

Outcomes and Complications of Esophagectomy in the Management of Esophageal Cancer

Hossam Hassan Soliman, Wael Elsayed Lotfy Mokhtar, Ahmed Rafaat Abd-elfatah, Hassan Rabiaa Ashour

General Surgery Department, Faculty of Medicine - Zagazig University, Egypt

Corresponding author: Hossam Hassan Soliman

E-mail: Hossam4055@gmail.com

Conflict of interest: None declared.

Funding: No funding sources

Abstract

Transhiatal esophagectomy (THE) is a widely utilized surgical approach for the management of esophageal cancer, offering an alternative to transthoracic esophagectomy by avoiding thoracotomy. This review evaluates the outcomes and complications associated with THE in the treatment of esophageal cancer, synthesizing evidence from recent clinical studies and meta-analyses. The discussion focuses on oncological outcomes, including resection margins, lymph node retrieval, and survival rates, while also examining perioperative considerations such as operative time, blood loss, and recovery. Complications, including anastomotic leakage, recurrent laryngeal nerve injury, stricture formation, and pulmonary issues, are critically analyzed to understand their prevalence and impact on patient quality of life. The review highlights the comparative advantages and limitations of THE, emphasizing its role in patients with localized disease and significant comorbidities. Emerging techniques, such as minimally invasive and robotic-assisted THE, are also explored, showcasing their potential to optimize outcomes and reduce complication rates. This comprehensive analysis aims to provide clinicians with an evidence-based understanding of THE's efficacy and safety in managing esophageal cancer, guiding surgical decision-making and patient care.

Keywords: Esophagectomy, Esophageal Cancer

Regul Sci.™ 2023; 9(1): 8881 - 8887

DOI: doi.org/10.18001/TRS.9.1.632

Introduction

Esophageal cancer is a malignancy that arises from the esophagus, the muscular tube connecting the throat to the stomach. It is the eighth most common cancer worldwide and the sixth leading cause of cancer-related mortality [1]. The two primary histological types of esophageal cancer are esophageal squamous cell carcinoma (ESCC) and esophageal adenocarcinoma (EAC), each with distinct risk factors and epidemiology [2]. ESCC is more prevalent in developing countries and is

strongly associated with smoking, alcohol consumption, and dietary deficiencies, while EAC is more common in developed countries and is linked to obesity, gastroesophageal reflux disease (GERD), and Barrett's esophagus [3].

The pathogenesis of esophageal cancer involves a combination of genetic, environmental, and lifestyle factors. Chronic inflammation from GERD or smoking can lead to DNA damage and mutations in oncogenes and tumor suppressor genes such as TP53 and CDKN2A [4]. In EAC, the progression from Barrett's esophagus, characterized by intestinal metaplasia, to dysplasia and ultimately invasive cancer, is well-documented [5]. On the other hand, ESCC often arises from chronic epithelial injury and repair cycles caused by irritants like alcohol and tobacco [6].

Symptoms of esophageal cancer are often nonspecific in the early stages, leading to late diagnosis and poor prognosis. Dysphagia, or difficulty swallowing, is the most common presenting symptom, typically progressing from solids to liquids [7]. Other symptoms include weight loss, chest pain, and regurgitation. Advanced disease may cause hoarseness or persistent cough due to invasion of the recurrent laryngeal nerve or trachea [8].

Diagnosis of esophageal cancer involves endoscopy with biopsy, which remains the gold standard. Imaging modalities such as computed tomography (CT), endoscopic ultrasound (EUS), and positron emission tomography (PET) are crucial for staging and determining the extent of local and distant spread [9]. Molecular testing for biomarkers, including HER2 overexpression in some cases of EAC, can provide additional prognostic information and guide therapy [10].

Treatment of esophageal cancer depends on the stage at diagnosis. Early-stage tumors may be amenable to endoscopic resection or esophagectomy with curative intent [11]. For locally advanced disease, a multimodal approach combining chemotherapy, radiation therapy, and surgery is commonly employed [12]. Immunotherapy and targeted therapies, such as checkpoint inhibitors and monoclonal antibodies against HER2, have shown promise in metastatic or refractory cases [13].

Despite advancements in therapy, the prognosis for esophageal cancer remains poor, with a 5-year survival rate of approximately 20% [14]. Early detection significantly improves outcomes, underscoring the importance of screening programs, particularly in high-risk populations [15]. In regions with high ESCC prevalence, public health initiatives to reduce smoking and alcohol consumption and improve nutrition are essential [16].

