

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 PLA2G2B 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

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

Wen-Si Xu, Hui-Yu Zhang, Shuang Jin, Qi Zhang, Hong-Dan Liu, Ming-Tao Wang, Bo Zhang

Specialty type: Gastroenterology and hepatology

Provenance and peer review:

Unsolicited article; Externally peer reviewed.

Peer-review model: Single blind

Peer-review report's scientific quality classification

Grade A (Excellent): 0
Grade B (Very good): 0
Grade C (Good): C
Grade D (Fair): 0
Grade E (Poor): 0

P-Reviewer: Han KT, South Korea

Received: December 5, 2023

Peer-review started: December 5, 2023

First decision: December 21, 2023

Revised: January 5, 2024

Accepted: January 17, 2024

Article in press: January 17, 2024

Published online: February 27, 2024



Wen-Si Xu, Hui-Yu Zhang, Shuang Jin, Qi Zhang, Hong-Dan Liu, Ming-Tao Wang, Bo Zhang, Department of Gastroenterology, The Third Affiliated Hospital of Qiqihar Medical University, Qiqihar 161099, Heilongjiang Province, China

Corresponding author: Hui-Yu Zhang, MSc, Doctor, Department of Gastroenterology, The Third Affiliated Hospital of Qiqihar Medical University, No. 27 Taishun Street, Tiefeng District, Qiqihar 161099, Heilongjiang Province, China. 32397208@qq.com

Abstract

BACKGROUND

With advancements in the development of endoscopic technologies, the endoscopic submucosal dissection (ESD) has been one of the gold-standard therapies for early gastric cancer.

AIM

To investigate the efficacy and safety ESD in the treatment of early gastric cancer and precancerous lesions in the elderly patients.

METHODS

Seventy-eight elderly patients with early gastric cancer and precancerous lesions admitted to the Third Affiliated Hospital of Qiqihar Medical University were selected and classified into two groups according to the different surgical therapies they received between January 2021 and June 2022. Among them, 39 patients treated with ESD were included in an experimental group, and 39 patients treated with endoscopic mucosal resection (EMR) were included in a control group. We compared the basic intraoperative conditions, postoperative short-term recovery, long-term recovery effects and functional status of gastric mucosa between the two groups; the basic intraoperative conditions included lesion resection, intraoperative bleeding and operation time; the postoperative short-term recovery assessment indexes were length of hospital stay and incidence of surgical complications; and the long-term recovery assessment indexes were the recurrence rate at 1 year postoperatively and the survival situation at 1 year and 3 years postoperatively; and we compared the preoperative and predischARGE serum pepsinogen I (PG I) and PG II levels and PG I/PG II ratio in the two groups before surgery and discharge.

RESULTS

The curative resection rate and the rate of *en bloc* resection were higher in the

experimental group than in the control group. The intraoperative bleeding volume was higher in the experimental group than in the control group. The operation time was longer in the experimental group than that in the control group, and the rate for base residual focus was lower in the experimental group than that of the control group, and the differences were all statistically significant (all $P < 0.05$). The length of hospital stay was longer in the experimental group than in the control group, and the incidence of surgical complications, 1-year postoperative recurrence rate and 3-year postoperative survival rate were lower in the experimental group than in the control group, and the differences were statistically significant (all $P < 0.05$). However, the difference in the 1-year postoperative survival rate was not statistically significant between the two groups ($P > 0.05$). Before discharge, PG I and PG I/PG II ratio were elevated in both groups compared with the preoperative period, and the above indexes were higher in the experimental group than those in the control group, and the differences were statistically significant (both $P < 0.05$). Moreover, before discharge, PG II level was lower in both groups compared with the preoperative period, and the level was lower in the experimental group than in the control group, and the differences were all statistically significant (all $P < 0.05$).

CONCLUSION

Compared with EMR, ESD surgery is more thorough. It reduces the rate of base residual focus, recurrence rate, surgical complications, and promotes the recovery of gastric cells and glandular function. It is safe and suitable for clinical application.

Key Words: Endoscopic submucosal dissection; Endoscopic mucosal resection; Early gastric cancer; Serum pepsinogen; Elderly

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

Core Tip: Endoscopic submucosal dissection is one of the most commonly used minimally invasive therapies for early gastric cancer and precancerous lesions. The present study compared the primary intraoperative conditions, postoperative short- and long-term recovery and functional status of gastric mucosa between elderly patients undergoing endoscopic submucosal dissection vs those undergoing endoscopic mucosal resection to evaluate the efficacy and safety of these two operations.

