ORIGINAL SCIENTIFIC REPORT



Long-Term Outcome of Patients with Postoperative Refractory Diarrhea After Tailored Nerve Plexus Dissection Around the Major Visceral Arteries During Pancreatoduodenectomy for Pancreatic Cancer

Naomi Kuroki¹ · Yoshihiro Ono¹ · Takafumi Sato¹ · Yosuke Inoue¹ · Atsushi Oba¹ · Hiromichi Ito¹ · Yoshihiro Mise² · Akio Saiura² · Yu Takahashi¹

Accepted: 7 January 2022 / Published online: 4 February 2022 © The Author(s) under exclusive licence to Société Internationale de Chirurgie 2022

Abstract

Background For pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma (PDAC) surgery, extended dissection of the nerve plexus (pl) around the superior mesenteric artery (SMA) or celiac artery (CA) is sometimes necessary. This consequently results in postoperative refractory diarrhea. This study aimed to evaluate the clinical impact of extended nerve plexus dissection around major arteries on postoperative diarrhea.

Methods Patients who underwent pancreatoduodenectomy (PD) for PDAC between January 2013 and December 2016 were included. The frequency of diarrhea (defined as a condition requiring opioid antidiarrheal drug for at least 6 months after surgery) and its short- and long-term outcomes were reviewed.

Results Of 200 consecutive patients who underwent PD, 78 (39.0%) developed postoperative refractory diarrhea (diarrhea group), and 73 of them (93.6%) underwent hemi-circumferential or more nerve dissection for SMA or CA; both plSMA and plCA dissection were associated with diarrhea. Borderline resectable artery (BR-A) PDAC was included more in the diarrhea group (32.0% vs. 13.1%, P = 0.001); however, the local recurrence rate in the diarrhea group was significantly lower than that in the non-diarrhea group (14.1% vs. 26.2%, P = 0.036). The completion of adjuvant chemotherapy and overall survival were comparable between the two groups. The pre-albumin level improved in 2 years, and 61.3% of patients with diarrhea could stop opioid antidiarrheal drugs within 3 years of surgery.

Conclusions Although the frequency of diarrhea increased following nerve plexus dissection around arteries, diarrhea was controllable and resulted in a reduced local recurrence rate. Aggressive dissection of the nerve plexus may be justified for local disease control in BR-A PDAC.

⊠ Yu Takahashi yu.takahashi@jfcr.or.jp

Introduction

The results of randomized controlled trials (RCTs) do not favor extended lymphadenectomy during pancreatoduodenectomy (PD) for pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma (PDAC) and infer that extended lymphadenectomy could increase complications, such as delayed gastric emptying and pancreatic fistula[1–6]. However, the significance of dissection of the nerve plexus (pl) around major arteries (superior mesenteric artery [SMA] or celiac artery [CA]) is still unclear. Since PDAC often invades the nerve plexus around major arteries, dissection of the nerve plexus is

¹ Division of Hepatobiliary and Pancreatic Surgery, Cancer Institute Hospital, Japanese Foundation for Cancer Research, 3-8-31 Ariake, Koto-ku, Tokyo 135-8550, Japan

² Department of Hepatobiliary-Pancreatic Surgery, Juntendo University Graduate School, Tokyo, Japan

sometimes necessary for R0 resection if it is close to those [7, 8]. Reports have suggested that circumferential dissection of the nerve plexus around the SMA (plSMA) causes more cases of diarrhea [4, 5, 9] than hemi-circumferential nerve dissection [6, 10]. However, the long-term outcomes of patients with diarrhea and the role of combined dissection of plSMA and plCA are unclear.

In our hospital, a standard lymphadenectomy [11] is routinely performed during PD for PDAC. The dissection level of the nerve plexus is tailored to the distance between the tumor and arteries, preservation of the nerve plexus (Level 2), or hemi to whole circumferential nerve plexus dissection (Level 3) [12–15]. These tailored nerve dissection techniques apply not only to plSMA but also to plCA [15].

The aim of this study was to determine diarrhea profiles by combining the dissection levels of plSMA and plCA, and to evaluate the short- and long-term outcomes of patients with diarrhea.

Methods

Ethics

Approval from the institutional ethical committee was obtained for this study (Institutional Review Board no. 2018-1179). The requirement of informed consent was waived because of the retrospective study design.

Patients

Patients who underwent subtotal stomach-preserving pancreatoduodenectomy (SSPPD) between January 2013 and December 2016 were included. Patient demographics, perioperative and postoperative details, nutritional status, and clinical course of diarrhea were collected retrospectively from charts.

Surgical technique and the degree of plexus dissection (level classification)

An artery-first approach in SSPPD was performed to judge resectability, such as the invasion to the SMA, maximize the resection margin to the SMA, or reduce blood loss. A standard lymphadenectomy was routinely performed, as previously described [12, 14]. The plSMA and plCA indicate a bundle of nerves that circumferentially surround the SMA and CA, respectively, and lead to the plexus of pancreatic head. The degree of plSMA and plCA dissection was categorized into three levels [12–15]. Level (LV) 1 dissection comprised simple resection of the pancreatic head, duodenum, and biliary system without dissection of

LNs or the nerve plexus, and this was not applied to PDAC surgery. LV2 dissection included en bloc resection of LNs along the artery, preserving the plSMA or plCA. LV3 included en bloc dissection of the regional LNs and the nerve plexus close to cancer invasion accompanied by hemi-circumferential or more dissection of the plSMA or plCA. A combined dissection of SMA LV2-3 and CA LV2-3 in SSPPD was performed for PDAC (Fig. 1). The level of nerve plexus dissection was not an operating surgeon's discretion, but rather determined preoperatively in the multidisciplinary conference, based on the preoperative CT scan.

Since neoadjuvant radiotherapy is not a standard treatment in Japan, it was not performed in our hospital.

Definitions

The extent of diarrhea was estimated based on the frequency of defecation and fecal status. If a patient experienced watery defecation more than five times a day without any evidence of bacterial enteritis and if diarrhea occurred immediately after eating, despite pancreatic enzyme administration, postoperative refractory diarrhea was suspected. Non-opioid antidiarrheal drugs (albumin tannate, 3-6 g/day; and natural aluminum silicate, 3-6 g/day) were first administered. An opioid antidiarrheal drug (Opium tincture; Daiichi Sankyo, Japan) was used if the non-opioid version could not relieve the symptoms. An initial dose of 0.3 ml of opium tinctures was administered before each meal, and the dose was modified based on the symptom to achieve solid or soft stool three or fewer times a day. Since most of the patients received adjuvant chemotherapy for 6 months after surgery and it took time to stabilize the diarrhea, we defined postoperative refractory diarrhea as a condition requiring opioid antidiarrheal drugs 6 months after surgery. All the patients had the same symptoms (watery diarrhea within 2 h after feeding), and diarrhea could not be controlled with non-opioid antidiarrheal drugs.