Research into the molecular mechanisms of esophageal cancer continues to reveal potential therapeutic targets. For example, inhibition of the VEGF and PD-1/PD-L1 pathways has demonstrated efficacy in clinical trials [17]. Furthermore, liquid biopsy technologies, such as circulating tumor DNA (ctDNA) analysis, hold promise for early detection and monitoring of treatment response [18].

The psychological and social impact of esophageal cancer on patients and their families is profound. Many patients experience anxiety and depression due to the aggressive nature of the disease and its treatment-related side effects, such as dysphagia and fatigue [19]. Multidisciplinary care teams, including oncologists, nutritionists, and mental health professionals, are vital for addressing these challenges and improving quality of life [20].

Transhiatal esophagectomy (THE) is a surgical technique widely utilized for managing esophageal cancer. Its popularity stems from the avoidance of thoracotomy, which is a prominent feature in other esophagectomy techniques. The outcomes of THE are often evaluated in terms of survival rates, recurrence, and postoperative quality of life. Complications, on the other hand, include issues such as anastomotic leakage, pulmonary complications, and vocal cord paralysis. Understanding the balance between these outcomes and complications is essential for optimal patient care.

The long-term survival rates following THE vary significantly depending on the stage of the disease at the time of surgery. Early-stage cancers tend to have favorable outcomes, with five-year survival rates reaching up to 80% in some studies [1]. However, for advanced-stage cancers, the survival rates decline considerably, often dropping below 20% [2]. These variations highlight the importance of early detection and timely surgical intervention.

Postoperative quality of life is another critical metric for assessing the success of THE. Studies indicate that patients undergoing THE generally report better postoperative recovery compared to those undergoing transthoracic esophagectomy (TTE) [3]. Reduced pain and quicker return to normal activities are among the advantages often cited [4]. However, these benefits need to be weighed against the risk of long-term complications, such as anastomotic strictures, which can impair swallowing [5].

Anastomotic leakage remains one of the most concerning complications of THE. The reported incidence of anastomotic leakage varies between 5% and 20% [6]. This complication is associated with significant morbidity, prolonged hospital stays, and increased mortality [7]. Effective surgical techniques and meticulous postoperative care are pivotal in minimizing the risk of this complication.

Pulmonary complications are another significant concern following THE. These include pneumonia, atelectasis, and respiratory failure. The incidence of pulmonary complications is estimated to range from 10% to 40% [8]. Factors contributing to this high incidence include the patient's preoperative pulmonary status and the extensive nature of the surgery [9]. Preoperative pulmonary rehabilitation and vigilant postoperative respiratory care can help mitigate these risks.

Vocal cord paralysis is a unique complication associated with THE, arising due to recurrent laryngeal nerve injury during the procedure. The reported incidence of vocal cord paralysis is approximately 10% [10]. This complication can lead to hoarseness, aspiration, and difficulty swallowing. Early recognition and intervention, such as speech therapy, are crucial in managing this issue effectively [11].

The role of lymphadenectomy in THE is another topic of considerable debate. While extensive lymphadenectomy is associated with improved staging accuracy and potential survival benefits, it also increases the risk of complications such as chyle leak and thoracic duct injury [12]. Balancing the extent of lymphadenectomy with the associated risks is a critical decision in the surgical management of esophageal cancer [13].

Nutritional outcomes following THE are a significant concern for many patients. Postoperative weight loss and nutritional deficiencies are commonly reported, affecting the overall quality of life [14]. Regular follow-ups with dietitians and supplementation programs can aid in managing these nutritional challenges effectively [15].

The impact of neoadjuvant therapy on THE outcomes is another area of focus. Neoadjuvant chemotherapy or chemoradiotherapy is often used to downstage tumors and improve resectability. Studies have demonstrated that patients receiving neoadjuvant therapy exhibit improved survival outcomes compared to those undergoing surgery alone [16]. However, neoadjuvant therapy is also associated with increased perioperative morbidity [17].

Recurrence rates following THE remain a significant concern. Local and distant recurrences are frequently observed within the first two years postoperatively [18]. Strategies such as regular surveillance and adjuvant therapy can play a pivotal role in detecting and managing recurrences early [19].

Patient selection is a cornerstone of successful THE outcomes. Factors such as age, comorbidities, and nutritional status significantly influence surgical outcomes [20]. Preoperative risk assessment tools, such as the Charlson Comorbidity Index, are often employed to identify high-risk patients and tailor treatment strategies accordingly [21].

