

1 Early detection of anastomotic leakage in upper gastrointestinal surgery

2
3 Felix Merboth ^{1,2*}, Friederike Sonntag³, Katharina Sonntag¹, Christoph Reißfelder ⁴, Daniel E.
4 Stange ^{1,2}, Jürgen Weitz ^{1,2}, Andreas Bogner ⁵

5
6 ¹Department of Visceral, Thoracic and Vascular Surgery, University Hospital and Faculty of
7 Medicine Carl Gustav Carus, Technische Universität Dresden, Dresden, Germany

8 ²National Center for Tumor Diseases (NCT/UCC), Dresden, Germany; German Cancer
9 Research Center (DKFZ), Heidelberg, Germany; University Hospital and Faculty of Medicine
10 Carl Gustav Carus, Technische Universität Dresden, Dresden, Germany; Helmholtz-Zentrum
11 Dresden-Rossendorf (HZDR), Dresden, Germany

12 ³Department of General, Visceral and Transplantation Surgery, Medical Faculty Heidelberg,
13 University of Heidelberg, Heidelberg, Germany

14 ⁴Department of Surgery, Universitätsmedizin Mannheim, Medical Faculty Mannheim,
15 Heidelberg University, Mannheim, Germany

16 ⁵General, Visceral and Transplant Surgery, Department of Surgery, Medical University of
17 Graz, Graz, Austria

18

19

20 * Corresponding Author

21 Felix Merboth, MD

22 felix.merboth@ukdd.de

23 **Abstract**

24 **Background**

25 Although surgical methods for upper gastrointestinal tract cancer continue to advance with the
26 aim of reducing the incidence of anastomotic leakage (AL), it remains a prevalent and serious
27 complication. Therefore, early identification of patients at high risk for AL is necessary for timely
28 therapeutic measures.

29 **Methods**

30 We retrospectively identified patients with AL who underwent elective gastric/esophageal
31 resection at our department between 2005 and 2017. Using propensity score matching, a
32 comparison group without AL but with comparable baseline characteristics was developed.
33 Several previously published risk scores (o-POSSUM, E-PASS, Steyerberg, NUn score) were
34 calculated, and their predictive accuracy for presence of AL was compared.

35 **Results**

36 Steyerberg Risk Score, o-POSSUM, and E-PASS were found to be unsuitable for early
37 detection of an anastomotic problem. However, an increased NUn score on the fourth to
38 seventh postoperative day was independently associated with the presence of AL. The test
39 accuracy (0.631-0.714), sensitivity (28.9%-50.5%), and specificity (72.5%-89.5%) were
40 marginally satisfactory. When only C-reactive protein levels were considered, similar test
41 accuracy (0.629-0.717), sensitivity (47.5%-69.9%), and specificity values (51.5%-81.6%) were
42 observed using a cut-off of 150 mg/l.

43 **Conclusions**

44 The NUn score showed no superiority over CRP values in the prediction of AL. Therefore,
45 further diagnostics should be carried out from the fourth postoperative day if the CRP is > 150
46 mg/l. However, large-scale registry studies and artificial intelligence may aid in more
47 appropriate determination of patient-specific risks in the future.

48 **Abbreviations**

49	AL	Anastomotic leakage
50	ASA	American Society of Anesthesiologists
51	AUC	Area Under the Curve
52	BMI	Body mass index
53	CDC	Clavien-Dindo Classification
54	CI	Confidence interval
55	CRP	C-reactive Protein
56	CRS	Comprehensive Risk Score
57	CT	Computed tomography
58	ECCG	Esophagectomy Complications Consensus Group
59	E-PASS	Estimation of Physiologic Ability and Surgical Stress
60	GI	Gastrointestinal
61	ICU	Intensive care unit
62	IQR	Interquartile range
63	OR	Odds ratio
64	POD	Postoperative day
65	POSSUM	Physiological and Operative Severity Score for the enUmeration of
66		Mortality and morbidity
67	PRS	Preoperative Risk Score
68	ROC	Receiver Operating Characteristics
69	SSS	Surgical Stress Score
70		

71 Introduction

72 Cancer of the upper gastrointestinal (GI) tract is among the most common malignancies and
73 the second leading cause of cancer-related death (after lung cancer) globally. Within the
74 framework of multimodal therapy concepts, surgery remains the most relevant component of
75 curative-intent therapies in most cases [1, 2]. However, gastric and esophageal resections are
76 among the most complex oncological surgeries, characterized by high perioperative morbidity
77 and mortality [3]. In recent years, studies have focused on surgical procedures to improve the
78 outcomes. Indeed, minimally invasive and robotic procedures have proven to be beneficial in
79 reducing postoperative complications and shortening of hospital stay [4]. Additionally, the
80 administration of the so-called "selective bowel decontamination" appears to reduce the rate
81 of anastomotic leakage (AL) in upper GI surgery [5].

