailto:yanxiaopeng9966@163.com)**Abstract****BACKGROUND**

Despite much work having been conducted on magnetic compression anastomosis (MCA) in the digestive tract, there are no reports on the influence of magnetic force on the anastomosis.

**AIM**

To investigate the effect of different magnetic force magnets on the MCA of the digestive tract.

**METHODS**Two groups of magnets of the same sizes but different magnetic forces were designed and produced. A total of 24 Sprague-Dawley rats were randomly assigned into two groups (powerful magnet group and common magnet group), with 12 rats in each group. Two types of magnets were used to complete the colonic side-to-side anastomosis of the rats. The operation time and magnet discharge time were recorded. The anastomotic specimens were obtained 4 wk after the operation and then the burst pressure and diameter of the anastomosis were measured, and the anastomosis was observed *via* the naked eye and subjected to histological examination.**RESULTS**

The magnetic forces of the powerful and common magnet groups at zero distance

were 8.26 N and 4.10 N, respectively. The colonic side-to-side anastomosis was completed in all 24 rats, and the operation success rate and postoperative survival rate were 100%. No significant difference was noted in the operation time between the two groups. The magnet discharge time of the powerful magnet group was slightly longer than that of the common magnet group, but the difference was not statistically significant ( $P = 0.513$ ). Furthermore, there was no statistical difference in the burst pressure ( $P = 0.266$ ) or diameter of magnetic anastomosis ( $P = 0.095$ ) between the two groups. The gross specimens of the two groups showed good anastomotic healing, and histological observation indicated good mucosal continuity without differences on healing.

## CONCLUSION

In the rat colonic side-to-side MCA model, both the powerful magnet with 8.26 N and the common magnet with 4.10 N showed no significant impact on the anastomosis establishment process or its effect.

**Key Words:** Magnetosurgery; Magnetic compression anastomosis; Colonic anastomosis; Magnetic force; Rats

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

**Core Tip:** Magnetic compression anastomosis, which is a new type of anastomosis, has been extensively studied in digestive tract anastomosis in animals and humans. Previous studies have focused on the feasibility and safety of different magnetic designs for gastrointestinal anastomosis. Moreover, some scholars have proposed the hypothesis that magnetic force may affect the anastomosis effect. In this study, two groups of magnets matched for shape and size but with different magnetic forces were used in colonic side-to-side anastomosis experiments. The findings demonstrated that magnetic force in the range of 4.10-8.26 N did not affect the colonic side-to-side anastomosis.

**Citation:** Tian BY, Zhang MM, Ma J, Lyu Y, Yan XP. Influence of different magnetic forces on the effect of colonic anastomosis in rats. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2024; 16(3): 860-870

**URL:** <https://www.wjgnet.com/1948-9366/full/v16/i3/860.htm>

**DOI:** <https://dx.doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v16.i3.860>

## INTRODUCTION

Since Obora reported the study of microvascular magnetic anastomosis in 1978, magnetic compression anastomosis (MCA) has attracted the attention of clinicians. The research on MCA and its clinical application in gastroenterology comprises esophageal[1-3], gastrointestinal[4-6], and small bowel[7-9] anastomosis. Other examples include vascular[10-11] and ureterovesical[12] anastomosis. During MCA of the digestive tract, the pathological process is ischemia-necrosis-shedding in the compressed tissues between the magnets and adherence-repair-healing in the surrounding tissues[13].

In MCA of the digestive tract, owing to differences in the materials, shape, size, and magnetic force of magnets used by various researchers, there is a lack of comparability in the quantitative indicators of the research findings (anastomosis establishment time, anastomosis size, and magnet discharge time). Some scholars also believe that there is an “optimal magnetic force” in MCA and have accordingly suggested that the magnetic force should be within this range when designing magnetic anastomosis devices[14,15]. Of course, the design of magnetic anastomosis device should also consider the tissue thickness, tissue edema, inflammation degree, and other related factors. However, there are only a few relevant studies, and, in the available studies, there are some flaws in the experimental design, which limit the results or obtained conclusions. Based on our cumulative research experience as a team, we believe that although magnetic devices used in digestive tract MCA should have a certain magnetic force, there might only be a lower limit for this force and not an optimal range. We propose this hypothesis based on our observation that the problem faced quite often is the magnetic force being too small to meet the demand, rather than it being too high.

