

Reflux after Bariatric Surgery

Barham Abu Dayyeh, MD MPH FASGE

Consultant in Gastroenterology, Hepatology, and Therapeutic Endoscopy Director of Advanced Endoscopy Vice Chair of Innovation Professor of Medicine Mayo Clinic, Rochester MN

Disclosures

- Consultant: Boston Scientific, Metamodix, BFKW, USGI, Endogastric Solutions, Endogenex
- Research Support: Apollo Endosurgery, USGI, Endogastric Solutions, Boston Scientific, Aspire Bariatrics, GI Dynamics, Medgus, Medtronic, Spatz, Cairn.
- Speaker: Johnson & Johnson, Olympus

Anatomy and Physiology



Anatomy and Physiology: Mechanism of Reflux Anatomic



N Engl J Med 2020; 383:1961-1972

Anatomy and Physiology: Mechanism of Reflux Neuronal



N Engl J Med 2020; 383:1961-1972

GERD and **Obesity**



Hales CM, National Center for Health Statistics 2020

GERD in Patients with Obesity

- Each five-points increase in BMI the DeMeester score increases by 3 units
- Increased esophageal acid exposure
- Reflux symptoms link positively with BMI
- Correlation between BMI and erosive esophagitis
- Increasing BMI is significantly associated with the incidence of adenocarcinoma of the esophagus and gastric cardia

Surgical Endoscopy (2020) 34:450–457

Bariatric Surgery: Physiology of Reflux



- Altered Esophageal Clearance
- Impact on LES complex
- Presence of hiatal hernia
- Impact on proximal cardia relaxation
- Increased intragastric pressure
- Anatomic abnormalities of procedure

Upper Endoscopy



GERD after **RYGB**





GERD after bariatric surgery pathophysiology short-term

Data on pathophysiologic changes after bariatric surgery is limited (small studies, conflicting, short term-follow-up)

- Meta-analysis: 27 studies
- 612 sleeve patients 470 RYGB
- Physiology: pH or manometry before and at least 1 month after surgery
- Outcomes: Changes in esophageal pH and manometric parameters compared to baseline before surgery



Jaruvongvanich V, et al. CTG 2020

Results: Sleeve Gastrectomy

	Parameters	SG		
		N	Pooled outcome (95% CI)	l ² (%)
Manometry	LES resting pressure (mm Hg)	10	-3.55 (-6.35 to -0.75)	93
	LES length (cm)	5	0.14 (-0.11 to 0.39)	91
	Esophageal body amplitude (mm Hg)	1	-23.30 (-33.97 to -8.63)	Inestimable
	Ineffective peristalsis (%) ^a	3	2.82 (1.34 to 5.98)	0
	Intragastric pressure (mm Hg)	6	0.78 (-3.87 to 5.42)	96
pH test	DeMeester score	9	5.46 (-1.26 to 12.18)	96
	AET, total (%)	10	1.95 (0.23 to 3.67)	96
	AET, recumbent (%)	5	2.64 (0.82 to 4.45)	90
	AET, upright (%)	5	1.79 (-0.68 to 4.25)	95
	Reflux episodes, total (n)	6	15.98 (0.05 to 31.90)	93
	Reflux episodes, total acid (n)	6	5.07 (-2.26 to 12.41)	87
	Reflux episodes, total nonacid (n)	6	11.65 (5.59 to 17.71)	82
	Reflux episodes, recumbent (n)	2	5.79 (-1.22 to 12.80)	52
	Reflux episodes, upright (n)	2	2.60 (-16.97 to 22.16)	91

Manometry:

- ↓LES pressure
- ↓Esophageal amplitude
- Alneffective peristalsis

pH:

- ↑Total AET, ↑recumbent AET
- Total reflux, recumbent reflux episodes

RYGB

			RYGB	
	Parameters	N	Pooled outcome (95% CI)	l ² (%)
Manometry	LES resting pressure (mm Hg)	10	-0.15 (-0.86 to 0.55)	51
	LES length (cm)	6	0.01 (-0.09 to 0.11)	68
	Esophageal body amplitude (mm Hg)	4	-0.31 (-14.36 to 13.74)	85
	Ineffective peristalsis (%) ^a	3	2.41 (1.38 to 4.20)	12
	Intragastric pressure (mm Hg)	1	-7.00 (-8.60 to -5.40)	Inestimable
pH test	DeMeester score	7	-16.65 (-22.36 to -10.93)	99
	AET, total (%)	5	-3.88 (-5.47 to -2.28)	97
	AET, recumbent (%)	1	-1.64 (-2.65 to -0.64)	0
	AET, upright (%)	1	-5.44 (-6.13 to -4.76)	34
	Reflux episodes, total (n)	4	-18.06 (-52.64 to 16.52)	100
	Reflux episodes, total acid (n)	2	-34.79 (-69.30 to -0.28)	100
	Reflux episodes, total nonacid (n)	2	43.21 (39.33 to 47.10)	94
	Reflux episodes, recumbent (n)	_	_	_
	Reflux episodes, upright (n)	_	_	—

Manometry:

↑Ineffective peristalsis

pH:

- ↓Total AET, ↓recumbent AET and ↓upright AET
- Unchanged total reflux episodes,

 ↓acid reflux, **↑**nonacid reflux

 episodes

Proposed Esophageal Clearance Progression: Long-Term



Normal RAC

RRC

Proposed Esophageal Clearance Progression: Long-Term



POSED (Posto Dysfunction)

BMI at manometry, kg/m²

Median time from surgery to manometry, yr (IQR)

Any Chicago classification abnormality Achalasia (types I-III)

POSED

Survey of postbariatric patients (I

- 38.4% reported dysphagi
- No difference between pc
- A time-dependent manne

Aperistalsis

Normal IRP

↑Intragastric pressure

al

LSG vs RYGB, P value	Presurgical vs postsurgical, <i>P</i> value
0.2187	< 0.0001
< 0.0001	
0.8311	0.0246
0.5146	0.0811
0.3440	0.1435

Am J Gastroenterol. 2020 Oct;115(10):1669-1680

GERD after Sleeve Clinical Studies





From: Effect of Laparoscopic Sleeve Gastrectomy vs Laparoscopic Roux-en-Y Gastric Bypass on Weight Loss in Patients With Morbid ObesityThe SM-BOSS Randomized Clinical Trial

JAMA. 2018;319(3):255-265. doi:10.1001/jama.2017.20897

- N = 101 Randomize to Sleeve
- 44/101 prior GERD 31.8% worsened
- 57/101 no prior GERD 31.6% De Novo GERD
- 9 converted to RYGB because of severe GERD
- Diagnosis only based on symptoms

ELSEVIER

Surgery for Obesity and Related Diseases 14 (2018) 751-756

Original article

Lack of correlation between gastroesophageal reflux disease symptoms and esophageal lesions after sleeve gastrectomy

N = 144 prospective series (66 months median follow-up)

- GERD symptoms from 40.9% pre to 70.2% post
- PPI use from 24.3% pre to 63.9%
- Erosive esophagitis 59.8% on endoscopy
- Non-dysplastic Barrett's esophagus 13.1%
- No correlation between symptoms and endoscopic findings

Ann Surg. 2019 Mar 20. Meta-analysis

- 46 studies totaling 10,718 patients were included.
- de novo reflux after sleeve 23%
- The long-term prevalence of esophagitis was 28%
- Barrett's esophagus 8%
- Conversion to RYGB for severe reflux 4%

Yeung KTD. Ann Surg 2020

Sleeve + Esophagitis + Hiatal Hernia

Obesity Surgery (2020) 30:161–168



Sleeve to RYGB Conversion for GERD 30.4%



GERD: Algorithmic approach to GERD symptoms after Bariatric Surgery



QUESTIONS



