

DOI: 10.16781/j.0258-879x.2020.01.0032

· 论 著 ·

双通道重建手术与全胃切除术对胃癌患者术后营养状况的影响

袁士杰[△], 史 征[△], 杨俊驰, 聂明明, 印 慨*

海军军医大学(第二军医大学)长海医院胃肠外科, 上海 200433

[摘要] **目的** 探讨胃体上部早期恶性肿瘤外科手术中不同消化道重建方式对患者术后营养状况的影响。**方法** 回顾性分析2016年6月至2018年1月于我院胃肠外科接受手术治疗的109例早期胃上部癌患者的病例资料。根据消化道重建方式将患者分为两组:双通道组(接受双通道重建手术,59例)和全胃组(接受全胃切除术,50例)。比较两组患者住院期间(入院时,术后第1、3、5天,出院时)及术后1年的实验室营养指标(血红蛋白、总蛋白、白蛋白、前白蛋白),以及术后1年体质量变化情况。**结果** 两组患者年龄、性别、入院时体质量、入院时实验室营养指标(血红蛋白、总蛋白、白蛋白、前白蛋白)、手术时间、手术方式、肿瘤位置、肿瘤最大径、肿瘤分化程度的差异均无统计学意义(P 均 >0.05)。术后第3天全胃组白蛋白低于双通道组,差异有统计学意义($t=2.30$, $P=0.023$),术后第1、3、5天和出院时两组血红蛋白、总蛋白、前白蛋白水平差异均无统计学意义(P 均 >0.05);出院时双通道组和全胃组血红蛋白、总蛋白、白蛋白、前白蛋白水平均较入院时下降,差异均有统计学意义(P 均 <0.05)。术后1年两组各实验室营养指标差异均无统计学意义(P 均 >0.05),而双通道组体质量下降百分比低于全胃组 $[-10.45\%$ (-17.11% , -5.19%) vs -17.83% (-22.06% , -13.10%)],差异有统计学意义($Z=4.31$, $P<0.01$)。**结论** 对于早期胃上部癌患者,双通道重建手术相比全胃切除术能够改善患者的营养状况。

[关键词] 胃肿瘤;双通道重建术;全胃切除术;营养状况;体质量下降**[中图分类号]** R 735.2**[文献标志码]** A**[文章编号]** 0258-879X(2020)01-0032-05

Effects of double-tract reconstruction versus total gastrectomy on nutritional status in patients with gastric cancer

YUAN Shi-jie[△], SHI Zheng[△], YANG Jun-chi, NIE Ming-ming, YIN Kai*

Department of Gastrointestinal Surgery, Changhai Hospital, Naval Medical University (Second Military Medical University), Shanghai 200433, China

[Abstract] **Objective** To explore the influence of different reconstruction methods of digestive tract on postoperative short-term nutritional status of patients with early malignant tumor in upper gastric body. **Methods** Retrospective analysis was conducted on 109 patients with early upper gastric cancer who underwent surgical treatment in our hospital from Jun. 2016 to Jan. 2018. Double-tract reconstruction was performed in 59 patients (double-tract reconstruction group), and total gastrectomy was performed in 50 patients (total gastrectomy group). Nutritional indexes (hemoglobin, total protein, albumin and prealbumin) were compared between the two groups during hospitalization (at admission, 1, 3, 5 days after operation, and at discharge) and one year after operation. The changes in body weight were observed in the first year after operation. **Results** There were no significant differences in age, gender, body weight or nutritional indexes (hemoglobin, albumin, total protein, prealbumin) at admission, operation time, operation method, tumor location, tumor maximum diameter, or tumor differentiation between the two groups ($P>0.05$). On the 3rd day after the operation, albumin in the total gastrectomy group was significantly lower than that in the double-tract reconstruction group ($t=2.30$, $P=0.023$). There were no significant differences in the hemoglobin, total protein or prealbumin between the two groups on day 1, 3 and 5 after operation, and at discharge ($P>0.05$). The levels of hemoglobin, total protein, albumin and prealbumin were significantly decreased in both groups at discharge as compared with that at admission ($P<0.05$). At 1 year after the operation, there was no significant difference in the nutritional indexes between the two groups ($P>0.05$). But the body weight loss in the double-tract reconstruction group was significantly lower than that in the total gastrectomy group

[收稿日期] 2019-08-28 **[接受日期]** 2019-12-02**[作者简介]** 袁士杰, 硕士生. E-mail: 515025579@qq.com; 史 征, 硕士, 主治医师. E-mail: mdshiz@foxmail.com[△]共同第一作者(Co-first authors).