In this study, a powerful magnet with a magnetic force more than two times that of common magnets was designed. The colon of Sprague-Dawley (SD) rats was used as a model to explore the influence of different magnetic forces on the MCA effect in the digestive tract.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### Ethical statement

The experimental protocol was approved by the Animal Ethics Committee of Xi'an Jiaotong University (license No. 2021-1534). A total of 24 SD albino rats (male = 12, female = 12) weighing 200-250 g were acquired from the Laboratory Animal Center of the Xi'an Jiaotong University (Xi'an, China) and used as experimental animals. The research protocol and all experimental procedures were conducted strictly in accordance with the Guidelines for the Care and Use of Experimental Animals issued by the Xi'an Jiaotong University Medical Center.

## Magnets

Two types of magnets were used in this study. One was a common magnet, which was processed using N 35 sintered-type neodymium-iron-boron (NdFeB). This magnet is a cylinder of diameter 5 mm and height 3 mm, and its surface is nickel-coated. The other one is a powerful magnet, which was processed using N 52 sintered NdFeB; its size and surface coating is the same as that of the common magnet. The two types of magnets are shown in [Figure 1](#). At zero distance, the magnetic forces of the two types of magnets were 4.10 N and 8.26 N, respectively. The magnetic displacement curves of the two magnets are depicted in [Figure 2](#), and their physical parameters are listed in [Table 1](#).

## Study design

This study aimed to investigate the effect of the magnetic force on the MCA of the digestive tract. A transanal colonic side-to-side anastomosis model with minimal effect on the outcome was used. The SD rats were randomly categorized into common and powerful magnet groups, and the two types of magnets were used to complete the colonic side-to-side anastomosis. The operation time and magnet discharge time were recorded. Anastomotic specimens were obtained by euthanizing the animals 4 wk after the operation. The burst pressure and diameter of the anastomosis were measured, and the formation of the anastomosis was observed *via* the naked eye and by using a light microscope (Nikon Eclipse E100, Nikon Corporation).

## Surgical procedure

The SD rats were fed with a slag-free liquid diet 2 d before the surgery. In addition, they were fasted, and their water intake was restricted 4 h before the surgery. The animals were anesthetized *via* the intraperitoneal injection of pentobarbital sodium solution (30 mg/kg). After confirming the loss of the paw withdrawal reflex, the animals were fixed to a temperature-controlled operating table and their hypogastrium was shaved. The abdominal cavity was accessed *via* a 3 cm median incision in the skin of the lower abdomen and abdominal musculature in all rats. A magnet was pushed through the anus into the distal colon. A cotton swab was used to push it into the proximal colon under direct vision, at which time another magnet was pushed through the anus into the distal colon. After adjusting both magnets in their appropriate positions, they were attracted near the anti-mesenteric of the colon. The colon was placed back in the abdominal cavity, which was closed with a silk suture. The surgical procedure is illustrated in [Figure 3](#).

## Postoperative care

After the recovery from anesthesia, the animals were fed normally. During the first 3 d after surgery, intramuscular pethidine (0.1 mg/100 g) was injected every 12 h. The mental state, feeding, and defecation of rats were closely monitored after the operation. The stool was checked daily until the magnet was expelled through the anus. The magnet discharge time was recorded for each rat.

## Tissue harvest and burst pressure

The rats were euthanized *via* an intraperitoneal injection of pentobarbital sodium solution (60 mg/kg) 4 wk after the surgery, and anastomotic gross specimens were obtained (the proximal end was colon bypass anastomosis with 3-5 cm of the proximal colon, and the distal end was the anus). A catheter was introduced through the other end and ligated using a single silk suture. The entire anastomosis segment was immersed in 0.9% saline. Subsequently, the intraluminal pressure was increased gradually, and the value was recorded when the first air bubble leaked from the colon and rose to the surface of the liquid. This pressure was considered the burst pressure.