Resectability (resectable [R] or borderline resectable [BR]) was defined according to the 7th edition of the Union for International Cancer Control/American Joint Committee on Cancer TNM staging system and National Comprehensive Cancer Network guidelines [16, 17]. R0 resection was defined as no exposure of cancer cells in the dissection plane by pathological findings (0 mm rule). For the accurate pathological assessment, three-dimensional fixation, which we reported previously, was used for specimen staining and the evaluation of resection margin [18]. Postoperative complications were defined according to the Clavien-Dindo classification [19, 20]. For BR cases, upfront surgery was performed until 2014, and four courses of nab-paclitaxel combined with gemcitabine (GnP) were A SMA LV2 and CA LV2 CHA LGA CA LV2 CA LV2 GDA nerve plexus (green area) PV SMA LV2 SpV SMA LV2 IPDA & J1A SMV B SMA LV3 and CA LV2 CHA CA LV2 SpA GDA CA LV2 SMA LV3 ΡV SMA LV3 SpV SMV IPDA+J1A C SMA LV2 and CA LV3 CHA LGA GDA CA LV3 SMA LV2 SpA CA LV3 ΡV IPA SMV SMA LV2 IPDA J1A D SMA LV3 and CA LV3 LGA GDA CHA CA LV3 SpA CA LV3 SMA LV3 IPDA+J1A replaced RHA PV SpV SMV SMA LV3 graft LRV

Fig. 1 Degree of nerve plexus dissection (level classification). LV2: preserving of the nerve plexus. LV3: hemi-circumferential or more extended dissection of the nerve plexus. a: SMA LV2 and CA LV2. b: SMA LV3 (hemi-circumferential dissection) and CA LV2. c: SMA LV2 and CA LV3 (hemi-circumferential dissection). d: SMA LV3 (whole circumferential dissection) and CA LV3 (whole circumferential dissection) and CA LV3 (whole circumferential dissection). The green area around the artery signifies the nerve plexus. GDA, gastroduodenal artery; CHA, common hepatic artery; CA, celiac artery; LGA, left gastric artery; SpA, splenic artery; IPA, niferior pancreaticoduodenal artery; J1A, the first jejunal artery; IPA, inferior phrenic artery; PV, portal vein; SMV, superior mesenteric vein; SpV, splenic vein; LRV, left renal vein

administered as neoadjuvant chemotherapy (NAC) since 2015. For adjuvant chemotherapy, S-1 has been administered as a standard therapy based on the JASPAC 01 study [21]. No radiation therapy was used in this study. Recurrence was diagnosed by contrast-enhanced computed tomography, fluorodeoxyglucose-avidity on positron emission tomography scan or elevation of CA 19-9 during follow-up. "Local recurrence" was defined as an increase of low-density area or lymph node around the vascular or remnant pancreas regardless of distant metastasis, and "distant metastasis" was defined as distant metastasis without any local recurrence.

Statistical analyses

Chi-square and Mann–Whitney U tests or Wilcoxon ranksum tests were used. Survival curves were constructed using the Kaplan–Meier method. Differences in survival were analyzed using log-rank tests. A *P*-value of < 0.05 denoted statistical significance. All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS (version 21.0, SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA).

Results

Frequency of postoperative refractory diarrhea by dissection levels of plSMA or plCA (Table 1, Fig. 2)

Of 200 consecutive patients who underwent SSPPD, 83 and 117 underwent SMA LV2 and SMA LV3, and 141 and 59 CA LV2 and CA LV3 dissection, respectively. As shown in Table 1, diarrhea developed in 78 patients; diarrhea was significantly higher in those who underwent SMA LV3 than those who underwent SMA LV2 (n = 68 [87.2%] vs. n = 10 [12.9%], P < 0.001). Likewise, more patients who underwent CA LV3 developed diarrhea than those who underwent CA LV3 (n = 35 [59.3%] vs. n = 43 [30.4%], P < 0.001).

As shown in Fig. 2, SMA LV3 increased the incidence of diarrhea compared to SMA LV2 regardless of CA LV dissection level. Moreover, there was no difference in the incidence of diarrhea between CA LV2 and CA LV3 dissection in the SMA LV2 group (8.0% vs. 23.8%, P = 0.113). In contrast, in the SMA LV3 group, there was significant difference in the incidence of diarrhea between CA LV2 and CA LV3 dissection (48.1% vs. 78.9%, P = 0.002).

In the SMA LV3 group, three patients underwent whole circumferential dissection of the plSMA and all developed

Table 1 Incidence of ND and dissection LV of plSMA/CA

	Diarrhea $(n = 78)$	Non-diarrhea ($n = 122$)	P-value
plSMA	dissection		
LV2	10 (12.0%)	73 (88.0%)	< 0.001
LV3	68 (58.1%)	49 (41.9%)	
plCA di	ssection		
LV2	43 (30.4%)	98 (69.6%)	< 0.001
LV3	35 (59.3%)	24 (40.7%)	

LV, level; plSMA, nerve plexus around the superior mesenteric artery; CA, celiac artery



Fig. 2 Incidence of diarrhea in association with the dissection LV of plSMA/CA LV, level; plSMA, nerve plexus around the superior mesenteric artery; CA, celiac artery

diarrhea. In the CA LV3 group, six patients underwent circumferential dissection of the plCA, and five (83.3%) developed diarrhea. The patient who did not develop diarrhea following circumferential CA LV3 had undergone SMA LV2.

Overall, both SMA and CA LV3 dissections were associated with the incidence of diarrhea, although SMA LV3 dissection had a greater impact on diarrhea compared to CA LV3 dissection.

