

World Journal of *Gastrointestinal Surgery*

World J Gastrointest Surg 2024 February 27; 16(2): 260-634



EDITORIAL

- 260 Actuality and underlying mechanisms of systemic immune-inflammation index and geriatric nutritional risk index prognostic value in hepatocellular carcinoma
Tchilikidi KY
- 266 Prognostic impact of preoperative nutritional and immune inflammatory parameters on liver cancer
Bae SU
- 270 Don't forget emergency surgery! Lessons to learn from elective indocyanine green-guided gastrointestinal interventions
Perini D, Martellucci J
- 276 Mutational landscape of TP53 and CDH1 in gastric cancer
Cai HQ, Zhang LY, Fu LM, Xu B, Jiao Y
- 284 Overview of ectopic pancreas
Li CF, Li QR, Bai M, Lv YS, Jiao Y

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Clinical and Translational Research

- 289 Phospholipase A2 enzymes PLA2G2A and PLA2G12B as potential diagnostic and prognostic biomarkers in cholangiocarcinoma
Qiu C, Xiang YK, Da XB, Zhang HL, Kong XY, Hou NZ, Zhang C, Tian FZ, Yang YL

Case Control Study

- 307 Classification of anatomical morphology of cystic duct and its association with gallstone
Zhu JH, Zhao SL, Kang Q, Zhu Y, Liu LX, Zou H

Retrospective Cohort Study

- 318 Will partial splenic embolization followed by splenectomy increase intraoperative bleeding?
Huang L, Li QL, Yu QS, Peng H, Zhen Z, Shen Y, Zhang Q
- 331 Influence of donor age on liver transplantation outcomes: A multivariate analysis and comparative study
Bezjak M, Stresec I, Kocman B, Jadrijević S, Filipec Kanizaj T, Antonijević M, Dalbelo Bašić B, Mikulić D
- 345 Machine learning-based radiomics score improves prognostic prediction accuracy of stage II/III gastric cancer: A multi-cohort study
Xiang YH, Mou H, Qu B, Sun HR

- 357 Risk stratification in gastric cancer lung metastasis: Utilizing an overall survival nomogram and comparing it with previous staging
Chen ZR, Yang MF, Xie ZY, Wang PA, Zhang L, Huang ZH, Luo Y
- 382 Systemic inflammatory response index is a predictor of prognosis in gastric cancer patients: Retrospective cohort and meta-analysis
Ren JY, Xu M, Niu XD, Ma SX, Jiao YJ, Wang D, Yu M, Cai H
- Retrospective Study**
- 396 Development of a clinical nomogram for prediction of response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy in patients with advanced gastric cancer
Liu B, Xu YJ, Chu FR, Sun G, Zhao GD, Wang SZ
- 409 Laparoscopic left hemihepatectomy guided by indocyanine green fluorescence: A cranial-dorsal approach
Wang XR, Li XJ, Wan DD, Zhang Q, Liu TX, Shen ZW, Tong HX, Li Y, Li JW
- 419 Hemoglobin loss method calculates blood loss during pancreaticoduodenectomy and predicts bleeding-related risk factors
Yu C, Lin YM, Xian GZ
- 429 Short- and long-term outcomes of surgical treatment in patients with intestinal Behcet's disease
Park MY, Yoon YS, Park JH, Lee JL, Yu CS
- 438 Preoperative neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio predicts symptomatic anastomotic leakage in elderly colon cancer patients: Multicenter propensity score-matched analysis
Wang CY, Li XL, Ma XL, Yang XF, Liu YY, Yu YJ
- 451 Preoperative blood markers and intra-abdominal infection after colorectal cancer resection
Liu CQ, Yu ZB, Gan JX, Mei TM
- 463 Immune function status of postoperative patients with colon cancer for predicting liver metastasis
Xiong L, Liu FC
- 471 Efficacy of transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunts in treating cirrhotic esophageal-gastric variceal bleeding
Hu XG, Dai JJ, Lu J, Li G, Wang JM, Deng Y, Feng R, Lu KP
- 481 Correlation between serum markers and transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt prognosis in patients with cirrhotic ascites
Hu XG, Yang XX, Lu J, Li G, Dai JJ, Wang JM, Deng Y, Feng R
- 491 Development of a new Cox model for predicting long-term survival in hepatitis cirrhosis patients underwent transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunts
Lv YF, Zhu B, Meng MM, Wu YF, Dong CB, Zhang Y, Liu BW, You SL, Lv S, Yang YP, Liu FQ
- 503 "Five steps four quadrants" modularized *en bloc* dissection technique for accessing hepatic hilum lymph nodes in laparoscopic pancreaticoduodenectomy
Hu XS, Wang Y, Pan HT, Zhu C, Chen SL, Liu HC, Pang Q, Jin H

- 511** Efficacy and safety of endoscopic submucosal dissection for early gastric cancer and precancerous lesions in elderly patients

Xu WS, Zhang HY, Jin S, Zhang Q, Liu HD, Wang MT, Zhang B

- 518** Nomogram model including *LATS2* expression was constructed to predict the prognosis of advanced gastric cancer after surgery

Sun N, Tan BB, Li Y

Observational Study

- 529** To explore the pathogenesis of anterior resection syndrome by magnetic resonance imaging rectal defecography

Meng LH, Mo XW, Yang BY, Qin HQ, Song QZ, He XX, Li Q, Wang Z, Mo CL, Yang GH

- 539** Biopsy forceps are useful for measuring esophageal varices *in vitro*

Duan ZH, Zhou SY

SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS

- 546** First experience in laparoscopic surgery in low and middle income countries: A systematic review

Troller R, Bawa J, Baker O, Ashcroft J

- 554** Comparative effectiveness of several adjuvant therapies after hepatectomy for hepatocellular carcinoma patients with microvascular invasion

Pei YX, Su CG, Liao Z, Li WW, Wang ZX, Liu JL

META-ANALYSIS

- 571** Is tumor necrosis factor- α monoclonal therapy with proactive therapeutic drug monitoring optimized for inflammatory bowel disease? Network meta-analysis

Zheng FY, Yang KS, Min WC, Li XZ, Xing Y, Wang S, Zhang YS, Zhao QC

- 585** Poor oral health was associated with higher risk of gastric cancer: Evidence from 1431677 participants

Liu F, Tang SJ, Li ZW, Liu XR, Lv Q, Zhang W, Peng D

CASE REPORT

- 596** Treatment of hemolymphangioma by robotic surgery: A case report

Li TN, Liu YH, Zhao J, Mu H, Cao L

- 601** Postoperative encapsulated hemoperitoneum in a patient with gastric stromal tumor treated by exposed endoscopic full-thickness resection: A case report

