#### RESEARCH



# What determines complications and prognosis among patients subject to multivisceral resections for locally advanced gastric cancer?

Łukasz Bobrzyński<sup>1</sup> · Radosław Pach<sup>1</sup> · Antoni Szczepanik<sup>1</sup> · Piotr Kołodziejczyk<sup>1</sup> · Piotr Richter<sup>1</sup> · Marek Sierzega<sup>1</sup>

Received: 25 April 2023 / Accepted: 16 November 2023 / Published online: 21 November 2023 © The Author(s) 2023

# Abstract

**Background** Locally advanced gastric cancer (GC) extending to the surrounding tissues may require a multivisceral resection (MVR) to provide the best chance of cure. However, little is known about how the extent of organ resection affects the risks and benefits of surgery.

**Methods** An electronic database of patients treated between 1996 and 2020 in an academic surgical centre was reviewed. MVRs were defined as partial or total gastrectomy combined with splenectomy, distal pancreatectomy, or partial colectomy. **Results** Suspected intraoperative tumour invasion of perigastric organs (cT4b) was found in 298 of 1476 patients with non-metastatic GC, and 218 were subject to MVRs, including the spleen (n = 126), pancreas (n = 51), and colon (n = 41). MVRs were associated with higher proportions of surgical and general complications, but not mortality. A nomogram was developed to predict the risk of major postoperative morbidity (Clavien–Dindo's grade  $\geq$  3a), and the highest odds ratio for major morbidity identified by logistic regression modelling was found for distal pancreatectomy (2.53, 95% CI 1.23–5.19, P = 0.012) and colectomy (2.29, 95% CI 1.04–5.09, P = 0.035). Margin-positive resections were identified by the Cox proportional hazards model as the most important risk factor for patients' survival (hazard ratio 1.47, 95% CI 1.10–1.97). The extent of organ resection did not affect prognosis, but a MVR was the only factor reducing the risk of margin positivity (OR 0.44, 95% CI 0.21–0.87).

**Conclusions** The risk of multivisceral resections is associated with the organ being removed, but only MVRs increase the odds of complete tumour clearance for locally advanced gastric cancer.

Keywords Gastric cancer  $\cdot$  Locally advanced cancers  $\cdot$  Multivisceral resections  $\cdot$  Splenectomy  $\cdot$  Pancreatectomy  $\cdot$  Colectomy  $\cdot$  Nomogram

# Introduction

The primary aim of treatment for solid malignancies, including gastric cancer, is a radical surgical resection (R0), i.e. complete macroscopic and microscopic removal of the tumour [1, 2]. Since most cases of gastric cancer in Western patients are diagnosed at an advanced stage, those with a locally advanced disease extending to the surrounding

Marek Sierzega marek.sierzega@uj.edu.pl tissues (cT4b) may require a multivisceral resection (MVR), combining the stomach and adjacent organs, to provide the best chance of cure [3, 4].

The prevalence of combined resections for gastric cancer in various clinical registries reached between 10 and 30% with the pancreas, colon/mesocolon, and spleen among the most commonly resected organs [5–7]. However, the reported outcomes of MVRs remain highly inconsistent across studies with perioperative mortality and morbidity rates showing significant variability, ranging from 0 to 15% and 12 to 90%, respectively [4]. Part of the likely explanation is that usually all MVRs have been evaluated as a single entity without specifying results for individual organs [7–14]. Furthermore, most previous studies were underpowered, collecting data of relatively small populations not exceeding 100 cases [8, 14–22]. Consequently, still little is known about how the extent of a multivisceral resection

The paper is based on a previous communication to the XXVII Annual Meeting of the Polish Society of Oncological Surgery, Poznań, Poland.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> First Department of Surgery, Jagiellonian University Medical College, 2 Jakubowski Street, 30-688, Cracow, Poland

necessary to achieve tumour clearance affects early and late postoperative outcomes.

The present study aimed to assess whether the postoperative course and survival of patients subject to MVRs for locally advanced gastric cancer (cT4b) were affected by the extent of organ resection. Moreover, we attempted to develop a nomogram estimating the risk of major postoperative morbidity after MVRs.

# Methods

### **Patient population**

An electronic database (Microsoft Access) of all patients with resectable gastric cancer treated between January 1996 and December 2020 in the First Department of Surgery, Jagiellonian University Medical College, an academic tertiary surgical centre, was reviewed. The extent of surgery, definitions for lymph node dissection, and tumour staging were adapted to the recent guidelines [2, 23]. Multivisceral resections (MVRs) were defined as partial or total gastrectomy combined with splenectomy, distal pancreatectomy, or partial colectomy for direct tumour infiltration suspected during surgery (cT4b). Pancreatic resections were always combined with splenectomy and were referred to as pancreatectomy.

#### Fig. 1 Flowchart of the study

Patients who required resections of other organs and multiple organs were excluded to preserve the homogeneity of the study population. Ethical approval for the study was provided by the Bioethics Committee of the Jagiellonian University. The study has been registered in ClinicalTrials. gov (NCT01962519).

#### **Outcome measurements**

Postoperative complications were defined as previously reported [24] and were classified according to the Clavien–Dindo scoring system [25]. Major postoperative complications were defined as grade 3a or higher. Postoperative mortality was defined as any death during the hospital stay after surgery. Overall survival was defined as the time from surgery to all-cause death or the date of the last follow-up. Dates of death were verified through the census registry office.