Short- and long-term outcomes according to the development of diarrhea (Table 2)

There were more patients with BR-A (artery) PDAC in the diarrhea group

Among the preoperative factors between the diarrhea and non-diarrhea groups, there were no significant differences in gender, body mass index, tumor size, CA 19–9, and the rate of NAC. GnP was administered as NAC to 33 patients. The age of the diarrhea group was less than that of the non-diarrhea group (66 vs. 69 years, P = 0.028). The rate of R

Table 2 Factors associated with postoperative diarrhea

Pre-operative 66/56 0.83 Gender (male/female) 41/37 66/56 0.83 Age (years) 66 (43–80) 69 (36–86) 0.00 Body mass index 21.8 (14.4–23.6) 21.6 (12.6–26.6) 0.3 T factor N/A T1 1 3 T2 5 4 7 T3 47 99 T4 25 16 Tumor size (cm) 3.3 (0.5–8.5) 3.0 (1.0–7.1) 0.30 CA 19–9 (ng/ml) 82.1 (2.0–50,000) 86.7 (2.0–50,000) 0.79 Resectable 46 (58.9%) 95 (77.8%) 0.00 BR-PV 24 (30.7%) 26 (21.3%) 0.11 BR-A 25 (32.0%) 16 (13.1%) 0.00 Neoadjuvant chemotherapy 16 (20.5%) 20 (16.4%) 0.44 Operative 0 0 0.11 0.12 Blood loss (ml) 670 (85–1810) 615 (150–2700) 0.83 Number of dissected LNs 38 (12–87) 35 (10–77) 0.00 Number of metastatic LNs 2 (0–20) 2 (0–20)	
Gender (male/female)41/37 $66/56$ 0.83 Age (years) 66 (43-80) 69 (36-86) 0.02 Body mass index 21.8 (14.4-23.6) 21.6 (12.6-26.6) 0.33 T factorN/AT113T2 5 4T34799T42516Tumor size (cm) 3.3 (0.5-8.5) 3.0 (1.0-7.1) 0.33 CA 19-9 (ng/ml)82.1 (2.0-50,000) 86.7 (2.0-50,000) 0.77 Resectable46 (58.9%)95 (77.8%) 0.00 BR-PV24 (30.7%)26 (21.3%) 0.11 BR-A25 (32.0%)16 (13.1%) 0.00 Voerative 0 0.5% 0.11 Operation time (min) 522 (376-712) 505 (324-920) 0.17 Blood loss (ml) 670 (85-1810) 615 (150-2700) 0.87 Number of dissected LNs 38 (12-87) 35 (10-77) 0.02 Number of metastatic LNs 2 (0-20) 2 (0-20) 0.22 R0 resection 67 (85.8%) 96 (78.6%) 0.22 Complication (\geq Clavien-Dindo $3a$) 12 (15.3%) 18 (14.7%) 0.99	
Age (years) $66 (43-80)$ $69 (36-86)$ 0.02 Body mass index $21.8 (14.4-23.6)$ $21.6 (12.6-26.6)$ 0.32 T factorN/AT113T254T34799T42516Tumor size (cm) $3.3 (0.5-8.5)$ $3.0 (1.0-7.1)$ 0.33 CA 19-9 (ng/ml) $82.1 (2.0-50,000)$ $86.7 (2.0-50,000)$ 0.77 Resctable $46 (58.9\%)$ $95 (77.8\%)$ 0.00 BR-PV $24 (30.7\%)$ $26 (21.3\%)$ 0.11 BR-A $25 (32.0\%)$ $16 (13.1\%)$ 0.01 Operative 0 $670 (85-1810)$ $615 (150-2700)$ 0.17 Blood loss (ml) $670 (85-1810)$ $615 (150-2700)$ 0.83 Number of dissected LNs $38 (12-87)$ $35 (10-77)$ 0.02 Ro resection $67 (85.8\%)$ $96 (78.6\%)$ 0.22 Complication (≥ Clavien-Dindo $3a)$ $12 (15.3\%)$ $18 (14.7\%)$ 0.90	32
Body mass index 21.8 (14.4–23.6) 21.6 (12.6–26.6) 0.3 T factor N/A T1 1 3 T2 5 4 T3 47 99 T4 25 16 Tumor size (cm) 3.3 (0.5–8.5) 3.0 (1.0–7.1) 0.33 CA 19–9 (ng/ml) 82.1 (2.0–50,000) 86.7 (2.0–50,000) 0.79 Resectable 46 (58.9%) 95 (77.8%) 0.00 BR-PV 24 (30.7%) 26 (21.3%) 0.11 BR-A 25 (32.0%) 16 (13.1%) 0.00 Neoadjuvant chemotherapy 16 (20.5%) 20 (16.4%) 0.44 Operative 7 70 0.03 Number of dissected LNs 38 (12–87) 35 (10–77) 0.03 Number of metastatic LNs 2 (0–20) 2 (0–20) 0.22 R0 resection 67 (85.8%) 96 (78.6%) 0.22 Complication (≥ Clavien-Dindo 3a) 12 (15.3%) 18 (14.7%) 0.99	28
T factor N/A T1 1 3 T2 5 4 T3 47 99 T4 25 16 Tumor size (cm) 3.3 (0.5–8.5) 3.0 (1.0–7.1) 0.30 CA 19–9 (ng/ml) 82.1 (2.0–50,000) 86.7 (2.0–50,000) 0.79 Resectable 46 (58.9%) 95 (77.8%) 0.00 BR-PV 24 (30.7%) 26 (21.3%) 0.11 BR-A 25 (32.0%) 16 (13.1%) 0.00 Neoadjuvant chemotherapy 16 (20.5%) 20 (16.4%) 0.44 Operative 70 252 (376–712) 505 (324–920) 0.17 Blood loss (ml) 670 (85–1810) 615 (150–2700) 0.88 Number of dissected LNs 38 (12–87) 35 (10–77) 0.00 Number of metastatic LNs 2 (0–20) 2 (0–20) 0.22 R0 resection 67 (85.8%) 96 (78.6%) 0.22 Complication (≥ Clavien-Dindo 3a) 12 (15.3%) 18 (14.7%) 0.99	12
T113T254T34799T42516Tumor size (cm)3.3 (0.5–8.5) $3.0 (1.0–7.1)$ 0.30 CA 19–9 (ng/ml)82.1 (2.0–50,000) $86.7 (2.0–50,000)$ 0.79 Resectable46 (58.9%)95 (77.8%) 0.00 BR-PV24 (30.7%)26 (21.3%) 0.11 BR-A25 (32.0%)16 (13.1%) 0.00 Neoadjuvant chemotherapy16 (20.5%)20 (16.4%) 0.44 Operative 0 Operation time (min)522 (376–712)505 (324–920) 0.17 Blood loss (ml)670 (85–1810)615 (150–2700) 0.83 Number of dissected LNs38 (12–87)35 (10–77) 0.00 Number of metastatic LNs2 (0–20) $2 (0–20)$ 0.20 R0 resection67 (85.8%)96 (78.6%) 0.20 Complication (≥ Clavien-Dindo 3a)12 (15.3%)18 (14.7%) 0.99	4
T254T34799T42516Tumor size (cm) $3.3 (0.5-8.5)$ $3.0 (1.0-7.1)$ 0.30 CA 19-9 (ng/ml)82.1 (2.0-50,000)86.7 (2.0-50,000) 0.79 Resectable46 (58.9%)95 (77.8%) 0.00 BR-PV24 (30.7%)26 (21.3%) 0.11 BR-A25 (32.0%)16 (13.1%) 0.00 Neoadjuvant chemotherapy16 (20.5%)20 (16.4%) 0.44 Operative 0 Operation time (min)522 (376-712)505 (324-920) 0.17 Blood loss (ml)670 (85-1810)615 (150-2700) 0.83 Number of dissected LNs38 (12-87)35 (10-77) 0.02 Number of metastatic LNs2 (0-20)2 (0-20) 0.20 R0 resection67 (85.8%)96 (78.6%) 0.20 Complication (≥ Clavien-Dindo 3a)12 (15.3%)18 (14.7%) 0.99	
T34799T42516Tumor size (cm)3.3 (0.5–8.5) $3.0 (1.0–7.1)$ 0.30 CA 19–9 (ng/ml)82.1 (2.0–50,000)86.7 (2.0–50,000) 0.79 Resectable46 (58.9%)95 (77.8%) 0.00 BR-PV24 (30.7%)26 (21.3%) 0.12 BR-A25 (32.0%)16 (13.1%) 0.00 Neoadjuvant chemotherapy16 (20.5%)20 (16.4%) 0.44 Operative 0.12 $505 (324–920)$ 0.12 Blood loss (ml) $670 (85–1810)$ $615 (150–2700)$ 0.88 Number of dissected LNs $38 (12–87)$ $35 (10–77)$ 0.00 Number of metastatic LNs $2 (0–20)$ $2 (0–20)$ 0.20 R0 resection $67 (85.8\%)$ $96 (78.6\%)$ 0.20 Complication (≥ Clavien-Dindo 3a) $12 (15.3\%)$ $18 (14.7\%)$ 0.90	
