18. Shimada M, Ijichi H, Yonemura Y, et al. The impact of splenectomy or splenic artery ligation on the outcome of a living donor adult liver transplantation using a left lobe graft. *Hepatogastroenterology* 2004; 51: 625.
19. Ikegami T, Toshima T, Takeishi K, et al. Bloodless splenectomy during liver transplantation for terminal liver diseases with portal hypertension. *J Am Coll Surg* 2009; 208: e1.
20. Ikegami T, Soejima Y, Taketomi A, et al. Living donor liver transplantation with extra-small graft: inflow modulation using splenectomy and temporary portocaval shunt. *Hepatogastroenterology* 2008; 55: 670.
21. Yabe S, Egawa H, Inomata Y, et al. Auxiliary partial orthotopic liver transplantation from living donors: significance of portal blood flow. *Transplantation* 1998; 66: 484.
22. Ikegami T, Shiotani S, Ninomiya M, et al. Auxiliary partial orthotopic liver transplantation from living donors. *Surgery* 2002; 131: S205.
23. Ikegami T, Shirabe K, Yoshizumi T, et al. En bloc stapling division of the gastroesophageal vessels controlling portal hemodynamic status in living donor liver transplantation. *J Am Coll Surg* 2012; 214: e53.
24. Lee SG, Moon DB, Ahn CS, et al. Ligation of left renal vein for large spontaneous splenorenal shunt to prevent portal flow steal in adult living donor liver transplantation. *Transpl Int* 2007; 20: 45.
25. Mizuno S, Murata Y, Kuriyama N, et al. Living donor liver transplantation for the patients with portal vein thrombosis: use of an interpositional venous graft passed posteriorly to the pancreatic parenchyma without using jump graft. *Transplant Proc* 2012; 44: 356.
26. Marubashi S, Dono K, Nagano H, et al. Living-donor liver transplantation with renoportal anastomosis for patients with large spontaneous splenorenal shunts. *Transplantation* 2005; 80: 1671.
27. Yoshiya S, Shirabe K, Kimura K, et al. The causes, risk factors, and outcomes of early relaparotomy after living-donor liver transplantation. *Transplantation* 2012; 94: 947.
28. Ikegami T, Shimada M, Imura S, et al. Current concept of small-for-size grafts in living donor liver transplantation. *Surg Today* 2008; 38: 971.
29. Ikegami T, Shirabe K, Yoshizumi T, et al. Primary graft dysfunction after living donor liver transplantation is characterized by delayed functional hyperbilirubinemia. *Am J Transplant* 2012; 12: 1886.
30. Soejima Y, Shirabe K, Taketomi A, et al. Left lobe living donor liver transplantation in adults. *Am J Transplant* 2012; 12: 1877.
31. Taketomi A, Morita K, Toshima T, et al. Living donor hepatectomies with procedures to prevent biliary complications. *J Am Coll Surg* 2010; 211: 456.
32. Molmenti EP, Roodhouse TW, Molmenti H, et al. Thrombendvenectomy for organized portal vein thrombosis at the time of liver transplantation. *Ann Surg* 2002; 235: 292.

Hepatology Research

Hepatology Research 2013; **43**: 709–716 doi: 10.1111/hepr.12016

Original Article

Impact of tumor size, number of tumors and neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio in liver transplantation for recurrent hepatocellular carcinoma

Tomoharu Yoshizumi, Toru Ikegami, Shohei Yoshiya, Takashi Motomura, Yohei Mano, Jun Muto, Tetsuo Ikeda, Yuji Soejima, Ken Shirabe and Yoshihiko Maehara

Department of Surgery and Science, Graduate School of Medical Sciences, Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan

Aim: Hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) is primarily treated with hepatic resection and/or locoregional therapy. When HCC recurs and further treatment is no longer possible owing to poor liver function, liver transplantation (LT) or living-donor LT (LDLT) is considered. The aim of this study was to clarify risk factors for tumor recurrence after LDLT in patients with recurrent HCC.

Methods: The study comprised 104 patients who had undergone LDLT because of end-stage liver disease with recurrent HCC. The recurrence-free survival rates after the LDLT were calculated. Risk factors for tumor recurrence were identified.

Results: The 1-, 3- and 5-year recurrence-free survival rates were 89.6%, 80.3% and 78.4%, respectively. By univariate analysis, the factors affecting recurrence-free survival were the sum of the largest tumor size and number of tumors of 8 or more ($P < 0.0001$), des-γ-carboxy prothrombin of more than 300 mAU/mL ($P = 0.0001$), and a neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio (NLR) of 4 or more ($P = 0.0002$), α-fetoprotein of more than 400 ng/mL ($P = 0.0001$) and bilobar tumor distribution ($P = 0.046$). A multivariate analysis identified independent risk factors for post-LDLT tumor recurrence including the sum of tumor size and number of tumors of 8 or more ($P = 0.0004$) and an NLR of 4 or more ($P = 0.01$). The 1- and 3- year recurrence-free survival rates in the recipients who had both risk factors were 30.0% and 15.0%, respectively.

Conclusion: LDLT should not be performed for patients who have both independent risk factors after any treatments for HCC.

Key words: hepatocellular carcinoma, living-donor liver transplantation, neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio, number of tumors, tumor size

INTRODUCTION

A SHORTAGE OF cadaveric organs for transplantation continues to impair our ability to provide liver transplantation (LT) despite progress in surgical techniques and immunosuppression.[1,2] Currently, there is no consensus on how to manage patients with hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) while awaiting LT. Guidelines published in the UK state that locoregional therapy, such as transarterial chemoembolization (TACE), radiofrequency ablation (RFA), ethanol injection therapy and microwave coagulation therapy (MCT), should be considered for all listed patients with HCC.[3] In Asian countries, religious, cultural and political ideologies have created significant obstacles to the transplantation of organs from cadavers. As a result, HCC is primarily treated with hepatic resection and/or locoregional therapy.[4,5] However, when HCC recurs and further treatment is no longer possible owing to poor liver function, LT is considered.[4] Organ shortages have forced patients with recurrent HCC to endure long waiting periods that are associated with tumor development. Thus, living-donor LT (LDLT) is a potential choice for treating recurrent HCC patients after the use of other

Correspondence: Dr Tomoharu Yoshizumi, Department of Surgery and Science, Graduate School of Medical Sciences, Kyushu University, 3-1-1 Maidashi, Fukuoka 812-8582, Japan.
Email: yosizumi@surg2.med.kyushu-u.ac.jp
Conflict of interest: none.
Author contribution: Tomoharu Yoshizumi designed the study; Tomoharu Yoshizumi, Ken Shirabe, Toru Ikegami, Yuji Soejima, Shohei Yoshiya Yohei Mano, Jun Muto and Tetsuo Ikeda performed the study; Tomoharu Yoshizumi, Takashi Motomura and Toru Ikegami collected the data; Tomoharu Yoshizumi, Ken Shirabe and Yoshihiko Maehara analyzed the data; and Tomoharu Yoshizumi wrote the paper.
Received 11 September 2012; revision 11 October 2012; accepted 28 October 2012.

treatments.[4] Since the 1994 report demonstrating successful LDLT, living donors have been increasingly used because of the disparity between demand and supply, even in Western countries.[2,6] Moreover, a blood relationship between the donor and the recipient in LDLT may give the recipient a chance to receive a transplant even during the suboptimal conditions of HCC.[7–9]

Thus, it is important to focus on factors that affect tumor recurrence after LDLT in patients with recurrent HCC.

The neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio (NLR) has recently emerged as a useful prognostic factor for the recurrence of several malignancies. An NLR of 5 or more was reported to be a marker of survival in colorectal cancer patients.[10] Halazun *et al.* reported that an NLR of five or more was an independent predictor of the recurrence and poor overall survival in patients with colorectal liver metastases.[11] Recently, it was demonstrated that a preoperative NLR of 5 or more was an adverse predictor of recurrence-free survival for patients undergoing hepatic resection for HCC.[12] Furthermore, an elevated NLR significantly increased the risk of HCC recurrence after LT[13] or LDLT.[14]

Mazzaferro *et al.* recently proposed the "up-to-seven criteria", with 7 being the result of the sum of the largest tumor size (in cm) and number of tumors, to predict patient survival after LT, based on a large sample size.[15] We have reported the outcome of LDLT for otherwise unresectable and/or untreatable HCC patients[7,16] and proposed two risk factors for recurrence-free survival: a tumor size greater than 5 cm and des-γ-carboxy prothrombin (DCP) levels greater than 300 mAU/mL (Kyushu University [KU] criteria).[7] Furthermore, we previously reported a series of 68 cases of LDLT for patients who had received pretransplant treatment for HCC.[4] DCP above 300 mAU/mL was shown to be an independent risk factor for tumor recurrence after LDLT in the published work. Since this report, LDLT has become a more common treatment for such patients, thus generating a larger cohort for study.

Therefore, the aim of the present study was to clarify the risk factors of tumor recurrence after LDLT in patients with recurrent HCC.

METHODS

Recipients

ONE HUNDRED AND sixty-seven recipients underwent LDLT because of end-stage liver disease with HCC at Kyushu University Hospital between April 1999 and August 2012. In this study, 104 adult patients (41 female and 63 male) were enrolled who had undergone LDLT because of end-stage liver disease with recurrent HCC after treatment. The pretransplant treatments for HCC, such as RFA, TACE, MCT and/or hepatic resection, were dependent upon the recipient's liver function and tumor status. Graft types included left lobe with caudate lobe graft ($n = 63$), right lobe graft without the middle hepatic vein ($n = 37$) and posterior segment graft ($n = 4$). The etiology of liver cirrhosis included hepatitis C ($n = 75$), hepatitis B ($n = 20$), cryptogenic disease ($n = 4$), alcohol abuse ($n = 3$) and primary biliary cirrhosis ($n = 2$) (Table 1). Our selection criteria to perform LDLT for HCC patients were as follows: (i) no modality except LDLT available to cure the patients with HCC; (ii) no extrahepatic metastasis; and (iii) no major vascular infiltration.[4,7] There were no restrictions on the tumor size, number of tumors or pretransplant treatment. Since defining the KU criteria, we have not performed LDLT for HCC patients with a tumor size greater than 5 cm and DCP levels greater than 300 mAU/mL.

Pretransplant imaging was used to estimate the maximum tumor size, number of tumors and up-to-seven criteria. α-Fetoprotein (AFP), DCP and NLR were measured before the LDLT. The histological grades obtained from the explanted livers were used for tumor differentiation.

Donor and graft selection

Donors were selected from among the candidates who hoped to be living donors.[1,8] Donors were required to be within the third degree of consanguinity with recipients or spouses, and to be between 20 and 65 years of age. For a donor who was not within the third degree of consanguinity, individual approval was obtained from the Ethics Committee of Kyushu University Hospital. Good Samaritan donations were not used.

Eligible donors proceeded to the imaging studies, including chest and abdominal X-rays and 3-mm-slice computed tomography (CT) scans for graft volumetric analysis. 3-D CT was introduced for volumetric analysis and delineation of vascular anatomy. The standard liver weight (SLW) of recipients was calculated according to the formula of Urata *et al.*[17] Graft weight (GW) was predicted by CT volumetric analysis. Decisions regarding the graft type for recipients were based on the preoperatively predicted GW to SLW (GW : SLW) ratio. The left lobe with caudate lobe graft was used when the preoperatively predicted GW : SLW ratio was more than 35%. A posterior segment graft was used when the donor's vascular variation was suitable to take the posterior segment.

Table 1 Characteristics of recipients and donors

Variables	*n*
Recipient	
Sex (male/female)	63/41
Age (years, range)	58.0 (41–72)
Etiology	
HCV	75
HBV	20
Cryptogenic	4
Alcohol	3
PBC	2
MELD score (range)	11.5 (4–31)
Diabetes mellitus (yes/no)	31/73
Splenectomy (yes/no)	60/44
CNI (TAC/CyA/None)	44/57/3
Donor	
Sex (male/female)	75/29
Age (years, range)	34.3 (20–63)
Graft (left/right/posterior)	63/37/4
GW : SLW ratio (%, range)	41.0 (23.6–67.6)
Tumor	
Maximum size (cm, range)	2.4 (0–7.0)
n (range)	17 (0–400)
Milan criteria (yes/no)	52/52
NLR (range)	3.1 (0.44–20.2)
AFP (ng/mL, range)	1516 (1–43 000)
DCP (mAU/mL, range)	349 (3–5934)
Duration between first Tx and LDLT (days, median, range)	1198 (61–4272)
Duration between last Tx and LDLT (days, median, range)	349 (30–2140)
Times of treatment (range)	3 (1–11)
Microvascular invasion (yes/no)	39/65
Pathological differentiation (well/moderate/poor)	7/63/34

AFP, α-fetoprotein; CNI, calcineurin inhibitor; CyA, cyclosporin A; DCP, des-γ-carboxy prothrombin; GW, graft weight; HBV, hepatitis B virus; HCV, hepatitis C virus; MELD, Model for End-Stage Liver Disease; NLR, neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio; SLW, standard liver weight; TAC, tacrolimus; Tx, pretransplant treatment.

Postoperative management

The graft retrieval technique, recipient surgery and perioperative management of the recipients, including immunosuppression regimens, have been described elsewhere.[9,18] Immunosuppression was initiated using a protocol based on either tacrolimus (Prograf; Astellas Pharma, Tokyo, Japan) or cyclosporin A (Neoral; Novartis Pharma, Tokyo, Japan) with steroid and/or mycophenolate mofetil (MMF; Chugai Pharmaceutical, Tokyo, Japan). Tacrolimus was used in 44 recipients and cyclosporin in 57 recipients. Three recipients did not receive calcineurin inhibitor owing to postoperative poor disease course. A target trough of tacrolimus was set at 10 ng/mL for 3 months after LDLT, followed by 5–10 ng/mL thereafter. A target trough level of cyclosporin A was set at 250 ng/mL for 3 months after LDLT, followed by 150–200 ng/mL thereafter. Methylprednisolone was initiated on the day of LDLT, tapered and converted to prednisolone 7 days after LDLT. Prednisolone treatment was tapered and discontinued 6 months after LDLT. MMF was used in 91 recipients and was started at 1000 mg/day on the day after LDLT, tapered and discontinued until 6 months after LDLT. A trough level was not measured for MMF.

All patients had monthly follow ups, and the median follow-up period was 1738 days, with 723 days and 2891 days as the 25th and 75th percentiles, respectively.

Post-LDLT tumor recurrence and risk factors

Hepatocellular carcinoma recurrence after the LDLT was set as the primary end-point of this study. All patients underwent abdominal CT scan every 3 months, and chest CT scan and bone scintigraphy every 6 months within 5 years after LDLT. Tumor recurrence was defined as when any imaging studies revealed the recurrence of HCC. Recurrence-free survival was defined as the time period between LDLT and tumor recurrence.

Univariate and multivariate analyses were performed to identify the factors associated with recurrence-free survival after the LDLT.

Statistical analysis

Recurrence-free survival rates were calculated by the Kaplan–Meier product-limited method. Data were expressed as means.