#### **Statistical analysis**

All continuous variables are reported with their median and interquartile range (IQR) while categorical data are reported as proportions. Statistical significances of the differences in categorical and continuous variables were analysed by  $\chi^2$  and the Mann–Whitney U tests where appropriate. The



Table 1Patient demographicsand clinicopathologicalparameters

Characteristic	Overall ( <i>N</i> =1476)	Clinical staging		P
		cT1a-cT4a (N=1178)	cT4b (N=298)	
Gender (male)	1017 (69%)	808 (69%)	209 (70%)	0.607*
Age (≥65 y)	775 (53%)	616 (52%)	159 (53%)	$0.743^{\dagger}$
Race/ethnicity (Caucasian)	1476 (100%)	1178 (100%)	298 (100%)	$1.000^{+}$
Comorbidities				
Arterial hypertension	659 (45%)	540 (46%)	119 (40%)	$0.067^{\dagger}$
Ischemic heart disease	401 (27%)	327 (28%)	74 (25%)	0.310 <sup>†</sup>
Arrhythmia	142 (9.6%)	122 (10%)	20 (6.7%)	$0.057^{\dagger}$
Chronic heart failure	60 (4.1%)	55 (4.7%)	5 (1.7%)	$0.019^{\dagger}$
COPD/asthma	122 (8.3%)	101 (8.6%)	21 (7.0%)	$0.392^{\dagger}$
Diabetes	227 (15%)	183 (16%)	44 (15%)	$0.742^{\dagger}$
Liver cirrhosis	26 (1.8%)	21 (1.8%)	5 (1.7%)	$0.902^{\dagger}$
CKD	31 (2.1%)	29 (2.5%)	2 (0.7%)	$0.054^{\dagger}$
ASA class (3 or 4)	346 (23%)	285 (24%)	61 (20%)	$0.175^{\dagger}$
Charlson comorbidity index				$0.023^{\dagger}$
0	847 (57%)	662 (56%)	185 (62%)	
1	437 (30%)	349 (30%)	88 (30%)	
>2	192 (13%)	167 (14%)	25 (8.4%)	
Weight loss	876 (59%)	658 (56%)	218 (73%)	< 0.001 <sup>†</sup>
Percent weight loss*	11 (7, 16)	10 (7, 15)	14 (9, 20)	< 0.001 <sup>‡</sup>
Body mass index <sup>*</sup>	24.7 (22.1, 27.7)	24.9 (22.3, 27.8)	23.9 (21.6, 26.8)	< 0.001 <sup>‡</sup>
Tumour location (distal)	537 (36%)	462 (39%)	75 (25%)	< 0.001 <sup>†</sup>
Tumour size (mm)*	50 (30, 80)	50 (30, 70)	90 (60, 115)	< 0.001 <sup>‡</sup>
Lauren type, intestinal	741 (50%)	626 (53%)	115 (39%)	< 0.001 <sup>†</sup>
Tumour grade (2 or 3)	1.274 (87%)	995 (85%)	279 (94%)	< 0.001 <sup>†</sup>
Lymphovascular invasion	515 (35%)	383 (33%)	132 (44%)	< 0.001 <sup>†</sup>
Perineural invasion	255 (17%)	191 (16%)	64 (21%)	$0.032^{\dagger}$
Neoadiuvant chemotherapy	156 (11%)	125 (11%)	31 (10%)	0.917
Gastrectomy (total)	943 (64%)	689 (58%)	254 (85%)	< 0.001 <sup>†</sup>
Lymphadenectomy D2	1.066 (72%)	843 (72%)	223 (75%)	0.260
Surgeon caseload (>100)	1,174 (80%)	937 (80%)	237 (80%)	0.997
Organ resection	432 (29%)	214 (18%)	218 (73%)	< 0.001 <sup>†</sup>
Spleen	340 (23%)	214 (18%)	126 (42%)	< 0.001 <sup>†</sup>
Pancreas	51 (3.5%)	0(0%)	51 (17%)	< 0.001 <sup>†</sup>
Colon	41 (2.8%)	0 (0%)	41 (14%)	< 0.001
Curative resection (R0)	1220 (83%)	1082 (92%)	138 (46%)	< 0.001
Blood transfusion (yes)	476 (32%)	342 (29%)	134 (45%)	< 0.001 <sup>†</sup>
Blood transfusion (ml)*	440 (410, 830)	440 (300, 660)	545 (440, 880)	< 0.001 <sup>‡</sup>
Resected lymph nodes <sup>*</sup>	24(15, 32)	(300, 000) 23 (14, 31)	26(18, 34)	< 0.001 <sup>‡</sup>
Metastatic lymph nodes <sup>*</sup>	3(0, 12)	20(11,01) 2(0,9)	11(3,21)	< 0.001 <sup>‡</sup>
Depth of infiltration (nT)	5 (0, 12)	2 (0, ))	11 (3, 21)	< 0.001 <sup>†</sup>
T1a	112 (7.6%)	112 (9 5%)	0 (0%)	(01001
T1b	130 (8.8%)	130 (11%)	0 (0%)	
T2	150 (10%)	150 (13%)	0 (0%)	
 T3	653 (44%)	637 (54%)	16 (5 4%)	
T4a	243 (16%)	149 (13%)	94 (32%)	
T4b	188 (13%)	0 (0%)	188 (63%)	
Lymph node status (pN)	100 (1070)	0 (0/0)	100 (0570)	< 0.001
NO	512 (35%)	474 (40%)	38 (13%)	\$0.001
N1	191 (13%)	158 (13%)	33 (11%)	
	1/1 (10/0)	100 (10/0)	22 (11/0)	