T42516Tumor size (cm) $3.3 (0.5-8.5)$ $3.0 (1.0-7.1)$ 0.30 CA 19-9 (ng/ml) $82.1 (2.0-50,000)$ $86.7 (2.0-50,000)$ 0.79 Resectable $46 (58.9\%)$ $95 (77.8\%)$ 0.00 BR-PV $24 (30.7\%)$ $26 (21.3\%)$ 0.12 BR-A $25 (32.0\%)$ $16 (13.1\%)$ 0.00 Neoadjuvant chemotherapy $16 (20.5\%)$ $20 (16.4\%)$ 0.40 Operative 0.00 Operation time (min) $522 (376-712)$ $505 (324-920)$ 0.17 Blood loss (ml) $670 (85-1810)$ $615 (150-2700)$ 0.83 Number of dissected LNs $38 (12-87)$ $35 (10-77)$ 0.00 Number of metastatic LNs $2 (0-20)$ $2 (0-20)$ 0.20 R0 resection $67 (85.8\%)$ $96 (78.6\%)$ 0.20 Complication (≥ Clavien-Dindo $3a$) $12 (15.3\%)$ $18 (14.7\%)$ 0.90	
Tumor size (cm) $3.3 (0.5-8.5)$ $3.0 (1.0-7.1)$ 0.33 CA 19-9 (ng/ml) $82.1 (2.0-50,000)$ $86.7 (2.0-50,000)$ 0.79 Resectable $46 (58.9\%)$ $95 (77.8\%)$ 0.00 BR-PV $24 (30.7\%)$ $26 (21.3\%)$ 0.12 BR-A $25 (32.0\%)$ $16 (13.1\%)$ 0.00 Neoadjuvant chemotherapy $16 (20.5\%)$ $20 (16.4\%)$ 0.40 Operative 0.00 0.00 0.00 Operative 0.00 0.00 0.00 Number of dissected LNs $522 (376-712)$ $505 (324-920)$ 0.12 Number of dissected LNs $38 (12-87)$ $35 (10-77)$ 0.00 Number of metastatic LNs $2 (0-20)$ $2 (0-20)$ 0.20 R0 resection $67 (85.8\%)$ $96 (78.6\%)$ 0.20 Complication (≥ Clavien-Dindo 3a) $12 (15.3\%)$ $18 (14.7\%)$ 0.90	
CA 19-9 (ng/ml)82.1 (2.0-50,000)86.7 (2.0-50,000)0.79Resectable46 (58.9%)95 (77.8%)0.00BR-PV24 (30.7%)26 (21.3%)0.11BR-A25 (32.0%)16 (13.1%)0.00Neoadjuvant chemotherapy16 (20.5%)20 (16.4%)0.40Operative 22 (376-712)505 (324-920)0.11Blood loss (ml)522 (376-712)505 (324-920)0.12Number of dissected LNs38 (12-87)35 (10-77)0.02Number of metastatic LNs2 (0-20)2 (0-20)0.20R0 resection67 (85.8%)96 (78.6%)0.20Complication (≥ Clavien-Dindo 3a)12 (15.3%)18 (14.7%)0.90	61
Resectable46 (58.9%)95 (77.8%)0.00BR-PV24 (30.7%)26 (21.3%)0.12BR-A25 (32.0%)16 (13.1%)0.00Neoadjuvant chemotherapy16 (20.5%)20 (16.4%)0.40Operative022 (376-712)505 (324-920)0.12Blood loss (ml)522 (376-712)505 (324-920)0.12Number of dissected LNs38 (12-87)35 (10-77)0.02Number of metastatic LNs2 (0-20)2 (0-20)0.20R0 resection67 (85.8%)96 (78.6%)0.20Complication (≥ Clavien-Dindo 3a)12 (15.3%)18 (14.7%)0.90	91
BR-PV24 (30.7%)26 (21.3%)0.11BR-A25 (32.0%)16 (13.1%)0.00Neoadjuvant chemotherapy16 (20.5%)20 (16.4%)0.40Operative16 (20.5%)20 (16.4%)0.40Operation time (min)522 (376–712)505 (324–920)0.11Blood loss (ml)670 (85–1810)615 (150–2700)0.83Number of dissected LNs38 (12–87)35 (10–77)0.00Number of metastatic LNs2 (0–20)2 (0–20)0.20R0 resection67 (85.8%)96 (78.6%)0.20Complication (≥ Clavien-Dindo 3a)12 (15.3%)18 (14.7%)0.90	07
BR-A25 (32.0%)16 (13.1%)0.00Neoadjuvant chemotherapy16 (20.5%)20 (16.4%)0.44Operative $20 (16.4\%)$ 0.17Operation time (min)522 (376–712)505 (324–920)0.17Blood loss (ml)670 (85–1810)615 (150–2700)0.82Number of dissected LNs38 (12–87)35 (10–77)0.02Number of metastatic LNs2 (0–20)2 (0–20)0.20R0 resection67 (85.8%)96 (78.6%)0.20Complication (≥ Clavien-Dindo 3a)12 (15.3%)18 (14.7%)0.99	32
Neoadjuvant chemotherapy 16 (20.5%) 20 (16.4%) 0.40 Operative 0 0 0 0 0 0 Operation time (min) 522 (376–712) 505 (324–920) 0.1° Blood loss (ml) 670 (85–1810) 615 (150–2700) 0.83 Number of dissected LNs 38 (12–87) 35 (10–77) 0.02 Number of metastatic LNs 2 (0–20) 2 (0–20) 0.20 R0 resection 67 (85.8%) 96 (78.6%) 0.20 Complication (≥ Clavien-Dindo 3a) 12 (15.3%) 18 (14.7%) 0.90	01
Operative 522 (376–712) 505 (324–920) 0.17 Blood loss (ml) 670 (85–1810) 615 (150–2700) 0.82 Number of dissected LNs 38 (12–87) 35 (10–77) 0.02 Number of metastatic LNs 2 (0–20) 2 (0–20) 0.20 R0 resection 67 (85.8%) 96 (78.6%) 0.20 Complication (≥ Clavien-Dindo 3a) 12 (15.3%) 18 (14.7%) 0.90	60
Operation time (min)522 (376–712)505 (324–920) 0.1° Blood loss (ml)670 (85–1810)615 (150–2700) 0.83 Number of dissected LNs38 (12–87)35 (10–77) 0.03 Number of metastatic LNs2 (0–20)2 (0–20) 0.20 R0 resection67 (85.8%)96 (78.6%) 0.20 Complication (≥ Clavien-Dindo 3a)12 (15.3%)18 (14.7%) 0.90	
Blood loss (ml) 670 (85–1810) 615 (150–2700) 0.82 Number of dissected LNs 38 (12–87) 35 (10–77) 0.02 Number of metastatic LNs 2 (0–20) 2 (0–20) 0.20 R0 resection 67 (85.8%) 96 (78.6%) 0.20 Complication (≥ Clavien-Dindo 3a) 12 (15.3%) 18 (14.7%) 0.90	72
Number of dissected LNs 38 (12–87) 35 (10–77) 0.02 Number of metastatic LNs 2 (0–20) 2 (0–20) 0.20 R0 resection 67 (85.8%) 96 (78.6%) 0.20 Complication (≥ Clavien-Dindo 3a) 12 (15.3%) 18 (14.7%) 0.90	53
Number of metastatic LNs 2 (0-20) 2 (0-20) 0.20 R0 resection 67 (85.8%) 96 (78.6%) 0.20 Complication (≥ Clavien-Dindo 3a) 12 (15.3%) 18 (14.7%) 0.90	84
R0 resection 67 (85.8%) 96 (78.6%) 0.20 Complication (≥ Clavien-Dindo 3a) 12 (15.3%) 18 (14.7%) 0.90	04
Complication (\geq Clavien-Dindo 3a) 12 (15.3%) 18 (14.7%) 0.90	00
	03
Postoperative stay (days) 28 (17–111) 25 (12–106) 0.2	72
Postoperative	
Adjuvant chemotherapy	
Induction rate 67/73 (91.7%) 98/115 (85.2%) 0.18	81
Completion rate 49/55 (89.0%) 76/88 (86.3%) 0.6.	32
Recurrence 52 (66.7%) 79 (64.7%)	
Local recurrence* 11 (14.1%) 32 (26.2%) 0.0	36
Recurrence of distant metastasis** 41 (52.5%) 47 (38.5%) 0.00	64