Lu HF, Li JJ, Zhu DB, Mao LQ, Xu LF, Yu J, Yao LH

- 609** Early endoscopic management of an infected acute necrotic collection misdiagnosed as a pancreatic pseudocyst: A case report

Zhang HY, He CC

- 616** Percutaneous ultrasound-guided coaxial core needle biopsy for the diagnosis of multiple splenic lesions: A case report
Pu SH, Bao WYG, Jiang ZP, Yang R, Lu Q
- 622** Spilled gallstone mimicking intra-abdominal seeding of gallbladder adenocarcinoma: A case report
Huang CK, Lu RH, Chen CC, Chen PC, Hsu WC, Tsai MJ, Ting CT
- 628** Ileal collision tumor associated with gastrointestinal bleeding: A case report and review of literature
Wu YQ, Wang HY, Shao MM, Xu L, Jiang XY, Guo SJ

ABOUT COVER

Editorial Board Member of *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*, Nikolaos Chatzizacharias, FACS, FRCS, MD, PhD, Consultant Surgeon, Department of HPB and liver transplantation, Queen Elizabeth Hospital, University Hospitals Birmingham, Birmingham B15 2TH, United Kingdom. nikolaos.chatzizacharias@uhb.nhs.uk

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

February 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>



Retrospective Study

Hemoglobin loss method calculates blood loss during pancreaticoduodenectomy and predicts bleeding-related risk factors

Chao Yu, Yi-Min Lin, Guo-Zhe Xian

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): 0
Grade D (Fair): 0
Grade E (Poor): 0

P-Reviewer: Teixeira KN, Brazil;
Wani I, India

Received: September 24, 2023

Peer-review started: September 24, 2023

First decision: December 14, 2023

Revised: December 26, 2023

Accepted: January 19, 2024

Article in press: January 19, 2024

Published online: February 27, 2024



Chao Yu, Yi-Min Lin, Guo-Zhe Xian, Department of Hepatobiliary Surgery, Shandong Provincial Hospital Affiliated to Shandong First Medical University, Jinan 250021, Shandong Province, China

Corresponding author: Guo-Zhe Xian, MD, PhD, Chief Doctor, Professor, Department of Hepatobiliary Surgery, Shandong Provincial Hospital Affiliated to Shandong First Medical University, No. 324 Jingwu Weiqi Road, Huaiyin District, Jinan 250021, Shandong Province, China. xianguozhe@sdfmu.edu.cn

Abstract

BACKGROUND

The common clinical method to evaluate blood loss during pancreaticoduodenectomy (PD) is visual inspection, but most scholars believe that this method is extremely subjective and inaccurate. Currently, there is no accurate, objective method to evaluate the amount of blood loss in PD patients.

AIM

The hemoglobin (Hb) loss method was used to analyze the amount of blood loss during PD, which was compared with the blood loss estimated by traditional visual methods. The risk factors for bleeding were also predicted at the same time.

METHODS

We retrospectively analyzed the clinical data of 341 patients who underwent PD in Shandong Provincial Hospital from March 2017 to February 2019. According to different surgical methods, they were divided into an open PD (OPD) group and a laparoscopic PD (LPD) group. The differences and correlations between the intraoperative estimation of blood loss (IEBL) obtained by visual inspection and the intraoperative calculation of blood loss (ICBL) obtained using the Hb loss method were analyzed. ICBL, IEBL and perioperative calculation of blood loss (PCBL) were compared between the two groups, and single-factor regression analysis was performed.

RESULTS

There was no statistically significant difference in the preoperative general patient information between the two groups ($P > 0.05$). PD had an ICBL of 743.2 (393.0, 1173.1) mL and an IEBL of 100.0 (50.0, 300.0) mL ($P < 0.001$). There was also a certain correlation between the two ($r = 0.312$, $P < 0.001$). Single-factor analysis of ICBL showed that a history of diabetes [95% confidence interval (CI): 53.82-549.62;

$P = 0.017$] was an independent risk factor for ICBL. In addition, the single-factor analysis of PCBL showed that body mass index (BMI) (95% CI: 0.62-76.75; $P = 0.046$) and preoperative total bilirubin $> 200 \mu\text{mol/L}$ (95% CI: 7.09-644.26; $P = 0.045$) were independent risk factors for PCBL. The ICBLs of the LPD group and OPD group were 767.7 (435.4, 1249.0) mL and 663.8 (347.7, 1138.2) mL, respectively ($P > 0.05$). The IEBL of the LPD group 200.0 (50.0, 200.0) mL was slightly greater than that of the OPD group 100.0 (50.0, 300.0) mL ($P > 0.05$). PCBL was greater in the LPD group than the OPD group [1061.6 (612.3, 1632.3) mL *vs* 806.1 (375.9, 1347.6) mL] ($P < 0.05$).

CONCLUSION

The ICBL in patients who underwent PD was greater than the IEBL, but there is a certain correlation between the two. The Hb loss method can be used to evaluate intraoperative blood loss. A history of diabetes, preoperative bilirubin $> 200 \mu\text{mol/L}$ and high BMI increase the patient's risk of bleeding.

Key Words: Pancreaticoduodenectomy; Hemoglobin loss; Calculated blood loss; Estimated blood loss

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

Core Tip: Visual inspection is commonly used clinically to assess blood loss during pancreaticoduodenectomy (PD), but most scholars believe that this method is extremely subjective and inaccurate. We applied the hemoglobin loss method to calculate the intraoperative and perioperative blood loss in patients with PD, and compared the blood loss between different surgical methods. Univariate regression analysis revealed that a history of diabetes, a preoperative bilirubin concentration $> 200 \mu\text{mol/L}$, and high body mass index increased bleeding risk.