#### Table 1 (continued)

Characteristic	Overall $(N=1476)$	Clinical staging		P
		cT1a-cT4a (N=1178)	cT4b (N=298)	
N2	199 (13%)	157 (13%)	42 (14%)	
N3a	297 (20%)	226 (19%)	71 (24%)	
N3b	277 (19%)	163 (14%)	114 (38%)	

\*Median (interquartile range)

<sup>†</sup>Pearson's chi-squared test

<sup>‡</sup>Mann–Whitney U test

ASA, American Society of Anesthesiologists; CKD, chronic kidney disease; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; BMI, body mass index

Bonferroni correction was used to account for multiple testing.

Potential predictors of major postoperative complications were initially evaluated by odds ratios (ORs) with 95% confidence intervals (CI). Three penalised regression methods (ridge, lasso, and elastic net regression) were used for the selection of predictive variables and formulation of a multivariable logistic regression model based on minimising the Akaike information criterion (AIC). Collinearity among variables was evaluated by variance inflation factors (VIF) with values greater than 5 used as a cut-off for multicollinearity. Model validation was performed by bootstrapping with 1000 resamples [26]. Calibration was evaluated with GiViTI calibration belt [27]. The predictive performance of the model was evaluated by the area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC). A nomogram was formulated based on the results of the logistic regression model.

Survival data was analysed according to the Kaplan–Meier method and included postoperative mortality. Multivariate analysis was performed using a Cox proportional hazards model with a backward stepwise selection procedure. The significance level (P) < 0.05 in a two-tailed test was considered statistically significant. All statistical analyses were performed using the IBM® SPSS® Statistics 28 software package (IBM Corporation, NY) and RStudio (Integrated Development Environment for R) version 2021.9.2.382 with packages survival (3.3–1), rms (6.2–0), pROC (1.16.2), gtsummary (1.5.2), and caret (6.0–91).

#### Results

#### **Patient characteristics**

A total of 1792 patients who underwent stomach resections for gastric cancer were identified between January 1996 and December 2020. Subsequently, 316 patients were excluded due to metastatic disease (n=296) or combined resections of organs other than prespecified in inclusion criteria, including liver (n=10), ovary (n=7), and pancreatoduodenectomy (n=3). Figure 1 shows the flowchart of the study. A group of 298 patients had locally advanced tumours with infiltration of surrounding organs suspected intraoperatively (cT4b disease), and they comprised the final study population. Approximately 62% of them were diagnosed preoperatively as locally advanced tumours. Preoperative chemotherapy was used in only 11% of patients, consisting mostly of three regimens, i.e. ECF (epirubicin, cisplatin, and fluorouracil), DCF (docetaxel, cisplatin, and 5-fluorouracil), and FLOT (5-fluorouracil, leucovorin, oxaliplatin, and docetaxel). Response rates to preoperative treatment were not routinely evaluated. Table 1 summarises the clinical data and patient characteristics between subjects with locally advanced disease and the remaining population. Two hundred and eighteen (73%) of 298 patients with cT4b tumours underwent MVRs, including the spleen (n = 126), pancreas (n = 51), and colon (n = 41, including right colectomy in 15 and partial)resections in 26 patients). The overall proportion of patients with confirmed pT4b disease after MVR was 50% and was highest for colectomy (76%), followed by pancreatectomy (51%) and splenectomy (42%). The proportion was markedly higher among 80 subjects with cT4b disease who underwent gastrectomy alone and reached 97%.

# Postoperative outcomes for locally advanced (cT4b) tumours

The overall postoperative morbidity was 75%. Grades I and II complications, according to the Clavien–Dindo classification, were found in 44% of patients, and more than one half of them (24%) were due to red blood cell transfusions associated with a more liberal transfusion strategy in the early study period. Compared to gastric resections alone, MVRs were associated with increased postoperative morbidity (80% vs 62%, P=0.002) caused by higher proportions of surgical (41% vs 29%, P=0.048) and general complications (75% vs 60%, P=0.013). Patients after MVRs had higher median values of the Comprehensive Complication Index (CCI 26 vs 21, P=0.006), and longer median duration of hospital stay (13 vs 8 days, P<0.001). However, the

increased rates of grade  $\geq$  3a complications (34% vs 22%, P = 0.058), surgical reinterventions (17% vs 11%, P = 0.261), and hospital readmissions (9.2% vs 5.0%, P = 0.241) were insignificant. The overall mortality rate of 5.0% was equal for gastrectomy alone and MVRs.