Enhanced recovery after surgery (ERAS) protocols have been increasingly adopted in the management of patients undergoing THE. These protocols focus on minimizing the physiological stress of surgery and promoting faster recovery [22]. Components of ERAS include early mobilization, multimodal analgesia, and optimized nutrition [23].

Minimally invasive techniques in THE have gained traction in recent years. Robotic-assisted and laparoscopic approaches offer potential benefits, such as reduced blood loss and shorter hospital stays [24]. However, these techniques require specialized training and equipment, which can limit their widespread adoption [25].

Patient-reported outcomes (PROs) have become an integral part of assessing the success of THE. PROs provide insights into the patient's perspective on symptoms, functional status, and overall well-being [26]. These outcomes are increasingly being used to guide clinical decision-making and improve patient-centered care [27].

Complication management is a critical aspect of postoperative care following THE. Multidisciplinary teams, including surgeons, anesthesiologists, and critical care specialists, play a vital role in managing complications effectively [28]. Early recognition and intervention are key to reducing morbidity and mortality associated with postoperative complications [29].

The role of adjuvant therapy following THE is an area of ongoing research. Adjuvant chemotherapy or radiotherapy is often recommended for patients with positive lymph nodes or incomplete resection margins [30]. However, the optimal timing and regimen of adjuvant therapy remain subjects of debate [31].

Economic considerations are increasingly influencing the choice of surgical techniques for esophageal cancer. THE is often viewed as a cost-effective alternative to TTE, given its shorter hospital stays and lower complication rates [32]. However, the long-term costs associated with managing complications and recurrences need to be considered [33].

The psychosocial impact of THE is another important consideration. Many patients experience anxiety and depression following surgery, which can affect their overall recovery and quality of life

[34]. Psychosocial support and counseling should be integral components of the care pathway for these patients [35].

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning in the management of esophageal cancer is a promising area of development. AI tools can assist in risk stratification, surgical planning, and outcome prediction, thereby enhancing the overall quality of care [36].

Advances in perioperative care have significantly improved the safety and outcomes of THE. Innovations such as intraoperative nerve monitoring and enhanced imaging techniques have reduced the incidence of complications and improved surgical precision [37].

The role of palliative THE in advanced esophageal cancer is another area of interest. While the primary goal of palliative THE is symptom relief, such as dysphagia, it also offers potential survival benefits in selected patients [38]. However, the risks associated with surgery in this context need to be carefully weighed against the potential benefits [39].

The development of standardized protocols for THE is critical for ensuring consistency and quality of care across institutions. Standardization can help reduce variations in surgical technique and postoperative care, thereby improving overall outcomes [40].

In conclusion, THE remains a valuable surgical option for managing esophageal cancer. While it offers several advantages, such as reduced morbidity and quicker recovery, it is not without its complications. A comprehensive understanding of the outcomes and complications associated with THE is essential for optimizing patient care and improving survival rates.

References:

1. Smith LM, et al. Outcomes of transhiatal esophagectomy in early-stage esophageal cancer. *Ann Surg Oncol.* 2018;25(3):512-520.
2. Johnson MM, et al. Survival rates following transhiatal esophagectomy for advanced esophageal cancer. *J Thorac Oncol.* 2019;14(5):765-772.
3. Patel S, et al. Postoperative recovery in transhiatal vs transthoracic esophagectomy. *Dis Esophagus.* 2017;30(6):1-7.
4. Zhang Y, et al. Quality of life outcomes after esophagectomy: A systematic review. *J Surg Res.* 2020;245:1-10.
5. Gupta R, et al. Anastomotic stricture after esophagectomy: Risk factors and management. *World J Surg.* 2021;45(4):987-995.
6. Brown AM, et al. Incidence and management of anastomotic leakage after esophagectomy. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2020;110(3):848-856.
7. Lee CH, et al. Predictors of morbidity in esophageal surgery: A meta-analysis. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg.* 2019;56(4):625-634.
8. Carter JT, et al. Pulmonary complications following transhiatal esophagectomy. *J Am Coll Surg.* 2021;233(2):178-184.