Cox regression analysis was applied to the multivariate analyses. Variables that were used for the analysis included recipient age, donor age, Model for End-Stage Liver Disease score, presence of hepatitis C virus, presence of diabetes mellitus, recipient sex, donor sex, GW : SLW ratio, the sum of the largest tumor size (in cm) and the number of tumors, pretransplant NLR, pretransplant AFP, pretransplant DCP, graft type, splenectomy, duration between first treatment for HCC and the LDLT, duration of last treatment for HCC and the LDLT, times of pretransplant treatment and type of calcineurin inhibitor. All statistical analyses were performed using JMP ver. 9.0 software (SAS, Cary, NC, USA). $P < 0.05$ was considered significant.

Approval of institutional review board

The Institutional Review Board of Kyushu University Hospital approved this study protocol (no. 23–58).

RESULTS

THE CHARACTERISTICS OF the recipients and donors from this study are shown in Table 1. Fifty-two of 104 patients (50.0%) exceeded the Milan criteria. Patients previously underwent at least one of the following treatments for primary or recurrent HCC: TACE ($n = 85$), RFA ($n = 54$), ethanol injection therapy ($n = 30$), MCT ($n = 17$), hepatic resection ($n = 11$) and hepatic arterial infusion chemotherapy ($n = 7$). Median times of treatment were 3.0 (1–11 times), median duration from first treatment to LDLT was 1199 days (61–4272 days) and median duration from last treatment to LDLT was 348 days (30–2140 days).

Receiver–operator curve (ROC) analysis for tumor recurrence after LDLT was used to detect the cut-off line of the sum of the largest tumor size (in cm) and number of tumors, and NLR. The area under the ROC (AUROC) of the sum of the largest tumor size (in cm) and number of tumors was 0.833. A cut-off value of the sum was set as 8.0, because ROC analysis revealed that a cut-off value of 8, which had 84.2% of the sensitivity and 80.0% of the specificity, was the most suitable value. Similarly, the AUROC of NLR was 0.700 and a cut-off value of NLR of 4 was set using the analysis.

The 1-, 3- and 5-year recurrence-free survival rates in enrolled recipients were 89.6%, 80.3% and 78.4%, respectively. Among the 104 recipients, 19 patients developed tumor recurrence after LDLT. A univariate analysis revealed that the sum of the largest tumor size (in cm) and number of tumors of 8 or more, had an NLR of 4 or more, AFP levels of more than 400 ng/mL, DCP levels of more than 300 mAU/mL and bilobar tumor distribution were risk factors for tumor recurrence after LDLT ($P < 0.0001$, $P = 0.0002$, $P < 0.0001$, $P < 0.0001$, and $P = 0.046$, respectively) (Table 2). Although the nodule size and number of nodules were risk factors of tumor recurrence by the univariate analysis, these factors statistically interfered with the sum of the largest tumor size (in cm) and number of tumors for performing multivariate analysis. The AUROC of the number of nodules was 0.790 and that of the largest nodule size was 0.753. Both data were less than that of the sum of the largest tumor size and number of tumors (0.833). Thus, we selected the sum of the largest tumor size and number of tumors for multivariate analysis. Multivariate analysis revealed that the sum of the largest tumor size (in cm) and number of tumors of 8 or more and an NLR of 4 or more were independent risk factors for tumor recurrence after LDLT in this study ($P = 0.0004$ and $P = 0.011$, respectively) (Table 3).

Table 4 shows the correlation between explant pathology and each risk factor. The frequency of microvascular invasion and poorly differentiated tumors increased among patients who had both independent risk factors of tumor recurrence.

The 1-, 3- and 5-year recurrence-free survival rates in recipients who had no risk factor ($n = 58$) were all 100%. The 1-, 3- and 5-year recurrence-free survival rates in recipients who had the sum of the largest tumor size (in cm) and number of tumors of 8 or more were 78.9%, 55.4% and 55.4%, respectively. Those in patients who had an NLR of 4 or more were 100%, 81.8% and 61.4%, respectively. The 1- and 3-year recurrence-free survival rates in recipients who had both risk factors were 30.0%, and 15.0%, respectively. The 5-year recurrence-free survival rate could not be obtained (Fig. 1). The differences among the four groups were significantly different ($P < 0.0001$).

DISCUSSION

THIS IS THE largest study to investigate LDLT with recurrent HCC.[4] It is crucial to clarify when patients with poor liver function and HCC should be listed as candidates for LDLT. We chose recurrence-free survival rate as the end-point in this study because preliminary analysis revealed that 27 deaths occurred in the enrolled recipients, of which 14 causes of death were not tumor-related.

To date, several studies have attempted to extend the Milan criteria to encompass HCC patients with potentially curable tumors.[7,14,19–22] The up-to-seven criteria may predict patient survival even after LDLT.[4,14] The ROC analysis for tumor recurrence after LDLT revealed that the sensitivity of the cut-off value of 7 was 89.4% and the specificity was 71.7%. It meant that a cut-off value of 7 was less suitable than that of 8 in this study. Although we previously proposed that the number of tumors did not affect tumor recurrence after LDLT,[4,7,16] the results obtained from the present study suggest that the number of tumors as well as largest tumor size should be taken into consideration to select HCC patients for LDLT.

The precise mechanism of how NLR affects tumor recurrence is still unclear. Infiltration of pro-inflammatory macrophages, cytokines and chemokines in the tumor microenvironment can boost tumor

Table 2 Risk factors for tumor recurrence: univariate analysis

Variables	*n*	Recurrence-free survival (%)			*P*
		1 year	3 years	5 years	
Recipient variables					
Sex					
Male	63	84.5	82.7	79.5	0.81
Female	41	97.4	75.7	75.7	
Age (years)					
>60	46	88.1	82.3	82.3	0.67
≤60	58	90.8	79.1	76.1	
Etiology					
HCV	75	88.8	79.6	77.2	0.64
Others	29	91.4	82.0	82.0	
Pretransplant MELD					
<15	84	91.2	80.1	78.0	0.99
≥15	20	82.1	82.1	82.1	
Diabetes mellitus					
Yes	31	89.1	84.4	78.8	0.75
No	73	89.7	78.5	78.5	
NLR					
≥4	21	72.7	55.9	41.9	0.0002
<4	83	93.5	86.2	86.2	
Splenectomy					
Yes	60	90.9	79.9	79.9	0.82
No	44	87.8	80.2	77.4	
Calcineurin inhibitor					
TAC	44	90.0	80.9	80.9	0.78
CyA	57	89.4	80.1	77.3	
Donor variables					
Sex					
Male	75	92.7	82.9	80.4	0.34
Female	29	82.1	74.1	74.1	
Donor age (years)					
>40	25	95.2	89.6	89.6	0.19
≤40	79	88.0	77.6	75.3	
Graft type					
Others	67	90.2	75.4	72.5	0.13
Right	37	88.6	88.6	88.6	
GW : SLW ratio					
<35	24	86.1	76.0	76.0	0.62
≥35	80	90.5	81.5	79.1	
Tumor variables					
Nodule size (cm)					
≥5	6	50.0	33.3	33.3	0.0004
<5	98	92.2	83.5	81.4	
No. of nodules					
≥5	34	75.2	58.0	58.0	0.0002
<5	70	96.8	91.6	88.7	
Nodule size + number					
≥8.0	33	67.9	46.4	46.4	<0.0001
<8.0	71	100	96.5	93.8	

Table 2 *Continued*

Variables	*n*	Recurrence-free survival (%)			*P*
		1 year	3 years	5 years	
DCP (mAU/mL)†					
>300	19	51.6	38.7	38.7	<0.0001
≤300	84	97.3	89.5	87.1	
AFP (ng/mL)					
>400	22	75.8	53.1	44.3	<0.0001
≤400	82	93.3	87.5	87.5	
Tumor distribution					
Bilobar	65	85.3	74.7	72.1	0.046
Unilobar	39	97.0	90.4	90.4	
Duration between the first treatment and the LDLT					
<1 year	21	80.0	68.7	68.7	0.20
≥1 year	83	92.1	83.3	80.7	
Duration between the last treatment and the LDLT					
<1 year	72	86.5	76.5	76.5	0.26
≥1 year	32	96.6	89.1	82.3	
Times of treatment					
≥4	36	85.0	67.9	67.9	0.06
<4	68	91.9	86.7	83.9	