# Organ-specific morbidity for MVRs for cT4b tumours

Postoperative outcomes stratified by the resected organ are summarised in supplementary table 1. Figure 2 shows odds ratios of splenectomy, pancreatectomy, and colectomy compared to gastrectomy alone for outcome measures identified as possibly related to MVRs. Pairwise comparisons demonstrated that pancreatectomy compared to gastrectomy alone was associated with higher overall (P = 0.005), surgical (P=0.001), general (P=0.017), and major (P=0.007) complications, as well as pancreatic fistula (P = 0.007), pneumonia (P = 0.005), and sepsis (P = 0.049). Distal pancreatectomy also increased the odds for achieving higher values of CCI (P = 0.001) and longer hospital stay (P = 0.001). Splenectomy was associated with higher odds for overall morbidity (P = 0.019), general complications (P = 0.039), and prolonged hospital stay (P=0.001) but had no effect on individual complications. On the other hand, colonic resections significantly increased the odds of septic complications (P=0.004) and prolonged hospital stay (P=0.008) compared to gastrectomy alone.

# Prediction of major postoperative complications for cT4b tumours

Figure 3 shows the results of univariate logistic analysis of potential predictors for complications grade 3a or higher according to the Clavien-Dindo classification. Subsequently, penalised regression analysis was employed to build a multivariable logistic regression model predicting major postoperative morbidity. The best goodness of fit, as shown by the lowest AIC, was found for the model including 8 variables, i.e. age>65 years, history of myocardial infarction, cardiac arrhythmia, congestive heart failure, arterial hypertension, COPD or asthma, Charlson's comorbidity index, and multivisceral resection. Although splenectomy was not associated with major morbidity, distal pancreatectomy and colectomy were identified as independent risk factors with odds ratios of 2.53 (95% CI 1.23–5.19, P=0.012) and 2.29 (95% CI 1.04–5.09, P = 0.035), respectively. Model calibration by bootstrapping (mean absolute error of 0.01) and GiViTi calibration belt showed very good correlation between the predicted and actual probability of major postoperative complications. The AUC of ROC obtained from the model was 0.713 (95% CI 0.646 to 0.780). A nomogram to calculate the probability of major postoperative complications is presented in Fig. 4. History of congestive heart failure or myocardial infarction, as well as distal pancreatectomy and colectomy, had the greatest impact on grade  $\geq$  3a complications.

Outcome	OR (95% CI)		P value
Morbidity			
splenectomy	2.10 (1.13-3.91)		0.019
pancreatectomy	3.77 (1.58-10.10)		0.005
colectomy	2.13 (0.92-5.30)		0.087
Major complications			
splenectomy	1.32 (0.70-2.59)		0.399
pancreatectomy	2.83 (1.33-6.13)		0.007
colectomy	2.20 (0.97-5.03)		0.058
CCI*			
splenectomy	1.50 (0.85-2.68)		0.167
pancreatectomy	3.85 (1.85-8.28)		0.001
colectomy	1.67 (0.78-3.61)		0.185
Hospital stay*			
splenectomy	3.91 (2.16-7.21)		0.001
pancreatectomy	11.20 (4.37-35.10)		→ 0.001
colectomy	2.95 (1.35-6.79)		0.008
Surgical complicatio	ns		
splenectomy	1.20 (0.65-2.22)		0.567
pancreatectomy	3.84 (1.85-8.20)		0.001
colectomy	1.94 (0.88-4.27)		0.098
POPF			
splenectomy	1.64 (0.53-6.14)		0.418
pancreatectomy	5.22 (1.67-19.80)		- 0.007
colectomy	1.50 (0.28-7.14)		0.607
General complicatio	ns		
splenectomy	1.88 (1.03-3.43)		0.039
pancreatectomy	2.73 (1.23-6.48)		0.017
colectomy	1.61 (0.73-3.71)		0.247
Pneumonia			
splenectomy	1.96 (0.94-4.34)		0.081
pancreatectomy	3.42 (1.47-8.28)		0.005
colectomy	1.76 (0.65-4.69)		0.254
Sepsis			
splenectomy	1.82 (0.60-6.75)		0.321
pancreatectomy	3.53 (1.05-13.90)		0.049
colectomy	6.13 (1.90-23.70)		- 0.004
	0.1	0 0.50 2.0 8.02	ד 0.0

Fig. 2 Odds ratios (OR, 95% CI) of splenectomy, pancreatectomy, and colectomy compared to gastrectomy alone for postoperative outcome measures identified as possibly related to MVRs. \*OR for the likelihood of achieving values higher than the median value for gastrectomy alone

# Prognosis of locally advanced (cT4b) tumours

At the time of final follow-up, 1059 of 1476 patients (72%) had died. The median follow-up for all surviving subjects was 101 months, and 151 months for patients in the cT4b

Fig. 3 Univariate logistic analysis of potential predictors for major postoperative morbidity (Clavien–Dindo≥3a) among patients with cT4b disease. ASA, American Society of Anesthesiologists; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; RBC, red blood cell