Citation: Yu C, Lin YM, Xian GZ. Hemoglobin loss method calculates blood loss during pancreaticoduodenectomy and predicts bleeding-related risk factors. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2024; 16(2): 419-428

URL: <https://www.wjgnet.com/1948-9366/full/v16/i2/419.htm>

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v16.i2.419>

INTRODUCTION

Pancreaticoduodenectomy (PD) is a classic surgical method for the treatment of benign and malignant tumors such as pancreatic cancer, duodenal cancer, cholangiocarcinoma, and intraductal papillary mucinous tumor of the pancreas. In 1994, the Canadian scholar Gagner *et al*[1] successfully performed the world's first laparoscopic PD (LPD), pioneering LPD. Since then, LPD has been gradually performed more frequently in the clinic. Since the LPD procedure is extremely complex and difficult, the clinical effect of LPD is not precise compared with open PD (OPD)[2,3]. The indicator that best reflects the clinical efficacy and surgical safety of PD is bleeding because bleeding has the most direct impact on the patient's prognosis and survival. There are many methods for estimating blood loss[4,5], such as the gravimetric method, formula method, colorimetric method, and visual inspection method. The most commonly used method in clinical practice is visual inspection. However, visual inspection often underestimates the amount of blood loss in patients, and most scholars believe that this approach is extremely subjective and inaccurate[6,7]. Even surgeons with specific training and experience have difficulty determining the true amount of blood loss in a patient. In addition, each surgeon has his or her own habits and methods for estimating the amount of bleeding. Even if the estimated amount of bleeding is the same for each patient, there will be large differences in the recorded amounts. Therefore, these methods are even less reliable when comparing blood loss in patients treated with different surgical procedures. To evaluate patient blood loss more accurately and conveniently, we have used the hemoglobin (Hb) mass loss formula[7] to evaluate intraoperative blood loss and perioperative blood loss and introduced the concepts of intraoperative calculation of blood loss (ICBL) and perioperative calculation of blood loss (PCBL). ICBL refers to the amount of blood loss from before the operation to 72 h after the operation, and PCBL refers to the amount of blood loss from before the operation to discharge. This article retrospectively analyzed the amount of blood loss and its risk factors in patients who underwent PD in Shandong Provincial Hospital from 2017.3 to 2019.2 to provide a new method for comparing the amount of blood loss associated with different surgical methods, with the aim of reducing intraoperative and postoperative bleeding.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

General information

In this study, the clinical data of 400 patients who successfully underwent PD in Shandong Provincial Hospital from 2017.3 to 2019.2 were collected. Inclusion criteria: (1) Patients who underwent computed tomography, magnetic resonance imaging, endoscopic ultrasound or other examinations for preliminary diagnosis before surgery; (2) patients with surgical indications for PD and no surgical contraindications; (3) patients with no invasion of the portal vein, mesenteric

arteries and veins, inferior vena cava, *etc.*, and no distant metastasis to other organs such as the liver, abdominal cavity, *etc.*; (4) patients with no heart, lung, brain, kidney and other important organ insufficiency; (5) patients aged 18-80 years-old; and (6) patients who signed informed consent for surgery or whose family member signed it. Exclusion criteria: (1) Patients with heart, lung, brain or other functional insufficiency; (2) patients with incomplete case information; and (3) patients who underwent combined multiorgan resection such as liver, colon, and superior mesenteric vessel resection. Excluded patients were as follows: four patients who did not meet the age requirement, 15 patients who underwent combined resection of other organs, four patients with missing test results, and 36 patients who underwent endoscopic conversion to laparotomy. In total, 341 patients were finally included. Based on the surgical method, they were divided into the OPD group ($n = 175$) and the LPD group ($n = 166$). Sex, age, body mass index (BMI), preoperative total bilirubin $> 200 \mu\text{mol/L}$, history of diabetes, history of abdominal surgery, preoperative alkaline phosphatase, preoperative glutamyl transpeptidase, preoperative Hb concentration, and American Society of Anesthesiologists (ASA) classification were not statistically significant between the two groups ($P > 0.05$).

Surgical method

All LPD surgeries were completed laparoscopically in the following manner: (1) First, the abdominal cavity was explored to determine whether there was metastasis to any of the abdominal organs; (2) second, resection and lymph node dissection were performed; and (3) finally, the digestive tract was reconstructed. The specific surgical steps are detailed in the expert consensus on LPD[8]. The surgical method of OPD is mainly classic PD. Its process of separation and resection method, lymph node dissection sequence, and digestive tract reconstruction are basically the same as in LPD.

Observe and analyze indicators

The preoperative general information of the two groups of patients treated with OPD and LPD was compared, including sex, age, BMI, history of diabetes, history of abdominal surgery, preoperative alkaline phosphatase, preoperative glutamyl transpeptidase, preoperative Hb concentration, ASA classification, preoperative total bilirubin $> 200 \mu\text{mol/L}$, and the intraoperative estimation of blood loss (IEBL), ICBL, and PCBL. The differences and correlations between the patients' IEBL and ICBL were analyzed, and univariate regression analysis was performed on ICBL and PCBL.

Formula

Hb mass loss formula: $\text{MHbCBL} = 1000 \times (\text{Hbpreop} - \text{Hbpostop}) \times \text{blood volume (BV)} + \text{infusion of Hb}$; MHbCBL (g): Calculated Hb mass loss; Hbpreop (g/L): The patient's preoperative Hb concentration; Hbpostop (g/L): Hb concentration within 72 h after surgery or before discharge; BV (mL): Patient estimated BV calculated using the International Council for Standardization in Haematology formula[9]; infusion of Hb (g): Amount of Hb infused by the during surgery or perioperative period; calculate blood loss (mL): male: $[\text{MHbCBL (g)} / 140 \text{ (g/L)}] \times 1000$, female: $[\text{MHbCBL (g)} / 130 \text{ (g/L)}] \times 1000$.

Statistical analysis and processing

SPSS 25.0 statistical software was used for analysis and processing. Measurement data that conformed to the normal distribution are expressed as mean \pm SD, and they were compared between groups using the t-test of two independent samples. Measurement data that did not obey the normal distribution are represented by median (interquartile range), and these were compared between groups using the rank sum test. Count data are expressed as n (%), and the χ^2 test or Fisher's exact test was used for comparison between groups. When $P < 0.05$, the difference was considered statistically significant.

RESULTS

Comparison of general information before surgery

This trial retrospectively analyzed the clinical data of 341 patients who were treated in the Hepatobiliary Surgery Department of Shandong Provincial Hospital, including 201 males and 140 females, aged 60.0 (52.0, 65.0) years-old. According to the surgical method, they were divided into the LPD ($n = 166$) group and the OPD group ($n = 175$). The general preoperative information of the patients such as age, sex, BMI, combined underlying diseases (history of diabetes, abdominal surgery), preoperative total bilirubin $> 200 \mu\text{mol/L}$, preoperative carcinoembryonic antigen, preoperative alkaline phosphatase, preoperative Hb concentration, and ASA classification was not significantly different between the two groups ($P > 0.05$) (Table 1).

Blood loss comparison between OPD and LPD and analysis of the relationship between intraoperative estimation of blood loss and intraoperative calculation of blood loss

ICBL was 767.7 (435.4, 1249.0) mL in the LPD group compared to 663.8 (347.7, 1138.2) mL in the OPD group. This difference was not statistically significant ($P > 0.05$). Blood loss was 200.0 (50.0, 200.0) mL in the LPD group and 100.0 (50.0, 300.0) mL in the OPD group, but the difference was not significant ($P > 0.05$). Compared to the OPD group, the LPD group had greater PCBL at 1061.6 (612.3, 1632.3) mL vs 806.1 (375.9, 1347.6) mL ($P < 0.05$) (Table 2).