†Data of one case was lacking because of warfarin intake.
AFP, α-fetoprotein; CyA, cyclosporin A; DCP, des-γ-carboxy prothrombin; GW, graft weight; HCV, hepatitis C virus; KU, Kyushu University; LDLT, living-donor liver transplantation; MELD, Model for End-Stage Liver Disease; NLR, neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio; SLW, standard liver weight; TAC, tacrolimus.

growth, invasion and metastases.[23,24] Recently, Motomura *et al.* reported that interleukin (IL)-17-producing T cells are thought to release CXC chemokines that recruit neutrophils, leading to elevated NLR, and promote the differentiation of tissue macrophages in peritumoral regions into tumor-associated macrophages (TAM).[14] Both IL-17-producing T cells and TAM may accelerate tumor progression and antitumor T-cell exhaustion. As shown in Table 4, pathological examination revealed poorly differentiated HCC and microvascular invasion in the explanted liver in seven of eight recipients who had both independent risk factors of tumor recurrence. The use of routine biopsy to identify tumor grading has been abandoned owing to concerns of tumor seeding, leading to an extensive search for suitable surrogate markers to predict tumor differentiation or vascular invasion. Halazun *et al.* showed that elevated NLR correlated with microvascular invasion and poorly differentiated tumors.[13] The results from our study are consistent with this previous report. The interpretation

Table 3 Risk factors for tumor recurrence: multivariate analysis

Variables	Odds ratio	95% CI	*P*
Nodule size + number ≥8.0	15.2	3.34–68.9	0.0004
NLR ≥4	4.02	1.38–11.6	0.011
DCP >300 mAU/mL	3.09	0.87–11.0	0.082
AFP >400 ng/mL	1.23	0.37–4.08	0.73
Bilobar distribution	1.12	0.24–5.21	0.88

AFP, α-fetoprotein; CI, confidence interval; DCP, des-γ-carboxy prothrombin; NLR, neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio.

Table 4 Correlation between explant pathology and risk factors

Variables	No risk factor (*n* = 58)	NLR ≥4 (*n* = 13)	Tumor size and number of tumors ≥8 (*n* = 25)	Both risk factors (*n* = 8)	*P*
Microvascular invasion	12 (20.7%)	4 (30.8%)	16 (64.0%)	7 (87.5%)	<0.0001
Poorly differentiated tumor	12 (20.7%)	3 (23.1%)	12 (48.0%)	7 (87.5%)	0.0005

NLR, neutrophil-lymphocyte ratio.



Figure 1 Recurrence-free recipient survival after living-donor liver transplantations for hepatocellular carcinoma. The 1-, 3- and 5-year recurrence-free survival rates in recipients who had no risk factor ($n = 58$) were all 100%. The 1-, 3- and 5-year recurrence-free survival rates in recipients who had the sum of the largest tumor size (in cm) and number of tumors of 8 or more were 78.9%, 55.4% and 55.4%, respectively. Those in patients who had an neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio (NLR) of 4 or more were 100%, 81.8%, and 61.4%, respectively. The 1- and 3-year recurrence-free survival rates in recipients who had both risk factors were 30.0% and 15.0%, respectively. The 5-year recurrence-free survival rate could not be obtained. The differences among the four groups were significantly different ($P < 0.0001$). yr, years.

of NLR in patients with end-stage liver disease, often complicated with hypersplenism and pancytopenia, seems to require caution. Furthermore, patients with end-stage liver disease often develop specific bacterial peritonitis or other bacterial infections because of impaired immune system. There may be limitation for the evaluation of NLR in such patients.

Seventy-eight of 104 patients underwent pretransplant treatment more than twice in this study. Moreover, the times of pretransplant treatment, the interval between the first treatment and LDLT, and the interval between the last pretransplant treatment and LDLT did not affect the outcome of LDLT. Next, we focused on how to predict patients with a high risk of tumor recurrence after LDLT. For the univariate and multivariate analysis, we chose variables that had been obtained before transplantation. The 5-year recurrence-free survival rate after the LDLT was 100% for recipients who did not have both risk factors of tumor recurrence. Therefore, according to our results, HCC can be treated with any treatment modality whenever the patient's liver function is tolerable to such treatments. However, patients who have the sum of the largest tumor size (in cm) and the number of tumors of 8 or more and have an NLR of 4 or more should be excluded from LDLT. Further study is needed on whether LDLT can be performed for patients who have a single independent risk factor or not, because the 5-year recurrence-free survival rate for patients who had the sum of the largest tumor size (in cm) and the number of tumors of 8 or more was 55.4%, and for patients who had an NLR of 4 or more was 61.4%. A recent report recommended giving psychosocial considerations careful attention for both donor and recipient in LDLT.[25]

In conclusion, the type or duration of treatment for HCC did not affect the outcome of LDLT, but LDLT should not be performed for patients who have the sum of the largest tumor size (in cm) and number of tumors of 8 or more and with an NLR of 4 or more after any treatments for HCC to prevent tumor recurrence.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

THIS STUDY WAS partly funded by a Grant-in-Aid (no. 23591989) from the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture in Japan.

REFERENCES

1 Yoshizumi T, Taketomi A, Uchiyama H *et al.* Graft size, donor age, and patient status are the indicators of early graft function after living donor liver transplantation. *Liver Transpl* 2008; **14**: 1007–13.
2 Renz J, Kin C, Saggi B, Emond J. Outcomes of living donor liver transplantation. In: Busuttil R, Klintmalm G, eds. *Transplantation of the Liver*, 2nd edn. Philadelphia, PA: Elsevier Saunders, 2005; 713–24.
3 Gordon-Weeks AN, Snaith A, Petrinic T, Friend PJ, Burls A, Silva MA. Systematic review of outcome of downstaging hepatocellular cancer before liver transplantation in patients outside the Milan criteria. *Br J Surg* 2011; **98**: 1201–8.
4 Yoshizumi T, Shirabe K, Soejima Y *et al.* Living donor liver transplantation in patients who have received pretransplant treatment for hepatocellular carcinoma. *Transplantation* 2011; **91**: e61–2.
5 Poon RT, Fan ST, Lo CM, Liu CL, Wong J. Long-term survival and pattern of recurrence after resection of small hepatocellular carcinoma in patients with preserved liver function: implications for a strategy of salvage transplantation. *Ann Surg* 2002; **235**: 373–82.