Characteristic	OR (95% CI)		p-value
Male	1.21 (0.71 – 2.11)		0.498
Age >65 yr	1.66 (1.01 – 2.76)		0.048
Body Mass Index			
18.5-25 (ref)			
>25	1.28 (0.73 - 2.27)		0.388
<18.5	1.46 (0.54 - 3.78)		0.437
Weight loss	1.15 (0.66 - 2.04)		0.631
Angina pectoris	2.08 (1.20 - 3.60)		0.009
Myocardial infarction	5.00 (1.87 - 14.8)		0.002
Cardiac arrhythmia	2.39 (0.95 - 6.04)		0.062
Congestive heart failure	9.32 (1.35 - 184)	<b></b>	0.047
Arterial hypertension	1.71 (1.04 - 2.82)	-8-	0.035
COPD or asthma	2.66 (1.08 - 6.63)	<b></b>	0.032
Cerebrovascular disease	1.29 (0.33 - 4.39)		0.689
Liver cirrhosis	0.55 (0.03 - 3.82)	←	0.601
Chronic kidney disease	2.25 (0.09 - 57.4)	←	0.567
Diabetes	1.68 (0.86 - 3.24)		0.121
ASA Class 3 or 4	2.50 (1.40 - 4.48)		0.002
Charlson Comorbidity Index			
0 (ref)			
1	1.78 (1.02 - 3.08)		0.040
2 or more	4.67 (1.98 - 11.4)	<b></b>	<0.001
Distal location	0.99 (0.55 - 1.73)		0.964
Tumour size >70 mm	1.03 (0.59 - 1.80)		0.929
pT category			
pT1−3 (ref)			
pT4a	0.93 (0.31 - 3.19)	<b>_</b>	0.906
pT4b	1.01 (0.35 - 3.31)		0.991
Lymph node metastases	0.96 (0.47 - 2.07)		0.920
Neoadjuvant chemotherapy	1.07 (0.47 - 2.33)		0.860
Gastrectomy	1.23 (0.61 - 2.59)		0.576
D2 lymphadenectomy	0.79 (0.46 - 1.39)		0.411
Surgeon caseload >100	1.33 (0.72 - 2.56)		0.380
Adjacent organ resection			
none (ref)			
spleen	1.32 (0.70 - 2.59)		0.399
pancreas	2.83 (1.33 - 6.13)		0.007
colon	2.20 (0.97 - 5.03)		0.058
RBC transfusion	0.81 (0.49 - 1.32)		0.396
		0.10 0.25 1.0 2.0 4.0 8.0 20.0	

without MVRs (9.7 months, 7.3–12.2) and after resection of the spleen (9.9 months, 7.2–12.6), pancreas (12.7 months, 4.3–21.2), and colon (8.7 months, 4.4–12.9). A Cox proportional hazards model (Table 2) identified non-radical resection as the most important risk factor for patients' survival (HR 1.47), followed by age above 65 years (HR 1.43), and non-intestinal histology (HR 1.25). In the MVR group, the overall median survival of patients with pT3/T4a and pT4b tumours was 11.7 and 8.5 months (P=0.042), respectively. The median survival was also significantly affected by lymph node status and was markedly shorter in patients with positive lymph nodes (10.7 vs 22.5 months, P<0.001).

Margin-negative (R0) resections were carried out in 138 (46%) of 298 patients with cT4b disease. Non-radical resections were due to infiltration of transection margin (n=33, 11%), radial margin (n=87, 30%), and both margins (n=40, 13%). The proportion of margin-positive resections was highest after splenectomy (56%), followed by colectomy (34%), and pancreatectomy (22%). A logistic regression

analysis was carried out to identify factors associated with the risk of positive resection margins among patients with cT4b disease (Supplementary Table 2). The odds of nonradical resection were significantly higher for moderately/ poorly differentiated tumours (OR 6.52, 95% CI 1.86–31.0, P = 0.007) and for pathologically confirmed infiltration of surrounding organs (OR 10.2, 95% CI 2.61–67.6, P = 0.003). Multivisceral resection was the only factor reducing the risk of margin positivity (OR 0.44, 95% CI 0.21–0.87, P = 0.022).

# Discussion

Locally advanced gastric cancer requiring multivisceral resections of surrounding organs continues to pose an important clinical challenge. This single institutional study using data from a prospectively maintained database of Western patients found that MVRs significantly increased the odds of



**Fig. 4** Results of a logistic regression model predicting major postoperative morbidity (Clavien–Dindo $\geq$ 3 a). A The nomogram is used by adding up the points identified on the points scale for each variable.

The total points projected on the bottom scale indicate the probability of major morbidity. **B** Model calibration using GiViTI calibration belt. **C** Receiver operating characteristic plot for the model achieving complete (R0) tumour clearance. However, such resections were associated with increased postoperative morbidity related to the type of the organ being resected.

About 20–30% pathology reports for resected gastric cancers demonstrate tumour invasion of either serosal membrane (pT4a) or adjacent structures (pT4b) [28, 29]. In the latter case, the pancreas, the spleen, the transverse colon, and the liver are most commonly affected, determining the ability to achieve potentially curative resections [12, 22, 30]. Desmoplastic and inflammatory reactions around pT3 and pT4a tumours may sometimes mimic true invasion of surrounding organs (pT4b) and 20–60% of pathology reports fail to confirm the T4b disease [7, 8, 18–21, 31]. Therefore, the decision about the need to perform a MVR is made intraoperatively without knowing the exact extent of the disease, and one must balance the oncological benefits against the potential risks from extended resections.



**Fig. 5** Kaplan–Meier curves for overall survival of patients who underwent surgery for cT4b gastric cancer for groups defined by curability of resection (**A**) and the extent of resection (**B**) (log-rank test) The scepticism regarding MVRs in gastric cancer was primarily driven by an increased risk of postoperative morbidity reported in most studies [4]. Resection of additional organs was generally accompanied by higher rates of major postoperative complications (Clavien–Dindo  $\geq$  3) in about 30% of cases [7, 32] and mortality of up to 9–14% [7–9]. However, detailed information concerning early postoperative period in patients subject to MVRs for locally advanced cancers is generally missing and little is known about the risk associated with the resection of individual organs based on previous reports [10, 31, 33–36].

