# Meta-analysis of the impact of postoperative complications on survival after oesophagectomy for cancer

E. Booka<sup>1</sup><sup>(b)</sup>, H. Takeuchi<sup>1,2</sup>, K. Suda<sup>1</sup><sup>(b)</sup>, K. Fukuda<sup>1</sup>, R. Nakamura<sup>1</sup>, N. Wada<sup>1</sup>, H. Kawakubo<sup>1</sup> and Y. Kitagawa<sup>1</sup>

Departments of Surgery, <sup>1</sup>Keio University School of Medicine, Tokyo, and <sup>2</sup>Hamamatsu University School of Medicine, Hamamatsu, Shizuoka, Japan *Correspondence to:* Professor H. Takeuchi, Department of Surgery, Hamamatsu University School of Medicine, 1-20-1 Handayama, Higashi-ku, Hamamatsu, Shizuoka 431-3192, Japan (e-mail: takeuchi@hama-med.ac.jp)

**Background:** Oesophagectomy has a high risk of postoperative morbidity. The impact of postoperative complications on overall survival of oesophageal cancer remains unclear. This meta-analysis addressed the impact of complications on long-term survival following oesophagectomy.

**Methods:** A search of PubMed and Cochrane Library databases was undertaken for systematic review of papers published between January 1995 and August 2016 that analysed the relation between postoperative complications and long-term survival. In the meta-analysis, data were pooled. The main outcome was overall survival (OS). Secondary endpoints included disease-free (DFS) and cancer-specific (CSS) survival. **Results:** A total of 357 citations was reviewed; 21 studies comprising 11 368 patients were included in the analyses. Overall, postoperative complications were associated with significantly decreased 5-year OS (hazard ratio (HR) 1.16, 95 per cent c.i. 1.06 to 1.26; P = 0.001) and 5-year CSS (HR 1.27, 1.09 to 1.47; P = 0.002). Pulmonary complications were associated with decreased 5-year OS (HR 1.37, 1.16 to 1.62; P < 0.001), CSS (HR 1.60, 1.35 to 1.89; P < 0.001) and 5-year OS (HR 1.10, 1.00 to 1.33; P = 0.05). Patients with anastomotic leakage had significantly decreased 5-year OS (HR 1.20, 1.10 to 1.30; P < 0.001), 5-year CSS (HR 1.81, 1.11 to 2.95; P = 0.02) and 5-year DFS (HR 1.13, 1.02 to 1.25; P = 0.01). **Conclusion:** Postoperative complications after oesophagectomy, including pulmonary complications and anastomotic leakage, decreased long-term survival.

*Funding information* No funding information provided

Paper accepted 28 February 2018 Published online 19 April 2018 in Wiley Online Library (www.bjsopen.com). **DOI:** 10.1002/bjs5.64

# Introduction

Worldwide, oesophageal cancer is the fifth most common cause of cancer-related death in men, and the eighth in women<sup>1</sup>. The postoperative 5-year survival rate in patients with AJCC stage I oesophageal cancer is approximately 90 per cent, and decreases to 45, 20 and 10 per cent in patients with stage II, III and IV disease respectively<sup>2,3</sup>. For most patients without distant metastases, oesophagectomy is still the mainstay of cancer treatment with or without chemoradiotherapy<sup>4</sup>. Despite advances in surgical techniques and perioperative management<sup>5</sup>, oesophagectomy is a highly invasive procedure associated with serious postoperative complications<sup>3</sup>. In a Japanese national database comprising 5354 patients who underwent oesophagectomy in 2011 in 713 hospitals, the overall morbidity rate was 41.9 per cent, and 30-day and surgery-related mortality rates were 1.2 and 3.4 per cent respectively<sup>6</sup>.

The impact of postoperative complications on long-term survival has been investigated for many cancers<sup>3,7,8</sup>. In some studies<sup>3,9–21</sup>, a negative impact of complications following oesophagectomy on long-term survival was reported. In other studies<sup>3,18,19,22–29</sup>, complications did not affect long-term survival. Meta-analyses focusing on the long-term impact of postoperative complications are not available. A systematic review and meta-analysis was therefore performed to assess the impact of postoperative complications on long-term survival after oesophagectomy.

# **Methods**

A systematic review and meta-analysis was carried out in accordance with the MOOSE criteria<sup>30</sup>. The key clinical question was: 'Do postoperative complications after oesophagectomy for oesophageal cancer impact survival?'.

© 2018 The Authors. *BJS Open* published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd on behalf of BJS Society Ltd *BJS Open* 2018; **2**: 276–284 This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

A systematic literature search of studies describing clinical trials published from January 1995 to August 2016 was conducted. Literature searches of the PubMed and Cochrane Library databases were conducted using the search formula: ('esophageal cancer' OR 'esophageal neoplasms' OR 'esophageal squamous cell carcinoma') AND ('esophagectomy' OR 'resection' OR 'surgery') AND ('anastomotic leakage' OR 'lung disease' OR 'pneumonia' OR 'postoperative complications' OR 'respiratory tract disease') AND ('survival' OR 'disease free survival' OR 'mortality' OR 'prognosis' OR 'hospital mortality' OR 'neoplasm recurrence').