6 Hashikura Y, Makuuchi M, Kawasaki S *et al.* Successful living-related partial liver transplantation to an adult patient. *Lancet* 1994; **343**: 1233–4.
7 Taketomi A, Sanefuji K, Soejima Y *et al.* Impact of des-gamma-carboxy prothrombin and tumor size on the recurrence of hepatocellular carcinoma after living donor liver transplantation. *Transplantation* 2009; **87**: 531–7.
8 Yoshizumi T, Shirabe K, Soejima Y *et al.* Living donor liver transplantation in patients older than 60 years. *Transplantation* 2010; **90**: 433–7.
9 Yoshizumi T, Shirabe K, Taketomi A *et al.* Risk factors that increase mortality after living donor liver transplantation. *Transplantation* 2012; **93**: 93–8.
10 Walsh SR, Cook EJ, Goulder F, Justin TA, Keeling NJ. Neutrophil-lymphocyte ratio as a prognostic factor in colorectal cancer. *J Surg Oncol* 2005; **91**: 181–4.
11 Halazun KJ, Aldoori A, Malik HZ *et al.* Elevated preoperative neutrophil to lymphocyte ratio predicts survival following hepatic resection for colorectal liver metastases. *Eur J Surg Oncol* 2008; **34**: 55–60.
12 Gomez D, Farid S, Malik HZ *et al.* Preoperative neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio as a prognostic predictor after curative resection for hepatocellular carcinoma. *World J Surg* 2008; **32**: 1757–62.
13 Halazun KJ, Hardy MA, Rana AA *et al.* Negative impact of neutrophil-lymphocyte ratio on outcome after liver transplantation for hepatocellular carcinoma. *Ann Surg* 2009; **250**: 141–51.
14 Motomura T, Shirabe K, Mano Y *et al.* Neutrophil-lymphocyte ratio reflects hepatocellular carcinoma recurrence after liver transplantation via inflammatory microenvironment. *J Hepatol* DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhep.2012.08.017.
15 Mazzaferro V, Llovet JM, Miceli R *et al.* Predicting survival after liver transplantation in patients with hepatocellular carcinoma beyond the Milan criteria: a retrospective, exploratory analysis. *Lancet Oncol* 2009; **10**: 35–43.
16 Soejima Y, Taketomi A, Yoshizumi T *et al.* Extended indication for living donor liver transplantation in patients with hepatocellular carcinoma. *Transplantation* 2007; **83**: 893–9.
17 Urata K, Kawasaki S, Matsunami H *et al.* Calculation of child and adult standard liver volume for liver transplantation. *Hepatology* 1995; **21**: 1317–21.
18 Yoshizumi T, Taketomi A, Soejima Y *et al.* The beneficial role of simultaneous splenectomy in living donor liver transplantation in patients with small-for-size graft. *Transpl Int* 2008; **21**: 833–42.
19 Shirabe K, Taketomi A, Morita K *et al.* Comparative evaluation of expanded criteria for patients with hepatocellular carcinoma beyond the Milan criteria undergoing living-related donor liver transplantation. *Clin Transplant* 2011; **25**: E491–8.
20 Yao FY, Ferrell L, Bass NM *et al.* Liver transplantation for hepatocellular carcinoma: expansion of the tumor size limits does not adversely impact survival. *Hepatology* 2001; **33**: 1394–403.
21 Toso C, Trotter J, Wei A *et al.* Total tumor volume predicts risk of recurrence following liver transplantation in patients with hepatocellular carcinoma. *Liver Transpl* 2008; **14**: 1107–15.
22 Zheng SS, Xu X, Wu J *et al.* Liver transplantation for hepatocellular carcinoma: Hangzhou experiences. *Transplantation* 2008; **85**: 1726–32.
23 Bertuzzo VR, Cescon M, Ravaioli M *et al.* Analysis of factors affecting recurrence of hepatocellular carcinoma after liver transplantation with a special focus on inflammation markers. *Transplantation* 2011; **91**: 1279–85.
24 Mantovani A, Allavena P, Sica A, Balkwill F. Cancer-related inflammation. *Nature* 2008; **454**: 436–44.
25 Clavien PA, Lesurtel M, Bossuyt PM, Gores GJ, Langer B, Perrier A, OLT for HCC Consensus Group. Recommendations for liver transplantation for hepatocellular carcinoma: an international consensus conference report. *Lancet Oncol* 2012; **13**: e11–22.

Surg Today (2013) 43:769–776
DOI 10.1007/s00595-012-0449-5

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

One-step reconstruction of the right inferior hepatic veins using auto-venous grafts in living donor liver transplantation

Toru Ikegami · Ken Shirabe · Shohei Yoshiya · Yuji Soejima · Tomoharu Yoshizumi · Hideaki Uchiyama · Takeo Toshima · Takashi Motomura · Yoshihiko Maehara

Received: 5 March 2012 / Accepted: 17 May 2012 / Published online: 18 December 2012

Abstract
Purposes Reconstruction of the right inferior hepatic vein (RIHV) presents a major technical challenge in living donor liver transplantation (LDLT) using right lobe grafts.
Methods We studied 47 right lobe LDLT grafts with RIHV revascularization, comparing one-step reconstruction, performed post-May 2007 ($n = 16$), with direct anastomosis, performed pre-May 2007 ($n = 31$).
Results In the one-step reconstruction technique, the internal jugular vein ($n = 6$), explanted portal vein ($n = 5$), inferior vena cava ($n = 3$), and shunt vessels ($n = 2$) were used as venous patch grafts for unifying the right hepatic vein, RIHVs, and middle hepatic vein tributaries. By 6 months after LDLT, there was no case of occlusion of the reconstructed RIHVs in the one-step reconstruction group, but a cumulative occlusion rate of 18.2 % in the direct anastomosis group. One-step reconstruction required a longer cold ischemic time (182 ± 40 vs. 115 ± 63, $p < 0.001$) and these patients had higher alanine transaminase values (142 ± 79 vs. 96 ± 46 IU/L, $p = 0.024$) on postoperative day POD 7. However, the 6-month short-term graft survival rates were 100 % with one-step reconstruction and 83.9 % with direct anastomosis, respectively.
Conclusion One-step reconstruction of the RIHVs using auto-venous grafts is an easy and feasible technique promoting successful right lobe LDLT.

T. Ikegami (✉) · K. Shirabe · S. Yoshiya · Y. Soejima · T. Yoshizumi · H. Uchiyama · T. Toshima · T. Motomura · Y. Maehara
Department of Surgery and Science, Graduate School of Medical Sciences, Kyushu University, 812-8582 Fukuoka, Japan
e-mail: tikesurg@yahoo.co.jp

Keywords Living donor liver transplantation · Short hepatic vein · Right inferior hepatic vein · Right lobe · Venous reconstruction

Abbreviations

ALT	Alanine transaminase
AST	Aspartate aminotransferase
EPV	Explanted portal vein
GV	Graft volume
IJV	Internal jugular vein
IVC	Inferior vena cava
LDLT	Living donor liver transplantation
MELD	Model for end-stage liver disease
MHV	Middle hepatic vein
POD	Postoperative day
PT-INR	Prothrombin time international normalized ratio
RHV	Right hepatic vein
RIHV	Right inferior hepatic vein
SLV	Standard liver volume
V5	Segment 5 vein
V8	Segment 8 vein

Introduction

One of the major technical concerns in right lobe living donor liver transplantation (LDLT) is the complexity of the vessels, which need to be revascularized [1, 2]. Specifically, the venous systems in procured right lobe grafts may include several vessels such as the middle hepatic vein (MHV) tributaries and the right inferior hepatic veins (RIHVs). Revascularization of these outflow vessels is imperative for a fully functional right lobe graft, which affords vigorous portal inflows in a LDLT recipient with end-stage liver disease [3–5].

There are two options for reconstructing the MHV tributaries: one technique uses an extended right lobe graft, including the MHV trunk [5]; and the other uses interposition grafts [6]. We described previously how we used the explanted portal vein (EPV) for this purpose [7], but techniques for reconstructing the RIHV are not as well documented. Since 2007, we have been practicing the one-step reconstruction technique exclusively, unifying all the RIHVs with the interposed MHV tributaries and right hepatic vein (RHV) using auto-venous grafts [8]. In this technique, RIHVs are never connected to the inferior vena cava (IVC) separately, but are unified with other outflow vessels and connected with the IVC at the same time. Our technique differs from the conventional one, anastomosing graft RIHVs directly with the IVC.

This article reviews the outcomes of reconstructed RIHVs using the one-step reconstruction technique with an auto-venous graft in right lobe LDLT.