The continuous variables are shown as the median and range

*Indicates local recurrence with or without distant metastasis

**Contains distant metastasis only

BR-PV, borderline resectable portal vein; BR-A, borderline resectable artery; LNs, lymph nodes

was higher in the non-diarrhea group (P = 0.007). Although there was no significant difference in the rate of BR-PV (portal vein) (P = 0.132), the rate of BR-A was higher in the diarrhea group (P = 0.001).

Postoperative courses were comparable between the diarrhea and non-diarrhea groups

Among the diarrhea and non-diarrhea groups, there were no significant differences in the operation time, blood loss, the number of dissected LN (38 vs. 35, P = 0.084), number of LN metastases (2 vs. 2, P = 0.204), and R0 resection rate (85.8% vs. 78.6%, P = 0.200). Adjuvant chemotherapy was administered to 165 patients; 149 patients received S-1, eight received GEM, and eight received GnP. The induction (91.7% vs. 85.2%, P = 0.181) and completion (89.0% vs. 86.3%, P = 0.632) rates of adjuvant chemotherapy were comparable between the two groups. Furthermore, there were no significant differences in complications (higher than Clavien-Dindo grade 3a) (15.3% vs. 14.7%, P = 0.903) and postoperative stay (28 days vs. 25 days, P = 0.272) between the two groups.

The local recurrence rate was lower in the diarrhea group, and the overall survival was comparable between the two groups

Comparing postoperative factors, the induction and completion rates of adjuvant chemotherapy and the recurrence rates were similar in each group. The local recurrence rate was significantly lower in the diarrhea group than in the non-diarrhea group (14.1% vs. 26.2%, P = 0.036). There was no significant difference in the overall survival (median survival time 30.0 months vs. 33.4 months, P = 0.918) and recurrence-free survival (16.1 months vs. 19.6 months, P = 0.496) (Fig. 3a, b) rates between the diarrhea and non-diarrhea groups. In the sub-analysis comparing either the upfront group/neoadjuvant chemotherapy group, there was a trend toward fewer local recurrences in the diarrhea group in both the upfront surgery and the neoadjuvant chemotherapy group, but the difference was no longer significant due to the decrease in number (Supplementary Table 1, 2).

Long-term outcome for patients with diarrhea

There were no significant differences in terms of the body weight and albumin level between the diarrhea and nondiarrhea groups at discharge and 2 years after surgery (Table 3). The pre-albumin level was lower at discharge (11.9 g/dL vs. 16.5 g/dL, P = 0.006), but after 2 years of operation, it was significantly elevated in the diarrhea group compared to the non-diarrhea group (+ 8 g/dL vs. + 3.4 g/dL, P = 0.001). Thereafter, the pre-albumin level in the diarrhea group recovered to almost normal levels 2 years after surgery.