In the present study, MVRs among patients with locally advanced tumours were associated with an increased overall morbidity as well as higher proportions of surgical and general complications. An explanatory analysis demonstrated that these effects were mainly due to morbidity attributed to pancreatic and colonic resections, but not splenectomy. Both types of resections significantly increased odds ratios for major complications reaching 2.53 for distal pancreatectomy and 2.29 for colectomy, but the mortality rates were unaffected. Interestingly, the type of the resected organ was the only surgery-related parameter included in the nomogram developed to predict major complications. Intuitively, one could anticipate increased morbidity after MVRs based on data obtained from randomised clinical trials evaluating planned pancreatectomy and splenectomy upon initial experience with D2 lymphadenectomy [37]. However, such findings were rarely reported for resections carried out for locally advanced tumours. Similarly to our results, Min et al. in a population of 243 patients with locally advanced cancers (pT4b) demonstrated morbidity rates higher for pancreatic resections (30%) than for partial colectomy (13%) or hepatectomy (19%) [38]. However, some contrary results were reported by van der Werf et al. who demonstrated similar rates of Clavien–Dindo grade 3 or higher complications among patients with pT4 tumours after partial pancreatectomy (17%) and gastrectomy and anticipation (17%) [39].

Previous studies established that the completeness of resection, achievable in about 30–85% of cases, was the most important predictor of long-term survival after MVRs for gastric cancer [8, 10, 12, 19, 21, 30–33, 35]. Most reports also failed to demonstrate significant prognostic differences among patients subject to MVRs and related to the type of the resected organ, including the spleen, pancreas, or colon

**Table 2** Univariate andmultivariate analyses ofprognostic factors in patientswith locally advanced (cT4b)tumours (n = 298)

Characteristic	Univariate		Multivariate	
	HR (95% CI)	P-value	HR (95% CI)	<i>P</i> -value
Gender (male)	1.16 (0.88–1.53)	0.280		
Age (≥65 y)	1.53 (1.20-1.96)	< 0.001	1.43 (1.10–1.87)	0.008
Weight loss	1.51 (1.14-2.01)	0.004	1.16 (0.85–1.59)	0.346
ASA class (3 or 4)	1.37 (1.01–1.86)	0.041	1.21 (0.88-1.68)	0.241
Tumour location (distal)	1.08 (0.82–1.43)	0.573		
Tumour size (>70 mm)	1.37 (1.04–1.82)	0.026	1.20 (0.89–1.63)	0.229
Lauren type (intestinal)	0.74 (0.58-0.96)	0.021	0.75 (0.57-0.99)	0.039
Tumour grade (2 or 3)	1.54 (0.91–2.60)	0.104	0.96 (0.54-1.72)	0.888
Lymphovascular invasion	1.30 (1.02–1.67)	0.035	1.13 (0.87–1.47)	0.355
Perineural invasion	0.99 (0.73-1.35)	0.954		
Neoadjuvant chemotherapy	0.64 (0.41-0.99)	0.047	0.71 (0.45-1.12)	0.145
RBC transfusion	0.95 (0.74-1.21)	0.672		
Gastrectomy, total	1.13 (0.80–1.58)	0.492		
Lymphadenectomy D2	1.03 (0.78–1.37)	0.824		
Surgeon caseload (>100)	0.81 (0.60-1.09)	0.159		
Multivisceral resection	0.77 (0.59-1.01)	0.059	0.94 (0.68-1.29)	0.699
Non-radical resection (R1)	1.78 (1.39-2.29)	< 0.001	1.47 (1.10–1.97)	0.010
Depth of infiltration (pT)				
T1a-T3	Reference		Reference	
T4a	2.24 (1.15-4.34)	0.017	1.55 (0.78-3.10)	0.210
T4b	2.80 (1.47-5.34)	0.002	1.74 (0.87–3.49)	0.120
Lymph node status (pN)				
N0	Reference		Reference	
N1 or N2	1.34 (0.87–2.07)	0.184	1.19 (0.75–1.88)	0.459
N3a or N3b	1.84 (1.25–2.72)	0.002	1.50 (0.98–2.28)	0.062

HR, hazard ratio; CI, confidence intervals; RBC, red blood cell

[10, 12, 18, 32, 33]. Even though the resected organ does not seem to determine survival, as in our cohort, some data suggest that it may be related to the likelihood of curative resections with the highest rates reported among patients requiring pancreaticosplenectomy [7, 19, 35]. This was somehow conflicting with findings suggesting significantly poorer survival after pancreatic resection. Among 243 patients with pT4b disease, Min et al. found that only patients with pancreatic invasion (n=67) had higher hazard ratio for death (1.46, 95% CI 1.01–2.11, P=0.043), and no such differences were demonstrated for tumours invading the colon or liver [38]. Similar findings were reported in a group where pancreatectomy was associated with increased hazard ratio for death (1.67, 95% CI 1.02–2.76, P=0.044) [7].