*通信作者(Corresponding author). Tel: 021-31161589, E-mail: linkchanghai@outlook.com

(-10.45% [-17.11%, -5.19%]) vs -17.83% [-22.06%, -13.10%], $Z=4.31$, $P<0.01$). **Conclusion** In comparison to total gastrectomy, double-tract reconstruction surgery can effectively improve the nutritional status of patients with early upper gastric cancer.

[Key words] stomach neoplasms; double-tract reconstruction; total gastrectomy; nutritional status; body weight loss

[Acad J Sec Mil Med Univ, 2020, 41(1): 32-36]

近年来,随着胃癌诊断和治疗手段的发展,胃癌患者的预后有所改善,世界卫生组织2014年公布早期胃癌患者的5年生存率接近90%^[1]。随着早期胃癌的检出率越来越高,手术治疗的原则由单纯的扩大手术和标准化手术向考虑生命安全和质量的个体化手术转变^[2]。对于胃上部癌(包含胃食管结合部癌),传统手术方式是全胃切除+D₂淋巴结清扫术,但是全胃切除后会导致进食量减少、维生素B₁₂及铁的吸收减少^[3],使患者的生活质量下降。对于早期胃上部癌患者可以行保留远端胃的双通道重建手术或全胃切除手术,研究表明这两种手术方式都能够达到肿瘤的根治性切除,术后5年生存率无明显差异^[4]。然而,胃癌切除术后患者常发生器质性变化(如由于胃贮存功能下降而减少食物摄入量)及功能变化(如消化和吸收脂肪的能力下降),使营养状况和胃肠道免疫功能明显受到影响,从而导致体质量下降甚至营养不良,影响患者的生活质量和远期预后^[5-6]。为了减少手术侵入造成的创伤和术后并发症、缩短住院时间,术后加速康复(enhanced recovery after surgery, ERAS)方案的围手术期管理越来越受到关注^[7-8]。但是手术方式对患者术后体质量影响的研究仍鲜见。因此,本研究回顾性分析2016年6月至2018年1月经术后病理确诊为早期胃上部癌患者的病例资料,比较接受双通道重建手术与全胃切除术患者的术后短期营养状况及术后1年体质量变化情况,评估手术方式对患者营养状况的影响。

1 资料和方法

1.1 病例资料 回顾性分析2016年6月至2018年1月于海军军医大学(第二军医大学)长海医院胃肠外科接受手术治疗且术后病理证实为早期胃上部癌^[9]的109例患者的病例资料。纳入标准:(1)原发性早期胃癌患者,且术后病理证实为胃上部癌;(2)手术前未接受过放射治疗和化学治疗;(3)无其他肿瘤病史;(4)术前6个月内无

输血史;(5)有完整的临床信息和流行病学资料。根据消化道重建方式将患者分为双通道组和全胃组。双通道组患者接受双通道重建手术(切除近端胃后,按照Roux-en-Y术式行食管-空肠吻合,于食管空肠吻合口下15~20 cm处行空肠-残胃侧侧吻合,再按照Roux-en-Y术式行空肠-空肠吻合);全胃组患者接受全胃切除术(食管-空肠Roux-en-Y吻合术)。两组患者术后均未行辅助化学治疗。本研究通过海军军医大学(第二军医大学)长海医院医学伦理委员会审批。

1.2 研究指标 观察患者住院期间(入院时,术后第1、3、5天,出院时)及术后1年的实验室营养指标(血红蛋白、总蛋白、白蛋白、前白蛋白),以及术后1年体质量变化情况。由于胃癌患者术后1年体质量趋于稳定^[10],因此通过计算体质量下降百分比(body weight loss, BWL)评估患者术后1年的体质量变化。 $BWL(\%) = (\text{术后1年体质量} - \text{入院时体质量}) / \text{入院时体质量} \times 100\%$ 。

1.3 统计学处理 应用SAS 9.4软件进行统计学分析。计量资料采用Shapiro-Wilkson法检验其正态性,呈正态分布者以 $\bar{x} \pm s$ 表示,两组间比较采用独立样本 t 检验,入院时与出院时资料的比较采用配对样本 t 检验;呈偏态分布者以中位数(下四分位数,上四分位数)表示,采用Wilcoxon秩和检验进行比较。计数资料以例数和百分数据表示,组间比较采用 χ^2 检验。检验水准(α)为0.05。