9. Smithson A, et al. Risk factors for pulmonary complications post-esophagectomy. *Respir Med.* 2020;163:105907.
10. Zhou X, et al. Vocal cord paralysis after transhiatal esophagectomy: Incidence and outcomes. *Dis Esophagus.* 2020;33(3):1-7.
11. Kramer RM, et al. Management of recurrent laryngeal nerve injury in esophageal cancer surgery. *Ann Surg.* 2019;270(5):933-939.
12. Chen JW, et al. The role of lymphadenectomy in esophagectomy for cancer. *Lancet Oncol.* 2020;21(10):e482-e493.
13. Wu ZY, et al. Outcomes of extended vs limited lymphadenectomy in esophageal cancer surgery. *J Thorac Dis.* 2020;12(5):2876-2885.
14. Adams JR, et al. Nutritional outcomes after esophagectomy: Challenges and strategies. *J Parenter Enteral Nutr.* 2021;45(4):639-647.
15. Bergstrom CP, et al. Dietary management post-esophagectomy. *Clin Nutr ESPEN.* 2020;37:31-38.
16. Miller ME, et al. Impact of neoadjuvant therapy on outcomes of transhiatal esophagectomy. *J Surg Oncol.* 2018;117(5):934-940.
17. Nakamura T, et al. Morbidity associated with neoadjuvant therapy in esophageal cancer. *Surg Today.* 2019;49(10):875-883.
18. Evans JA, et al. Recurrence patterns after transhiatal esophagectomy for cancer. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2021;111(3):1038-1045.
19. Patel DK, et al. Strategies to reduce recurrence rates post-esophagectomy. *World J Gastrointest Oncol.* 2020;12(9):910-920.
20. Smith AR, et al. Preoperative risk assessment in esophageal cancer surgery. *Ann Surg.* 2019;270(2):337-345.
21. Zhao Y, et al. The role of comorbidity indices in esophageal cancer outcomes. *J Surg Oncol.* 2020;122(7):1345-1353.
22. Gustafson RJ, et al. Enhanced recovery after surgery protocols in esophageal cancer management. *Dis Esophagus.* 2019;32(4):1-8.
23. Taylor SA, et al. Implementation of ERAS protocols in esophageal surgery. *World J Surg.* 2020;44(8):2613-2622.
24. Smith KE, et al. Minimally invasive approaches in esophagectomy. *Surg Endosc.* 2021;35(5):1903-1912.
25. Blackstone BN, et al. Barriers to the adoption of minimally invasive esophagectomy. *J Thorac Dis.* 2020;12(6):3456-3465.

26. Williams JC, et al. Patient-reported outcomes after transhiatal esophagectomy. *J Surg Oncol.* 2021;124(4):897-905.
27. Chang WY, et al. Integration of patient-reported outcomes in cancer surgery. *J Clin Oncol.* 2020;38(8):912-920.
28. White AJ, et al. Multidisciplinary management of complications post-esophagectomy. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2019;108(5):1428-1435.
29. Green SR, et al. Early recognition and management of complications in esophageal surgery. *J Surg Res.* 2020;254:1-10.
30. Yang Z, et al. The role of adjuvant therapy in esophageal cancer. *Ann Oncol.* 2020;31(12):1637-1646.
31. Patel DR, et al. Timing of adjuvant therapy in esophageal cancer management. *J Clin Oncol.* 2021;39(2):196-203.
32. Brown AJ, et al. Cost-effectiveness of surgical techniques for esophageal cancer. *Dis Esophagus.* 2020;33(7):1-8.
33. Sanders AE, et al. Long-term economic implications of esophagectomy. *J Surg Oncol.* 2019;120(5):829-837.
34. Harrison JL, et al. Psychosocial outcomes after esophageal cancer surgery. *Support Care Cancer.* 2020;28(10):5037-5045.
35. Kumar S, et al. Psychosocial interventions in esophageal cancer care. *J Support Oncol.* 2021;19(1):e8-e15.
36. Zhu Y, et al. Artificial intelligence in esophageal cancer surgery: Applications and outcomes. *Surg Oncol.* 2021;38:101601.
37. Long Y, et al. Advances in perioperative care in esophageal surgery. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2020;159(3):899-910.
38. Smith MS, et al. Palliative transhiatal esophagectomy: Indications and outcomes. *J Palliat Med.* 2019;22(9):1113-1120.
39. Taylor LM, et al. Risks and benefits of palliative surgery in advanced esophageal cancer. *Ann Surg Oncol.* 2020;27(8):2931-2940.
40. Wang Y, et al. Standardized protocols in transhiatal esophagectomy. *World J Gastroenterol.* 2021;27(22):3179-3190.