## Anastomotic gross observation and anastomotic diameter measurement

The colon specimens were dissected longitudinally from both sides of the anastomosis, and the formation of the anastomosis was observed *via* the naked eye. The tip of the conical aperture scale was inserted into the colon anastomosis, and the intestinal anastomosis specimen was slid toward the end of the handle with appropriate force. When the resistance increased, the movement was stopped. At this time, the scale corresponding to the conical aperture scale indicated the magnetic anastomosis diameter.

## Histological analyses

The anastomotic specimen was soaked overnight in 10% formalin for fixation and embedded in paraffin, and a 4  $\mu$ m-thick section was prepared from the anastomosis. The sections were stained with hematoxylin and eosin (H&E) and Masson trichrome and examined under a bright-field microscope.


## Statistical analyses

IBM SPSS statistical software version 20.0 was used for data analyses. Normally distributed quantitative data were described using mean and standard deviation, whereas non-normally distributed data were represented as median. Differences between the groups were compared using an independent samples *t*-test or a nonparametric test.  $P < 0.05$  indicated a significant difference.

Table 1 Parameters of the powerful magnet and common magnet

Group	Material (NdFeB)	Size (mm)	Weight (g)	Surfaces modification	MFD (mT)	Magnetic force (N)		
						0 mm <sup>1</sup>	0.5 mm <sup>1</sup>	1 mm <sup>1</sup>
Powerful magnet	N52	D = 5 H = 3	0.44	Nickel coating	421	8.26	5.07	3.44
Common magnet	N35	D = 5 H = 3	0.40	Nickel coating	283	4.10	2.65	1.78

<sup>1</sup>The distance between the working faces of the two magnets. D: Diameter; H: Height; MFD: Magnetic flux density.



**Figure 1 Magnets.** A: Front view of the powerful magnet; B: Side view of the powerful magnet; C: Front view of the common magnet; D: Side view of the common magnet.

## RESULTS

### Procedural parameters

The colonic side-to-side anastomosis was performed successfully in all experimental animals with magnets inserted through the anus. During the operation, the implantation of the magnet was smooth, and it successfully completed the attraction after reaching the target position without perforation or bleeding. The operation times of the powerful and common magnet groups were  $11.6 \pm 2.3$  min and  $11.8 \pm 2.4$  min, respectively, with no statistical difference between the two groups ( $P = 0.865$ ). The intraoperative procedures of the two groups are presented in [Figure 4](#).

### Survival rate and postoperative adverse events


All rats survived until 4 wk after the surgery (survival rate 100%). The mental state and food intake of the animals were normal after the operation, and there were no postoperative complications, such as bleeding or intestinal obstruction.

### Expulsion time of the magnets

When the anastomosis was formed, all magnets were smoothly discharged from the body. The magnet discharge time of rats in the powerful magnet group ( $5.3 \pm 1.4$  d) was slightly longer than that in the common magnet group ( $5.6 \pm 1.1$  d), but there was no statistical difference between the two groups ( $P = 0.513$ ).

### Tissue harvest, burst pressure, and anastomotic measurements

All experimental animals were euthanized 4 wk after the surgery, and colon samples of at least 3 cm on both ends,



**Figure 2 Magnetic force test.** A: Magnetic force test procedure; B: Magnetic force curve of the magnet.

including the anastomosis, were obtained. The burst pressure of the anastomosis was measured using the water pumping method, and the results showed a lack of statistical difference between the two groups ( $261.3 \pm 6.0$  mmHg *vs*  $264.3 \pm 6.9$  mmHg,  $P = 0.266$ ). The anastomotic diameters of the two groups were  $5.5 \pm 0.4$  mm and  $5.8 \pm 0.5$  mm, respectively, with no statistical difference ( $P = 0.095$ ). The relevant data of the results are shown in [Table 2](#).