82 Despite all improvements, complication rates after gastric or esophageal resection remain
83 high, with AL being the most concerning complication to surgeons. Thus, perioperative scores
84 have been developed to identify patients at risk for postoperative morbidity and mortality.
85 Scores like Steyerberg Risk Score, o-POSSUM, or E-PASS use variables such as age,
86 comorbidity, physiological status, neoadjuvant therapy, hospital volume, surgical factors, and
87 histological features in multilevel logistic regression models to predict postoperative mortality
88 or severity of postoperative complications [6-8]. In contrast to these scores from previous
89 studies, which performed risk stratification based on patient and/or surgical characteristics,
90 other studies have attempted to identify postoperative complications using only laboratory
91 value changes in routine blood samples [9]. Noble et al. developed the NUn score, which is
92 calculated using the log-likelihood ratio of the blood-borne variables albumin, leukocyte count,
93 and C-reactive protein (CRP). Thus, AL can be detected on postoperative day (POD) 4 with
94 high sensitivity and specificity [10].

95 This retrospective study aimed to compare the predictive power of different perioperative
96 scores for the incidence of AL in gastroesophageal surgery.

97

98 **Material and Methods**

99 **Study design**

100 This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of the Technische Universität
101 Dresden, Dresden, Germany, and was conducted in compliance with the Declaration of
102 Helsinki, according to the ICH Harmonized Tripartite Guideline for Good Clinical Practice
103 (decision number: 224062017). Due to the retrospective study design the ethics committee
104 waived the requirement for informed consent. Before the data were accessed for research
105 purposes at 18.03.2020 all data were fully anonymized. We applied the STROCSS 2021
106 guidelines, owing to the retrospective nature of our study [11].

107 We included all patients with esophageal or esophagogastric junction cancer who underwent
108 elective gastroesophageal resection between 2005 and 2017 at the Department of Visceral,
109 Thoracic, and Vascular Surgery of the University Hospital Carl Gustav Carus, Dresden.
110 Esophageal resection types included transhiatal extended gastrectomy, abdomino-thoracic
111 esophagectomy (Ivor Lewis), and abdomino-thoracic-cervical esophagectomy (McKeown).
112 These were performed as open, minimally invasive, robotic, or hybrid procedures. These
113 different surgical procedures were evaluated together because the anastomosis always
114 involves the esophagus and further complications of AL (mediastinitis, empyema, sepsis) and
115 AL treatment strategies (endosponge, drains, esophageal diversion) are the same.

116 Patient characteristics, preoperative risk factors, and other relevant factors were recorded to
117 calculate the o-POSSUM, E-PASS, and Steyerberg risk scores, according to original
118 publications [6-8]. Serum levels of leukocytes (Gpt/l), CRP (mg/l), and albumin (g/l) within the
119 first 7 postoperative days were used to calculate the NUn score, according to the original
120 formula [10]:

$$121 \quad NUn \text{ score} = 11.3894 + (0.005 \times CRP) + (0.186 \text{ leukocytes}) - (0.174 \times \text{albumin})$$

122 Postoperative morbidity and mortality rates were evaluated using patient charts and medical
123 records. The severity of postoperative complications was classified using the Clavien–Dindo
124 classification (CDC) [12]. AL definition was in accordance with the 2015 Esophagectomy

125 Complications Consensus Group (ECCG) [13]. In addition, the time of definite AL diagnosis
126 and the diagnostic method used were noted. For this purpose, a contrast leak on computed
127 tomography (CT), endoscopic evidence, or both were scored. Patients were grouped into
128 either AL or non-AL groups, depending on whether they developed AL postoperatively.
129 Subsequently, a 1:2 propensity score matching was performed.

130

131 **Statistical analysis and propensity score matching**

132 Owing to the retrospective nature of the present data, the sample size was not selected based
133 on a power calculation. Propensity scores for the AL and control cohorts were calculated using
134 multivariate logistic regression model that included 14 variables (S1 Table). Patients in the two
135 cohorts were matched in a 1:2 ratio, with a maximum difference between propensity scores of
136 0.05. Continuous variables are expressed as medians and interquartile ranges (IQR) and
137 compared using Student's t-test or Wilcoxon rank sum test. Dichotomous data were compared
138 using the χ^2 test. Variables with $p < 0.1$ in univariate analysis were included in a stepwise
139 backward multivariate logistic regression model. Results were reported as odds ratios (OR)
140 and 95% confidence intervals (CI). The level of significance was set at $p < 0.05$. Receiver
141 operating characteristic (ROC) curves were created to measure the sensitivity and specificity
142 of the scores. The Area Under the Curve (AUC) was measured, and values ranging from 0.6
143 to 0.7 represented a reasonable test accuracy. Values > 0.7 represented a good test accuracy.
144 Sensitivity and specificity were determined using ROC curves for the original published NUn
145 score cut-off of 10 and for a separate CRP cut-off. For an optimal CRP cut-off, the value was
146 taken at the point when sensitivity and specificity were close to the AUC value, whereas the
147 absolute difference between sensitivity and specificity was as small as possible [14]. Statistical
148 analyses were performed using IBM SPSS Statistics v23 (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY), and
149 graphical illustrations were performed using GraphPad Prism v7 (GraphPad Software, Inc., La
150 Jolla, CA).