To see the percentage of the patients who could discontinue opioid antidiarrheal drug, the clinical data were assessed at 2 and 3 years after operation. Patients who had died or were lost to follow-up were excluded. Consequently, 40 patients were analyzed at 2 years after operation and 31 patients at 3 years. Among them, 17 patients (42.5%) could discontinue opioid antidiarrheal drug in 2 years and 19 (61.3%) in 3 years (Fig. 4).

Discussion

We examined the frequency of diarrhea in association with the combined dissection level of plSMA and plCA and investigated the long-term outcomes of patients with diarrhea. We found that both plSMA and plCA dissection were associated with diarrhea. The local recurrence rate was significantly lower in the diarrhea group than in the nondiarrhea group. The overall survival and recurrence-free survival were similar in each group despite the high BR-A PDAC rate in the diarrhea group. Moreover, the postoperative nutritional status in the diarrhea group improved in 2 years, and more than 60% of patients with diarrhea could discontinue opioid antidiarrheal drugs within 3 years after surgery.

The results of five RCTs [1-6] do not favor extended lymphadenectomy during PD. However, the definitions of extended/standard lymphadenectomy and degrees of plSMA/CA dissection varied across these studies, and the postoperative diarrhea was not precisely defined (Table 4). Focusing on the relationship between pISMA dissection and postoperative diarrhea, Yeo et al. [2, 3] performed hemi-circumferential dissection of the plSMA in all cases, although they did not mention postoperative diarrhea. However, four other studies used extended nerve plexus dissection in patients undergoing extended lymphadenectomy; three studies used whole circumferential dissection, and one used hemi-circumferential dissection. Among the three RCTs which used circumferential dissection, Pedrazzoli [1] reported no severe diarrhea in either group, whereas Farnell [4] and Nimura [5] reported that the frequency of postoperative diarrhea increased with the degree of pISMA dissection. Farnell et al. [4] reported that 42% of patients experienced diarrhea at 4 months postoperatively in the extended lymphadenectomy group and 8% in the standard lymphadenectomy group. Nimura et al. [5] reported that diarrhea developed in 65.7% of patients at 6 months after surgery in the extended lymphadenectomy group and 31.5% in the standard lymphadenectomy group. Jang et al. [6] reported that the postoperative diarrhea could



Fig. 3 Survival curve of the two groups. No significant difference was observed between the two groups in terms of either the overall survival (\mathbf{a} , P = 0.918) or recurrence-free survival (\mathbf{b} , P = 0.496). Numbers below the X-axis indicate the number of patients at risk. OS, overall survival; MST, median survival time; RFS, recurrence-free survival

	Table 3	Postoperative	nutrition
--	---------	---------------	-----------

	Diarrhea (n = 78)	Non-diarrhea $(n = 122)$	P-value
Body weight loss $(n = 58)$	<i>n</i> = 18	n = 40	
On discharge (kg)*	-2.9(-6.5 to + 0.9)	-2.4 (-8.6 to +3.6)	0.444
2 years after operation (kg)**	-2.7 (-13.0 to + 3.2)	-4.9(-19 to +12)	0.512
Albumin $(n = 103)$	<i>n</i> = 35	n = 68	
On admission (g/dL)	3.9 (2.2–5.1)	3.8 (2.7–4.6)	0.194
On discharge (g/dL)	3.2 (2.5–4.0)	3.3 (1.9–4.1)	0.282
2 years after operation (g/dL)	3.8 (1.1-4.6)	3.85 (2.0-4.6)	0.856
Pre-albumin $(n = 66)$	<i>n</i> = 23	<i>n</i> = 43	
On admission (g/dL)	25.5 (13.4–35.1)	24.5 (5.0-36.6)	0.340
On discharge (g/dL)	11.9 (6.6–21.2)	16.5 (8.4–25.6)	0.006
2 years after operation (mg/dL)	19.7 (8.2–32.5)	19.8 (3.5 to 32.6)	0.360
Difference***	+ 8 (- 7.4 to 15.3)	+ 3.4 (- 14.9 to 12.7)	0.001

*Difference in body weight between discharge and admission

**The difference in the body weight between 2 years after surgery and admission

***The difference in the pre-albumin level between 2 years after surgery and discharge

be suppressed by limiting plSMA dissection to the hemicircumference (postoperative diarrhea at 3 months, 15.1% in the extended lymphadenectomy group, and 12.0% in the standard lymphadenectomy group). Unlike Jang's study [6], we reported that postoperative diarrhea developed in 50% of patients undergoing hemi-circumferential dissection of the plSMA and 85% of patients undergoing extended (plSMA dissection > 180°) circumferential dissection [12].

Diarrhea associated with nerve plexus dissection is an important clinical issue not only for pancreatic surgery but for colon surgery with D3 lymphadenectomy, in which nerve plexus around SMA is dissected. Denervation of plSMA with D3 extended mesenterectomy for right hemicolectomy increases the frequency of diarrhea. However, this symptom most likely improves in a half of year and does not impact gastrointestinal quality of life [22-24]. Comparing to colon surgery, diarrhea after PD is severer and intractable likely because broader and more proximal part of pISMA and/or pICA is dissected. Duodenum and the first part of jejunum resection may also contribute to refractory diarrhea. Although the mechanism of



postoperative diarrhea can be multi-factorial, our findings for the impact of the depth of nerve plexus around major mesenteric arteries on postoperative diarrhea indicate the damage in the nerve plexus is likely at least one of the causes for this clinically important symptom. In this study, the frequency of diarrhea was evaluated in association with combined dissection of the plSMA and plCA. It was revealed that the combined dissection of pISMA and pICA (both LV3) increased the frequency of diarrhea. This result indicates that both pISMA and pICA are associated with diarrhea, although they are more strongly associated with plSMA. Circumferential dissection of the plSMA caused postoperative diarrhea in 100% of patients regardless of the plCA level, whereas 33.3% of patients with extended circumferential dissection of the plCA did not experience diarrhea if the dissection of the plSMA was LV2. This result also suggests that pISMA dissection level is more related to diarrhea than the plCA dissection level.

Although none of the RCTs demonstrated any improvement in the prognosis with extended lymphadenectomy, those studies did not take into account the tumor resectability (R or BR-PDAC) [25–28]. If the tumor is in contact with the arteries, the nerve plexus should be resected to achieve R0 resection. Tailored and strict adjustments of nerve plexus dissection should be considered to avoid inadequate or excessive dissection. In this study, the level of nerve plexus dissection was adjusted according to the tumor location. Despite the higher BR-A rate in the diarrhea group, the R0 resection rate and the prognosis were comparable in both groups. The postoperative local recurrence rate was predominantly lower in the diarrhea group than in the non-diarrhea group, indicating the significance of local disease control by extending nerve plexus dissection in BR-A PDAC.

