Journal of Hepatology and Gastrointestinal Disorders

OPEN ACCESS Freely available online

Perspective

Complications and Management Strategies in Gastrointestinal Surgery

Michael Gottlieb*

Department of Emergency Medicine, Rush University Medical Center, Chicago, USA

ABOUT THE STUDY

Gastrointestinal (GI) surgery is a branch of surgery that deals with disorders and conditions affecting the digestive system. While advances in surgical techniques have improved outcomes, complications can still occur. Complications in GI surgery can lead to significant morbidity and mortality, prolong hospital stays, and increase healthcare costs.

Wound complications

These are among the most frequently encountered issues in GI surgery [1]. These include wound infections, wound dehiscence (separation of wound edges), and incisional hernias. Strategies to minimize wound complications include proper preoperative assessment and optimization of the patient's nutritional status, meticulous surgical technique, adherence to infection control measures, and appropriate postoperative wound care. Early recognition and prompt management of wound complications are essential to prevent further deterioration and the development of systemic infections [2].

Anastomotic leaks

These occur when there is a breakdown in the integrity of a surgical connection between two segments of the gastrointestinal tract. This can result in leakage of gastric or intestinal contents into the abdominal cavity, leading to peritonitis and sepsis [3]. Factors that contribute to anastomotic leaks include poor tissue perfusion, tension on the anastomosis, compromised tissue healing, and technical errors during surgery [4]. Management strategies involve meticulous surgical technique, adequate vascular supply to the anastomosis, and the use of appropriate suture materials. Early recognition, timely intervention, and close postoperative monitoring are crucial in minimizing the impact of anastomotic leaks [5].

Postoperative bleeding

It is another potential complication in GI surgery. It can occur immediately after surgery or present later as delayed bleeding. Common causes include damage to blood vessels during surgery, coagulopathy, or inadequate hemostasis [6].

Strategies to manage postoperative bleeding involve careful surgical technique, identification, and control of bleeding vessels, and the use of hemostatic agents or adjunctive procedures when necessary [7]. Prompt recognition and intervention are essential to prevent hemodynamic instability and the need for additional surgical interventions [8].

Bowel obstruction

It can occur as a result of adhesions, hernias, tumors, or strictures following GI surgery. It presents with symptoms such as abdominal pain, distension, and vomiting [9]. Early postoperative bowel obstruction is typically managed conservatively with bowel rest, fluid resuscitation, and monitoring. However, if the obstruction persists or is associated with signs of bowel ischemia or perforation, surgical intervention may be necessary [10]. Strategies to minimize bowel obstruction include careful handling of tissues during surgery, meticulous closure of the abdominal wall, and addressing potential causes of adhesions during surgery [11].

Abscess formation

Intra-abdominal abscesses can develop following GI surgery, often as a consequence of anastomotic leaks, wound infections, or inadequate drainage of fluid collections [12]. These abscesses can lead to sepsis and require timely intervention. Prevention strategies include meticulous surgical technique, effective drainage of potential spaces during surgery, and appropriate use of prophylactic antibiotics [13]. Prompt recognition and adequate drainage of abscesses, along with targeted antibiotic therapy, are crucial in managing this complication [14].

Gastrointestinal surgery is associated with various complications that can impact patient outcomes. Surgeons must be aware of these potential complications and employ effective management strategies to minimize their occurrence and mitigate their impact [15].

Correspondence to: Michael Gottlieb, Department of Emergency Medicine, Rush University Medical Center, Chicago, USA, E-mail: Micgottlieb356@gmail.com

Received: 25-Apr-2023, Manuscript No. JHGD-23-24793; **Editor assigned:** 28-Apr-2023, PreQC No. JHGD-23-24793 (PQ); **Reviewed:** 15-May-2023, QC No. JHGD-23-24793; **Revised:** 22-May-2023, Manuscript No. JHGD-23-24793 (R); **Published:** 29-May-2023, DOI: 10.35248/2475-3181.23.9.255

Citation: Gottlieb M (2023) Complications and Management Strategies in Gastrointestinal Surgery. J Hepatol Gastroint Dis. 9:255.

REFERENCES

1. Bilimoria KY, Liu Y, Paruch JL, Zhou L, Kmiecik TE, Ko CY, et al. Development and evaluation of the universal ACS NSQIP surgical risk calculator: a decision aid and informed consent tool for patients and surgeons. J Am Coll Surg. 2013;217(5):833-842.e1-3.
2. Boffa DJ, Rosen JE, Mallin K, Loomis A, Gay G, Palis B, et al. Using the National Cancer Database for outcomes research: a review. JAMA Oncol. 2017;3(12):1722-1728.
3. Doll KM, Rademaker A, Sosa JA. Practical guide to surgical data sets: surveillance, epidemiology, and end results (SEER) database. JAMA surgery. 2018;153(6):588-589.
4. Lee TH, Marcantonio ER, Mangione CM, Thomas EJ, Polanczyk CA, Cook EF, et al. Derivation and prospective validation of a simple index for prediction of cardiac risk of major noncardiac surgery. Circulation. 1999;100(10):1043-1049.
5. Beal EW, Saunders ND, Kearney JF, Lyon E, Wei L, Squires MH, et al. Accuracy of the ACS NSQIP online risk calculator depends on how you look at it: results from the United States Gastric Cancer Collaborative. The Am Surg. 2018;84(3):358-364.
6. Rajkomar A, Dean J, Kohane I. Machine learning in medicine. N Engl J Med. 2019;380(14):1347-1358.
7. Hung AJ, Chen J, Gill IS. Automated performance metrics and machine learning algorithms to measure surgeon performance and anticipate clinical outcomes in robotic surgery. JAMA Surg. 2018;153(8):770-771.
8. Kilic A, Goyal A, Miller JK, Gjekmarkaj E, Tam WL, Gleason TG, et al. Predictive utility of a machine learning algorithm in estimating mortality risk in cardiac surgery. Ann Thorac Surg. 2020 ; 109(6):1811-1819.
9. Deo RC. Machine learning in medicine. Circulation. 2015;132(20): 1920-1930.
10. Seymour CW, Kennedy JN, Wang S, Chang CC, Elliott CF, Xu Z, et al. Derivation, validation, and potential treatment implications of novel clinical phenotypes for sepsis. JAMA. 2019;321(20):2003-2017.
11. Loftus TJ, Tighe PJ, Filiberto AC, Efron PA, Brakenridge SC, Mohr AM, et al. Artificial intelligence and surgical decision-making. JAMA Surg. 2020;155(2):148-158.
12. Komorowski M, Celi LA, Badawi O, Gordon AC, Faisal AA. The artificial intelligence clinician learns optimal treatment strategies for sepsis in intensive care. Nat Med. 2018;24(11):1716-1720.
13. Horie Y, Yoshio T, Aoyama K, Yoshimizu S, Horiuchi Y, Ishiyama A, et al. Diagnostic outcomes of esophageal cancer by artificial intelligence using convolutional neural networks. Gastrointest Endosc. 2019;89(1):25-32.
14. Guo L, Xiao X, Wu C, Zeng X, Zhang Y, Du J, et al. Real-time automated diagnosis of precancerous lesions and early esophageal squamous cell carcinoma using a deep learning model (with videos). Gastrointest Endosc. 2020;91(1):41-51.
15. Hashimoto R, Requa J, Dao T, Ninh A, Tran E, Mai D, et al. Artificial intelligence using convolutional neural networks for real-time detection of early esophageal neoplasia in Barrett's esophagus (with video). Gastrointest Endosc. 2020;91(6):1264-1271.