151

152

153

154 **Results**

155 All patients who underwent esophageal and/or gastric resection for carcinoma in our
156 department from 2015 to 2017 were screened for AL. After performing propensity score
157 matching according to the above mentioned criteria, 146 and 292 patients were classified into
158 the AL and non-AL groups, respectively. Patient characteristics before matching can be found
159 in S2 Table.

160

161 **Patient characteristics and surgical findings**

162 Patient characteristics, histopathologic data, and surgical findings did not differ significantly in
163 the two groups on the whole. Only pre-existing pulmonary disease was more frequent in the
164 AL group than in the non-AL group (27.4% vs. 15.1%, $p=0.002$) and the AL group had markedly
165 more hand-sewn anastomoses ($p=0.043$). A further detailed list can be found in Table 1.

166 All transhiatal extended gastrectomies in both groups ($n=95$) were reconstructed according to
167 Roux-Y as an end-to-side esophagogastrostomy. For reconstruction after esophageal
168 resection ($n=343$), a gastric conduit pull-up was used in all patients. In most of these cases,
169 this was performed according to Ivor Lewis with intrathoracic esophagogastrostomy (89.8%).

170 A cervical esophagogastrostomy according to McKeown was used in 10.2%. If the thoracic
171 part was performed minimally invasively, the anastomosis was created side to side with a linear
172 stapler (13.1% vs. 14.7%, $p=0.812$). In most other cases, the end-to-side anastomosis was
173 created either with a circular stapler (74.7% vs. 77.0%, $p=0.448$) or by hand suturing ($n=5.4%$

174 vs. 1.1%, $p=0.043$). Only in a few cases was an end-to-end anastomosis performed by hand
175 suturing (6.8% vs. 7.2%, $p=0.812$). The technique of hand-sewn anastomosis depended on
176 the individual surgeon and was therefore not standardized. There were variations between
177 single knot suture, continuous suture or continuous suture of the posterior wall in combination

178 with single knot suture of the anterior wall. All anastomoses were sutured in two rows, and the
 179 circular stapler anastomoses were also sutured over.

180

181 **Table 1** Patient characteristics, histopathologic data, and surgical findings

	Non-AL	AL	p-value
	n = 292	n = 146	
Age [years]	63.4 (10.6)	64.0 (9.5)	0.568 [#]
Sex			0.846*
female	42 (14.4)	20 (13.7)	
male	250 (85.6)	126 (86.3)	
BMI [kg/m²]	25.9 (4.4)	26.0 (4.8)	0.918 [#]
ASA			0.631*
1	6 (2.1)	1 (0.7)	
2	117 (40.1)	57 (39.0)	
3	166 (56.8)	86 (58.9)	
4	3 (1.0)	2 (1.4)	
Smoking	84 (28.8)	52 (35.6)	0.144*
Alcohol	46 (15.8)	26 (17.8)	0.584*
Diabetes mellitus	66 (22.6)	33 (22.6)	1.000*
Coronary artery disease	40 (13.7)	23 (15.8)	0.563*
Hypertension	171 (58.6)	93 (63.7)	0.300*
Renal insufficiency	25 (8.6)	12 (8.2)	0.903*
Pulmonary disease	44 (15.1)	40 (27.4)	0.002*
Histology			0.099*
Adenocarcinoma	192 (65.8)	84 (57.5)	
Squamous cell carcinoma	81 (27.7)	55 (37.7)	
Others	19 (6.5)	7 (4.8)	
Neoadjuvant treatment			0.192*
None	113 (38.7)	46 (31.5)	
Chemotherapy	74 (25.3)	32 (21.9)	
Radiotherapy	1 (0.3)	1 (0.7)	
Chemoradiotherapy	104 (35.6)	67 (45.9)	
T			0.192*
0	43 (14.7)	18 (12.3)	
1	71 (24.3)	30 (20.5)	
2	54 (18.5)	43 (29.5)	
3	110 (37.7)	50 (34.2)	
4	14 (4.8)	5 (3.4)	

N				0.750*
	0	165 (56.5)	87 (59.6)	
	1	62 (21.2)	32 (21.9)	
	2	36 (12.3)	13 (8.9)	
	3	29 (9.9)	14 (9.6)	
M				0.880*
	0	277 (94.9)	138 (94.5)	
	1	15 (5.1)	8 (5.5)	
R				0.301*
	0	269 (92.1)	136 (93.2)	
	1	23 (7.9)	9 (6.2)	
Surgical procedure				0.005*
	Transhiatal extended gastrectomy	63 (21.6)	32 (21.9)	
	Ivor Lewis esophagectomy	215 (73.6)	93 (63.7)	
	McKeown esophagectomy	14 (4.8)	21 (14.4)	
Surgical access				0.953*
	Fully open	221 (75.7)	113 (77.4)	
	Laparoscopic/open	21 (7.2)	9 (6.2)	
	Open/thoracoscopic	5 (1.7)	3 (2.1)	
	Laparoscopic/thoracoscopic	9 (3.1)	3 (2.1)	
	Open/thoracic robotic	7 (2.4)	5 (3.4)	
	Laparoscopic/thoracic robotic	29 (9.9)	13 (8.9)	
Anastomotic layout technique				0.812*
	End to side	228 (78.1)	117 (80.1)	
	End to end	21 (7.2)	10 (6.8)	
	Side to side	43 (14.7)	19 (13.1)	
Anastomotic suture				0.043*
	Handsewn	36 (16.1)	26 (25.7)	
	Stapled	150 (67.3)	66 (65.3)	
	Combined	37 (16.6)	9 (8.9)	
Operative time [min]		402.0 (108.1)	423.1 (138.7)	0.081#
Blood loss [ml]		611.9 (486.4)	722.6 (672.6)	0.018#