# Eligibility criteria

RCTs and observational studies, including all types of operation (such as salvage surgery) and all types of neoadjuvant or adjuvant therapy, comparing the long-term survival of patients with or without postoperative oesophagectomy complications were eligible for inclusion. Postoperative pulmonary complications, anastomotic leakage and the total number of postoperative oesophagectomy complications were included in the analysis. Other complications such as recurrent laryngeal nerve paralysis or atrial fibrillation were excluded. Articles for which the full text was not available in English were excluded.

# Data extraction

Data were extracted by one author and one reviewer from the Japan Medical Library Association. Any discrepancies were dealt with by discussion among all authors until consensus was reached. The primary outcome was 5-year overall survival (OS) and secondary outcomes included disease-free (DFS) and cancer-specific (CSS) survival rates, which were extracted from the Kaplan-Meier curves in each study. The GRADE guidelines<sup>31</sup> were used to evaluate the quality of individual studies, considering risk of bias, inconsistency, indirectness, imprecision, publication bias, size of effect, dose-dependent gradient and plausible confounders. Studies assessed as of high quality in GRADE were included in the qualitative synthesis. It was expected that some studies would and others would not have included postoperative mortality. If some studies including postoperative mortality were excluded from the meta-analysis, the sample size for each comparison would have been smaller, and the results would have been meaningless; these studies were therefore included in the meta-analysis.



Fig. 1 Flow diagram of inclusion and exclusion criteria for the study

#### Statistical analysis

Analyses were performed using Review Manager<sup>®</sup> version 5.3 software (The Cochrane Collaboration, Oxford, UK). Pooled analysis was performed using a Mantel–Haenszel model, and the values were reported as hazard ratios (HRs) with 95 per cent confidence intervals. The significance of pooled HRs was determined by the Z test. P < 0.050 was considered statistically significant.

Statistical heterogeneity for each pooled estimate was assessed using Cochran's  $\chi^2$  statistic and quantified with the  $I^2$  statistic. An  $I^2$  value exceeding 50 per cent was considered to indicate heterogeneity. When heterogeneity was detected, a random-effects model was adopted; when heterogeneity was not observed, a fixed-effect model was used.

#### **Results**

# Search results

A total of 357 potentially relevant studies were identified, of which 32 were eligible for full-text review (*Fig. 1*). Twenty-one studies<sup>3,9–21,23–29</sup> met the eligibility criteria for qualitative synthesis (*Table 1*), and  $20^{3,9,10,12-21,23-29}$ 

Reference	Year	Complication	No. with complications	No. without complications
Hirai et al. <sup>12</sup>	1998	Any	47	100
Kinugasa <i>et al.</i> 9	2004	Pulmonary	38	80
Rizk <i>et al.</i> <sup>10</sup>	2004	Any	138	372
Abou-Jawde et al.13	2005	Pulmonary	18	123
Junemann-Ramirez et al.23	2005	Anastomotic leak	9	251
Martin et al.28	2005	Anastomotic leak	30	446
Ancona et al. <sup>24</sup>	2006	Pulmonary	110	327
		Any	85	437
Ferri <i>et al.</i> <sup>26</sup>	2006	Any	98	336
Lerut et al.11	2009	Any	97	41
Hu <i>et al.</i> <sup>14</sup>	2010	Any	90	271
D'Annoville et al. <sup>25</sup>	2012	Pulmonary	118	223
Xia <i>et al.</i> <sup>29</sup>	2013	Any	72	99
Lindner <i>et al.</i> <sup>27</sup>	2014			
Adenocarcinoma		Any	14	49
Squamous cell carcinoma		Any	7	15
Booka <i>et al.</i> <sup>3</sup>	2015	Pulmonary	64	220
		Anastomotic leak	55	229
Markar et al. <sup>15</sup>	2015	Anastomotic leak	208	2231
Doorakkers et al. <sup>16</sup>	2015	Any	75	221
Luc et al. <sup>17</sup>	2015	Any	16	95
Baba et al. <sup>18</sup>	2016	Pulmonary	99	403
		Any	217	285
Yamashita <i>et al.</i> <sup>21</sup>	2016	Pulmonary	22	233
		Anastomotic leak	6	249
		Any	104	151
Kataoka <i>et al.</i> <sup>19</sup>	2017	Pulmonary	22	130
		Anastomotic leak	21	131
Saeki <i>et al.</i> <sup>20</sup>	2017			
Stage 0-2		Pulmonary	44	360
		Anastomotic leak	88	316
Stage 3-4		Pulmonary	15	161
		Anastomotic leak	26	150
Stage 0-4		Any	154	426

Table 1 Characteristics of included studies

were eventually included for quantitative synthesis. The study that did not report 5-year outcome results was excluded from the quantitative synthesis<sup>11</sup>. One study<sup>19</sup> was a randomized trial; the others were observational studies.

The severity of postoperative complications was based on each study, and there was variability on grading of the severities. Almost all studies categorized the severity of postoperative complications using the Clavien–Dindo classification<sup>32</sup>.

