# Clinical Outcome of Endoscopic Submucosal Dissection for Early Gastric Cancer: A Retrospective Single-Center Study Sera Satoi, MD<sup>1,2</sup>, Makoto Nishimura, MD<sup>1</sup>, Kana Chin, MD<sup>1,3</sup>, Jacques Beauvais, MD<sup>1</sup>, Mark A. Schattner<sup>1</sup>



1. Gastroenterology, Hepatology, and Nutrition Service, Department of Medicine, Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, New York, NY, United States 2. Internal Medicine, Mount Sinai Beth Israel, New York, NY, United States 3. Internal Medicine, Long Island Jewish Forest Hills Hospital, Northwell Health, Queens, NY, United States

#### OBJECTIVE

- Endoscopic submucosal dissection (ESD) is a minimally invasive treatment for early gastric cancer. However, the outcomes of ESD for early gastric cancer in the United States are not we studied because of the low prevalence gastric cancer.
- We aimed to assess the efficacy, and safety of ESD for early gastric cancer the United States.

## METHODS

- We performed a single-center retrospective analysis of patients who underwent gastric ESD between June **2018 and December 2021.**
- The main outcome measures were en resection rate, R0 (complete) resectio rate, procedure time, tumor size, hos length of stay (LOS), histology, and complication rate.
- Complete resection (R0) was defined en-bloc resection with lateral and dee margins free of neoplasia on histologi evaluation.

BASE	<b>BASELINE CHARACTERISTICS</b>		
Age, y, median (IQ	R)		71 (68.9-76.8)
Sex, men/women,	n		30/16
ASA grade, n (%)	Ι		0
	п		0
	Ш		5 (10.9)
	IV		41 (89.1)
Anesthesia, n (%)	Profo	pol	7 (15.2)
	Gene	ral anesthesia	39 (84.8)
Lesion site, n (%)	Antru	ım	10 (21.7)
	Body	•	24(52.2)
		a	12 (26.1)
Type of injection, n	(%) Elevie	ew	11(23.9)
$\mathbf{D}$ and $\mathbf{n}$ (9())	Orise	len if a	35 (76.1)
Device, n (%)	Duar	knite	29 (03.0)
Interventions befor n (%)	e ESD, Tatto	o into the lesion	6 (13.0)
	Lesic	on with scar	10 (21.7)
	Radio	ofrequency ablation	1 (2.2)
	ESD		4 (8.7)
	EMR		4 (8.7)
	OUT	COMES	
En bloc resection, n	(%)		43 (94.5)
R0 resection, n (%)			36 (78.3)
Procedure time, min	Procedure time, min, median (IQR)		87.5
	diam (IOP)		(09.3-110.0)
Tumor size, mm, me	ulali (IQR)		20 (20-33)
Length of hospital s	tay,		$1.8 \pm 1.4$
$\frac{u_{1}}{Histology_{1}} n (\%)$		Low-grade dysplasia	6 (13.0)
		High-grade dysplasia	5 (10.9)
		pT1a	21(45.7)
		pT1b	12(26.1)
		Neuroendocrine tumor	2(4.3)
Advese event, n (%)			3 (6.5)
Type of adverse even	Type of adverse event, n (%)		3 (6.5)
		Perforation	0
		Infection	0
		Hypotension	0



#### RESULTS

median procedure time was 87.5 min nge, 69.3-118.8 min). The median tumor e was 26mm (range, 20-35 mm). Mean spital length of stay was  $1.87 \pm 1.38$ vs. The most common histologic type s pT1a (45.7%), followed by pT1b .1%), low-grade dysplasia (13.0%), highde dysplasia (10.9%), and roendocrine tumor (4.3%).

ere were 3 adverse events all of which re delayed bleeding and no perforations re reported.

#### CONCLUSIONS

study showed that gastric ESD is a e and effective method for early gastric ncer. ESD should be considered to ients with suitable lesions in the U.S.

### REFERENCES

I, Yao K, Fujishiro M, et al. Guidelines for endoscopic submucosal ection and endoscopic mucosal resection for early gastric cancer. Indosc 2016; 28:3.

5, Choi KD, Han M, et al. Long-term outcomes of endoscopic nucosal dissection versus surgery in early gastric cancer meeting nded indication including undifferentiated-type tumors: a criteriad analysis. Gastric Cancer 2018; 21:490.