It is also important to evaluate the patients' diarrhea and nutritional status several years after surgery. Although the pre-albumin level at discharge was significantly lower in the diarrhea group than in the non-diarrhea group, it returned to a comparable level within 2 years. More than 60% of patients could discontinue opioid antidiarrheal drugs within 3 years after surgery. Overall, even if postoperative diarrhea occurs by aggressive nerve plexus dissection for BR-A PDAC, intestinal function, including regulation of peristalsis, could recover with time. Considering that PDAC easily invades the plexus [7, 29], LV3 dissection is justified to obtain R0 resection in BR-A cases.

This study has several limitations. Firstly, only a small number of patients underwent NAC. In an era of multidisciplinary therapy for BR-PDAC, preserving the nerve plexus by combining neoadjuvant chemotherapy or chemoradiation therapy is becoming a preferred treatment modality for PDAC [30–36]. However, in contrast, some expert surgeons advocate that arterial LV3 dissection (arterial skeletonization) can be performed successfully after

	Pedrazzol (Italy)	li et al. [1]	Yeo et al. (USA)	[2, 3]	Famell, et al. [4]	(NSA)	Nimura, et al. [5]	(Japan)	Jang, et al. [6] (S	outh Korea)
	Standard	Extended	Standard	Extended	Standard	Extended	Standard	Extended	Standard	Extended
No. of patients	40	41	146	148	40	39	51	50	83	86
Disease										
PDAC	100%	100%	59%	57%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Ampullary cancer			24%	19%						
Bile duct cancer			16%	19%						
Duodenal cancer			1%	5%						
plSMA	No	Circ	Hemi	Hemi	N/a	Circ	No	Circ	No	Hemi
plCA	No	Circ	No	No	No	Circ	No	Hemi	No	Hemi
LN metastasis	960%	59%	73%	74%	55%	68%	63%	9/09	68%	966%
R0 resection	72%	78%	80%	95%	76%	82%	94%	90%	85%	%06
Diarrhea	No disabl diarrhe:	ling a	Not menti	oned	8% (after 4 months)	42% (after 4 months)	31.5% (after 6 months)	65.7% (after 6 months)	12.0% (after 3 months)	15.1% (after 3 months)
					0% (after 14 months)	15% (after 14 months)	26.3% (after 1 year)	66.6% (after 1 year)		
Local recurrence							29.5%	35.4%	27.7%	17.4%
Distant metastasis									63.8%	65.1%
Median survival (months)	11.2	16.7	30	28	26	18.8	19.9	13.8	18.8	16.5
PDAC, pancreatic du UICC, Union for Intu artery; LN, lymph no	ictal adenoci ernational C ode: Circ. ci	arcinoma; PI ancer Contro ircumferentia	D, pancreatc ol; AJCC, A al; hemi, he	oduodenecto American Joi mi-circumfe	omy; PPPD, pyloru int Committee on srential	s-preserving pancrea Cancer; plSMA, ner	ticoduodenectomy; the plexus around the	SSPPD, sub-total stor superior mesenteric	ach-preserving panc artery; CA, nerve pl	reaticoduodenectomy; exus around the celiac

D Springer

NAC in patients who have previously been subjected to either arterial resection or non-operative therapy [37, 38]. In order to perform such aggressive surgery, the clinical course of postoperative diarrhea should be well understood. Secondly, long-term outcomes for 47 patients (61.3%) at 3 years after surgery could not be evaluated due to death or loss to follow-up; only 31 patients (38.7%) could be evaluated.

Conclusion

While combined pISMA and pICA dissection increased the frequency of diarrhea, most of the diarrhea status was controllable within 2–3 years after surgery. Considering the low local recurrence rate in the diarrhea group, aggressive dissection of the nerve plexus and diarrhea may be justified for local disease control in BR-A PDAC.

Supplementary Information The online version contains supplementary material available at https://doi.org/10.1007/s00268-022-06457-5.

Acknowledgements We would like to thank Editage (www.editage. com) for English language editing.

Funding No funding was received for this work.

Declarations

Conflict of interest The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- Pedrazzoli S, DiCarlo V, Dionigi R et al (1998) Standard versus extended lymphadenectomy associated with pancreatoduodenectomy in the surgical treatment of adenocarcinoma of the head of the pancreas: a multicenter, prospective, randomized study lymphadenectomy study group. Ann Surg 228:508–517
- Yeo CJ, Cameron JL, Sohn TA et al (1999) Pancreaticoduodenectomy with or without extended retroperitoneal lymphadenectomy for periampullary adenocarcinoma: comparison of morbidity and mortality and short-term outcome. Ann Surg 229:613–622
- Yeo CJ, Cameron JL, Lillemoe KD et al (2002) Pancreaticoduodenectomy with or without distal gastrectomy and extended retroperitoneal lymphadenectomy for periampullary adenocarcinoma, part 2: randomized controlled trial evaluating survival, morbidity, and mortality. Ann Surg 236:355–366
- Farnell MB, Pearson RK, Sarr MG et al (2005) A prospective randomized trial comparing standard pancreatoduodenectomy with pancreatoduodenectomy with extended lymphadenectomy in resectable pancreatic head adenocarcinoma. Surgery 138:618–628
- 5. Nimura Y, Nagino M, Takao S et al (2012) Standard versus extended lymphadenectomy in radical pancreatoduodenectomy for ductal adenocarcinoma of the head of the pancreas: long-term

results of a Japanese multicenter randomized controlled trial. J Hepatobiliary Pancreat Sci 19:230–241