The range in 1-, 3- and 5-year OS rates for patients with complications was 47-84 per cent<sup>27,29</sup>, 18–84 per cent<sup>27,29</sup> and 8–84 per cent<sup>27,29</sup> respectively. For patients without complications, the respective rates were 70–90 per cent<sup>18,29</sup>, 30–71 per cent<sup>18,29</sup> and 10–66 per cent<sup>27,29</sup>. The range in 1-, 3-, and 5-year OS rates for patients with pulmonary complications was 28–87 per cent<sup>13,19</sup>, 22–59 per cent<sup>13,19</sup> and 6–41 per cent<sup>13,20</sup> respectively, compared with 58–96 per cent<sup>13,19</sup>, 36–78 per cent<sup>13,20</sup>

and 29–65.7 per cent<sup>13,20</sup> for those without pulmonary complications. The range in 1-, 3- and 5-year OS rates for patients with anastomotic leakage was 66–86 per cent<sup>19,23</sup>, 20–58 per cent<sup>20</sup> and 15–57 per cent<sup>19,20</sup> respectively, compared with 64–94 per cent<sup>19,23</sup>, 30–79 per cent<sup>20,23</sup> and 24–68 per cent<sup>20,23</sup> for those without anastomotic leakage. Of the 20 studies included in the quantitative synthesis, seven<sup>15–17,20,23,25,27</sup> excluded and 13<sup>3,9,10,12–14,18,19,21,24,26,28,29</sup> included perioperative mortality.

# Impact of pulmonary complications on survival

The impact of pulmonary complication on OS, CSS and DFS was evaluated in seven studies<sup>3,9,13,18–20,24</sup> including 2214 patients (*Fig. 2a*), three studies<sup>18,20,21</sup> including 1337 patients (*Fig. 3a*) and three studies<sup>3,19,25</sup> including 777 patients (*Fig. 4a*) respectively. Patients with pulmonary complications had significantly decreased 5-year OS (HR

	Overa	II survival									
Reference	Pulmonary complication	Pulmonary No pulmonary complication		Hazard ratio			Ha	zard ra	tio		
Kinugasa <i>et al</i> . <sup>9</sup>	28 of 38	37 of 80	12.3	1.59 (1.18, 2.16)				—			
Abou-Jawde et al. <sup>13</sup>	17 of 18	87 of 123	17.2	1.34 (1.14, 1.57)				-0-	_		
Ancona <i>et al</i> . <sup>24</sup>	68 of 110	209 of 327	16.9	0.97 (0.82, 1.14)							
Booka <i>et al</i> . <sup>3</sup>	38 of 64	105 of 220	14.2	1.24 (0.97, 1.59)					_		
Saeki <i>et al</i> . <sup>20</sup>	36 of 59	214 of 521	14.8	1.49 (1.18, 1.87)							
Baba <i>et al</i> . <sup>18</sup>	59 of 99	137 of 403	15.4	1.75 (1.42, 2.17)							
Kataoka <i>et al</i> . <sup>19</sup>	13 of 22	52 of 130	9.3	1.48 (0.98, 2.22)					•		
Total	359 of 410	841 of 1804	100.0	1.37 (1.16, 1.62)					•		
Heterogeneity: τ <sup>2</sup> =0·0	4; χ <sup>2</sup> =23·12, 6 d.	f., <i>P</i> <0.001; <i>I</i> <sup>2</sup> =74%									
Test for overall effect:	Z = 3.64, P < 0.001	l			0.1	0.2	0.5	1	2	5	10
					Favo	ours puli complica	monary tion	F	avours n comp	o pulmo plication	nary

## a Pulmonary complications

	Overa	all survival									
Reference	Anastomotic leak	No anastomotic leak	Weight (%)	Hazard ratio			Ha	zard ra	tio		
Junemann-Ramirez et al.2	<sup>23</sup> 6 of 9	190 of 251	3.4	0.88 (0.55, 1.41)				0			
Martin et al.28	23 of 30	303 of 446	9.9	1.13 (0.92, 1.39)				+			
Booka et al.3	29 of 55	114 of 229	11.4	1.06 (0.80, 1.40)							
Markar et al.15	127 of 208	1160 of 2231	51.3	1.17 (1.05, 1.32)							
Kataoka <i>et al</i> . <sup>19</sup>	9 of 21	58 of 131	4.2	0.97 (0.57, 1.64)					_		
Saeki et al. <sup>20</sup>	70 of 114	194 of 466	19.8	1.47 (1.23, 1.77)				-	-		
Total	264 of 437	2019 of 3754	100.0	1.20 (1.10, 1.30)				•			
Heterogeneity: $\chi^2 = 8.53$ , 5	5 d.f., P=0·13;	l <sup>2</sup> =41%									
Test for overall effect: Z=	4·24, <i>P</i> <0·01				0.1	0.2	0.5	1	2	5	10
					Favo	ours anas leak	tomotic	Fa	vours n	o anasto eak	motic

# **b** Anastomotic leakage

	Overal	ll survival									
Reference	Any complication	No complication	Weight (%)	Hazard ratio			Ha	izard ra	tio		
Hiri et al. <sup>12</sup>	37 of 47	58 of 100	7.5	1.36 (1.09, 1.70)				-0-	_	-	
Rizk et al.10	108 of 138	231 of 372	11.6	1.26 (1.12, 1.42)				-0-			
Ferri et al.26	79 of 98	263 of 336	11.8	1.03 (0.92, 1.15)				+			
Ancona et al.24	55 of 85	280 of 437	9.4	1.01 (0.85, 1.20)				-			
Hu et al.14	76 of 90	212 of 271	12.0	1.08 (0.97, 1.20)				-			
Xia et al.29	66 of 72	89 of 99	12.5	1.02 (0.93, 1.12)				+			
Lindner et al.27	4 of 21	27 of 64	0.8	0.45 (0.18, 1.14)							
Doorakkers et al.16	61 of 75	166 of 221	11.0	1.08 (0.95, 1.24)				-			
Luc et al.17	14 of 16	53 of 95	6.4	1.57 (1.21, 2.03)				-			
Baba et al. <sup>18</sup>	98 of 217	103 of 285	7.8	1.25 (1.01, 1.55)					-		
Saeki et al. <sup>20</sup>	89 of 154	176 of 426	9.2	1.40 (1.17, 1.67)				-0	_		
Total	687 of 1013	1658 of 2706	100.0	1.16 (1.06, 1.26)				•			
Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.0$	01; χ <sup>2</sup> =33·34, 10 d	.f., <i>P</i> <0.001; <i>I</i> <sup>2</sup> =70	0%								
Test for overall effect:	Z=3·27, P=0·001				0.1	0.2	0.5	1	2	5	10
					Favou	rs any co	mplicatio	n Fa	vours r	10 compl	ication