**Gross and histological appearance of the anastomosis**


The colons on both sides of the anastomosis were dissected longitudinally, and the mucosa of the anastomosis was smooth without retention of any foreign body (Figures 5 and 6). H&E and Masson staining indicated good continuity of the mucosal layer of the anastomosis (Figure 7). There was no significant difference in the anastomosis between the two groups.

**DISCUSSION**

Several feasibility studies have been performed on MCA, a new suture-free anastomosis method; however, its clinical application is limited[16,17]. On the one hand, there are few commercial magnetic anastomosis medical devices, and on the other hand, the basic research on MCA is weak. Some scholars believe that the magnetic force plays a pertinent role in MCA, which is related to the success of the anastomosis[18]. Therefore, some researchers have examined the optimal magnetic range for MCA in different tissues. Xue *et al*[19] using the dog as the animal model, concluded experimentally that 0.2-0.3 MPa is the most suitable magnetic force for choledochojejunal magnetic pressure. Another study reported that the magnetic force of 6.27-13.3 N is most suitable for small intestine anastomosis in dogs[15]. However, there are

Table 2 Sample data and observation index data


	Powerful magnet group	Common magnet group	P value
Subjects, <i>n</i>	12	12	1.00
Gender, <i>n</i> (%)			
Male	6 (50)	6 (50)	1.00
Female	6 (50)	6 (50)	
Weight (g)	234.3 ± 13.5	233.0 ± 14.4	0.828
Operative time (min)	11.6 ± 2.3	11.8 ± 2.4	0.865
Magnet discharge time (d)	5.3 ± 1.4	5.6 ± 1.1	0.513
Bursting pressure (mmHg)	261.3 ± 6.0	264.3 ± 6.9	0.266
Anastomotic diameter (mm)	5.5 ± 0.4	5.8 ± 0.5	0.095




**Figure 3 Schematic presentation of the surgical procedure.** A: A magnet is inserted through the anus into the proximal portion of the colon; B: Another magnet is inserted through the anus to the distal end of the colon; C: The two magnets in the colon are attracted; D: The magnets enter the rectum after a side-to-side colonic anastomosis is established.

presently only a few reports on the correlation between magnetic compression and the optimal magnetic force. There are differences in the schemes used, and the evaluation criteria for the optimal magnetic force are inconsistent. Hence, we believe that such studies are not sufficient.

Under a continuous magnetic force field, the intestinal wall compressed between the magnets is thought to undergo a pathological process of ischemia-necrosis-shedding. Simultaneously, the intestinal wall tissue adjacent to the magnets is believed to undergo adherence-repair-healing, which results in the formation of the anastomosis. The process of pathological change has reached a wide consensus in magnetic surgery research and has been recognized by most researchers. Based on this fact, some researchers believe that when the magnetic force is increased, the time of tissue ischemic necrosis and the time of magnetic anastomosis formation are reduced; on the contrary, when the magnetic force is reduced, the time of tissue ischemic necrosis and the time of magnetic anastomosis formation are increased. However, there is no consensus on the most suitable time for the formation of magnetic anastomosis. The so-called long or excessive anastomosis formation time may come from the subjective will of the researcher. Therefore, attempts have been made to shorten the time for establishing magnetic anastomosis by increasing the magnetic force. Nonetheless, some scholars have raised objections that excessive magnetic force can reduce the tissue ischemia-necrosis-shedding time, resulting in the incomplete healing of the tissues around the magnet. This could reduce the magnetic anastomotic burst pressure, which is an adverse consequence.




**Figure 4 Surgical procedure.** A: A powerful magnet is placed in the proximal colon (white arrow); B: A powerful magnet is placed in the distal end of the colon (black arrow); C: The two powerful magnets are attracted (yellow circle); D: A common magnet in the proximal colon area (white arrow); E: A common magnet in the distal end of the colon (black arrow); F: The two common magnets are attracted (yellow circle).




**Figure 5 Anastomotic gross specimen of the powerful magnet group.** A: Gross specimen of colon anastomosis; B and C: The anastomosis observed after a longitudinal dissection of the colon (white arrow); D: Measurement of the anastomotic diameter; E: Colonic anastomosis observed on the mucosal surface.