Citation: Xu WS, Zhang HY, Jin S, Zhang Q, Liu HD, Wang MT, Zhang B. Efficacy and safety of endoscopic submucosal dissection for early gastric cancer and precancerous lesions in elderly patients. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2024; 16(2): 511-517

URL: <https://www.wjgnet.com/1948-9366/full/v16/i2/511.htm>

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v16.i2.511>

INTRODUCTION

Early gastric cancer mainly refers to the condition that cancer tissues occurred in the submucosa or mucosa[1]. With the progress in the therapy instruments and technological advancement in endoscopic examination[2-4], endoscopic submucosal dissection (ESD) has become one of the main therapies for early gastric cancer, and is widely used in clinical practice achieving inspiring comparable efficacy with radical resection. ESD, which originated in Japan, is characterized by a high rate of *en bloc* resection and low recurrence rate. Several studies[5-7] showed the long- and short-term outcomes of patients eligible for ESD are comparable with those undergoing gastric resection. Moreover, ESD is associated with less complications, shorter hospital stays and better quality of life. In the clinical practice, identifying risk factors for cancer recurrence and then developing corresponding therapeutic strategies is essential for the intervention in elderly patients with early gastric cancer and precancerous lesions. The present study discussed the efficacy and safety of ESD in the elderly population.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Participants

Seventy-eight elder patients with early gastric cancer and precancerous lesions treated at The Third Affiliated Hospital of Qiqihar Medical University were selected and classified into two groups based on the different surgical therapies they received between January 2021 and June 2022. Among them, 39 patients who underwent ESD were included in an experimental group and 39 patients who underwent endoscopic mucosal resection (EMR) were included in a control group. The present study was approved by the Hospital Ethics Committees. Eligible patients were patients aged 65 or older with early gastric cancer and precancerous lesions confirmed by histological biopsy and indications for ESD and EMR based on Japanese Gastric Cancer Treatment Guidelines 2010[8]. All patients were informed about the research and signed the

consent form. Patients younger than 65 years old with intrinsic muscle layer invasive gastric cancer, acute exacerbation, coagulopathy or major organ dysfunction were excluded from the study. Patients in the experimental group were aged 66 years to 81 years, 23 were male, 16 were female, and body mass index (BMI) was 19 kg/m² to 27 kg/m² (23.58 ± 9.31). Gastric lesions were located in the gastric antrum in 22 patients, gastric body in 11 patients, and gastric cardia and fundus in 6 patients. Pathological diagnostic results showed that 5 patients had intramucosal carcinoma, 20 patients had high-grade intraepithelial neoplasia, and 14 patients had low-grade intraepithelial neoplasia. The mean lesion diameter was 1.2 cm to 4.2 cm (1.46 ± 0.36) and the mean tumor area was 1.0 cm² to 7.6 cm² (6.59 ± 1.72). Patients in the control group were aged 65 years to 81 years (74.54 ± 12.43), 22 were male, 17 were female, and the BMI was 20 kg/m² to 26 kg/m² (24.12 ± 8.69). Gastric lesions were located in the gastric antrum in 21 patients, gastric body in 12 patients, and gastric cardia and fundus in 6 patients. Pathological diagnostic results showed that 6 patients had intramucosal carcinoma, 18 patients had high-grade intraepithelial neoplasia and 15 patients had low-grade intraepithelial neoplasia. The mean lesion diameter was 1.0 cm to 3.8 cm (1.57 ± 0.61) and the mean tumor area was 1.1 cm² to 7.5 cm² (7.14 ± 1.69). There was no significant difference in the general information between the two groups ($P > 0.05$).