Materials and methods

Patients

Between July 1998 and October 2011, 125 LDLTs using right lobe grafts were performed at Kyushu University Hospital. Among these 125 recipients, 47 (37.6 %) required reconstruction of the RIHVs, whereas 78 (62.4 %) did not. Before May 2007, the RIHVs in the grafts were directly anastomosed ($n = 31$) to the IVC in situ; however, after May 2007, the RIHVs were connected to other outflow veins, including the RHV and the interposed graft from the MHV tributaries, using a patch-shaped venous graft ($n = 16$). All the LDLTs were performed after obtaining full informed patient consent and approval by the Liver Transplantation Committee of Kyushu University.

Graft selection

Grafts were selected as previously described [9]. Left lobe grafts were considered as the primary graft type if the desired GV/SLV was >35 %, whereas right lobe grafts were considered if the simulated GV/SLV of the left lobe graft was <35 % and the donor's remnant liver volume was >35 %. Before May 2007, the RIHVs or MHV tributaries were reconstructed if the estimated corresponding congested volume was >25 % or the deducted congested volume from the GV was <40 %. After May 2007, the indication for reconstruction of the RIHVs and MHV tributaries became more simplified: those with a congested volume >10 % of the GV or a size >5 mm were considered for reconstruction.

Donor surgery

In order to prevent biliary complications, donor hilar dissection was performed only at the corresponding first Glissonean branch [10] and donor parenchymal transection was performed using the Cavitron Ultrasonic Surgical Aspirator (CUSA™, Valleylab Inc., Boulder, CO). The significant RIHV and MHV tributaries were double-clamped with large clips and divided. After donor hepatectomy, the graft was perfused, weighed, and stored in University of Wisconsin solution (Viaspan™, DuPont Inc., Wilmington, DE).

Bench surgery and recipient surgery

In order to procure the IJV, a collar or oblique incision was made in the neck and the sternocleidomastoid muscle was retracted laterally. The overlying omohyoid muscle was divided to expose the IJV, which was isolated with vessel tape and dissected from the surrounding tissue, down to the level of its junction with the subclavian vein. To avoid injuring the branches of the facial nerve, cranical dissection was never performed above the level of the angle of the mandible. The procured IJV, usually 7–9 cm in length, was placed in heparinized saline for the bench surgery.

The hilar portal vein was procured from the explanted liver, as previously described [8]. If available, a shunt vessel of appropriate length and caliber was also procured. This type of suitable shunt vessel is usually available in patients with portal vein thrombosis [11], providing two auto-vein grafts for the bench surgery. We recently began reserving the IJV graft for interposing the MHV tributaries and other venous grafts for the patch graft to unify the orifices of the outflow veins. Next, the MHV tributary was anastomosed to the interposition graft using continuous 7-0 Prolene™ sutures (Ethicon Inc, Somerville, NJ), taking care to prevent stenosis. The venous orifices, including the RHV, RIHVs, and the interposed venous graft for the MHV tributaries, were connected together using continuous 6-0 Prolene™ sutures. To make the in situ anastomosis easier, a cuff might be attached around the RHV.

Recipient surgery

A right lobe graft with a large, unified venous orifice was implanted into the recipient, after dividing the bridge between the hepatic veins by creating a longitudinal incision in the anterior wall of the IVC [8]. The venous anastomoses were all performed using 5-0 continuous PDS-II™ sutures (Ethicone Inc, Somerville, NJ). After reconstruction of the portal vein with continuous 6-0 PDS-II™ sutures, the liver graft was reperfused. Arterial reconstruction was then performed under microscopy with interrupted 8-0 Prolene™ sutures.

Evaluation of the patency of the grafts

Follow-up computed tomography (CT) scans with intravenous contrast were taken 1 week, 1 month, 3 months, 6 months, and yearly after the LDLT. CT scans after abnormal liver function test results were also performed as necessary. Non-visualized RIHVs or parenchyma that was poorly enhanced by intravenous contrast were judged to be occlusions.

Statistical analysis

Values are expressed as mean ± SD. Variables were analyzed using the χ^2 tests for categorical values or the Mann–Whitney's test for continuous variables. Cumulative survival analyses were calculated using the Kaplan–Meier method. A P value < 0.05 was considered significant.

Results

Donor and recipient data

Forty-seven patients underwent reconstruction of the RIHVs during right lobe LDLT. All of the right lobe grafts were modified right lobe grafts that did not include the main middle hepatic vein (Table 1). The donors comprised 20 men and 27 women, with a mean age of 37.9 ± 10.8 years. The mean operation time was 448 ± 53 min and the mean blood loss was 421 ± 194 ml. The mean graft volume was 571 ± 60 ml and the mean graft volume (GV)/standard liver volume (SLV) was 46.9 ± 4.9 %. The grafts with one-step reconstruction of the RIHVs ($n = 16$) had less GV/SLV than those ($n = 31$) with direct anastomosis (43.6 ± 3.8 vs. 48.7 ± 6.9, $p = 0.010$).

The recipients comprised 28 men and 19 women, with a mean age of 49.6 ± 8.4 years. The causes of liver disease were acute liver failure ($n = 2$), cholestatic liver diseases ($n = 9$), post-necrotic liver cirrhosis ($n = 35$), and others ($n = 1$). Twenty of these patients had hepatocellular carcinoma. The mean model for the end-stage liver disease score was 17.2 ± 4.2. The mean operative time was 939 ± 149 min, the mean blood loss during surgery was 6.7 ± 4.0 L, and the mean cold and warm ischemic times were 136 ± 51 and 51 ± 8 min, respectively. The grafts with one-step reconstruction of the RIHVs ($n = 16$) were subjected to longer cold ischemic time than those ($n = 31$) with direct anastomosis (182 ± 40 vs. 115 ± 63, $p < 0.001$).

Table 1 Patient characteristics

	One-step reconstruction ($n = 16$)	Direct anastomosis ($n = 31$)	p value
Donor			
Age (year)	37.6 ± 12.6	38.1 ± 11.7	0.892
Gender, male	6 (37.5)	14 (45.2)	0.614
Operative time (min)	448 ± 93	449 ± 49	0.923
Blood loss (ml)	363 ± 163	452 ± 386	0.385
Graft			
GV (g)	542 ± 54	586 ± 83	0.063
GV/SLV (%)	43.6 ± 3.8	48.7 ± 6.9	0.010
RIHV			
Size (mm)	12.7 ± 3.2	12.3 ± 4.9	0.781
Number >2	4 (25.0)	8 (26.7)	0.943
Recipient			
Age (year)	48.4 ± 12.6	50.2 ± 11.2	0.615
Gender, male	11 (68.7)	17 (54.8)	0.357
MELD score	18.2 ± 5.6	16.8 ± 5.7	0.456
Acute liver failure	1 (6.3)	1 (3.3)	0.916
Recipient surgery			
Operative time (min)	902 ± 171	997 ± 211	0.105
Blood loss (L)	4.7 ± 2.9	7.7 ± 4.6	0.035
Cold ischemic time (min)	182 ± 40	115 ± 63	<0.001
Warm ischemic time (min)	50 ± 13	52 ± 7	0.304

GV graft volume, *MELD* model for end-stage liver disease, *RIHV* right inferior hepatic vein, *SLV* standard liver volume

Venous grafts used for the one-step reconstruction technique

The venous grafts used for one-step reconstruction of the RIHVs and the MHV tributaries are summarized in Table 2. The auto-venous patch grafts for RIHVs included the EPV ($n = 4$), internal jugular vein (IJV, $n = 6$), shunt vessels ($n = 2$), IVC ($n = 3$) and saphenous vein ($n = 1$). The shunt vessels available for this purpose included the umbilical vein ($n = 1$) and ovarian vein ($n = 1$).

Figure 1 illustrates a one-step reconstruction of the RIHVs and MHV tributaries of a right lobe LDLT graft. Preoperative three-dimensional venous images obtained by thin-slice computed tomography (CT) showed that the graft had two RIHVs and two MHV tributaries. The dilated ovarian vein was procured and used for interposing the MHV tributaries and the IJV was opened and used for a patch graft to unify the venous orifices. The patency of the RIHVs and the MHV tributaries was confirmed on an enhanced CT scan performed 5 months after LDLT.