The findings from this investigation show that even when the magnetic force difference between the magnets is doubled, there is no significant difference in the magnet discharge time, anastomotic burst pressure, or colonic anastomotic healing effect. However, such a conclusion does not completely deny the potential influence of magnetic force factors on MCA of the digestive tract but merely suggests that the prime concern should be the minimum magnetic force required for MCA of the digestive tract, rather than the optimal range. In this study, the magnetic force of a similar-sized magnet was doubled, but it had no impact on the anastomosis effect. In other words, even if there is a maximum magnetic force that researchers imagine can cause a match to fail, currently available technologies cannot manufacture a magnet with such a magnetic force.

Although this study appears to have yielded a negative result, it is of great significance in the basic research on MCA. A simple animal experiment has corrected our misconceptions about the adverse effects of excessive magnetism. The findings of this investigation emphasize that developers of magnetic anastomosis devices should focus on the lower limit



**Figure 6 Anastomotic gross specimen of the common magnet group.** A: Gross specimen of colon anastomosis; B and C: The anastomosis observed after a longitudinal dissection of the colon (white arrow); D: Measurement of the anastomotic diameter; E: Colonic anastomosis observed on the mucosal surface.



**Figure 7 Histological images of the colonic anastomosis.** A: Hematoxylin and eosin staining of the colonic anastomosis in the powerful magnet group; B: Masson's staining of the colonic anastomosis in the powerful magnet group; C: Hematoxylin and eosin staining of the colonic anastomosis in the common magnet group; D: Masson's staining of the colonic anastomosis in the common magnet group.

of magnetic force, rather than its upper limit. With the expansion of the application scenarios of MCA, the shapes of magnets are also getting diversified [20-22], and the magnetic force of these irregularly shaped magnets will also vary significantly. However, recent studies have shown that the magnetic force change has no influence on the anastomosis [23-25], which is consistent with our research results. Based on these results, a preliminary hypothesis regarding MCA was proposed, referred to as the “Yan-Zhang’s Magnetic Force Sea-Level Theory”: In gastrointestinal magnetic compression anastomosis, as it is constrained by anatomical and functional, the God limits of magnetic force cannot be reached, yet the lower limits determine whether the result is submerged in icy seawater or basking in the warm sunshine. Nevertheless, this study has certain limitations. First of all, there are only two groups in this experiment, and multiple groups with different magnetic forces should be set up to enable discoveries. Secondly, there are only a few histological indicators of colon anastomotic specimens, hence the collagen content of the anastomotic specimens should be quantitatively detected, and the inflammatory cell infiltration of the anastomotic specimens should be observed by immunofluorescence staining. Finally, the observation time of this study is short, so it is possible to obtain anastomotic specimens

of more than 6 months for analysis in future studies. Therefore, designing magnets with different magnetic gradients and increasing the number of experimental groups may enhance the reliability of the experimental conclusions.

---

## CONCLUSION

---

The present results establish that a magnetic force of > 4 N had no significant impact on the effect of colonic side-to-side anastomosis in rats. This observation suggests that the minimum magnetic force, rather than the maximum force, required to achieve the anastomosis warrants our attention in the MCA of the digestive tract.

## ARTICLE HIGHLIGHTS

### **Research background**

Magnetic compression anastomosis, as a new type of anastomosis, mainly includes esophageal anastomosis, gastrointestinal anastomosis and intestinal anastomosis in the study and clinical application of digestive tract. At present, there are more and more researches on magnetic compression anastomosis (MCA), but there is no relevant research report on magnetic force and anastomosis healing.

### **Research motivation**

At present, there are few reports on the relationship between MCA and optimal magnetic force, and the evaluation criteria of optimal magnetic force are inconsistent. We think that such studies are not enough.

### **Research objectives**

To investigate the influence of different magnetic magnets on the anastomosis formed by MCA of digestive tract.

### **Research methods**

Colonic MCA was performed on two groups of rats using two sets of magnets of the same size but different magnetic forces. The anastomotic specimens were collected 4 wk after operation to evaluate the formation of the anastomosis in the two groups.