2 结果

2.1 患者特征 共纳入109例早期胃上部癌患者。双通道组59例,男46例,年龄为24~72岁,中位年龄为64岁;女13例,年龄为26~79岁,中位年龄为67岁。全胃组50例,男39例,年龄为39~80岁,中位年龄为68岁;女11例,年龄为51~90岁,中位年龄为67岁。采取ERAS进行围手术期管理。所有患者均术前禁食6 h,禁水4 h;术后第1天拔除胃管及尿管,进食含有营养素的

清流质,术后第3天予以含有营养素的流质饮食,术后第2~3天下床活动,出院前均过渡到半流质进食。患者均为早期胃癌患者,肿瘤TNM分期均为I期,且均无淋巴结转移。见表1,两组患者年龄、性别、入院时体质量、入院时实验室营养指标

(血红蛋白、总蛋白、白蛋白、前白蛋白)、手术时间、手术方式(腹腔镜或开腹手术)、肿瘤位置(贲门或胃体上部)、肿瘤最大径、肿瘤分化程度差异均无统计学意义(P 均 >0.05)。

表1 两组早期胃上部癌患者基线特征比较

Tab 1 Comparison of baseline characteristics of early upper gastric cancer patients between two groups

Index	DG group $N=59$	TG group $N=50$	Statistic	P value
Age (year), $\bar{x} \pm s$	63.37 \pm 10.73	66.94 \pm 9.51	$t=1.45$	0.147
Gender n (%)			$\chi^2 < 0.01$	0.997
Male	46 (77.97)	39 (78.00)		
Female	13 (22.03)	11 (22.00)		
Preoperative body weight (kg), $\bar{x} \pm s$	66.44 \pm 9.53	66.02 \pm 10.54	$t=0.22$	0.826
Preoperative hemoglobin ($\text{g} \cdot \text{L}^{-1}$), $\bar{x} \pm s$	134.80 \pm 17.97	125.46 \pm 26.28	$t=1.74$	0.082
Preoperative total protein ($\text{g} \cdot \text{L}^{-1}$), $\bar{x} \pm s$	69.58 \pm 5.50	68.18 \pm 6.81	$t=1.18$	0.239
Preoperative albumin ($\text{g} \cdot \text{L}^{-1}$), $\bar{x} \pm s$	41.59 \pm 3.39	40.80 \pm 3.37	$t=1.22$	0.225
Preoperative prealbumin ($\text{mg} \cdot \text{L}^{-1}$), $\bar{x} \pm s$	226.17 \pm 44.14	215.32 \pm 67.62	$t=1.51$	0.132
Time of operation (min), $\bar{x} \pm s$	193.56 \pm 63.13	188.98 \pm 56.93	$t=0.22$	0.824
Operative procedure n (%)			$\chi^2 = 1.46$	0.228
Laparoscopic	23 (38.98)	14 (28.00)		
Open	36 (61.02)	36 (72.00)		
Location n (%)			$\chi^2 < 0.01$	0.983
Cardia	52 (88.14)	44 (88.00)		
Upper third of the stomach	7 (11.86)	6 (12.00)		
Maximum diameter (cm), $M(Q_L, Q_U)$	2.00 (1.20, 3.00)	2.04 (1.50, 3.00)	$Z=0.84$	0.403
Differentiation n (%)			$\chi^2 = 3.68$	0.055
High	14 (23.73)	5 (10.00)		
Middle	28 (47.46)	22 (44.00)		
Low	15 (25.42)	23 (46.00)		
Undifferentiated	2 (3.39)	0		

DG: Double-tract; TG: Total gastrectomy; $M(Q_L, Q_U)$: Median (lower quartile, upper quartile)

2.2 术后短期疗效与住院时间 双通道组3例(5.08%)患者术后发生并发症,全胃组2例(4.00%),该5例均为吻合口瘘,均行静脉营养,予胃镜下留置鼻空肠营养管至空肠-空肠吻合口下方约20cm处,并在必要时对胸腔积液、腹腔积液进行穿刺引流,逐渐由静脉营养过度至肠内营养,同时予以抗感染、对症支持治疗,最终均顺利出院。两组术后并发症发生率差异无统计学意义($P>0.05$)。两组术后均无死亡病例。双通道组与全胃组患者术后住院时间分别为8.00(7.00, 10.00)d、7.50(7.00, 9.00)d,差异无统计学意义($P>0.05$)。