In this study, PD patients had greater ICBL than IEBL at 743.2 (393.0, 1173.1) mL and 100.0 (50.0, 300.0) mL, respectively ($P < 0.001$) (Table 3). There is also a certain correlation between IEBL and ICBL ($r = 0.312$, $P < 0.001$) (Table 4).

Table 1 Comparison of general patient characteristics between the open and laparoscopic pancreaticoduodenectomy groups

Characteristic	OPD group, <i>n</i> = 175	LPD group, <i>n</i> = 166	χ^2/Z value	<i>P</i> value
Sex			3.224	0.073
Male	95 (54.3)	106 (63.9)		
Female	80 (45.7)	60 (36.1)		
Age in yr	60.0 (52.0, 65.0)	60.0 (52.0, 66.0)	-0.008	0.993
BMI in kg/m ²	23.80 (21.30, 26.03)	23.65 (21.16, 25.85)	-0.556	0.578
History of abdominal surgery			0.025	0.874
none	154 (88)	147 (88.6)		
Yes	21 (12)	19 (11.4)		
History of diabetes			0.426	0.514
none	147 (84)	135 (81.3)		
Yes	28 (16)	31 (18.7)		
Preoperative CEA in ng/mL	3.11 (2.10, 4.96)	3.03 (1.77, 4.31)	-1.431	0.152
Preoperative alkaline phosphatase in U/L	302.0 (121.0, 496.0)	300.5 (112.3, 554.5)	-0.089	0.929
Preoperative glutamyl transpeptidase in U/L	323.0 (62.0, 855.0)	335.5 (44.8, 792.5)	-0.187	0.852
Preoperative Hb in g/L	127.0 (114.0, 137.0)	128.0 (114.0, 137.3)	-0.171	0.864
ASA classification			-1.277	0.202
I	2 (1.1)	1 (0.6)		
II	129 (73.7)	113 (68.1)		
III	42 (24.0)	51 (30.7)		
IV	2 (1.1)	1 (0.6)		
Preoperative total bilirubin > 200 μ mol/L			0.000	0.984
No	139 (79.4)	132 (79.5)		
Yes	36 (20.6)	34 (20.5)		

Data are *n* (%) or M (IQR). ASA: American Society of Anesthesiologists; BMI: Body mass index; CEA: Carcinoembryonic antigen; Hb: Hemoglobin; LPD: Laparoscopic pancreaticoduodenectomy; OPD: Open pancreaticoduodenectomy.

Table 2 Comparison of blood loss between the open and laparoscopic pancreaticoduodenectomy groups

Blood loss	OPD group, <i>n</i> = 175	LPD group, <i>n</i> = 166	χ^2/Z value	<i>P</i> value
IEBL in mL	100.0 (50.0, 300.0)	200.0 (50.0, 200.0)	-1.084	0.278
ICBL in mL	663.8 (347.7, 1138.2)	767.7 (435.4, 1249.0)	-1.833	0.067
PCBL in mL	806.1 (375.9, 1347.6)	1061.6 (612.3, 1632.3)	-3.112	0.002

ICBL: Intraoperative calculation of blood loss; IEBL: Intraoperative estimation of blood loss; LPD: Laparoscopic pancreaticoduodenectomy; OPD: Open pancreaticoduodenectomy; PCBL: Perioperative calculation of blood loss.

Intraoperative calculation of blood loss and perioperative calculation of blood loss single factor regression factor analysis

This study included eight variables in the single-factor regression analysis of ICBL. The results showed that a history of diabetes was an independent risk factor for ICBL ($P < 0.05$), which meant that a history of diabetes before surgery was expected to increase the amount of intraoperative bleeding. Age, abdominal surgery history, BMI, nature of tumor, preoperative albumin levels, pancreatic tumors, *etc.* were not related to ICBL by univariate analysis ($P > 0.05$) (Table 5).

For the study of PCBL, we also included eight variables in a single-factor regression analysis. The results show that BMI and preoperative total bilirubin > 200 μ mol/L are independent risk factors for perioperative blood loss ($P < 0.05$),

Table 3 Comparison of the differences between the intraoperative estimation of blood loss and intraoperative calculation of blood loss

Blood loss	Intraoperative blood loss in mL	Z value	P value
IEBL	100.0 (50.0, 300.0)	-16.924	0.000
ICBL	743.2 (393.0, 1173.1)		

ICBL: Intraoperative calculation of blood loss; IEBL: Intraoperative estimation of blood loss.

Table 4 Correlation analysis between intraoperative estimation of blood loss and intraoperative calculation of blood loss

Blood loss	Statistical test	ICBL in mL
IEBL in mL	Pearson correlation value	0.312
	P value	0.000

ICBL: Intraoperative calculation of blood loss; IEBL: Intraoperative estimation of blood loss.

Table 5 Single factor analysis of intraoperative calculation of blood loss

Parameter	B value	P value	95%CI
Age in yr	3.575	0.448	-5.68-12.83
History of diabetes	301.719	0.017	53.82-549.62
History of abdominal surgery	-19.508	0.896	-313.37-274.35
BMI in kg/m ²	18.799	0.186	-9.10-46.70
Nature of tumor	-120.529	0.383	-392.12-151.07
Preoperative albumin in g/L	-4.133	0.648	-21.90-13.63
Pancreatic tumors	15.438	0.884	-192.26-223.14
Preoperative total bilirubin > 200 in μmol/L	196.479	0.098	-36.69-429.65

BMI: Body mass index; CI: Confidence interval.

indicating that high BMI and preoperative total bilirubin > 200 μmol/L will increase the risk of perioperative blood loss and the risk of intraoperative bleeding. The results of the PCBL univariate analysis are shown in Table 6.

DISCUSSION

Pancreas-specific complications are a major cause of severe morbidity and mortality[10]. Pancreatic fistula, biliary fistula, delayed gastric emptying, bleeding, *etc.* are common complications of PD, and they are also important reasons for delayed postoperative recovery of patients[11,12]. Generally, the most important factor that threatens a patient's life is bleeding[13,14], including intraoperative bleeding and postoperative bleeding.