Therapies

Patients in the experimental group underwent ESD. First, the superficial lesions were stained with 0.4% Indigo Rouge after general anesthesia to help identify the circumferential range. Second, resection area was identified through argon electrocoagulation marking at 0.5 cm surrounding the lesion with a 0.2 cm margin between markers[9]. Third, mixed solutions which mainly composed of adrenaline, glycerol, glucose and normal saline were multi-point injected outside electrocoagulation marking points to lift the lesion. Fourth, a Hook knife was used to cut through the lesions to the submucosal fibers around the outside of the electrocoagulation marking points and mixed solutions were injected into the submucosa so that the lesions could be completely resected. Electrocautery was used in case bleeding points formed. A negative pressure suction device was used to create clear vision. During the operation, the hemostatic agent sucralfate gel was sprayed on the wound surface if necessary. The removed tissues were sent to the Department of Pathology for detailed examination. The patients received symptomatic treatment after the procedure. The type of anesthesia and electrocoagulation marking applied in the control group was comparable to those of the experimental group. Small lesions were removed by ligation-assisted (banding). EMR techniques and cap-assisted endoscopic resection was applied for the bigger lesions. To be specific, a transparent cap was attached to the distal end of the endoscope and in the meantime a high-frequency snare was inserted into the cap. Then, a negative pressure suction device was used to suck the lesional mucosa to the cap. When the lesional mucosa is fully retracted through the transparent cap, the band-ligation device was tightened up to remove the lesion. The way for lesion management is comparable to that of the experimental group.

Outcome measures

Basic information during the operation, and short- and long-term recovery and the function of gastric mucosa after the operation were compared between the two groups[10-13]. First, intraoperative basic information included lesion resection, intraoperative bleeding and the operation time. Lesion resection had two measures of *en bloc* resection and curative resection. The former was performed to remove the lesion as a whole and the latter was performed to prevent lymphatic metastasis. Second, postoperative short-term recovery involved length of hospital stay and incidence of surgical complications which included fever, bleeding, perforation, *etc.* Overall incidence of postoperative complications was the composite of these complications. Third, the assessment of long-term recovery refers to 1-year recurrence rate and 1- and 3-year survival rate. Fourth, the level of serum pepsinogen (PG) I and PG II and PG I/II ratio were compared between the two groups before the operation and discharge, respectively.

Statistical analysis

SPSS statistics 22.0 was used to process the data. Measurement data was presented as mean ± SD and *t* test was used when comparing the differences between the two groups. Count data was presented as *n* (%) and Pearson's χ^2 test was used when comparing the differences between the two groups. A $P < 0.05$ represented that there was a significant difference.

RESULTS

General intraoperative information

Both *en bloc* resection rate and curative resection rate were higher in the experimental group than in the control group. Moreover, the intraoperative blood loss was greater in the experimental group than in the control group. However, rate of residual tumors at the base of the primary tumors was lower in the experimental group than in the control group (all $P < 0.05$, Table 1).

Postoperative recovery

Length of hospital stay was longer in the experimental group than in the control group. However, the incidence of surgical complications and postoperative recurrence rates at 1 year and 3 years were lower in the experimental group than in the control group (all $P < 0.05$, Table 2 and Table 3). There was no significant difference in the 1-year survival rate between the two groups ($P > 0.05$).

Table 1 Comparison of general intraoperative information between the two groups

Group	n	En bloc resection	Curative resection	Rate of residual tumors at the base of the primary tumors	Intraoperative blood loss in mL	Operation time in min
Experimental group	39	38 (97.44)	29 (74.36)	1 (2.56)	102.21 ± 9.31	85.32 ± 8.93
Control group	39	28 (71.79)	20 (51.28)	11 (28.21)	76.53 ± 7.83	68.22 ± 7.34
χ^2/t value		12.733	10.721	17.412	6.426	5.315
P value		0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001

Data are n (%).

Table 2 Comparison of postoperative recovery between the two groups

Group	n	Length of hospital stay in d	1-yr recurrence rate	1-yr survival rate	3-yr survival rate
Experimental group	39	13.41 ± 3.25	0 (0.00)	37 (94.87)	29 (74.36)
Control group	39	10.38 ± 2.84	5 (12.82)	33 (84.62)	25 (64.10)
χ^2/t value		6.359	7.534	7.683	6.706
P value		0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001

Data are n (%).

Table 3 Comparison of surgical complications between the two groups

Group	n	Fever	Intraoperative perforation	Postoperative bleeding	Overall incidence of surgical complications
Experimental group	39	11 (28.21)	1 (2.56)	2 (5.13)	14 (35.90)
Control group	39	10 (25.64)	0 (0.00)	8 (20.51)	18 (46.15)
χ^2 value		0.834	0.000	8.476	6.580
P value		0.361	1.000	0.001	0.001

Data are n (%).