182

183 BMI, body mass index; ASA, American Society of Anesthesiologists Classification; n (%)

184 *Fisher's exact test; mean (standard deviation), and #t-test.

185

186 Morbidity and mortality

187 Diagnosis of AL was made according to aforementioned criteria either by contrast leak in CT

188 scan, endoscopically, or both. In the non-AL group, 105 patients (36.0%) had no postoperative

189 complications (CDC=0). Serious complications (CDC≥3a) were observed in 14.0% of patients

190 in the non-AL group and in 69.9% in the AL group ($p < 0.001$). A further detailed list of the CDC
191 distribution is presented in S3 Table. Both 30-d (4.1% vs. 3.1%, $p = 0.577$) and in-hospital
192 mortality (6.8% vs. 6.5%, $p = 0.892$) rates did not differ between the two groups.

193 More patients in the AL group developed pneumonia during hospitalization (21.5%) than those
194 in the non-AL group (15.0%), and the difference was significant ($p = 0.007$). However, these
195 pneumonias occurred significantly later in the AL group than in the non-AL group (6.3 ± 2.4 d
196 vs. 4.8 ± 2.3 d, $p < 0.001$). In addition, anastomotic insufficiency was diagnosed later than
197 pneumonia, at 10.6 days on average (± 13.1 days).

198

199 **AL prediction by perioperative scores and laboratory** 200 **parameters**

201 In univariate and multivariate analyses, o-POSSUM ($p = 0.320$), E-PASS ($p > 0.692$), and
202 Steyerberg Risk Score ($p = 0.537$) did not emerge as risk factors for AL. In contrast, the NUn
203 score was found to be suitable for identifying AL from POD4 (OR 1.526, 95% CI 1.113-2.091,
204 $p = 0.009$), with an increased probability of AL associated with higher NUn scores by POD7 (OR
205 3.200, 95% CI 1.989-5.150, $p < 0.001$, Table 2). ROC curves were used to determine the
206 diagnostic accuracy of the NUn score (Figure 1). The diagnostic accuracy, expressed by the
207 AUC, was sufficient on the fourth (AUC 0.638) and fifth (AUC 0.631) POD and good on the
208 sixth (AUC 0.714) and seventh (AUC 0.712) POD. Using the NUn score cutoff value of 10
209 derived from the original publication, the sensitivity and specificity were 36.6% and 80.5% on
210 POD4, which remained unchanged until POD7 (Table 3).

211 However, when the laboratory parameters that constitute the NUn score (leukocytes, CRP,
212 and albumin) were considered individually (Figure 2), large differences in CRP values between
213 the two groups were noted from POD3 (206.3 mg/l vs. 180.7 mg/l, $p < 0.001$) and increased
214 further until POD7 (160.6 mg/l vs. 104.5 mg/l, $p < 0.001$). Leukocytes showed significant
215 differences only from POD5. Albumin levels, on the other hand, were significantly lower in the
216 AL group on POD3 and 4 as well as on POD6 and 7 (S4 Table). Preoperative albumin

217 substitution was generally not carried out. Only postoperative albumin levels below 20.0 g/l
 218 were substituted in an adjusted manner.

219 ROC curves were created and analyzed for CRP levels (S1 Figure). A CRP level of 150 mg/l
 220 was a valid cut-off value. POD4 showed a significantly higher sensitivity (69.9%) with a lower
 221 specificity of 51.5%. In the following PODs, however, the sensitivity was marginally higher, with
 222 almost equivalent specificity for CRP values compared to the NUn Score (Table 3).

223

224 **Table 2** Univariate and multivariate analysis of Steyerberg, o-POSSUM, E-PASS, and NUn
 225 scores

	Univariate			Multivariate		
	Non-AL	AL	p-value	OR	95% CI	p-value
Steyerberg	-0.2 (1.6)	0.2 (1.6)	0.008	-	-	0.537
o-POSSUM	0.3 (0.2)	0.3 (0.2)	0.302	-	-	-
E-PASS						
PRS Score	0.6 (0.3)	0.7 (0.3)	0.083	-	-	0.692
SSS Score	0.5 (0.3)	0.6 (0.3)	0.067	-	-	0.850
CRS Score	0.8 (0.4)	0.9 (0.4)	0.021	-	-	0.841
NUn Score preoperative	5.2 (1.1)	5.3 (1.0)	0.367	-	-	-
NUn Score POD1	8.4 (1.4)	8.4 (1.2)	0.924	-	-	-
NUn Score POD2	8.9 (1.1)	9.2 (1.2)	0.029	-	-	0.528
NUn Score POD3	9.6 (1.1)	10.0 (1.1)	0.008	-	-	0.598
NUn Score POD4	9.3 (1.3)	9.7 (1.2)	0.002	1.526	1.113-2.091	0.009
NUn Score POD5	9.3 (2.8)	10.0 (1.1)	0.010	1.906	1.322-2.749	0.001
NUn Score POD6	8.7 (2.9)	9.5 (1.2)	0.003	2.732	1.790-4.169	<0.001
NUn Score POD7	8.8 (1.3)	9.6 (1.4)	<0.001	3.200	1.989-5.150	<0.001