# C Any complication

Fig. 2 Forest plot comparing overall survival following oesophagectomy in patients with and without **a** pulmonary complications, **b** anastomotic leakage and **c** any complication. Mantel–Haenszel random-effects (a,c) or fixed-effect (b) models were used for meta-analysis. Hazard ratios are shown with 95 per cent confidence intervals

	Cancer-sp	ecific survival								
Reference	Pulmonary complication	No pulmonary complication	Weight (%)	Hazard ratio		Ha	azard ratio	1		
Saeki et al.20	35 of 59	183 of 521	39.0	1.69 (1.33, 2.15)			_	F		
Yamashita et al.21	13 of 22	98 of 233	17.7	1.40 (0.96, 2.05)				_		
Baba et al. <sup>18</sup>	41 of 99	105 of 403	43.3	1.59 (1.19, 2.12)						
Total	89 of 180	389 of 1157	100.0	1.60 (1.35, 1.89)			•	•		
Heterogeneity: $\chi^2 = 0.6$	65, 2 d.f., <i>P</i> =0·72;	l <sup>2</sup> =0%			1 1					
Test for overall effect:	Z=5·41, P<0·001	l			0.1 0.2	0.5	1	2	5	10
					Favours pul complica	monary ation	Favo	ours no pul complicati	mona ion	ary

#### **a** Pulmonary complications

	Cancer-sp	pecific survival									
Reference	Anastomotic leak	astomotic No anastomotic leak leak		Hazard ratio			Haz	zard rat	io		
Yamashita et al.21	6 of 6	103 of 249	49·1	2.24 (1.74, 2.89)							
Saeki et al.20	59 of 114	163 of 466	50.9	1.48 (1.19, 1.84)				-	-		
Total	65 of 120	266 of 715	100.0	1.81 (1.11, 2.95)							
Heterogeneity: $\tau^2=0.7$	11; χ <sup>2</sup> =8·59, 1 d.f.	, <i>P</i> =0·003; <i>I</i> <sup>2</sup> =88%					1			1	
Test for overall effect:	Z=2·40, P=0·02				0.1	0.5	0.2	1	2	5	10
					Favou	ırs anast leak	tomotic	Fav	ours no le	anastor eak	motic

#### **b** Anastomotic leakage

	Cancer-sp	ecific survival									
Reference	Any complication	No complication	Weight (%)	Weight (%) Hazard ratio			Haza	zard ratio			
Baba et al. <sup>18</sup>	61 of 217	71 of 285	32.6	1.13 (0.84, 1.51)			-				
Yamashita et al.21	51 of 104	60 of 151	26.0	1.23 (0.94, 1.63)				+	-		
Saeki <i>et al.</i> <sup>20</sup>	74 of 154	147 of 426	41.4	1.39 (1.13, 1.72)					_		
Total	186 of 475	278 of 862	100.0	1.27 (1.09, 1.47)							
Heterogeneity: $\chi^2 = 1.4$	42, 2 d.f., <i>P</i> =0·49;	l <sup>2</sup> =0%									
Test for overall effect:	Z=3·14, P=0·002				0.1	0.2	0.5	1	2	5	10
					Favour	rs any co	mplication	Fav	ours no	complic	ation

### C Any complication

Fig. 3 Forest plot comparing cancer-specific survival following oesophagectomy in patients with and without **a** pulmonary complications, **b** anastomotic leakage and **c** any complication. Mantel–Haenszel fixed-effect ( $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c}$ ) or random-effects ( $\mathbf{b}$ ) models were used for meta-analysis. Hazard ratios are shown with 95 per cent confidence intervals

1.37, 95 per cent c.i. 1.16 to 1.62; P < 0.001), 5-year CSS (HR 1.60, 1.35 to 1.89; P < 0.001) and 5-year DFS (HR 1.16, 1.00 to 1.33; P = 0.05).

# Impact of anastomotic leakage on survival

The impact of anastomotic leakage on OS, CSS and DFS was evaluated in six studies<sup>3,15,19,20,23,28</sup> including 4191 patients (*Fig. 2b*), two studies<sup>20,21</sup> including 835 patients (*Fig. 3b*) and three studies<sup>3,15,19</sup> including 2875 patients

(*Fig. 4b*) respectively. Patients with an astomotic leakage had significantly decreased 5-year OS (HR 1·20, 95 per cent c.i. 1·10 to 1·30; P < 0.001), 5-year CSS (HR 1·81, 1·11 to 2·95; P = 0.02) and 5-year DFS (HR 1·13, 1·02 to 1·25; P = 0.01).