Our results provide detailed data from a Western population supporting safety and long-term outcomes of MVRs for gastric cancer. However, two important limitations should also be considered. First, due to the retrospective nature of this study, we could not strictly define the reasons that prompted the decision to perform resection of adjacent organs or gastrectomy alone for cT4b tumours. Generally, the decision was left to the surgeon and was balanced between the feasibility of performing a macroscopically curative resection and the overall perioperative risk for the patient. Second, the proportion of patients with locally advanced cancers receiving perioperative chemotherapy was low considering the current guidelines recommending perioperative treatment for most patients. As chemotherapy prior to surgery lowered the HR of death in the univariate analysis, a more common use of systemic treatment could likely increase the rates of R0 resections and further improve long-term results.

In conclusion, the present study demonstrated that MVRs for locally advanced gastric cancer significantly increased the likelihood of achieving tumour-free resection margins. Resection of organs adjacent to the stomach increased the risk of postoperative complications and prolonged hospital stay in an organ-dependent manner. Analysis of further large-scale population-based data sets is still desirable to determine whether preoperative treatment may further potentiate the benefits from MVRs.

Supplementary Information The online version contains supplementary material available at https://doi.org/10.1007/s00423-023-03187-7.

Author's Contributions L.B. and R.P. collected all relevant data. L.B. and M.S. wrote the main manuscript text and carried out data analysis. P.K., A.S. and P.R. edited the manuscript. All authors reviewed the manuscript.

**Data Availability** The data that support the findings of this study are available from the authors upon reasonable request.

# Declarations

Competing interests The authors declare no competing interests.

**Ethical approval** All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki Declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards.

**Informed consent** The study was planned as a retrospective cohort study. Therefore, no informed consent could be obtained retrospectively from the participants. The Bioethics Committee of the Jagiellonian University approved the protocol of this study.

**Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/.

# References

- Smyth EC, Verheij M, Allum W, Cunningham D, Cervantes A, Arnold D, Committee EG (2016) Gastric cancer: ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines for diagnosis, treatment and follow-up. Ann Oncol 27:v38–v49
- Japanese Gastric Cancer Association (2017) Japanese gastric cancer treatment guidelines 2014 (ver. 4). Gastric Cancer 20:1–19
- Van Cutsem E, Sagaert X, Topal B, Haustermans K, Prenen H (2016) Gastric cancer. Lancet 388:2654–2664
- Brar SS, Seevaratnam R, Cardoso R, Yohanathan L, Law C et al (2012) Multivisceral resection for gastric cancer: a systematic review. Gastric Cancer 15(Suppl 1):S100-107
- Katai H, Ishikawa T, Akazawa K, Isobe Y, Miyashiro I, Oda I et al (2018) Five-year survival analysis of surgically resected gastric cancer cases in Japan: a retrospective analysis of more than 100,000 patients from the nationwide registry of the Japanese Gastric Cancer Association (2001–2007). Gastric Cancer 21:144–154
- Papenfuss WA, Kukar M, Oxenberg J, Attwood K, Nurkin S, Malhotra U et al (2014) Morbidity and mortality associated with gastrectomy for gastric cancer. Ann Surg Oncol 21:3008–3014
- Tran TB, Worhunsky DJ, Norton JA, Squires MH 3rd, Jin LX, Spolverato G et al (2015) Multivisceral resection for gastric cancer: results from the US Gastric Cancer Collaborative. Ann Surg Oncol 22(Suppl 3):S840-847
- Carboni F, Lepiane P, Santoro R, Lorusso R, Mancini P, Sperduti I et al (2005) Extended multiorgan resection for T4 gastric carcinoma: 25-year experience. J Surg Oncol 90:95–100
- Shchepotin IB, Chorny VA, Nauta RJ, Shabahang M, Buras RR, Evans SR (1998) Extended surgical resection in T4 gastric cancer. Am J Surg 175:123–126
- Kim DY, Joo JK, Seo KW, Park YK, Ryu SY, Kim HR et al (2006) T4 gastric carcinoma: the benefit of non-curative resection. ANZ J Surg 76:453–457