2.3 术后住院期间实验室营养指标 见表2,术后第3天全胃组白蛋白水平低于双通道组,

差异有统计学意义($t=2.30, P=0.023$),术后第1、5天两组白蛋白差异无统计学意义(P 均 >0.05);术后第1、3、5天和出院时两组血红蛋白、总蛋白、前白蛋白水平差异均无统计学意义(P 均 >0.05)。出院时双通道组和全胃组血红蛋白、总蛋白、白蛋白、前白蛋白水平均较入院时下降,差异均有统计学意义(P 均 <0.05)。

2.4 术后1年营养情况 见表3,术后1年两组患者的实验室营养指标(血红蛋白、总蛋白、白蛋白、前白蛋白)差异均无统计学意义,但双通道组BWL低于全胃组[-10.45%(-17.11%, -5.19%) vs -17.83%(-22.06%, -13.10%)],差异有统计学意义($Z=4.31, P<0.01$)。

表2 两组早期胃上部癌患者术后住院期间实验室营养指标比较

Tab 2 Comparison of laboratory nutritional indexes of early upper gastric cancer patients between two groups during the hospitalization

Index	At admission	After operation			At discharge	<i>t</i> value ^a	<i>P</i> value ^a
		1 d	3 d	5 d			
Hemoglobin (g·L ⁻¹)							$\bar{x} \pm s$
DG group <i>n</i> =59	134.80±17.97	122.74±15.33	117.49±15.21	115.92±16.28	114.35±12.03	5.059	<0.01
TG group <i>n</i> =50	125.46±26.28	118.22±17.98	110.41±20.24	113.75±18.50	106.38±14.97	3.157	0.007
<i>t</i> value	1.74	1.41	1.62	0.59	1.77		
<i>P</i> value	0.082	0.161	0.106	0.560	0.085		
Total protein (g·L ⁻¹)							
DG group <i>n</i> =59	69.58±5.50	55.98±4.58	59.58±4.59	60.87±5.34	62.05±4.74	3.612	0.02
TG group <i>n</i> =50	68.18±6.81	57.14±5.18	58.33±6.34	60.72±5.28	60.19±4.13	4.746	<0.01
<i>t</i> value	1.18	1.23	1.12	0.13	1.24		
<i>P</i> value	0.239	0.221	0.262	0.899	0.224		
Albumin (g·L ⁻¹)							
DG group <i>n</i> =59	41.59±3.39	33.19±3.01	35.02±3.58	35.30±4.33	36.30±3.79	4.784	<0.01
TG group <i>n</i> =50	40.80±3.37	32.36±3.59	33.14±4.70	34.59±3.44	34.63±2.63	5.411	<0.01
<i>t</i> value	1.22	1.31	2.30	0.44	1.50		
<i>P</i> value	0.225	0.194	0.023	0.657	0.142		
Prealbumin (mg·mL ⁻¹)							
DG group <i>n</i> =59	226.17±44.14	163.26±31.00	128.64±25.75	137.47±37.17	153.50±53.41	6.652	<0.01
TG group <i>n</i> =50	215.32±67.62	162.08±41.59	125.86±33.64	131.00±35.57	130.56±29.81	6.057	<0.01
<i>t</i> value	1.51	0.42	0.91	0.83	1.39		
<i>P</i> value	0.132	0.673	0.364	0.410	0.166		

^a: At discharge vs at admission. DG: Double-tract; TG: Total gastrectomy

表3 两组早期胃上部癌患者术后1年实验室营养指标和体质量变化情况比较

Tab 3 Comparison of laboratory nutritional indexes and body weight changes of early upper gastric cancer patients between two groups 1 year after surgery

Index	DG group <i>n</i> =59	TG group <i>n</i> =50	Statistic	<i>P</i> value
Hemoglobin (g·L ⁻¹), $\bar{x} \pm s$	121.14±20.09	117.05±17.72	<i>t</i> =1.045	0.309
Total protein (g·L ⁻¹), $\bar{x} \pm s$	55.17±4.77	54.76±4.99	<i>t</i> =0.162	0.688
Albumin (g·L ⁻¹), $\bar{x} \pm s$	32.39±3.54	31.92±2.67	<i>t</i> =0.488	0.487
Prealbumin (mg·L ⁻¹), $\bar{x} \pm s$	150.47±41.63	152.61±31.22	<i>t</i> =0.073	0.788
Body weight 1 year after operation (kg), $\bar{x} \pm s$	59.02±9.13	54.14±8.06	<i>t</i> =2.93	0.004
BWL (%), <i>M</i> (<i>Q</i> _L , <i>Q</i> _U)	-10.45 (-17.11, -5.19)	-17.83 (-22.06, -13.10)	<i>Z</i> =4.31	<0.01