# Impact of overall complications on survival

The impact of postoperative complications in general on OS and CSS was evaluated in 11 studies<sup>10,12,14,16–18,20,24,26,27,29</sup> including 3719 patients

Disease-	free survival									
Pulmonary complication	No pulmonary complication	Weight (%)	Hazard ratio			Н	azard ra	atio		
65 of 118	118 of 223	55·1	1.04 (0.85, 1.28)							
39 of 64	105 of 220	32.0	1.28 (1.00, 1.62)					⊢		
15 of 22	66 of 130	12.9	1.34 (0.96, 1.87)				-	<b>—</b>		
119 of 204	289 of 573	100.0	1.16 (1.00, 1.33)				•			
2 d.f., P=0·29;	l <sup>2</sup> =18%									
=2·00, <i>P</i> =0·05				0.1	0.2	0.5	1	2	5	10
				Fav	ours puli complica	nonary tion	F	avours n comp	o pulmo plication	nary
	Disease-           Pulmonary           complication           65 of 118           39 of 64           15 of 22           119 of 204           2 d.f., P=0.29;           =2.00, P=0.05	Disease-tree survival           Pulmonary complication         No pulmonary complication           65 of 118         118 of 223           39 of 64         105 of 220           15 of 22         66 of 130           119 of 204         289 of 573           2 d.f., $P=0.29$ ; $l^2=18\%$ =2.00, $P=0.05$	Disease-tree survival           Pulmonary complication         No pulmonary complication         Weight (%)           65 of 118         118 of 223         55·1           39 of 64         105 of 220         32·0           15 of 22         66 of 130         12·9           119 of 204         289 of 573         100·0           2 d.f., $P=0·29$ ; $l^2=18\%$ =2·00, $P=0·05$	Disease-tree survival           Pulmonary complication         No pulmonary complication         Weight (%)         Hazard ratio           65 of 118         118 of 223 $55 \cdot 1$ $1 \cdot 04 \ (0 \cdot 85, 1 \cdot 28)$ 39 of 64         105 of 220 $32 \cdot 0$ $1 \cdot 28 \ (1 \cdot 00, 1 \cdot 62)$ 15 of 22         66 of 130 $12 \cdot 9$ $1 \cdot 34 \ (0 \cdot 96, 1 \cdot 87)$ 119 of 204         289 of 573 $100 \cdot 0$ $1 \cdot 16 \ (1 \cdot 00, 1 \cdot 33)$ 2 d.f., $P = 0 \cdot 29; l^2 = 18\%$ $= 2 \cdot 00, P = 0 \cdot 05$	Disease-tree survival           Pulmonary complication         No pulmonary complication         Weight (%)         Hazard ratio           65 of 118         118 of 223 $55 \cdot 1$ $1 \cdot 04 (0.85, 1.28)$ $39 \text{ of } 64$ $105 \text{ of } 220$ $32 \cdot 0$ $1 \cdot 28 (1 \cdot 00, 1 \cdot 62)$ 15 of 22         66 of 130 $12 \cdot 9$ $1 \cdot 34 (0.96, 1.87)$ 119 of 204         289 of 573 $100 \cdot 0$ $1 \cdot 16 (1 \cdot 00, 1 \cdot 33)$ 2 d.f., $P = 0.29$ ; $l^2 = 18\%$ $= 2 \cdot 00, P = 0.05$ $\frac{1}{0.1}$	Disease-tree survival           Pulmonary complication         No pulmonary complication         Weight (%)         Hazard ratio           65 of 118         118 of 223         55·1         1·04 (0·85, 1·28)           39 of 64         105 of 220         32·0         1·28 (1·00, 1·62)           15 of 22         66 of 130         12·9         1·34 (0·96, 1·87)           119 of 204         289 of 573         100·0         1·16 (1·00, 1·33)           2 d.f., $P = 0·29; l^2 = 18\%$ =         -         -           =2·00, $P = 0·05$ -         -         -	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Disease-tree survival           Pulmonary complication         No pulmonary complication         Weight (%)         Hazard ratio         Hazard ratio           65 of 118         118 of 223 $55 \cdot 1$ $1 \cdot 04$ ( $0 \cdot 85$ , $1 \cdot 28$ ) $-$ 39 of 64         105 of 220 $32 \cdot 0$ $1 \cdot 28$ ( $1 \cdot 00$ , $1 \cdot 62$ ) $-$ 15 of 22         66 of 130 $12 \cdot 9$ $1 \cdot 34$ ( $0 \cdot 96$ , $1 \cdot 87$ ) $-$ 119 of 204         289 of 573 $100 \cdot 0$ $1 \cdot 16$ ( $1 \cdot 00$ , $1 \cdot 33$ ) $-$ 2 d.f., $P = 0 \cdot 29$ ; $I^2 = 18\%$ $   = 2 \cdot 00$ , $P = 0 \cdot 05$ $   Favours pulmonary complication         Favours n complication         - $	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $

	Disease	-free survival											
Reference	Anastomotic leak	No anastomotic leak	Weight (%)	Hazard ratio	Hazard ratio								
Booka et al.3	29 of 55	115 of 229	16.1	1.05 (0.79, 1.39)									
Markar et al.15	133 of 208	1249 of 2231	77.1	1.14 (1.02, 1.27)									
Kataoka et al.19	13 of 21	68 of 131	6.8	1.19 (0.82, 1.73)									
Total	175 of 284	1432 of 2591	100.0	1.13 (1.02, 1.25)				•					
Heterogeneity: $\chi^2 = 0.3$	88, 2 d.f., <i>P</i> =0·83;	l <sup>2</sup> =0%											
Test for overall effect:	Z=2·45, P=0·01				0.1	0.2	0.5	1	2	5	10		
					Fav	ours anas leak	stomotic	Fa	vours no	anasto eak	motic		