226

227 POD, postoperative day; mean (standard deviation) and t-test; binary logistic regression, OR:
 228 odds ratio; 95% CI: 95% confidence interval

229

230 **Figure 1** Receiver operating characteristics (ROC) curves and associated area under the
231 curve (AUC) values of the NUn score from postoperative day (POD) 2 to 7
232

233 **Table 3** AUC, sensitivity, and specificity within postoperative days 4-7 for NUn score with an
234 original cut-off of 10 and for CRP values with a cut-off of 150 mg/l

POD	Value	AUC	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)
POD4	NUn Score	0.638	36.6	80.5
	CRP	0.629	69.9	51.5
POD5	NUn Score	0.631	50.5	72.5
	CRP	0.642	54.0	68.4
POD6	NUn Score	0.714	28.9	89.5
	CRP	0.717	55.1	78.1
POD7	NUn Score	0.712	36.3	85.8
	CRP	0.692	47.5	81.6

235

236 **Figure 2** Postoperative course of laboratory parameters a) albumin, b) C-reactive protein
237 (CRP), c) leukocytes (WBC) and the d) NUn score calculated therefrom
238

239 Discussion

240 In this retrospective data analysis, perioperative scores were compared in terms of their
241 predictive value for anastomotic insufficiency after esophageal and gastric surgery. To
242 minimize the influence of known patient-related risk factors [9, 15] and instead focus on
243 perioperative factors, a 1:2 propensity score matching for AL with the above-mentioned factors
244 was performed.

245 Many technical factors influencing the AL rate have been established, including the volume of
246 surgeries conducted by both the hospital and the surgeon, as well as surgical and anastomotic
247 techniques, and the anastomotic site [16-18]. However, patient-specific factors, such as age,

248 obesity, and nicotine consumption have also been identified as risk factors [19]. Surgical and
249 perioperative strategies for gastroesophageal resection have improved in recent years, but
250 nevertheless, an AL rate <8% across the board is hardly achievable [20]. In our study, AL was
251 detected in the mean after approximately 11 days. This raises the question of what diagnostic
252 tools can be used to make an early diagnosis and initiate appropriate therapy.

253 Most risk scores published to date are aimed at short-term outcomes after esophageal and
254 gastric resection rather than AL. Steyerberg Score, o-POSSUM, and E-PASS were slightly
255 increased in the AL group but were not suitable for risk stratification with respect to AL in the
256 multivariate analysis.

257 In contrast to the previously described scores, the NUn score uses the change in postoperative
258 laboratory values to detect AL. The log-likelihood ratios of CRP, leukocytes, and albumin were
259 used for the calculation. Noble and Underwood, the first two authors after whom the NUn score
260 was named, determined its optimal cut-off as 10 after analyzing the assessment dataset. With
261 this cut-off, a sensitivity of 100%, specificity of 57%, and diagnostic accuracy of 0.879 could
262 be achieved in a validation dataset consisting of 42 patients, including four patients with AL
263 [10]. Other research groups have attempted to apply the NUn score to their cohorts. Bundred
264 et al. showed that in 382 patients (48 of whom had AL), the NUn score significantly predicted
265 AL from POD4. However, the sensitivity, specificity, and diagnostic accuracy achieved were
266 significantly lower at 73%, 65%, and 0.77, respectively [21]. Paireder et al. found lower
267 sensitivity and specificity in their own dataset, resulting in a positive predictive value of only
268 19.4%. Therefore, the authors concluded that the NUn score was not useful because of its
269 poor discrimination [22]. Findlay et al. found an even poorer test accuracy, with the limitation
270 that their biochemical laboratory had a maximum CRP value of 156 mg/l. Owing to the resulting
271 bias, the group developed their own NUn score cut-off of 7.65 [23]. In contrast to the results of
272 these studies, our dataset had a higher number of patients with AL, with an overall larger
273 sample size. Using the original cut-off of 10, we found a low sensitivity of 37% and acceptable
274 specificity and diagnostic accuracy of 80% and 0.638, respectively. However, the test accuracy
275 of the NUn score in our cohort was far from the value originally described.

276 A reason for this imprecision could be that the values used for the NUn score are infection-
277 associated parameters that show changes in infectious complications. For example, these
278 parameters may also change in the presence of pneumonia, which is much more common
279 than AL after gastroesophageal resection [3]. The original NUn Score study did not address
280 this complication. However, we were able to show that 21.5% of AL patients and 15.0% of
281 patients in the non-AL group additionally developed pneumonia. In the non-AL group,
282 pneumonia occurred on an average of 5 days postoperatively and was thus exactly within the
283 time frame of use of the NUn score.