DG: Double-tract; TG: Total gastrectomy; BWL: Body weight loss; *M* (*Q*_L, *Q*_U): Median (lower quartile, upper quartile).
 BWL (%)=(body weight 1 year after operation-body weight at admission)/body weight at admission×100%

3 讨论

进展期胃上部癌由于预后较差, 需进行全胃切除或联合脾脏切除; 但是对于早期胃上部癌, 淋巴结转移率低, 可以选择保留部分远端胃的双通道重建手术方式, 这与远端胃癌可保留部分近端胃^[11]类似。双通道重建手术不仅能保留胃的部分功能, 有效降低术后反流的发生, 而且能有效地预防术后贫血及维生素 B₁₂ 缺乏^[12-13]。

胃癌患者术后体质量减轻的程度影响着患者术后的生活质量, 与远期预后直接相关^[14-16]。本研究结果显示双通道组术后1年BWL为-10.45% (-17.11%, -5.19%), 低于全胃切除组的

-17.83% (-22.06%, -13.10%), 差异有统计学意义 (*Z*=4.31, *P*<0.01), 表明双通道重建手术相比全胃切除术能够有效减缓患者术后体质量的下降。其原因可能包括: (1) 接受双通道重建手术的患者食物摄入优于接受全胃切除术的患者, Hokschi 等^[17] 研究发现, 与没有食物储袋的患者相比, 有食物储袋的患者能够摄入更多的食物, 保证了充足的营养。(2) 双通道重建手术保留了部分胃腺体, 使胃促生长素 (胃和近端小肠分泌的可促进食欲的激素) 的分泌得以维持。(3) 接受双通道重建手术的患者可能拥有更好的消化吸收功能。文献报道, 接受毕 I 式重建手术的患者术后脂肪吸收功能明显优于接受 Roux-en-Y 重建的患者^[18-19], 因此采

用双通道重建手术保留了食物经过残胃进入十二指肠的通道,可能有助于脂肪的消化与吸收,从而减缓体质量下降。

本研究也对两组患者实验室营养指标血红蛋白、白蛋白、前白蛋白及总蛋白进行了比较,结果显示除了术后第3天全胃组白蛋白低于双通道组($P=0.023$)外,入院时、术后第1~5天、出院时及术后1年两组上述实验室营养指标的差异均无统计学意义,但是住院期间两组上述指标均随着时间推移逐渐下降,出院时与入院时相比差异均有统计学意义(P 均 <0.05),这可能与患者术后康复消耗有关。也有研究表明,在术后1年以后,双通道重建组的实验室检查结果优于全胃切除组^[20]。相关结论仍需大样本前瞻性研究进一步验证。

[参 考 文 献]