Changes in the function of gastric mucosa

No significant difference was observed in PG I, PG II and PG I/II between the two groups before the operation ($P > 0.05$). However, PG I and PG I/II increased in both groups before the discharge compared with those before the operation and these levels were higher in the experimental group than in the control group (all $P < 0.05$, Table 4). On the contrary, PG II decreased in both groups before the discharge compared with those before the operation and it was lower in the experimental group than in the control group (all $P < 0.05$, Table 4).

DISCUSSION

The case fatality rate of advanced gastric cancer accounted for 13.6% of cancer fatality rates in China. After standardized treatment, 5-year survival rate for patients with early-stage gastric cancer was over 90%. The earliest diagnosis and precision therapy thus are crucial to improving the survival rate and should be highlighted. ESD is low cost and minimally invasive, and patients undergoing ESD generally have a better quality of life after surgery. The efficacy of ESD for distal early-stage gastric cancer and precancerous lesions is comparable with that for proximal ones in the elderly. However, the risk of postoperative fever is higher for ESD in patients with distal gastric cancer and precancerous lesions than in patients with proximal ones, and the surgery may cause greater trauma in the former. This may be attributed to biological characteristics and structural features related to the location of the lesions[14,15]. ESD allows endoscopists to achieve *en bloc* resection of flat lesions larger than 2 cm including early-stage gastric cancer. The ESD procedure requires greater endoscopic management skills compared with EMR. The incidence of surgical complications in ESD procedures is relatively high. Factors influencing ESD operational challenges include location and size of lesions, presence of ulcer and scar as well as intraoperative bleeding. Intraoperative hemorrhage may lead to extended operation time and perforation

Table 4 Comparison of changes in the function of gastric mucosa between the two groups

Group	n	PG I		PG II		PG I/II	
		Before the operation	Before the discharge	Before the operation	Before the discharge	Before the operation	Before the discharge
Experimental group	39	65.31 ± 12.32	95.36 ± 19.26 ^a	23.28 ± 2.51	14.20 ± 2.35 ^a	2.72 ± 0.31	5.97 ± 1.52
Control group	39	66.38 ± 12.48	75.42 ± 13.48 ^a	24.03 ± 3.04	18.05 ± 1.03 ^a	2.71 ± 0.29	4.76 ± 1.21
t value		0.359	153.313	0.728	6.706	0.000	12.832
P value		0.501	0.001	0.342	0.001	1.000	0.001

^aP < 0.05 vs those before the operation.

PG: Pepsinogen.

due to the blurry visual field it caused[16]. Postoperative bleeding should be prevented to better assess the risk in the surgery. Endoscopic ultrasound can be used to evaluate the depth of invasion in early gastric cancer before ESD surgery. In addition, patient's medication status, *e.g.*, whether antiplatelets are used, coagulation monitoring, and platelet tests can help evaluate the risk for bleeding[17]. In general, studies have shown the advantages of ESD over EMR in the aspect of *en bloc* resection rate, complete resection rate and local recurrence rate.

The present study showed that the curative resection rate, *en bloc* resection rate, 1- and 3-year survival rate were higher in patients undergoing ESD than in those undergoing EMR, although ESD was associated with greater intraoperative hemorrhages and longer length of hospital stays. The relatively long duration of operation and length of hospital stay and greater intraoperative hemorrhage may attribute to surgical difficulty, wide resection range, *etc* in elderly patients with early gastric cancer and precancerous lesions. PG is a pepsin precursor, and its level can indicate the function of gastric mucosa. PG I, PG II and PG I/PG II ratio can be used to evaluate the number of gastric parietal cells, the function of gastric mucosa and the degree of gastric mucosal atrophy[18,19]. The results manifested that ESD can protect the function of the gastric mucosa by conserving most parts of the mucosa of the stomach.

CONCLUSION

Above all, ESD can improve treatment efficacy and reduce postoperative complications in elderly patients with early gastric cancer and precancerous lesions. It can be widely used in clinical practice.

ARTICLE HIGHLIGHTS

Research background

Endoscopic submucosal dissection (ESD) can realize curative *en bloc* resection of gastrointestinal superficial lesions as well as organ preservation in spite of some surgical risks such as perforation, intraoperative bleeding and prolonged operative duration.

Research motivation

Age is an important risk factor for the development of gastric cancer and meanwhile it influences the treatment options for gastric cancer, especially for the older patients who are more vulnerable to laparotomy.