# **b** Anastomotic leak

Fig. 4 Forest plot comparing disease-free survival following oesophagectomy in patients with and without **a** pulmonary complications and **b** anastomotic leakage. A Mantel–Haenszel fixed-effect model was used for meta-analysis. Hazard ratios are shown with 95 per cent confidence intervals

(*Fig. 2c*) and three studies<sup>18,20,21</sup> including 1337 patients (*Fig. 3c*) respectively. There was no study investigating the impact of overall postoperative complications on DFS. Patients with more complications had significantly worse 5-year OS (HR 1·16, 95 per cent c.i. 1·06 to 1·26; P = 0.001) and 5-year CSS (HR 1·27, 1·09 to 1·47; P = 0.002).

# Impact of postoperative oesophagectomy complications on type of recurrence

Of the 21 eligible studies, four<sup>12,15,17,21</sup> investigated the impact of postoperative complications on recurrence type. One<sup>15</sup> of these studies investigated the impact of anastomotic leakage on recurrence type and found it to be independently associated with locoregional and mixed recurrence (simultaneous local and distant recurrence) but not distant recurrence. The other three studies<sup>12,17,21</sup> investigated the impact of overall complications on recurrence pattern. Meta-analysis revealed that postoper-ative oesophagectomy complications did not specifically

influence the site of recurrence (*Fig. S1*, supporting information).

#### **Risk of bias**

Only studies that were assessed as high quality in GRADE<sup>31</sup> were included. The  $I^2$  statistic detected heterogeneities in the studies analysed in *Figs 2a*, 2c and 3b; however, the forest plots showed that the direction of the point estimates was, in general, similar for all of the figures. As the heterogeneity was not significant, a random-effects analysis was used, which resolved the heterogeneity that could not readily be explained, leading to reliable results.

# Discussion

In this meta-analysis, postoperative complications after oesophagectomy had a significant negative impact on survival. Previous reports<sup>3,9–29</sup> of the impact of postoperative complications on long-term survival have been inconsistent.

Long-term survival was influenced in two ways. Some complications resulted in perioperative mortality, and there was an incremental effect of any type of complication on long-term survival. Deterioration of the general condition may have affected long-term OS and may have increased deaths unrelated to the oesophageal cancer<sup>3,19</sup>. Moreover, worsening of the general condition may have led to delay or cessation of additional therapy after oesophagectomy, resulting in oesophageal cancer recurrence and having a negative impact on CSS and DFS<sup>3,19</sup>.

Specific complications studied included pulmonary complications and anastomotic leakage. These often lead to generalized infection, which impacts significantly on the immunological system and in turn may lead to oesophageal cancer recurrence<sup>3</sup>. It was reported previously<sup>33</sup> that infectious postoperative oesophagectomy complications significantly increased the levels of inflammatory cytokines such as interleukin (IL) 6 and IL-8. Increased expression of both IL-8 and its receptor CXCR-2 have been correlated with tumour progression after oesophagectomy<sup>34</sup>. Anastomotic leakage may result in the local spread of viable tumour cells from stapled or sutured anastomoses. Locoregional recurrence after anastomotic leakage may be associated with a proinflammatory response that promotes tumour growth<sup>15</sup>.

Preventing postoperative complications may improve long-term survival after oesophagectomy. High-volume institutions with appropriate infrastructure are more able to deliver high-quality outcomes<sup>35–37</sup>. Recently, minimally invasive oesophagectomy has become widespread, and may reduce the number of postoperative complications<sup>38</sup>. Moreover, better selection for surgery using risk models may improve outcomes<sup>6</sup>. Previously it was reported<sup>3</sup> that oesophagectomy was not recommended for patients over 65 years of age or those with stage I if they were smokers. Definitive chemoradiotherapy may be recommended as an effective treatment for patients at high risk of postoperative surgical morbidity<sup>4,39</sup>.

Survival was clearly affected by a higher mortality rate in patients with postoperative complications compared with that in patients without complications. The exclusion of postoperative mortality could have avoided this bias, but the sample size would have been significantly smaller. In the 13 studies<sup>3,9,10,12-14,18,19,21,24,26,28,29</sup> that included postoperative mortality, however, the postoperative mortality rate was low. Thus the impact of postoperative mortality on long-term survival was relatively limited and a superimposed effect of complications in the long-term is clear.

This meta-analysis had some limitations. Nearly all studies were retrospective and only one<sup>19</sup>

evaluated prospectively collected data. However, only the high-quality observational studies were included in the meta-analysis, and heterogeneity was overcome by using a random-effects analysis. The severity of postoperative complications, neoadjuvant chemotherapy regimen and surgical procedure differed between studies. Some studies included neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy for more advanced cancer stages or salvage surgery: factors known to be related to respiratory and gastric tube complications, and associated with poor survival<sup>40</sup>. The extent of confounding as a result of co-morbidity and (neo)adjuvant treatments means that the present results should be interpreted with caution.

# Acknowledgements

The authors thank M. Sonohara of the Japan Medical Library Association for assisting in the systematic literature search.