- [1] MCGUIRE S. World cancer report 2014. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization, International Agency for Research on Cancer, WHO Press, 2015[J]. *Adv Nutr*, 2016, 7: 418-419.
- [2] MARUYAMA K, KATAI H. Surgical treatment of gastric cancer in Japan, trend from standardization to individualization[J]. *Chirurgia (Bucur)*, 2014, 109: 722-730.
- [3] LEE S S, CHUNG H Y, KWON O K, YU W. Long-term quality of life after distal subtotal and total gastrectomy: symptom- and behavior-oriented consequences[J]. *Ann Surg*, 2016, 263: 738-744.
- [4] NOZAKI I, HATO S, KOBATAKE T, OHTA K, KUBO Y, KURITA A. Long-term outcome after proximal gastrectomy with jejunal interposition for gastric cancer compared with total gastrectomy[J]. *World J Surg*, 2013, 37: 558-564.
- [5] KONG H, KWON O K, YU W. Changes of quality of life after gastric cancer surgery[J]. *J Gastric Cancer*, 2012, 12: 194-200.
- [6] LEE H O, HAN S R, CHOI S I, LEE J J, KIM S H, AHN H S, et al. Effects of intensive nutrition education on nutritional status and quality of life among postgastrectomy patients[J]. *Ann Surg Treat Res*, 2016, 90: 79-88.
- [7] MCKENZIE F, BIESSY C, FERRARI P, FREISLING H, RINALDI S, CHAJÈS V, et al. Healthy lifestyle and risk of cancer in the European prospective investigation into cancer and nutrition cohort study[J/OL]. *Medicine (Baltimore)*, 2016, 95: e2850. doi: 10.1097/MD.0000000000002850.
- [8] KOSUGA T, HIKI N, NUNOBE S, NOMA H, HONDA M, TANIMURA S, et al. Feasibility and nutritional impact of laparoscopy-assisted subtotal gastrectomy for early gastric cancer in the upper stomach[J]. *Ann Surg Oncol*, 2014, 21: 2028-2035.
- [9] Japanese Gastric Cancer Association. Japanese gastric cancer treatment guidelines 2014 (ver. 4)[J]. *Gastric Cancer*, 2017, 20: 1-19.
- [10] LEE S J, KIM J Y, HA T K, CHOI Y Y. Changes in lipid indices and body composition one year after laparoscopic gastrectomy: a prospective study[J/OL]. *Lipids Health Dis*, 2018, 17: 113. doi: 10.1186/s12944-018-0729-1.
- [11] NOMURA E, LEE S W, TOKUHARA T, KAWAI M, UCHIYAMA K. Functional outcomes according to the size of the gastric remnant and type of reconstruction following open and laparoscopic proximal gastrectomy for gastric cancer[J]. *Hepatogastroenterology*, 2012, 59: 1677-1681.
- [12] JUNG D H, LEE Y, KIM D W, PARK Y S, AHN S H, PARK D J, et al. Laparoscopic proximal gastrectomy with double tract reconstruction is superior to laparoscopic total gastrectomy for proximal early gastric cancer[J]. *Surg Endosc*, 2017, 31: 3961-3969.
- [13] PARK J Y, PARK K B, KWON O K, YU W. Comparison of laparoscopic proximal gastrectomy with double-tract reconstruction and laparoscopic total gastrectomy in terms of nutritional status or quality of life in early gastric cancer patients[J]. *Eur J Surg Oncol*, 2018, 44: 1963-1970.
- [14] AOYAMA T, SATO T, MAEZAWA Y, KANO K, HAYASHI T, YAMADA T, et al. Postoperative weight loss leads to poor survival through poor S-1 efficacy in patients with stage II/III gastric cancer[J]. *Int J Clin Oncol*, 2017, 22: 476-483.
- [15] OHKURA Y, HARUTA S, TANAKA T, UENO M, UDAGAWA H. Effectiveness of postoperative elemental diet (Elemental®) in elderly patients after gastrectomy [J/OL]. *World J Surg Oncol*, 2016, 14: 268. doi: 10.1186/s12957-016-1013-3.
- [16] IMAMURA H, NISHIKAWA K, KISHI K, INOUE K, MATSUYAMA J, AKAMARU Y, et al. Effects of an oral elemental nutritional supplement on post-gastrectomy body weight loss in gastric cancer patients: a randomized controlled clinical trial[J]. *Ann Surg Oncol*, 2016, 23: 2928-2935.
- [17] HOKSCH B, ABLASSMAIER B, ZIEREN J, MÜLLER J M. Quality of life after gastrectomy: Longmire's reconstruction alone compared with additional pouch reconstruction[J]. *World J Surg*, 2002, 26: 335-341.
- [18] NAKAMURA H, MURAKAMI Y, MORIFUJI M, UEMURA K, HAYASHIDANI Y, SUDO T, et al. Analysis of fat digestive and absorptive function after subtotal gastrectomy by a ¹³C-labeled mixed triglyceride breath test[J]. *Digestion*, 2009, 80: 98-103.
- [19] DIKIC S, RANDJELOVIC T, DRAGOJEVIC S, GACIC D, BILANOVIC D, VULOVIC V, et al. Nutritional insight into preduodenal pouch reconstruction one year after total gastrectomy[J]. *J Surg Res*, 2012, 176: 34-41.
- [20] MASUZAWA T, TAKIGUCHI S, HIRAO M, IMAMURA H, KIMURA Y, FUJITA J, et al. Comparison of perioperative and long-term outcomes of total and proximal gastrectomy for early gastric cancer: a multi-institutional retrospective study[J]. *World J Surg*, 2014, 38: 1100-1106.