We often describe intraoperative bleeding through IEBL and the blood transfusion rate. There are many methods to estimate intraoperative blood loss[4,5], such as the gravimetric method, formula method, visual inspection method, *etc.* The more commonly used method in clinical practice is visual inspection[15,16]. The visual inspection method is also called the visual estimation method[17]. During the operation, doctors and anesthesiologists estimate blood loss by visually assessing the color and flow rate of the blood, size of the blood pool, amount of blood soaked into the gauze, amount of blood observed on the doctor's gloves, and volume of blood on clothes, but intraoperative blood loss estimated by this method is considered by most scholars to be extremely subjective and inaccurate[7]. Even surgeons with specific training and experience have difficulty determining the true amount of blood loss in a patient. In addition, each surgeon has different habits and methods for estimating it. Even if the amount of bleeding is estimated for the same patient, there will be large differences between surgeons. Therefore, reliability is reduced when comparing the blood loss of different surgical methods. The gravimetric method[18,19] is relatively accurate. Generally, the amount of blood loss is estimated by weighing the amount of the suction bucket and the gauze and absorbent materials used before and after operation and calculating the weight difference. This method is too cumbersome and requires weighing the gauze and absorbent material before and after the operation, and it also does not account for the blood that was not collected by the suction device

Table 6 Single factor analysis of perioperative calculation of blood loss

Parameter	B value	P value	95%CI
Age in yr	10.585	0.100	-2.04-23.21
History of diabetes	107.218	0.538	-234.79-449.23
History of abdominal surgery	-87.189	0.670	-489.35-314.97
BMI in kg/m ²	38.688	0.046	0.62-76.75
Nature of tumor	-207.523	0.273	-579.06-164.02
Preoperative albumin in g/L	-5.487	0.658	-29.81-18.84
Pancreatic tumors	33.033	0.819	-251.28-317.34
Preoperative total bilirubin > 200 in $\mu\text{mol/L}$	325.675	0.045	7.09-644.26

BMI: Body mass index; CI: Confidence interval.

or gauze during the operation, which may lead to an underestimation of intraoperative blood loss. Large amounts of blood loss during surgery can promote systemic inflammatory responses and have a negative impact on the prognosis of postoperative patients. Therefore, surgeons should accurately assess patients' intraoperative blood loss and strive to reduce blood loss and blood transfused during surgery to improve patient prognosis[20,21]. To estimate the intraoperative blood loss of patients more accurately, Jaramillo *et al*[7] studied 100 patients who underwent laparoscopic urological surgery. Comparing the Hb mass loss formula method, the López-Picado formula method and the empirical volume formula method, they found that the Hb mass loss formula method has advantages over other methods in assessing various parameters of blood loss. Therefore, we can calculate the amount of Hb lost by comparing the changes in the patient's Hb concentration from before to after surgery; from this, we can calculate the patient's intraoperative blood loss more accurately and objectively.

Although the incidence of post-PD hemorrhage (PPH) is low, it is the main cause of adverse patient outcomes. The current incidence of PPH ranges from 1% to 8% [22], but its mortality rate is as high as 11% to 38%. PPH is mainly divided into abdominal bleeding and gastrointestinal bleeding according to the location of bleeding[23-25]. When a patient suffers from abdominal bleeding after surgery, the amount of blood loss calculated from the scale on the drainage bag is inaccurate because there is not only blood in the abdominal drainage bag but also exudate, leakage, *etc.* On the other hand, when gastrointestinal bleeding occurs, the amount of hematemesis, melena, or bleeding fluid drained from the gastric tube cannot be measured directly. Whether it is abdominal bleeding or gastrointestinal bleeding, we can only make qualitative judgments and cannot conduct quantitative analysis. In such cases, the Hb mass loss method can quantitatively calculate the patient's postoperative blood loss. Therefore, in this study, we calculated the patient's intraoperative blood loss and perioperative blood loss through changes in Hb concentration and analyzed their risk factors to provide empirical data support for improving PD.

The results of this study showed that the intraoperative blood loss estimated by the surgeon, 100.0 (50.0, 300.0) mL, was significantly less than the ICBL of 743.2 (393.0, 1173.1) mL by the Hb loss method ($P < 0.05$). It shows that there is a difference in the intraoperative blood loss obtained by the two methods. This situation occurs, on the one hand, because visual inspection will underestimate the patient's intraoperative blood loss[6]; on the other hand, it may be related to the fact that we count Hb loss from before surgery to 72 h after surgery. However, there is a certain significant positive correlation between IEBL and ICBL. The intraoperative blood loss estimated by experienced and trained surgeons can reflect the patient's true blood loss to a certain extent. In this study, the IEBL of OPD and LPD was 100.0 (50.0, 300.0) mL and 200.0 (50.0, 200.0) mL, respectively ($P > 0.05$). The ICBL of OPD and LPD was 663.8 (347.7, 1138.2) mL and 767.7 (435.4, 1249.0) mL, respectively ($P > 0.05$). Whether IEBL or ICBL, the blood loss of the LPD group was greater than that of the OPD group, which may be mainly related to the shorter development time of LPD in our center. We also analyzed the risk factors related to ICBL and found that a history of diabetes [95% confidence interval (CI): 53.82-549.62; $P = 0.017$] is an independent risk factor for ICBL, which means that a history of diabetes before surgery will increase the patient's risk of intraoperative bleeding. Diabetes can cause coagulation defects by causing changes in coagulation protein concentration and changes in metal ion homeostasis, thereby affecting physiological changes and functions of hemostasis[26,27]. Diabetes is an independent risk factor for atherosclerosis[28]. Diabetes will cause atherosclerosis of small arteries, weakening the endothelial cells of small arteries, making blood vessels more likely to rupture. Atherosclerosis easily leads to thrombus formation, leading to tissue hypoxia, accumulation of lactic acid, and increased permeability of blood vessel walls. Some scholars believe that normal platelet function is essential for surgical hemostasis. Diabetes can cause changes in glycoprotein molecules on the surface of patients' platelets, thereby affecting hemostatic function[29]. When Zheng *et al*[30] studied the relationship between blood sugar and incidence of cerebral hemorrhage, they found that high blood sugar level was significantly related to the poor prognosis of patients with cerebral hemorrhage, indicated by an increased short-term and long-term mortality risk. In addition, research by Zhang *et al*[31] also shows that elevated blood sugar can damage microvessel integrity and easily cause bleeding. Therefore, controlling the patient's perioperative blood sugar level and maintaining a stable internal environment are extremely important for surgical safety[32].