### **Research results**

There was no significant difference in operation time, bursting pressure and anastomotic diameter between the two groups. The discharge time of the strong magnet group was slightly longer than that of the common magnet group, but the difference was not statistically significant. The anastomosis of the two groups of specimens healed well, the continuity of the mucosa was good, and there was no difference in healing.

### **Research conclusions**

The results indicate that there is no significant difference in the formation of the anastomosis between the magnets with different magnetic forces used in this experiment.

### **Research perspectives**

Although this study seems to have a negative result, it has important significance in the basic research of MCA.

---

## FOOTNOTES

---

**Co-first authors:** Bo-Yan Tian and Miao-Miao Zhang.

**Co-corresponding authors:** Xiao-Peng Yan and Yi Lyu.

**Author contributions:** Lyu Y and Yan XP designed and coordinated the study; Tian BY, Zhang MM, Ma J, Yan XP performed the research and acquired the data; Tian BY, Zhang MM, Ma J analyzed the data; Zhang MM tested and analyzed the magnetic test; Tian BY, Zhang MM and Yan XP wrote the manuscript; Yan XP and Lyu Y conceived of the study and contributed to the study design, the interpretation of the results, and the critical revision of the manuscript; Yan XP and Zhang MM proposed the “Yan-Zhang’s Magnetic Force Sea-Level Theory”; all authors read and approved the final manuscript.

**Supported by** the Key Research and Development Program of Shaanxi, No. 2022SF-036; the Institutional Foundation of The First Affiliated Hospital of Xi’an Jiaotong University, No. 2022MS-07; and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities, No. xzy022023068.

**Institutional review board statement:** This study was reviewed and approved by the Xi’an Jiaotong University Institution Review Board, No. 2021-1534.

**Institutional animal care and use committee statement:** The study protocol and all experimental procedures were carried out strictly in accordance with the Guidelines for Care and Use of Experimental Animals issued by the Xi'an Jiaotong University Medical Center. This experimental study was approved by the Experimental Ethics Committee of Xi'an Jiaotong University, No. 2021-1534.

**Conflict-of-interest statement:** All the authors report no relevant conflicts of interest for this article.

**Data sharing statement:** The authors declare that the data supporting the findings of this study are available within the article or from the corresponding authors upon request.

**ARRIVE guidelines statement:** The authors have read the ARRIVE guidelines, and the manuscript was prepared and revised according to the ARRIVE guidelines.

**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:** Bo-Yan Tian 0000-0002-8806-138X; Miao-Miao Zhang 0000-0001-5679-7061; Jia Ma 0000-0002-9176-0472; Yi Lyu 0000-0003-3636-6664; Xiao-Peng Yan 0000-0002-0335-829X.