- 6. Jang JY, Kang MJ, Heo JS et al (2014) A prospective randomized controlled study comparing outcomes of standard resection and extended resection, including dissection of the nerve plexus and various lymph nodes, in patients with pancreatic head cancer. Ann Surg 259:656–664
- Nagakawa T, Kayahara M, Ueno K et al (1992) A clinicopathologic study on neural invasion in cancer of the pancreatic head. Cancer 69:930–935
- Nagakawa T, Mori K, Nakano T et al (1993) Perineural invasion of carcinoma of the pancreas and biliary tract. Br J Surg 80:619–621
- Nagakawa T, Ueno K, Ohta T et al (1990) Appraisal of extended operation for Carcinoma of the pancreas and biliary tract observated from quality of life. Jpn J Gastroenterol Surg 23:967–972
- Orci LA, Meyer J, Combescure C et al (2015) A meta-analysis of extended versus standard lymphadenectomy in patients undergoing pancreatoduodenectomy for pancreatic adenocarcinoma. HPB (Oxford) 17:565–572
- Tol JA, Gouma DJ, Bassi C et al (2014) Definition of a standard lymphadenectomy in surgery for pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma: a consensus statement by the International Study Group on Pancreatic Surgery (ISGPS). Surgery 156:591–600
- Inoue Y, Saiura A, Yoshioka R et al (2015) Pancreatoduodenectomy with systematic mesopancreas dissection using a supracolic anterior artery-first approach. Ann Surg 262:1092–1101
- Inoue Y, Saiura A, Tanaka M et al (2016) Technical details of an anterior approach to the superior mesenteric artery during pancreaticoduodenectomy. J Gastrointest Surg 20:1769–1777
- Inoue Y, Saiura A, Oba A et al (2018) Optimal extent of superior mesenteric artery dissection during pancreaticoduodenectomy for pancreatic cancer: balancing surgical and oncological safety. J Gastrointest Surg 16:1373–1383
- Inoue Y, Saiura A, Takahashi Y (2018) A novel classification and staged approach for dissection along the celiac and hepatic artery during pancreaticoduodenectomy. World J Surg 42:2963–2967. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00268-018-4550-9
- Sobin L, Gospodarowicz M, Wittekind C (2009) Pancreas. In: TNM classification of malignant tumours, 7th edn. Wiley-Blackwell, 2010, Chichester, West Sussex, UK ; Hoboken, NJ, England, p 132–135
- Tempero MA, Malafa MP, Al-Hawary M et al (2017) Pancreatic adenocarcinoma, version 2.2017, NCCN clinical practice guidelines in oncology. J Natl Compr Canc Netw 15:1028–1061
- Tanaka M, Inoue Y, Matsueda K et al (2020) Three-dimensional fixation: pathological protocol following pancreaticoduodenectomy with portal vein resection for pancreatic cancer. J Gastrointest Surg 24:619–626
- Clavien PA, Barkun J, de Oliveira ML et al (2009) The Clavien-Dindo classification of surgical complications: 5-year experience. Ann Surg 250:187–196
- 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
- Uesaka K, Boku N, Fukutomi A et al (2016) Adjuvant chemotherapy of S-1 versus gemcitabine for resected pancreatic cancer: a phase 3, open-label, randomised, non-inferiority trial (JASPAC 01). Lancet 388:248–257
- Thorsen Y, Stimec BV, Lindstrom JC et al (2021) Stool dynamics after extrinsic nerve injury during right colectomy with extended D3-mesenterectomy. Scand J Gastroenterol 56:770–776

- Thorsen Y, Stimec BV, Lindstrom JC et al (2019) Bowel motility after injury to the superior mesenteric plexus during D3 extended mesenterectomy. J Surg Res 239:115–124
- 24. Thorsen Y, Stimec B, Andersen SN et al (2016) Bowel function and quality of life after superior mesenteric nerve plexus transection in right colectomy with D3 extended mesenterectomy. Tech Coloproctol 20:445–453
- Varadhachary GR, Tamm EP, Abbruzzese JL et al (2006) Borderline resectable pancreatic cancer: definitions, management, and role of preoperative therapy. Ann Surg Oncol 13:1035–1046
- 26. Vauthey JN, Dixon E (2009) AHPBA/SSO/SSAT consensus conference on resectable and borderline resectable pancreatic cancer: rationale and overview of the conference. Ann Surg Oncol 16:1725–1726
- Tempero MA, Arnoletti JP, Behrman SW et al (2012) Pancreatic Adenocarcinoma, version 2.2012: featured updates to the NCCN Guidelines. J Natl Compr Canc Netw 10:703–713
- Katz MH, Marsh R, Herman JM et al (2013) Borderline resectable pancreatic cancer: need for standardization and methods for optimal clinical trial design. Ann Surg Oncol 20:2787–2795
- Nagakawa T, Kayahara M, Ueno K et al (1992) Clinicopathological study on neural invasion to the extrapancreatic nerve plexus in pancreatic cancer. Hepatogastroenterology 39:51–55
- 30. Maeda A, Boku N, Fukutomi A et al (2008) Randomized phase III trial of adjuvant chemotherapy with gemcitabine versus S-1 in patients with resected pancreatic cancer: Japan adjuvant study group of pancreatic cancer (JASPAC-01). Jpn J Clin Oncol 38:227–229
- Motoi F, Kosuge T, Ueno H et al (2019) Randomized phase II/III trial of neoadjuvant chemotherapy with gemcitabine and S-1 versus upfront surgery for resectable pancreatic cancer (Prep-02/ JSAP05). Jpn J Clin Oncol 49:190–194

- 32. Motoi F, Satoi S, Honda G et al (2019) A single-arm, phase II trial of neoadjuvant gemcitabine and S1 in patients with resectable and borderline resectable pancreatic adenocarcinoma: PREP-01 study. J Gastroenterol 54:194–203
- Takahashi H, Ohigashi H, Gotoh K et al (2013) Preoperative gemcitabine-based chemoradiation therapy for resectable and borderline resectable pancreatic cancer. Ann Surg 258:1040–1050
- 34. Talamonti MS, Small W Jr, Mulcahy MF et al (2006) A multiinstitutional phase II trial of preoperative full-dose gemcitabine and concurrent radiation for patients with potentially resectable pancreatic carcinoma. Ann Surg Oncol 13:150–158
- 35. Okano K, Suto H, Oshima M et al (2017) A prospective phase II trial of neoadjuvant S-1 with concurrent hypofractionated radiotherapy in patients with resectable and borderline resectable pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma. Ann Surg Oncol 24:2777–2784
- 36. Eguchi H, Takeda Y, Takahashi H et al (2019) A prospective, open-label, multicenter phase 2 trial of neoadjuvant therapy using full-dose gemcitabine and S-1 concurrent with radiation for resectable pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma. Ann Surg Oncol 26:4498–4505
- 37. Hackert T, Strobel O, Michalski CW et al (2017) The TRIAN-GLE operation–radical surgery after neoadjuvant treatment for advanced pancreatic cancer: a single arm observational study. HPB (Oxford) 19:1001–1007
- Diener MK, Mihaljevic AL, Strobel O et al (2020) Periarterial divestment in pancreatic cancer surgery. Surgery 169(5):1019–1025

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