Research objectives

This study aimed to investigate the efficacy and safety of ESD for the treatment of elderly patients with early gastric cancer and precancerous lesions.

Research methods

Surgical indexes, postoperative complications, recovery and prognosis were compared between patients with early gastric cancer and precancerous lesions undergoing ESD with those undergoing endoscopic mucosal resection (EMR).

Research results

ESD shows greater benefits in the aspects of the primary intraoperative conditions, postoperative short- and long-term recovery and functional status of gastric mucosa over EMR.

Research conclusions

ESD is a more effective option than EMR in the treatment of early gastric cancer and precancerous lesions in the elderly.

Research perspectives

Curative criteria after ESD for early gastric carcinoma should be considered in further studies to maximize the benefits of ESD for the recipients and provide evidence for the subsequent follow-up and treatment decision-making.

FOOTNOTES

Author contributions: Xu WS and Zhang HY designed the study; Jin S, Zhang Q, Liu HD, Wang MT and Zhang B contributed to the data collection and analysis; Xu WS drafted the manuscript; All authors have read and approved the final manuscript.

Supported by Qiqihar Scientific and Technological Plan Joint Guidance Projects, No. LSF GG-2023015.

Institutional review board statement: The study was reviewed and approved by The Third Affiliated Hospital of Qiqihar Medical University Institutional Review Board.

Informed consent statement: All study participants, or their legal guardian, provided informed written consent prior to study enrollment.

Conflict-of-interest statement: The authors report having no conflicts of interest.

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 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: Hui-Yu Zhang 0009-0000-1242-0617.

S-Editor: Wang JL

L-Editor: Filipodia

P-Editor: Xu ZH

REFERENCES

- Costa LCDS, Santos JOM, Miyajima NT, Montes CG, Andreollo NA, Lopes LR. Efficacy analysis of endoscopic submucosal dissection for the early gastric cancer and precancerous lesions. *Arq Gastroenterol* 2022; **59**: 421-427 [PMID: 36102442 DOI: 10.1590/S0004-2803.20220300075]
- Ono H, Yao K, Fujishiro M, Oda I, Uedo N, Nimura S, Yahagi N, Iishi H, Oka M, Ajioka Y, Fujimoto K. Guidelines for endoscopic submucosal dissection and endoscopic mucosal resection for early gastric cancer (second edition). *Dig Endosc* 2021; **33**: 4-20 [PMID: 33107115 DOI: 10.1111/den.13883]
- Shiotsuki K, Takizawa K, Ono H. Indications of Endoscopic Submucosal Dissection for Undifferentiated Early Gastric Cancer: Current Status and Future Perspectives for Further Expansion. *Digestion* 2022; **103**: 76-82 [PMID: 34736250 DOI: 10.1159/000519650]
- Liu Q, Ding L, Qiu X, Meng F. Updated evaluation of endoscopic submucosal dissection vs surgery for early gastric cancer: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Surg* 2020; **73**: 28-41 [PMID: 31783166 DOI: 10.1016/j.ijssu.2019.11.027]
- Yoon J, Yoo SY, Park YS, Choi KD, Kim BS, Yoo MW, Lee IS, Yook JH, Kim GH, Na HK, Ahn JY, Lee JH, Jung KW, Kim DH, Song HJ, Lee GH, Jung HY. Reevaluation of the expanded indications in undifferentiated early gastric cancer for endoscopic submucosal dissection. *World J Gastroenterol* 2022; **28**: 1548-1562 [PMID: 35582127 DOI: 10.3748/wjg.v28.i15.1548]
- Takizawa K, Ono H, Hasuiki N, Takashima A, Minashi K, Boku N, Kushima R, Katayama H, Ogawa G, Fukuda H, Fujisaki J, Oda I, Yano T, Hori S, Doyama H, Hirasawa K, Yamamoto Y, Ishihara R, Tanabe S, Niwa Y, Nakagawa M, Terashima M, Muto M; Gastrointestinal Endoscopy Group (GIESG) and the Stomach Cancer Study Group (SCSG) of Japan Clinical Oncology Group. A nonrandomized, single-arm confirmatory trial of expanded endoscopic submucosal dissection indication for undifferentiated early gastric cancer: Japan Clinical Oncology Group study (JCOG1009/1010). *Gastric Cancer* 2021; **24**: 479-491 [PMID: 33161444 DOI: 10.1007/s10120-020-01134-9]
- Esaki M, Ihara E, Gotoda T. Endoscopic instruments and techniques in endoscopic submucosal dissection for early gastric cancer. *Expert Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2021; **15**: 1009-1020 [PMID: 33909540 DOI: 10.1080/17474124.2021.1924056]
- Japanese Gastric Cancer Association. Japanese gastric cancer treatment guidelines 2010 (ver. 3). *Gastric Cancer* 2011; **14**: 113-123 [PMID: 21573742 DOI: 10.1007/s10120-011-0042-4]
- Nishizawa T, Yahagi N. Long-Term Outcomes of Using Endoscopic Submucosal Dissection to Treat Early Gastric Cancer. *Gut Liver* 2018; **12**: 119-124 [PMID: 28673068 DOI: 10.5009/gnl17095]
- Hatta W, Gotoda T, Oyama T, Kawata N, Takahashi A, Yoshifuku Y, Hoteya S, Nakagawa M, Hirano M, Esaki M, Matsuda M, Ohnita K,