We also performed quantitative analysis of PCBL, which is intraoperative plus postoperative blood loss. PCBL can not only reveal the patient's overall surgical effect during hospitalization but also indirectly reflect the patient's postoperative blood loss. According to the definition of the International Study Group on Pancreatic Surgery[23], PPH can be divided into grade A, grade B and grade C. In this study, 17 patients had grade C bleeding, accounting for 4.5% of all cases of postoperative bleeding. Among them, six had gastrointestinal bleeding and 11 had abdominal bleeding, indicating that severe postoperative bleeding was mainly caused by abdominal bleeding. At present, there are relatively few studies using perioperative blood loss on the overall surgical effect during and after PD. Therefore, we analyzed it from the perspective of PCBL to provide a basis for the development of PD. The PCBL of the OPD and LPD groups was 806.1 (375.9,1347.6) mL and 1061.6 (612.3,1632.3) mL, respectively ($P < 0.05$). This shows that the overall blood loss of LPD is greater than that of OPD. This is mainly because the pancreatic-intestinal and gastrointestinal anastomoses are reinforced and sutured during OPD, which decrease the loss of postoperative Hb and reduce the patient's risk of postoperative bleeding. We found that the PCBL of patients undergoing PD in our center was 886.4 (487.3, 1466.2) mL. Univariate analysis on the risk factors for PCBL revealed that preoperative total bilirubin level $> 200 \mu\text{mol/L}$ (95%CI: 7.09-644.26; $P = 0.045$) and BMI (95%CI: 0.62-76.75; $P = 0.046$) were independent risk factors for PCBL, indicating that preoperative total bilirubin $> 200 \mu\text{mol/L}$ and high BMI increase the risk of perioperative bleeding. Preoperative total bilirubin $> 200 \mu\text{mol/L}$ can impair liver function and weaken coagulation function, while also causing endotoxemia, impairing the body's immune function, and inhibiting intravascular coagulation of blood cells[33]. Wang *et al*[34] analyzed the clinical data of patients who underwent PD from 2009 to 2014. Their single- and multi factor analyses on post-PD bleeding, showed that higher total bilirubin concentration was an independent risk factor for PD bleeding. Shen *et al*[35] conducted a retrospective cohort study of patients who underwent percutaneous bile duct drainage (PBD) and found that PBD reduced the incidences of overall complications and grades B and C bleeding after PD. They pointed out that for patients with total bilirubin $> 250 \mu\text{mol/L}$, PBD should be routinely performed before surgery. Studies have shown that a high BMI will limit the surgeon's surgical options, make the operation more difficult, and increase the patient's bleeding risk. In an observational study[36], 155332 patients at risk for atherogenesis participated in a clinical trial of clopidogrel. Compared to patients with a high BMI, patients with a low BMI had a lower risk of bleeding, in line with the idea that patients with a high BMI have an increased risk of bleeding and consistent with the results of our study. Farvacque *et al*[37] analyzed risk factors for post-pancreatectomy bleeding in 307 patients and found that higher BMI was associated with bleeding. They concluded that higher BMI will increase the technical difficulties during various operations, leading to an increased risk of bleeding and increased bleeding volume.

In this study, we provide an objective method for assessing blood loss during PD and analyze risk factors for bleeding. However, this study also has certain limitations. First, this is a retrospective study, which may be affected by selection bias during data collection. Secondly, this is a single-center study. In the future, multi-center studies with well-designed and larger sample sizes are needed for verification.

CONCLUSION

In summary, we found that there are some differences between intraoperative blood loss estimated using visual inspection and intraoperative blood loss calculated using the Hb loss method, but there is also a correlation between the two. The Hb loss method can be used to calculate the intraoperative and perioperative blood loss of PD patients and to compare the blood loss of different surgical methods. Univariate regression analysis showed that a history of diabetes, preoperative bilirubin $> 200 \mu\text{mol/L}$, and high BMI increase the PD patient's bleeding risk.

ARTICLE HIGHLIGHTS

Research background

The most common way to evaluate blood loss during pancreaticoduodenectomy (PD) is visual inspection, but this method is inaccurate. The hemoglobin (Hb) loss method provides a new way to evaluate blood loss during PD.

Research motivation

There was no accurate and objective way to assess blood loss in PD, and therefore, to identify the risk factors for blood loss.

Research objectives

The Hb loss method was used to analyze blood loss during PD and predict risk factors for bleeding.

Research methods

We retrospectively collected the clinical data of 341 patients who underwent PD in Shandong Provincial Hospital from March 2017 to February 2019. The differences and correlations between the intraoperative estimation of blood loss (IEBL) obtained by visual inspection and the intraoperative calculation of blood loss (ICBL) obtained using the Hb loss method were analyzed. Univariate regression analysis was performed on ICBL, IEBL, and perioperative calculation of blood loss (PCBL).

Research results

PD had an ICBL of 743.2 (393.0, 1173.1) mL and an IEBL of 100.0 (50.0, 300.0) mL ($P < 0.001$), but the two were also correlated ($r = 0.312$, $P < 0.001$). Single-factor analysis of ICBL showed that a history of diabetes [95% confidence interval (CI): 53.82-549.62; $P = 0.017$] was an independent risk factor for ICBL. In addition, the single-factor analysis of PCBL showed that body mass index (BMI) (95%CI: 0.62-76.75; $P = 0.046$) and preoperative total bilirubin $> 200 \mu\text{mol/L}$ (95%CI: 7.09-644.26; $P = 0.045$) were independent risk factors for PCBL.

Research conclusions

The Hb loss method can be used to evaluate intraoperative blood loss. A history of diabetes, preoperative bilirubin $> 200 \mu\text{mol/L}$ and high BMI increase the patient's risk of bleeding.

Research perspectives

This study provides an objective measurement to evaluate blood loss during PD and thoroughly explores the risk factors for bleeding.

FOOTNOTES

Author contributions: Yu C designed the study, collected and analyzed data, and wrote the manuscript; Lin YM participated in the study's conception and data collection; Xian GZ participated in study design and provided guidance; All authors read and approved the final version.

Supported by Shandong Provincial Natural Science Foundation General Project, No. ZR2020MH248.

Institutional review board statement: This study was reviewed and approved by the Ethics Committee of the Shandong Provincial Hospital Affiliated to Shandong First Medical University (Shandong Provincial 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: We have no financial relationships to disclose.

Data sharing statement: No additional data are available.

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 Non-Commercial (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: Chao Yu 0009-0007-7432-8972; Yi-Min Lin 0009-0004-5231-7058; Guo-Zhe Xian 0000-0001-8620-620X.