**S-Editor:** Gong ZM

**L-Editor:** A

**P-Editor:** Cai YX

## REFERENCES

- Hornok Z, Kubiak R, Csukas D, Ferencz A, Cserni T. Esophageal Magnetic Anastomosis Device (EMAD) to Simplify and Improve Outcome of Thoracoscopic Repair for Esophageal Atresia with Tracheoesophageal Fistula: A Proof of Concept Study. *J Pediatr Surg* 2023; **58**: 1489-1493 [PMID: 36307298 DOI: 10.1016/j.jpedsurg.2022.09.040]
- Sterlin A, Evans L, Mahler S, Lindner A, Dickmann J, Heimann A, Sahlabadi M, Aribindi V, Harrison MR, Muensterer OJ. An experimental study on long term outcomes after magnetic esophageal compression anastomosis in piglets. *J Pediatr Surg* 2022; **57**: 34-40 [PMID: 34656308 DOI: 10.1016/j.jpedsurg.2021.09.032]
- Mascagni P, Tringali A, Bošković I, Bove V, Schepis T, Perri V, Costamagna G. Magnetic kissing for the endoscopic treatment of a complete iatrogenic stenosis of the hypopharynx. *Endoscopy* 2023; **55**: E499-E500 [PMID: 36894138 DOI: 10.1055/a-2029-6340]
- Gagner M, Abuladze D, Koiava L, Buchwald JN, Van Sante N, Krinke T. First-in-Human Side-to-Side Magnetic Compression Duodeno-ileostomy with the Magnet Anastomosis System. *Obes Surg* 2023; **33**: 2282-2292 [PMID: 37393568 DOI: 10.1007/s11695-023-06708-x]
- Kawabata H, Nakase K, Okazaki Y, Yamamoto T, Yamaguchi K, Ueda Y, Miyata M, Motoi S. Endoscopic ultrasonography for pre-operative local assessment and endoscopic ultrasonography-guided marking before gastrojejunostomy for duodenal obstruction using magnetic compression anastomosis. *J Clin Transl Res* 2021; **7**: 621-624 [PMID: 34778591]
- van Hooft JE, Vleggaar FP, Le Moine O, Bizzotto A, Voermans RP, Costamagna G, Devière J, Siersema PD, Fockens P. Endoscopic magnetic gastroenteric anastomosis for palliation of malignant gastric outlet obstruction: a prospective multicenter study. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2010; **72**: 530-535 [PMID: 20656288 DOI: 10.1016/j.gie.2010.05.025]
- Lebares CC, Graves CE, Lin MY, Fidelman N, Cello J, Harrison MR, Rogers S. Endoscopic Magnetic Compression Anastomosis For Small Bowel Bypass in a High Operative Risk Setting. *Surg Laparosc Endosc Percutan Tech* 2019; **29**: e84-e87 [PMID: 31107851 DOI: 10.1097/SLE.0000000000000669]
- Schlottmann F, Ryou M, Lautz D, Thompson CC, Buxhoeveden R. Sutureless Duodeno-Ileal Anastomosis with Self-Assembling Magnets: Safety and Feasibility of a Novel Metabolic Procedure. *Obes Surg* 2021; **31**: 4195-4202 [PMID: 34181211 DOI: 10.1007/s11695-021-05554-z]
- Graves CE, Co C, Hsi RS, Kwiat D, Imamura-Ching J, Harrison MR, Stoller ML. Magnetic Compression Anastomosis (Magnamosis): First-In-Human Trial. *J Am Coll Surg* 2017; **225**: 676-681.e1 [PMID: 28843832 DOI: 10.1016/j.jamcollsurg.2017.07.1062]
- Erdmann D, Sweis R, Heitmann C, Yasui K, Olbrich KC, Levin LS, Sharkawy AA, Klitzman B. Side-to-side sutureless vascular anastomosis with magnets. *J Vasc Surg* 2004; **40**: 505-511 [PMID: 15337881 DOI: 10.1016/j.jvs.2004.05.026]
- Vicol C, Eifert S, Oberhoffer M, Boekstegers P, Reichart B. Mid-term patency after magnetic coupling for distal bypass anastomosis in coronary surgery. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2006; **82**: 1452-1456 [PMID: 16996952 DOI: 10.1016/j.athoracsur.2006.04.090]
- An Y, Zhang M, Xu S, Deng B, Shi A, Lyu Y, Yan X. An experimental study of magnetic compression technique for ureterovesical anastomosis in rabbits. *Sci Rep* 2023; **13**: 1708 [PMID: 36720998 DOI: 10.1038/s41598-023-27715-z]
- Zhang M, Lyu X, Zhao G, An Y, Lyu Y, Yan X. Establishment of Yan-Zhang's staging of digestive tract magnetic compression anastomosis in a rat model. *Sci Rep* 2022; **12**: 12445 [PMID: 35859162 DOI: 10.1038/s41598-022-16794-z]
- Lambe T, Ríordáin MG, Cahill RA, Cantillon-Murphy P. Magnetic compression in gastrointestinal and bilioenteric anastomosis: how much force? *Surg Innov* 2014; **21**: 65-73 [PMID: 23592733 DOI: 10.1177/1553350613484824]
- Zhao G, Ma J, Yan X, Li J, Ma F, Wang H, Liu Y, Lv Y. Optimized force range of magnetic compression anastomosis in dog intestinal tissue. *J Pediatr Surg* 2019; **54**: 2166-2171 [PMID: 30929946 DOI: 10.1016/j.jpedsurg.2019.03.005]
- Diaz R, Davalos G, Welsh LK, Portenier D, Guerron AD. Use of magnets in gastrointestinal surgery. *Surg Endosc* 2019; **33**: 1721-1730 [PMID: 30805789 DOI: 10.1007/s00464-019-06718-w]