- Yamanouchi K, Yoshida M, Dohi O, Takada J, Tanaka K, Yamada S, Tsuji T, Ito H, Hayashi Y, Nakaya N, Nakamura T, Shimosegawa T. A Scoring System to Stratify Curability after Endoscopic Submucosal Dissection for Early Gastric Cancer: "eCura system". *Am J Gastroenterol* 2017; **112**: 874-881 [PMID: 28397873 DOI: 10.1038/ajg.2017.95]
- 11 Gao YL, Zhang YH, Cao M. Preoperative evaluation of endoscopic submucosal dissection for early gastric cancer. *Medicine (Baltimore)* 2022; **101**: e30582 [PMID: 36123856 DOI: 10.1097/MD.00000000000030582]
- 12 Ahmed Y, Othman M. EMR/ESD: Techniques, Complications, and Evidence. *Curr Gastroenterol Rep* 2020; **22**: 39 [PMID: 32542462 DOI: 10.1007/s11894-020-00777-z]
- 13 Goto O, Kaise M, Iwakiri K. What's New with Endoscopic Treatments for Early Gastric Cancer in the "Post-ESD Era"? *Digestion* 2022; **103**: 92-98 [PMID: 34518449 DOI: 10.1159/000518892]
- 14 Yang HJ, Kim JH, Kim NW, Choi IJ. Comparison of long-term outcomes of endoscopic submucosal dissection and surgery for undifferentiated-type early gastric cancer meeting the expanded criteria: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Surg Endosc* 2022; **36**: 3686-3697 [PMID: 35194664 DOI: 10.1007/s00464-022-09126-9]
- 15 Draganov PV, Wang AY, Othman MO, Fukami N. AGA Institute Clinical Practice Update: Endoscopic Submucosal Dissection in the United States. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2019; **17**: 16-25.e1 [PMID: 30077787 DOI: 10.1016/j.cgh.2018.07.041]
- 16 Hatta W, Gotoda T, Koike T, Masamune A. History and future perspectives in Japanese guidelines for endoscopic resection of early gastric cancer. *Dig Endosc* 2020; **32**: 180-190 [PMID: 31529716 DOI: 10.1111/den.13531]
- 17 Kim HS, Lee DK, Baik SK, Kim JM, Kwon SO, Kim DS, Cho MY. Endoscopic mucosal resection with a ligation device for early gastric cancer and precancerous lesions: comparison of its therapeutic efficacy with surgical resection. *Yonsei Med J* 2000; **41**: 577-583 [PMID: 11079617 DOI: 10.3349/ymj.2000.41.5.577]
- 18 Zhou J, Ji DN, Li F, Xiao ZL, Huang RX, Xiang P. [Efficacy and safety of endoscopic submucosal dissection in elder patients with early gastric cancer and precancerous lesions]. *Laonian Yixue Yu Baojian* 2018; **2**: 203-204 [DOI: 10.3969/j.issn.1008-8296.2018.02.031]
- 19 Song C, Zhang Yh, Huang L. [Efficacy of endoscopic submucosal dissection vs endoscopic mucosal resection for early gastric cancer and precancerous lesions and the effects on serum pepsinogen]. *Guangxi Yixue* 2020; **42**: 2943-2947 [DOI: 10.11675/j.issn.0253-4304.2020.22.14]



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>