S-Editor: Qu XL

L-Editor: Filipodia

P-Editor: Qu XL

REFERENCES

- 1 Gagner M, Pomp A. Laparoscopic pylorus-preserving pancreatoduodenectomy. *Surg Endosc* 1994; **8**: 408-410 [PMID: 7915434 DOI: 10.1007/BF00642443]
- 2 Borie F, Pichy C, Nayeri M, Fall S. Laparoscopic Versus Open Pancreatoduodenectomy: Cost-Effectiveness Analysis. *J Laparoendosc Adv Surg Tech A* 2022; **32**: 1048-1055 [PMID: 35833839 DOI: 10.1089/lap.2021.0606]
- 3 Pędziwiatr M, Małczak P, Pisarska M, Major P, Wysocki M, Stefura T, Budzyński A. Minimally invasive versus open pancreatoduodenectomy-systematic review and meta-analysis. *Langenbecks Arch Surg* 2017; **402**: 841-851 [PMID: 28488004 DOI: 10.1007/s00423-017-1583-8]
- 4 Quantitative Blood Loss in Obstetric Hemorrhage: ACOG COMMITTEE OPINION, Number 794. *Obstet Gynecol* 2019; **134**: e150-e156 [PMID: 31764759 DOI: 10.1097/AOG.00000000000003564]
- 5 Gerdessen L, Meybohm P, Choorapoikayil S, Herrmann E, Taeuber I, Neef V, Raimann FJ, Zacharowski K, Piekarski F. Comparison of common perioperative blood loss estimation techniques: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Clin Monit Comput* 2021; **35**: 245-258 [PMID: 32815042 DOI: 10.1007/s10877-020-00579-8]
- 6 Budair B, Ahmed U, Hodson J, David M, Ashraf M, McBride T. Are we all guilty of under-estimating intra-operative blood loss during hip fracture surgery? *J Orthop* 2017; **14**: 81-84 [PMID: 27829730 DOI: 10.1016/j.jor.2016.10.019]
- 7 Jaramillo S, Montane-Muntane M, Gambus PL, Capitan D, Navarro-Ripoll R, Blasi A. Perioperative blood loss: estimation of blood volume loss or haemoglobin mass loss? *Blood Transfus* 2020; **18**: 20-29 [PMID: 31855150 DOI: 10.2450/2019.0204-19]