Disclosure: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

# References

- 1 Torre LA, Bray F, Siegel RL, Ferlay J, Lortet-Tieulent J, Jemal A. Global cancer statistics, 2012. *CA Cancer J Clin* 2015; 65: 87–108.
- 2 Ando N, Ozawa S, Kitagawa Y, Shinozawa Y, Kitajima M. Improvement in the results of surgical treatment of advanced squamous esophageal carcinoma during 15 consecutive years. *Ann Surg* 2000; 232: 225–232.
- 3 Booka E, Takeuchi H, Nishi T, Matsuda S, Kaburagi T, Fukuda K *et al.* The impact of postoperative complications on survivals after esophagectomy for esophageal cancer. *Medicine (Baltimore)* 2015; 94: e1369.
- 4 Cooper JS, Guo MD, Herskovic A, Macdonald JS, Martenson JA Jr, Al-Sarraf M et al. Chemoradiotherapy of locally advanced esophageal cancer: long-term follow-up of a prospective randomized trial (RTOG 85-01). Radiation Therapy Oncology Group. 7AMA 1999; 281: 1623–1627.
- 5 Takeuchi H, Saikawa Y, Oyama T, Ozawa S, Suda K, Wada N et al. Factors influencing the long-term survival in patients with esophageal cancer who underwent esophagectomy after chemoradiotherapy. World J Surg 2010; 34: 277–284.
- 6 Takeuchi H, Miyata H, Gotoh M, Kitagawa Y, Baba H, Kimura W et al. A risk model for esophagectomy using data of 5354 patients included in a Japanese nationwide web-based database. Ann Surg 2014; 260: 259–266.
- 7 Tokunaga M, Tanizawa Y, Bando E, Kawamura T, Terashima M. Poor survival rate in patients with postoperative intra-abdominal infectious complications following curative gastrectomy for gastric cancer. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2013; 20: 1575–1583.
- 8 McSorley ST, Horgan PG, McMillan DC. The impact of the type and severity of postoperative complications on

long-term outcomes following surgery for colorectal cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Crit Rev Oncol Hematol* 2016; **97**: 168–177.

- 9 Kinugasa S, Tachibana M, Yoshimura H, Ueda S, Fujii T, Dhar DK *et al.* Postoperative pulmonary complications are associated with worse short- and long-term outcomes after extended esophagectomy. *J Surg Oncol* 2004; 88: 71–77.
- 10 Rizk NP, Bach PB, Schrag D, Bains MS, Turnbull AD, Karpeh M et al. The impact of complications on outcomes after resection for esophageal and gastroesophageal junction carcinoma. J Am Coll Surg 2004; 198: 42–50.
- 11 Lerut T, Moons J, Coosemans W, Van Raemdonck D, De Leyn P, Decaluwé H *et al.* Postoperative complications after transthoracic esophagectomy for cancer of the esophagus and gastroesophageal junction are correlated with early cancer recurrence: role of systematic grading of complications using the modified Clavien classification. *Ann Surg* 2009; **250**: 798–807.
- 12 Hirai T, Yamashita Y, Mukaida H, Kuwahara M, Inoue H, Toge T. Poor prognosis in esophageal cancer patients with postoperative complications. *Surg Today* 1998; 28: 576–579.
- 13 Abou-Jawde RM, Mekhail T, Adelstein DJ, Rybicki LA, Mazzone PJ, Caroll MA *et al.* Impact of induction concurrent chemoradiotherapy on pulmonary function and postoperative acute respiratory complications in esophageal cancer. *Chest* 2005; **128**: 250–255.
- 14 Hu Y, Zheng B, Rong TH, Fu JH, Zhu ZH, Yang H *et al.* Prognostic analysis of the patients with stage-III esophageal squamous cell carcinoma after radical esophagectomy. *Chin J Cancer* 2010; **29**: 178–183.
- 15 Markar S, Gronnier C, Duhamel A, Mabrut JY, Bail JP, Carrere N et al.; FREGAT (French Eso-Gastric Tumors) working group, FRENCH (Fédération de Recherche EN CHirurgie), and AFC (Association Française de Chirurgie). The impact of severe anastomotic leak on long-term survival and cancer recurrence after surgical resection for esophageal malignancy. *Ann Surg* 2015; 262: 972–980.
- 16 Doorakkers E, Konings P, Mattsson F, Lagergren J, Brusselaers N. Early complications following oesophagectomy for cancer in relation to long-term healthcare utilisation: a prospective population-based cohort study. *PLoS One* 2015; **10**: e0121080.
- 17 Luc G, Durand M, Chiche L, Collet D. Major post-operative complications predict long-term survival after esophagectomy in patients with adenocarcinoma of the esophagus. *World J Surg* 2015; **39**: 216–222.
- 18 Baba Y, Yoshida N, Shigaki H, Iwatsuki M, Miyamoto Y, Sakamoto Y *et al.* Prognostic impact of postoperative complications in 502 patients with surgically resected esophageal squamous cell carcinoma: a retrospective single-institution study. *Ann Surg* 2016; **264**: 305–311.
- 19 Kataoka K, Takeuchi H, Mizusawa J, Igaki H, Ozawa S, Abe T *et al.* Prognostic impact of postoperative morbidity after esophagectomy for esophageal cancer: exploratory analysis of JCOG9907. *Ann Surg* 2017; 265: 1152–1157.