284 Because the formula for calculating the NUn score is rather complicated, other research
285 groups have tried artificial intelligence and machine learning approaches. These new methods
286 can predict overall survival as well as long-term oncological outcomes [24, 25]; nonetheless,
287 the prediction of specific postoperative complications such as that of AL has not been
288 satisfactory. To date, only one research group has shown that CRP-to-albumin ratio and
289 regression tree analysis can achieve a good prediction of AL after esophagectomy [26]. Our
290 objective was to simplify the procedure and expedite decision-making without using
291 complicated formulas or artificial intelligence, in order to achieve greater practicability in
292 everyday clinical practice. Therefore, we examined the test accuracy of only the CRP values.
293 At the determined cut-off of 150 mg/l, the specificity was almost the same as the NUn Score,
294 with marginally better sensitivity (Table 3). The CRP values function more as a search test
295 than as an absolute diagnostic; therefore, the higher sensitivity appears to be advantageous.
296 In the case of increased CRP values from POD4, a secondary examination modality should
297 always be conducted to confirm or rule out AL. Thus, a CT scan of the thorax with oral contrast
298 offers the advantage of detecting both AL and pneumonia [27]. According to the literature, AL
299 is detected late after 9 days on average [28] - in our cohort even after 11 days. Therefore, if
300 CRP is elevated at POD4 and CT findings are ambiguous, endoscopy should be performed
301 and, if necessary, repeated in the following days to exclude or confirm AL with certainty.

302

303 **Conclusions**

304 In summary, an increased NUn score from POD4 is suitable for identifying AL. However, the
305 accuracy of the test is unsatisfactory, and the calculation formula is too complicated to be
306 beneficial in routine clinical practice. The test accuracy of postoperative CRP values was
307 nearly equivalent to the NUn Score but these were considerably more manageable. Therefore,
308 we recommend that further diagnostics be performed immediately if the CRP value exceeds
309 150 mg/l from POD4 for early detection and prompt treatment of AL; this step could potentially
310 prevent devastating complications. However, the cut-off of 150 mg/l determined in our analysis
311 should be transferred to other institutions cautiously since the measurement methods and
312 standard values differ from laboratory to laboratory.

313 To reliably screen for AL in the postoperative course, new approaches are necessary; artificial
314 intelligence can be used to link laboratory data, radiological diagnostics, and clinical
315 presentations. However, large-scale registry studies are required to obtain sufficient data. Until
316 then, regarding screening for AL, CRP values and clinical appearance should be considered
317 from POD4 to promptly initiate extended diagnostics, such as CT scan or endoscopy, and
318 subsequent treatment.

319

320 **Acknowledgements**

321 The authors thank all study nurses, especially Heike Polster, who were involved in this study.

322

323 **References**

- 324 1. Cocolini F, Montori G, Ceresoli M, Cima S, Valli MC, Nita GE, et al.
325 Advanced gastric cancer: What we know and what we still have to learn. *World J*
326 *Gastroenterol.* 2016;22(3):1139-59. Epub 2016/01/27. doi: 10.3748/wjg.v22.i3.1139.
327 PubMed PMID: 26811653; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4716026.
- 328 2. Cummings D, Wong J, Palm R, Hoffe S, Almhanna K, Vignesh S.
329 Epidemiology, Diagnosis, Staging and Multimodal Therapy of Esophageal and
330 Gastric Tumors. *Cancers (Basel).* 2021;13(3). Epub 2021/02/06. doi:
331 10.3390/cancers13030582. PubMed PMID: 33540736; PubMed Central PMCID:
332 PMCPMC7867245.
- 333 3. Baum P, Diers J, Lichthardt S, Kastner C, Schlegel N, Germer CT, et al.
334 Mortality and Complications Following Visceral Surgery: A Nationwide Analysis
335 Based on the Diagnostic Categories Used in German Hospital Invoicing Data. *Dtsch*
336 *Arztebl Int.* 2019;116(44):739-46. Epub 2019/11/28. doi: 10.3238/arztebl.2019.0739.
337 PubMed PMID: 31774053; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC6912125.
- 338 4. Siaw-Acheampong K, Kamarajah SK, Gujjuri R, Bundred JR, Singh P, Griffiths
339 EA. Minimally invasive techniques for transthoracic oesophagectomy for
340 oesophageal cancer: systematic review and network meta-analysis. *BJS Open.*
341 2020;4(5):787-803. Epub 2020/09/08. doi: 10.1002/bjs5.50330. PubMed PMID:
342 32894001; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7528517.
- 343 5. Scheufele F, Schirren R, Friess H, Reim D. Selective decontamination of the
344 digestive tract in upper gastrointestinal surgery: systematic review with meta-
345 analysis of randomized clinical trials. *BJS Open.* 2020. Epub 2020/08/05. doi:
346 10.1002/bjs5.50332. PubMed PMID: 32749070; PubMed Central PMCID:
347 PMCPMC7709368.
- 348 6. Haga Y, Ikei S, Ogawa M. Estimation of Physiologic Ability and Surgical
349 Stress (E-PASS) as a new prediction scoring system for postoperative morbidity and
350 mortality following elective gastrointestinal surgery. *Surg Today.* 1999;29(3):219-25.
351 Epub 1999/04/07. doi: 10.1007/BF02483010. PubMed PMID: 10192731.
- 352 7. Tekkis PP, McCulloch P, Poloniecki JD, Prytherch DR, Kessaris N, Steger AC.
353 Risk-adjusted prediction of operative mortality in oesophagogastric surgery with O-
354 POSSUM. *Br J Surg.* 2004;91(3):288-95. Epub 2004/03/03. doi: 10.1002/bjs.4414.
355 PubMed PMID: 14991628.
- 356 8. Steyerberg EW, Neville BA, Koppert LB, Lemmens VE, Tilanus HW, Coebergh
357 JW, et al. Surgical mortality in patients with esophageal cancer: development and
358 validation of a simple risk score. *J Clin Oncol.* 2006;24(26):4277-84. Epub
359 2006/09/12. doi: 10.1200/JCO.2005.05.0658. PubMed PMID: 16963730.
- 360 9. Fischer C, Lingsma H, Hardwick R, Cromwell DA, Steyerberg E, Groene O.
361 Risk adjustment models for short-term outcomes after surgical resection for
362 oesophagogastric cancer. *Br J Surg.* 2016;103(1):105-16. Epub 2015/11/27. doi:
363 10.1002/bjs.9968. PubMed PMID: 26607783.