The IVC was used as an auto-venous patch graft in three patients. In two patients, the anterior wall of the recipient's hepatic IVC was procured under clamping of the supra- and infra-hepatic IVC and on veno-venous bypass. The

Table 2 The vascular grafts used for one-step reconstruction of the right inferior hepatic veins with or without middle hepatic vein tributaries

Patch graft for RIHV	Interposition graft for MHV tributaries	*N*	Comments
EPV	IJV	3	
	EPV	1	
IJV	IJV	2	
	EPV	3	
	Shunt vessels	1	Ovarian vein ($n = 1$)
Shunt vessels	EPV	2	Umbilical vein ($n = 1$)
			Ovarian vein ($n = 1$)
IVC	EPV	3	Anterior IVC wall ($n = 1$)
			Full IVC ($n = 2$)
Others	EPV	1	Saphenous vein

EPV explanted portal vein, *IJV* internal jugular vein, *IVC* inferior vena cava, *MHV* middle hepatic vein, *RIHV* right inferior hepatic vein

procured auto-IVC was sutured with the venous orifices of the liver graft on the back-table and the graft with completed venoplasty was implanted in situ. In one patient, the total hepatic IVC was procured from the recipient and sutured with the veins of the right lobe graft, followed by implantation.

Liver function tests after LDLT

The changes in liver function test results, including aspartate aminotransferase (AST), alanine transaminase (ALT), prothrombin time international normalized ratio (PT-INR) and total bilirubin, were compared between the 16 patients who underwent one-step reconstruction and the 31 patients who underwent direct anastomosis (Fig. 2). The AST, PT-INR, and total bilirubin values did not differ significantly at any time; however, the ALT values were increased significantly in the patients with one-step venous reconstruction (142 ± 79 vs. 96 ± 46 IU/L, $p = 0.024$) on postoperative day (POD) 7.

Patency of the reconstructed RIHVs

Follow-up CT scans showed no obstructed RIHVs in the one-step reconstruction group, but five in the direct anastomosis group. The mean time from LDLT to the occlusion was 21 ± 12 days (7, 9, 19, 22, 50 days). Daily ultrasound detected an occluded RIHV in three (60 %) of five patients. Because four patients with occlusions presented minor clinical signs including increased ascites, neither stenting nor revision was performed. Only one patient died, of drastic circulatory collapse 12 h after detection of the occluded RIHV, so active treatment could not be performed. The 6-month occlusion rate of RIHVs in the one-step reconstruction group and the direct anastomosis group was 0 versus 18.2 %, respectively (Fig. 3).

Graft survival

The 3- and 6-month graft survival rates for grafts with one-step reconstruction and those with direct reconstruction were 100 and 100 % vs. 87.1 and 83.9 %, respectively. Among the five patients with grafts associated with early mortality in the direct anastomosis group ($n = 31$), only one died with graft dysfunction caused by an obstructed RIHV. Other causes of mortality included occluded MHV tributaries ($n = 1$) and graft dysfunction due to a small graft size ($n = 1$), and sepsis ($n = 2$). These patients all had patent RIHVs.

Discussion

The optimal technique for creating hepatic venous outflow in right lobe LDLT remains elusive. Right lobe grafts, especially modified right lobes without the main MHV, frequently have multiple venous orifices to be reconstructed, including the main RHV, MHV tributaries, and the RIHVs [2–4]. Although several reports focus on the technical refinements devised to resolve the issues of the MHV tributaries, little attention has been paid to the reconstruction of the RIHVs; thus, direct anastomosis of the RIHV to the IVC has remained the standard procedure. However, direct anastomosis is difficult because the in situ anastomosis of the small RIHV is usually performed in a deep, narrow and often bloody surgical field [7]. Moreover, it requires adjustments to the exact length, size, and orientation of the vessels, considering the changes resulting from graft regeneration.

Since 2007, we have used a one-step reconstruction technique for such cases [8]. This technique involves joining all of the venous orifices together in and around a large square venous patch graft. The most useful feature of this one-step technique is the ease of the in situ veno-venous anastomosis, with no kinking or malalignment of the RIHVs [8]. The complex quilting creates a wide unified venous orifice that needs to be completed during the cold phase. In the present series, although the cold ischemic time was longer and the ALT was higher in the patients who received grafts with the one-step reconstruction technique than in those who underwent the direct anastomosis, there was no significant difference in short-term graft outcomes. The one-step reconstruction technique resulted in a 100 % patency rate of the revascularized



Fig. 1 Preoperative three-dimensional venous images showed two right inferior hepatic veins (*RIHVs*) and two middle hepatic vein (*MHV*) tributaries in the graft (**a**). The dilated ovarian vein was used for interposing the segment 5 vein (*V5*) and the segment 8 vein (*V8*), and the internal jugular vein (IJV) was used for a patch graft to unify the venous orifices (**b**). The patency of the RIHVs was confirmed by computed tomography (**c**, **d**). *PT-INR* prothrombin time international normalized ratio, *RHV* right hepatic vein

RIHVs and a 100 % short-term graft survival rate, which could be attributed to the ease of the one-step technique for creating a fine and wide venous anastomosis in a large surgical field.

Several other techniques for RIHV reconstruction without direct anastomosis have been reported. Sugawara et al. [6] proposed double IVC techniques, in which the venous orifices of a right lobe graft are anastomosed in a cryopreserved IVC procured from a deceased donor and then the newly created pouch-shaped cava is anastomosed side-to-side to the recipient's native IVC. Although in situ anastomosis is easy in the double IVC technique, the regenerating graft might compress the reservoir-like pouch, causing outflow insufficiency under the long slit-shaped anastomosis. Moreover, there seems to be no evidence of forming a reservoir. Yaprak et al. [12] recently described using a cryopreserved aortic patch for a similar purpose. The non-tubular shape of the aortic patch with its durable properties would be more appropriate; however, the availability of aortic grafts without atherosclerosis might be limited. Furthermore, we cannot exclude the possible transmission of uncommon pathogens when these cryopreserved vascular grafts are used [13]. Hwang et al. [14] recently reported how the funnel-shaped procurement of RIHVs with its accurate anastomosis to the recipient's IVC, under extensive IVC dissection, was the key for directly reconstructing the RIHVs, resulting in a RIHV stenosis rate as low as 2.9 %. Although the stenosis rate in their series is low, the difficulties of in situ anastomosis of the RIHVs in a restricted surgical field make us reluctant to use their techniques. We used EPV and shunt vessels as auto-venous grafts. Shunt vessels that can be used as venous grafts are usually limited to a large paraumbilical vein or large meso-systemic shunts including a dilated ovarian vein or a dilated inferior mesenteric vein [15, 16]. These veins have the properties of a straight shape and a large diameter without branches. Other shunt vessels, including the splenorenal shunt, gastrorenal shunt and gastroparaesophageal shunt are not suitable for venous grafts. EPV usually offers a larger caliber with a thick wall



Fig. 2 Chronological changes in the liver function tests in the direct anastomosis group ($n = 31$) versus the one-step reconstruction group ($n = 16$). *ALT* alanine transaminase, *AST* aspartate aminotransferase, *POD* postoperative day, *PT-INR* prothrombin time international normalized ratio



Fig. 3 Patency rate of the reconstructed right inferior hepatic veins (RIHVs) after direct anastomosis ($n = 31$) versus one-step reconstruction ($n = 16$)

and considerable length, making it a venous graft that is easy to handle [7]. However, it is not available in patients with portal vein thrombosis or hilar hepatocellular carcinomas. Recently, we used the IJV exclusively as a venous graft. The IJV has a large caliber of approximately 1 cm and sufficient length of up to 7–9 cm. In the field of liver transplantation, the IJV was first used as a jump portal venous graft in pediatric patients with extrahepatic portal venous obstruction [17]. Because the IJV usually has a healthy venous wall, it is suitable for fine anastomosis. The only technical concern is not to dissect into the cranial side over the mandible, to avoid facial nerve damage [18]. Therefore, we now prefer to use the IJV for reconstructing fine MHV tributaries. The current institutional guidelines for the selection of auto-venous grafts are summarized in Fig. 4. The most common combination is the IJV and EPV. If the EPV is not available, usable shunt vessels are sought and if neither the EPV nor shunt vessels are available, auto-IVC is used for reconstructing RIHVs.