- Aversa JG, Diggs LP, Hagerty BL, Dominguez DA, Ituarte PHG, Hernandez JM et al (2021) Multivisceral resection for locally advanced gastric cancer. J Gastrointest Surg 25:609–622
- 12. Cheng CT, Tsai CY, Hsu JT, Vinayak R, Liu KH, Yeh CN et al (2011) Aggressive surgical approach for patients with T4 gastric carcinoma: promise or myth? Ann Surg Oncol 18:1606–1614
- Onate-Ocana LF, Becker M, Carrillo JF, Aiello-Crocifoglio V, Gallardo-Rincon D, Brom-Valladares R et al (2008) Selection of best candidates for multiorgan resection among patients with T4 gastric carcinoma. J Surg Oncol 98:336–342
- Ozer I, Bostanci EB, Orug T, Ozogul YB, Ulas M, Ercan M et al (2009) Surgical outcomes and survival after multiorgan resection for locally advanced gastric cancer. Am J Surg 198:25–30
- Molina JC, Al-Hinai A, Gosseling-Tardif A, Bouchard P, Spicer J, Mulder D et al (2019) Multivisceral resection for locally advanced gastric and gastroesophageal junction cancers-11-year experience at a high-volume North American center. J Gastrointest Surg 23:43–50
- Lo SS, Wu CW, Shen KH, Hsieh MC, Lui WY (2002) Higher morbidity and mortality after combined total gastrectomy and pancreaticosplenectomy for gastric cancer. World J Surg 26:678–682
- Dias AR, Pereira MA, Ramos M, Oliveira RJ, Ribeiro U Jr, Zilberstein B et al (2020) Prediction scores for complication and recurrence after multivisceral resection in gastric cancer. Eur J Surg Oncol 46:1097–1102
- Isozaki H, Tanaka N, Tanigawa N, Okajima K (2000) Prognostic factors in patients with advanced gastric cancer with macroscopic invasion to adjacent organs treated with radical surgery. Gastric Cancer 3:202–210
- Jeong O, Choi WY, Park YK (2009) Appropriate selection of patients for combined organ resection in cases of gastric carcinoma invading adjacent organs. J Surg Oncol 100:115–120
- Kim JH, Jang YJ, Park SS, Park SH, Kim SJ, Mok YJ et al (2009) Surgical outcomes and prognostic factors for T4 gastric cancers. Asian J Surg 32:198–204
- Kobayashi A, Nakagohri T, Konishi M, Inoue K, Takahashi S, Itou M et al (2004) Aggressive surgical treatment for T4 gastric cancer. J Gastrointest Surg 8:464–470
- 22. Mita K, Ito H, Fukumoto M, Murabayashi R, Koizumi K, Hayashi T et al (2012) Surgical outcomes and survival after extended multiorgan resection for T4 gastric cancer. Am J Surg 203:107–111
- Edge SB, Byrd DR, Compton CC, Fritz AG, Greene FL, Trotti A (2010) AJCC cancer staging manual (7th edn). Springer, New York
- 24. Klek S, Kulig J, Sierzega M, Szybinski P, Szczepanek K, Kubisz A et al (2008) The impact of immunostimulating nutrition on infectious complications after upper gastrointestinal surgery: a prospective, randomized, clinical trial. Ann Surg 248:212–220
- Dindo D, Demartines N, Clavien PA (2004) Classification of surgical complications: a new proposal with evaluation in a cohort of 6336 patients and results of a survey. Ann Surg 240:205–213
- Steyerberg EW, Harrell FE Jr, Borsboom GJ, Eijkemans MJ, Vergouwe Y, Habbema JD (2001) Internal validation of predictive models: efficiency of some procedures for logistic regression analysis. J Clin Epidemiol 54:774–781

- 27. Nattino G, Finazzi S, Bertolini G (2014) A new calibration test and a reappraisal of the calibration belt for the assessment of prediction models based on dichotomous outcomes. Stat Med 33:2390–2407
- Sano T, Coit DG, Kim HH, Roviello F, Kassab P, Wittekind C et al (2017) Proposal of a new stage grouping of gastric cancer for TNM classification: International Gastric Cancer Association staging project. Gastric Cancer 20:217–225
- 29. Che K, Wang Y, Wu N, Liu Q, Yang J, Liu B et al (2021) Prognostic nomograms based on three lymph node classification systems for resected gastric adenocarcinoma: a large populationbased cohort study and external validation. Ann Surg Oncol 28:8937–8949
- Korenaga D, Okamura T, Baba H, Saito A, Sugimachi K (1988) Results of resection of gastric cancer extending to adjacent organs. Br J Surg 75:12–15
- Yang Y, Hu J, Ma Y, Chen G, Liu Y (2021) Multivisceral resection for locally advanced gastric cancer: a retrospective study. Am J Surg 221:1011–1017
- Pacelli F, Cusumano G, Rosa F, Marrelli D, Dicosmo M, Cipollari C et al (2013) Multivisceral resection for locally advanced gastric cancer: an Italian multicenter observational study. JAMA Surg 148:353–360
- Mita K, Ito H, Katsube T, Tsuboi A, Yamazaki N, Asakawa H et al (2017) Prognostic factors affecting survival after multivisceral resection in patients with clinical T4b gastric cancer. J Gastrointest Surg 21:1993–1999
- 34. Dhar DK, Kubota H, Tachibana M, Kinugasa S, Masunaga R, Shibakita M et al (2001) Prognosis of T4 gastric carcinoma patients: an appraisal of aggressive surgical treatment. J Surg Oncol 76:278–282
- 35. Kunisaki C, Akiyama H, Nomura M, Matsuda G, Otsuka Y, Ono HA et al (2006) Surgical outcomes in patients with T4 gastric carcinoma. J Am Coll Surg 202:223–230
- 36. Saito H, Tsujitani S, Maeda Y, Fukuda K, Yamaguchi K, Ikeguchi M et al (2001) Combined resection of invaded organs in patients with T4 gastric carcinoma. Gastric Cancer 4:206–211
- 37. Jiang L, Yang KH, Chen Y, Guan QL, Zhao P, Tian JH et al (2014) Systematic review and meta-analysis of the effectiveness and safety of extended lymphadenectomy in patients with resectable gastric cancer. Br J Surg 101:595–604
- Min JS, Jin SH, Park S, Kim SB, Bang HY, Lee JI (2012) Prognosis of curatively resected pT4b gastric cancer with respect to invaded organ type. Ann Surg Oncol 19:494–501
- 39. van der Werf LR, Eshuis WJ, Draaisma WA, van Etten B, Gisbertz SS, van der Harst E et al (2019) Nationwide outcome of gastrectomy with en-bloc partial pancreatectomy for gastric cancer. J Gastrointest Surg 23:2327–2337

**Publisher's Note** Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.