- 8 **Study Group of Pancreatic Surgery in Chinese Society of Surgery of Chinese Medical Association**; Pancreas of Minimally Invasive Treatment Group in Pancreatic Disease Branch of China International Exchange and Promotion Association for Medical and Healthcare; Pancreas Minimally Invasive Group in Pancreatic Diseases Committee of Chinese Research Hospital Association; Pancreas Minimally Invasive Group in Pancreatic Cancer Committee of Chinese Anti-Cancer Association. [Expert consensus of laparoscopic pancreaticoduodenectomy(postscript of operation process and main steps)]. *Zhonghua Wai Ke Za Zhi* 2017; **55**: 335-339 [PMID: 28464571 DOI: 10.3760/cma.j.issn.0529-5815.2017.05.004]
- 9 **Barrachina B**, Lopez-Picado A, Albinarrate A, Iriarte I, Remón M, Basora M, Ferreira-Laso L, Blanco Del Val B, Andrés J, Paredes SP, Pharm RCC. Analysis of the estimation of bleeding using several proposed haematometric equations. *Ir J Med Sci* 2023; **192**: 327-333 [PMID: 35391653 DOI: 10.1007/s11845-022-02946-7]
- 10 **Palanivelu C**, Senthilnathan P, Sabnis SC, Babu NS, Srivatsan Gurumurthy S, Anand Vijai N, Nalankilli VP, Praveen Raj P, Parthasarathy R, Rajapandian S. Randomized clinical trial of laparoscopic versus open pancreatoduodenectomy for periampullary tumours. *Br J Surg* 2017; **104**: 1443-1450 [PMID: 28895142 DOI: 10.1002/bjs.10662]
- 11 **Karim SAM**, Abdulla KS, Abdulkarim QH, Rahim FH. The outcomes and complications of pancreaticoduodenectomy (Whipple procedure): Cross sectional study. *Int J Surg* 2018; **52**: 383-387 [PMID: 29438817 DOI: 10.1016/j.ijssu.2018.01.041]
- 12 **Simon R**. Complications After Pancreaticoduodenectomy. *Surg Clin North Am* 2021; **101**: 865-874 [PMID: 34537148 DOI: 10.1016/j.suc.2021.06.011]
- 13 **Wei HK**, Wang SE, Shyr YM, Tseng HS, Tsai WC, Chen TH, Su CH, Wu CW, Lui WY. Risk factors for post-pancreaticoduodenectomy bleeding and finding an innovative approach to treatment. *Dig Surg* 2009; **26**: 297-305 [PMID: 19602889 DOI: 10.1159/000228245]
- 14 **Lu JW**, Ding HF, Wu XN, Liu XM, Wang B, Wu Z, Lv Y, Zhang XF. Intra-abdominal hemorrhage following 739 consecutive pancreaticoduodenectomy: Risk factors and treatments. *J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2019; **34**: 1100-1107 [PMID: 30511762 DOI: 10.1111/jgh.14560]
- 15 **Athar MW**, Abir G, Seay RC, Guo N, Butwick A, Carvalho B. Accuracy of visual estimation of blood loss in obstetrics using clinical reconstructions: an observational simulation cohort study. *Int J Obstet Anesth* 2022; **50**: 103539 [PMID: 35397264 DOI: 10.1016/j.ijoa.2022.103539]
- 16 **Lemée J**, Scalabre A, Chaleur C, Raia-Barjat T. Visual estimation of postpartum blood loss during a simulation training: A prospective study. *J Gynecol Obstet Hum Reprod* 2020; **49**: 101673 [PMID: 31816433 DOI: 10.1016/j.jogoh.2019.101673]
- 17 **Meiser A**, Casagrande O, Skipka G, Laubenthal H. [Quantification of blood loss. How precise is visual estimation and what does its accuracy depend on?]. *Anaesthesist* 2001; **50**: 13-20 [PMID: 11220251 DOI: 10.1007/s001010050957]
- 18 **Vitello DJ**, Ripper RM, Fettiplace MR, Weinberg GL, Vitello JM. Blood Density Is Nearly Equal to Water Density: A Validation Study of the Gravimetric Method of Measuring Intraoperative Blood Loss. *J Vet Med* 2015; **2015**: 152730 [PMID: 26464949 DOI: 10.1155/2015/152730]
- 19 **Rubenstein AF**, Zamudio S, Douglas C, Sledge S, Thurer RL. Automated Quantification of Blood Loss versus Visual Estimation in 274 Vaginal Deliveries. *Am J Perinatol* 2021; **38**: 1031-1035 [PMID: 32052398 DOI: 10.1055/s-0040-1701507]
- 20 **Nakanishi K**, Kanda M, Kadera Y. Long-lasting discussion: Adverse effects of intraoperative blood loss and allogeneic transfusion on prognosis of patients with gastric cancer. *World J Gastroenterol* 2019; **25**: 2743-2751 [PMID: 31235997 DOI: 10.3748/wjg.v25.i22.2743]
- 21 **Imai D**, Maeda T, Wang H, Shimagaki T, Sanefuji K, Kayashima H, Tsutsui S, Matsuda H, Yoshizumi T, Mori M. Risk Factors for and Outcomes of Intraoperative Blood Loss in Liver Resection for Hepatocellular Tumors. *Am Surg* 2021; **87**: 376-383 [PMID: 32993315 DOI: 10.1177/0003134820949995]
- 22 **Chierici A**, Frontali A, Granieri S, Facciorusso A, De' Angelis N, Cotsoglou C. Postoperative morbidity and mortality after pancreatoduodenectomy with pancreatic duct occlusion compared to pancreatic anastomosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *HPB (Oxford)* 2022; **24**: 1395-1404 [PMID: 35450800 DOI: 10.1016/j.hpb.2022.03.015]
- 23 **Wente MN**, Veit JA, Bassi C, Dervenis C, Fingerhut A, Gouma DJ, Izbicki JR, Neoptolemos JP, Padbury RT, Sarr MG, Yeo CJ, Büchler MW. Postpancreatectomy hemorrhage (PPH): an International Study Group of Pancreatic Surgery (ISGPS) definition. *Surgery* 2007; **142**: 20-25 [PMID: 17629996 DOI: 10.1016/j.surg.2007.02.001]
- 24 **Chen JF**, Xu SF, Zhao W, Tian YH, Gong L, Yuan WS, Dong JH. Diagnostic and therapeutic strategies to manage post-pancreaticoduodenectomy hemorrhage. *World J Surg* 2015; **39**: 509-515 [PMID: 25287917 DOI: 10.1007/s00268-014-2809-3]
- 25 **Habib JR**, Gao S, Young AJ, Ghabi E, Ejaz A, Burns W, Burkhart R, Weiss M, Wolfgang CL, Cameron JL, Liddell R, Georgiades C, Hong K, He J, Lafaro KJ. Incidence and Contemporary Management of Delayed Bleeding Following Pancreaticoduodenectomy. *World J Surg* 2022; **46**: 1161-1171 [PMID: 35084554 DOI: 10.1007/s00268-022-06451-x]
- 26 **Sobczak AIS**, Stewart AJ. Coagulatory Defects in Type-1 and Type-2 Diabetes. *Int J Mol Sci* 2019; **20** [PMID: 31888259 DOI: 10.3390/ijms20246345]
- 27 **Johansson M**, Eriksson AC, Östgren CJ, Whiss PA. Platelet adhesion in type 2 diabetes: impact of plasma albumin and mean platelet volume. *Thromb J* 2021; **19**: 40 [PMID: 34078390 DOI: 10.1186/s12959-021-00291-w]
- 28 **Lei C**, Zhong L, Ling Y, Chen T. Blood Glucose Levels Are Associated with Cerebral Microbleeds in Patients with Acute Ischaemic Stroke. *Eur Neurol* 2018; **80**: 187-192 [PMID: 30572338 DOI: 10.1159/000494990]
- 29 **Zaccardi F**, Rocca B, Rizzi A, Ciminello A, Teofili L, Ghirlanda G, De Stefano V, Pitocco D. Platelet indices and glucose control in type 1 and type 2 diabetes mellitus: A case-control study. *Nutr Metab Cardiovasc Dis* 2017; **27**: 902-909 [PMID: 28838851 DOI: 10.1016/j.numecd.2017.06.016]
- 30 **Zheng J**, Yu Z, Ma L, Guo R, Lin S, You C, Li H. Association Between Blood Glucose and Functional Outcome in Intracerebral Hemorrhage: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *World Neurosurg* 2018; **114**: e756-e765 [PMID: 29555604 DOI: 10.1016/j.wneu.2018.03.077]
- 31 **Zhang F**, Li H, Qian J, Tao C, Zheng J, You C, Yang M. Hyperglycemia Predicts Blend Sign in Patients with Intracerebral Hemorrhage. *Med Sci Monit* 2018; **24**: 6237-6244 [PMID: 30191900 DOI: 10.12659/MSM.910024]
- 32 **Xie FL**, Ren LJ, Xu WD, Xu TL, Ge XQ, Li W, Ge XM, Zhou WK, Li K, Zhang YH, Wang Z. Preoperative and postoperative complications as risk factors for delayed gastric emptying following pancreaticoduodenectomy: A single-center retrospective study. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2023; **15**: 1941-1949 [PMID: 37901734 DOI: 10.4240/wjgs.v15.i9.1941]
- 33 **Baron TH**, Kozarek RA. Preoperative biliary stents in pancreatic cancer--proceed with caution. *N Engl J Med* 2010; **362**: 170-172 [PMID: 20071708 DOI: 10.1056/NEJMe0908773]
- 34 **Wang WG**, Fu L, Babu SR, Wang L, Tian BL. Incidence of and Risk Factors and Reinterventions for Post-Pancreatoduodenectomy Hemorrhage: Retrospective Analysis. *Dig Surg* 2018; **35**: 19-27 [PMID: 28384642 DOI: 10.1159/000460263]
- 35 **Shen Z**, Zhang J, Zhao S, Zhou Y, Wang W, Shen B. Preoperative biliary drainage of severely obstructive jaundiced patients decreases overall

- postoperative complications after pancreaticoduodenectomy: A retrospective and propensity score-matched analysis. *Pancreatology* 2020; **20**: 529-536 [PMID: [32107192](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.pan.2020.02.002](#)]
- 36 **Mak KH**, Bhatt DL, Shao M, Haffner SM, Hamm CW, Hankey GJ, Johnston SC, Montalescot G, Steg PG, Steinhubl SR, Fox KA, Topol EJ. The influence of body mass index on mortality and bleeding among patients with or at high-risk of atherothrombotic disease. *Eur Heart J* 2009; **30**: 857-865 [PMID: [19233855](#) DOI: [10.1093/eurheartj/ehp037](#)]
- 37 **Farvacque G**, Guilbaud T, Loundou AD, Scemamma U, Berdah SV, Moutardier V, Chirica M, Risse O, Girard E, Birnbaum DJ. Delayed post-pancreatectomy hemorrhage and bleeding recurrence after percutaneous endovascular treatment: risk factors from a bi-centric study of 307 consecutive patients. *Langenbecks Arch Surg* 2021; **406**: 1893-1902 [PMID: [33758966](#) DOI: [10.1007/s00423-021-02146-4](#)]



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>