- 364 10. Noble F, Curtis N, Harris S, Kelly JJ, Bailey IS, Byrne JP, et al. Risk
365 assessment using a novel score to predict anastomotic leak and major
366 complications after oesophageal resection. *J Gastrointest Surg.* 2012;16(6):1083-95.
367 Epub 2012/03/16. doi: 10.1007/s11605-012-1867-9. PubMed PMID: 22419007.
- 368 11. Mathew G, Agha R, Group S. STROCSS 2021: Strengthening the reporting of
369 cohort, cross-sectional and case-control studies in surgery. *Int J Surg.*
370 2021;96:106165. Epub 2021/11/15. doi: 10.1016/j.ijvsu.2021.106165. PubMed PMID:
371 34774726.
- 372 12. Clavien PA, Barkun J, de Oliveira ML, Vauthey JN, Dindo D, Schulick RD, et
373 al. The Clavien-Dindo classification of surgical complications: five-year experience.
374 *Ann Surg.* 2009;250(2):187-96. Epub 2009/07/30. doi:
375 10.1097/SLA.0b013e3181b13ca2. PubMed PMID: 19638912.
- 376 13. Low DE, Alderson D, Cecconello I, Chang AC, Darling GE, D'Journo XB, et al.
377 International Consensus on Standardization of Data Collection for Complications
378 Associated With Esophagectomy: Esophagectomy Complications Consensus Group
379 (ECCG). *Ann Surg.* 2015;262(2):286-94. Epub 2015/01/22. doi:
380 10.1097/SLA.0000000000001098. PubMed PMID: 25607756.
- 381 14. Unal I. Defining an Optimal Cut-Point Value in ROC Analysis: An Alternative
382 Approach. *Comput Math Methods Med.* 2017;2017:3762651. Epub 2017/06/24. doi:
383 10.1155/2017/3762651. PubMed PMID: 28642804; PubMed Central PMCID:
384 PMC5470053.
- 385 15. Kassis ES, Kosinski AS, Ross P, Jr., Koppes KE, Donahue JM, Daniel VC.
386 Predictors of anastomotic leak after esophagectomy: an analysis of the society of
387 thoracic surgeons general thoracic database. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2013;96(6):1919-26.
388 Epub 2013/10/01. doi: 10.1016/j.athoracsur.2013.07.119. PubMed PMID: 24075499.
- 389 16. Viklund P, Lindblad M, Lu M, Ye W, Johansson J, Lagergren J. Risk factors
390 for complications after esophageal cancer resection: a prospective population-
391 based study in Sweden. *Ann Surg.* 2006;243(2):204-11. Epub 2006/01/25. doi:
392 10.1097/01.sla.0000197698.17794.eb. PubMed PMID: 16432353; PubMed Central
393 PMCID: PMC5470053.
- 394 17. Gooszen JAH, Goense L, Gisbertz SS, Ruurda JP, van Hillegersberg R, van
395 Berge Henegouwen MI. Intrathoracic versus cervical anastomosis and predictors of
396 anastomotic leakage after oesophagectomy for cancer. *Br J Surg.* 2018;105(5):552-
397 60. Epub 2018/02/08. doi: 10.1002/bjs.10728. PubMed PMID: 29412450; PubMed
398 Central PMCID: PMC5900725.
- 399 18. Liu YJ, Fan J, He HH, Zhu SS, Chen QL, Cao RH. Anastomotic leakage after
400 intrathoracic versus cervical oesophagogastric anastomosis for oesophageal
401 carcinoma in Chinese population: a retrospective cohort study. *BMJ Open.*
402 2018;8(9):e021025. Epub 2018/09/06. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2017-021025. PubMed
403 PMID: 30181184; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6129039.
- 404 19. Jogiat UM, Sasewich H, Turner SR, Baracos V, Eurich DT, Filafilo H, et al.
405 Sarcopenia Determined by Skeletal Muscle Index Predicts Overall Survival, Disease-
406 free Survival, and Postoperative Complications in Resectable Esophageal Cancer: A