- 17 **Trujillo Loli Y**, Trejo Huamán MD, Campos Medina S, Vega Landa JI, García Pérez R, Targarona Soler EM. Physical Bases, Indications, and Results of the Use of Magnets in Digestive Surgery: A Narrative Review. *J Laparoendosc Adv Surg Tech A* 2022; **32**: 485-494 [PMID: 34492199 DOI: [10.1089/lap.2021.0314](https://doi.org/10.1089/lap.2021.0314)]
- 18 **Wall J**, Diana M, Leroy J, Deruijter V, Gonzales KD, Lindner V, Harrison M, Marescaux J. MAGNAMOSIS IV: magnetic compression anastomosis for minimally invasive colorectal surgery. *Endoscopy* 2013; **45**: 643-648 [PMID: 23807805 DOI: [10.1055/s-0033-1344119](https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0033-1344119)]
- 19 **Xue F**, Guo HC, Li JP, Lu JW, Wang HH, Ma F, Liu YX, Lv Y. Choledochojejunostomy with an innovative magnetic compressive anastomosis: How to determine optimal pressure? *World J Gastroenterol* 2016; **22**: 2326-2335 [PMID: 26900294 DOI: [10.3748/wjg.v22.i7.2326](https://doi.org/10.3748/wjg.v22.i7.2326)]
- 20 **Uygun I**, Okur MH, Cimen H, Keles A, Yalcin O, Ozturk H, Otcu S. Magnetic compression ostomy as new cystostomy technique in the rat: magnacystostomy. *Urology* 2012; **79**: 738-742 [PMID: 22386431 DOI: [10.1016/j.urology.2011.11.048](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2011.11.048)]
- 21 **Uygun I**, Okur MH, Arayici Y, Keles A, Ozturk H, Otcu S. Magnetic compression ostomy for simple tube colostomy in rats--magnacolostomy. *Adv Clin Exp Med* 2012; **21**: 301-305 [PMID: 23214192]
- 22 **Uygun I**, Okur MH, Cimen H, Keles A, Yalcin O, Ozturk H, Otcu S. Magnetic compression gastrostomy in the rat. *Pediatr Surg Int* 2012; **28**: 529-532 [PMID: 22270732 DOI: [10.1007/s00383-012-3053-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00383-012-3053-2)]
- 23 **Li GZ**, Ryou M, Thompson CC, Wang J. A Preclinical Study of an Esophagojejunal Compression Anastomosis After Total Gastrectomy with Self-Forming Magnets. *J Gastrointest Surg* 2023; **27**: 1710-1712 [PMID: 37059963 DOI: [10.1007/s11605-023-05664-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11605-023-05664-2)]
- 24 **Ore AS**, Askenasy E, Ryou M, Baldwin T, Thompson CC, Messaris E. Evaluation of sutureless anastomosis after ileostomy takedown using the self-forming magnet anastomosis system in a porcine model. *Surg Endosc* 2022; **36**: 7664-7672 [PMID: 35157121 DOI: [10.1007/s00464-022-09082-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00464-022-09082-4)]
- 25 **Pichakron KO**, Jelin EB, Hirose S, Curran PF, Jamshidi R, Stephenson JT, Fechter R, Strange M, Harrison MR. Magnamosis II: Magnetic compression anastomosis for minimally invasive gastrojejunostomy and jejunojejunostomy. *J Am Coll Surg* 2011; **212**: 42-49 [PMID: 21184956 DOI: [10.1016/j.jamcollsurg.2010.09.031](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jamcollsurg.2010.09.031)]



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](mailto:office@baishideng.com)  
**Help Desk:** <https://www.f6publishing.com/helpdesk>  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