- 20 Saeki H, Tsutsumi S, Tajiri H, Yukaya T, Tsutsumi R, Nishimura S *et al.* Prognostic significance of postoperative complications after curative resection for patients with esophageal squamous cell carcinoma. *Ann Surg* 2017; 265: 527–533.
- 21 Yamashita K, Makino T, Miyata H, Miyazaki Y, Takahashi T, Kurokawa Y *et al.* Postoperative infectious complications are associated with adverse oncologic outcomes in esophageal cancer patients undergoing preoperative chemotherapy. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2016; **23**: 2106–2114.
- 22 Karl RC, Schreiber R, Boulware D, Baker S, Coppola D. Factors affecting morbidity, mortality, and survival in patients undergoing Ivor Lewis esophagogastrectomy. *Ann* Surg 2000; 231: 635–643.
- 23 Junemann-Ramirez M, Awan MY, Khan ZM, Rahamim JS. Anastomotic leakage post-esophagogastrectomy for esophageal carcinoma: retrospective analysis of predictive factors, management and influence on longterm survival in a high volume centre. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg* 2005; 27: 3–7.
- 24 Ancona E, Cagol M, Epifani M, Cavallin F, Zaninotto G, Castoro C *et al.* Surgical complications do not affect longterm survival after esophagectomy for carcinoma of the thoracic esophagus and cardia. *J Am Coll Surg* 2006; 203: 661–669.
- 25 D'Annoville T, D'Journo XB, Trousse D, Brioude G, Dahan L, Seitz JF *et al.* Respiratory complications after oesophagectomy for cancer do not affect disease-free survival. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg* 2012; **41**: e66–e73.
- 26 Ferri LE, Law S, Wong KH, Kwok KF, Wong J. The influence of technical complications on postoperative outcome and survival after esophagectomy. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2006; **13**: 557–564.
- 27 Lindner K, Fritz M, Haane C, Senninger N, Palmes D, Hummel R. Postoperative complications do not affect long-term outcome in esophageal cancer patients. *World J Surg* 2014; 38: 2652–2661.
- 28 Martin LW, Swisher SG, Hofstetter W, Correa AM, Mehran RJ, Rice DC *et al.* Intrathoracic leaks following esophagectomy are no longer associated with increased mortality. *Ann Surg* 2005; 242: 392–399.
- 29 Xia BT, Rosato EL, Chojnacki KA, Crawford AG, Weksler B, Berger AC. Major perioperative morbidity does not affect long-term survival in patients undergoing esophagectomy for cancer of the esophagus or gastroesophageal junction. *World J Surg* 2013; 37: 408–415.
- 30 Stroup DF, Berlin JA, Morton SC, Olkin I, Williamson GD, Rennie D et al. Meta-analysis of observational studies in epidemiology: a proposal for reporting. Meta-analysis Of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) group. *JAMA* 2000; 283: 2008–2012.
- 31 Balshem H, Helfand M, Schünemann HJ, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Brozek J et al. GRADE guidelines: 3. Rating the quality of evidence. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2011; 64: 401–406.
- 32 Clavien PA, Barkun J, de Oliveira ML, Vauthey JN, Dindo D, Schulick RD *et al.* The Clavien–Dindo classification of

surgical complications: five-year experience. *Ann Surg* 2009; **250**: 187–196.

- 33 Okamura A, Takeuchi H, Matsuda S, Ogura M, Miyasho T, Nakamura R *et al.* Factors affecting cytokine change after esophagectomy for esophageal cancer. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2015; 22: 3130–3135.
- 34 Ogura M, Takeuchi H, Kawakubo H, Nishi T, Fukuda K, Nakamura R *et al.* Clinical significance of CXCL-8/CXCR-2 network in esophageal squamous cell carcinoma. *Surgery* 2013; **154**: 512–520.
- 35 Anderson O, Ni Z, Møller H, Coupland VH, Davies EA, Allum WH *et al.* Hospital volume and survival in oesophagectomy and gastrectomy for cancer. *Eur J Cancer* 2011; 47: 2408–2414.
- 36 Birkmeyer JD, Sun Y, Wong SL, Stukel TA. Hospital volume and late survival after cancer surgery. *Ann Surg* 2007; 245: 777–783.
- 37 Markar SR, Karthikesalingam A, Thrumurthy S, Low DE. Volume–outcome relationship in surgery for esophageal

malignancy: systematic review and meta-analysis 2000–2011. *J Gastrointest Surg* 2012; 16: 1055–1063.

- 38 Biere SS, van Berge Henegouwen MI, Maas KW, Bonavina L, Rosman C, Garcia JR *et al.* Minimally invasive *versus* open oesophagectomy for patients with oesophageal cancer: a multicentre, open-label, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2012; **379**: 1887–1892.
- 39 Kato H, Sato A, Fukuda H, Kagami Y, Udagawa H, Togo A et al. A phase II trial of chemoradiotherapy for stage I esophageal squamous cell carcinoma: Japan Clinical Oncology Group Study (JCOG9708). *Jpn J Clin Oncol* 2009; 39: 638–643.
- 40 Kumagai K, Rouvelas I, Tsai JA, Mariosa D, Klevebro F, Lindblad M *et al.* Meta-analysis of postoperative morbidity and perioperative mortality in patients receiving neoadjuvant chemotherapy or chemoradiotherapy for resectable oesophageal and gastrooesophageal junctional cancers. *Br J Surg* 2014; **101**: 321–338.

#### **Supporting information**

Additional supporting information can be found online in the Supporting Information section at the end of the article.