- 407 Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Ann Surg.* 2022;276(5):e311-e8. Epub
408 2022/07/07. doi: 10.1097/SLA.0000000000005452. PubMed PMID: 35794004.
- 409 20. Merboth F, Hasanovic J, Stange D, Distler M, Kaden S, Weitz J, et al.
410 [Change of strategy to minimally invasive esophagectomy-Results at a certified
411 center]. *Chirurg.* 2021. Epub 2021/12/22. doi: 10.1007/s00104-021-01550-2.
412 PubMed PMID: 34932142.
- 413 21. Bundred J, Hollis AC, Hodson J, Hallissey MT, Whiting JL, Griffiths EA.
414 Validation of the NUn score as a predictor of anastomotic leak and major
415 complications after Esophagectomy. *Dis Esophagus.* 2020;33(1). Epub 2019/05/12.
416 doi: 10.1093/dote/doz041. PubMed PMID: 31076741.
- 417 22. Paireder M, Jomrich G, Asari R, Kristo I, Gleiss A, Preusser M, et al. External
418 validation of the NUn score for predicting anastomotic leakage after oesophageal
419 resection. *Sci Rep.* 2017;7(1):9725. Epub 2017/08/31. doi: 10.1038/s41598-017-
420 10084-9. PubMed PMID: 28852063; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC575338.
- 421 23. Findlay JM, Tilson RC, Hari Krishnan A, Sgromo B, Marshall RE, Maynard ND,
422 et al. Attempted validation of the NUn score and inflammatory markers as predictors
423 of esophageal anastomotic leak and major complications. *Dis Esophagus.*
424 2015;28(7):626-33. Epub 2014/06/05. doi: 10.1111/dote.12244. PubMed PMID:
425 24894195.
- 426 24. Wang Y, Liang E, Zhao X, Song X, Wang L, Sun J. Prediction of Survival Time
427 of Patients With Esophageal Squamous Cell Carcinoma Based on Univariate
428 Analysis and ASSA-BP Neural Network. *IEEE Access.* 2020;8:181127-36. doi:
429 10.1109/ACCESS.2020.3028147.
- 430 25. Jung JO, Crnovrsanin N, Wirsik NM, Nienhuser H, Peters L, Popp F, et al.
431 Machine learning for optimized individual survival prediction in resectable upper
432 gastrointestinal cancer. *J Cancer Res Clin Oncol.* 2022. Epub 2022/05/27. doi:
433 10.1007/s00432-022-04063-5. PubMed PMID: 35616729.
- 434 26. Shao CY, Liu KC, Li CL, Cong ZZ, Hu LW, Luo J, et al. C-reactive protein to
435 albumin ratio is a key indicator in a predictive model for anastomosis leakage after
436 esophagectomy: Application of classification and regression tree analysis. *Thorac
437 Cancer.* 2019;10(4):728-37. Epub 2019/02/09. doi: 10.1111/1759-7714.12990.
438 PubMed PMID: 30734487; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6449232.
- 439 27. Grimminger PP, Goense L, Gockel I, Bergeat D, Bertheuil N, Chandramohan
440 SM, et al. Diagnosis, assessment, and management of surgical complications
441 following esophagectomy. *Ann N Y Acad Sci.* 2018;1434(1):254-73. Epub
442 2018/07/10. doi: 10.1111/nyas.13920. PubMed PMID: 29984413.
- 443 28. Struecker B, Andreou A, Chopra S, Heilmann AC, Spenke J, Denecke C, et al.
444 Evaluation of Anastomotic Leak after Esophagectomy for Esophageal Cancer:
445 Typical Time Point of Occurrence, Mode of Diagnosis, Value of Routine
446 Radiocontrast Agent Studies and Therapeutic Options. *Dig Surg.* 2018;35(5):419-26.
447 Epub 2017/11/14. doi: 10.1159/000480357. PubMed PMID: 29131024.
448
449

450 **Supporting information**

451 **S1 Figure.** Receiver operating characteristics (ROC) curves and associated area under the
452 curve (AUC) values of CRP from postoperative day (POD) 2 to 7

453 **S1 Table.** List of all 14 variables for propensity scoring

454 **S2 Table.** Patient characteristics, histopathologic data, and surgical findings all patients

455 **S3 Table.** Morbidity and mortality data of study participants

456 **S4 Table.** Course of leukocytes, albumin and CRP within the first seven postoperative days.

457

<https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.24.24307864>
(which was not certified by peer review)

CC-BY 4.0 International license




Fig2