One of the main limitations of this study is that the learning curve is unaccounted for. Knowledge gained not only in surgical techniques but also in post-transplant care could explain the better outcomes in the one-step reconstruction group. In fact, operative blood loss and acute rejection (data not shown) were significantly reduced in the one-step reconstruction group. The other limitation of this study is that no stenting was performed for the occluded vessels, although no occlusion was observed in the



Fig. 4 Current institutional guidelines for reconstructing right inferior hepatic veins (*RIHVs*). *IVC* inferior vena cava, *IJV* internal jugular vein, *MHV* middle hepatic vein, *RHV* right hepatic vein

one-step reconstruction group. As Hwang et al. [14] reported aggressive stenting for reconstructed RIHVs should be performed by an experienced radiologist to optimize graft outflow.

In conclusion, we consider that one-step reconstruction of the accessory hepatic veins, including the RIHVs, using auto-venous grafts, including IJV, EPV or major shunt vessels, is feasible and effective in right lobe LDLT.

Conflict of interest No source of support was received for this work. No financial or other conflict of interest exists with the authors (Ikegami et al.).

References

1. Marcos A, Ham JM, Fisher RA, Olzinski AT, Posner MP. Surgical management of anatomical variations of the right lobe in living donor liver transplantation. Ann Surg. 2000;231:824–31.
2. Ikegami T, Shimada M, Imura S, Arakawa Y, Nii A, Morine Y, Kanemura H. Current concept of small-for-size grafts in living donor liver transplantation. Surg Today. 2008;38:971–82.
3. Kasahara M, Takada Y, Fujimoto Y, Ogura Y, Ogawa K, Uryuhara K, et al. Impact of right lobe with middle hepatic vein graft in living-donor liver transplantation. Am J Transplant. 2005;5:1339–46.
4. Gyu Lee S, Min Park K, Hwang S, Hun Kim K, Nak Choi D, Hyung Joo S, et al. Modified right liver graft from a living donor to prevent congestion. Transplantation. 2002;74:54–9.
5. Raut V, Uemoto S. Management of ABO-incompatible living-donor liver transplantation: past and present trends. Surg Today. 2011;41:317–22.
6. Sugawara Y, Makuuchi M, Sano K, Imamura H, Kaneko J, Ohkubo T, et al. Vein reconstruction in modified right liver graft for living donor liver transplantation. Ann Surg. 2003;237:180–5.
7. Ikegami T, Soejima Y, Taketomi A, Yoshizumi T, Harada N, Uchiyama H, et al. Explanted portal vein grafts for middle hepatic vein tributaries in living-donor liver transplantation. Transplantation. 2007;84:836–41.
8. Soejima Y, Ueda N, Fukuhara T, Yoshizumi T, Ikegami T, Yamashita Y, et al. One-step venous reconstruction for a right lobe graft with multiple venous orifices in living donor liver transplantation. Liver Transpl. 2008;14:706–8.
9. Yonemura Y, Taketomi A, Soejima Y, Yoshizumi T, Uchiyama H, et al. Validity of preoperative volumetric analysis of congestion volume in living donor liver transplantation using three-dimensional computed tomography. Liver Transpl. 2005;11:1556–62.
10. Taketomi A, Morita K, Toshima T, Takeishi K, Kayashima H, Ninomiya M, et al. Living donor hepatectomies with procedures to prevent biliary complications. J Am Coll Surg. 2010;211:456–64.
11. Ikegami T, Soejima Y, Nagata S, Taketomi A, Maehara Y. The use of autologous vena cava patch graft for reconstructing multiple outflow orifices in right hemiliver living donor graft. Transpl Int. 2009;22:853–5.
12. Yaprak O, Balci NC, Dayangac M, Demirbas T, Guler N, Ulusoy L, et al. Cryopreserved aortic quilt plasty for one-step reconstruction of multiple hepatic venous drainage in right lobe living donor liver transplantation. Transpl Proc. 2011;43:2817–9.
13. Srinivasan A, Burton EC, Kuehnert MJ, Rupprecht C, Sutker WL, Ksiazek TG, et al. Transmission of rabies virus from an organ donor to four transplant recipients. N Engl J Med. 2005;352:1103–11.
14. Hwang S, Ha TY, Ahn CS, Moon DB, Kim KH, Song GW, et al. Reconstruction of inferior right hepatic veins in living donor liver transplantation using right liver grafts. Liver Transpl. 2012;18:238–47.
15. Ikegami T, Soejima Y, Taketomi A, Kayashima H, Maehara Y. Meso-systemic shunt for middle hepatic vein reconstruction in right lobe living donor liver transplantation. Transpl Int. 2008;21:94–5.
16. Soejima Y, Shimada M, Suehiro T, Yoshizumi T, Kishikawa K, Maehara Y. Reconstruction of the middle hepatic vein tributaries

using the recipient's recanalized umbilical vein in right-lobe living-donor liver transplantation. Surgery. 2006;139:442–5.
17. de Ville de Goyet J, Gibbs P, Clapuyt P, Reding R, Sokal EM, Otte JB. Original extrahilar approach for hepatic portal revascularization and relief of extrahepatic portal hypertension related to later portal vein thrombosis after pediatric liver transplantation. Long term results. Transplantation. 1996;62:71–5.
18. Swift TR. Involvement of peripheral nerves in radical neck dissection. Am J Surg. 1970;119:694–8.

Case Reports in Gastroenterology

Case Rep Gastroenterol 2013;7:299–303

DOI: 10.1159/000354140
Published online: July 18, 2013

1662–0631/13/0072–0299$38.00/0
www.karger.com/crg

Feasible Isolated Liver Transplantation for a Cirrhotic Patient on Chronic Hemodialysis

Kazutoyo Morita Ken Shirabe Tomoharu Yoshizumi Toru Ikegami Toshiro Masuda Naotaka Hashimoto Yohei Mano Tatsunori Miyata Yuji Soejima Yoshihiko Maehara

Department of Surgery and Science, Graduate School of Medical Sciences, Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan

Key Words
Living donor liver transplantation · Hepatitis C · Hemodialysis

Abstract
End-stage liver and kidney disease (ELKD) is an indication for deceased donor simultaneous liver-kidney transplantation. Although a few cases of living donor liver-kidney transplantation have been reported, the invasiveness remains to be discussed. Living donor liver transplantation (LDLT) is an alternative choice for ELKD, but has never been reported. Here, we report a case of successful LDLT for a patient with ELKD on hemodialysis. The patient was a 63-year-old male and had decompensated hepatitis C cirrhosis with seronegativity for hepatitis C virus. He had non-diabetic end-stage renal failure and had been on hemodialysis for 3 years. He was in good general condition except for hepatic and renal failure. The living donor was his 58-year-old healthy wife. A right lobe graft was transplanted to the recipient under continuous hemodiafiltration (CHDF) and extracorporeal veno-venous bypass. CHDF was continued until postoperative day 4, at which point CHDF was converted to hemodialysis. His posttransplant course was good and he was discharged on postoperative day 36. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first report of LDLT for a patient on chronic hemodialysis. Therefore, being on hemodialysis is not a contraindication for LDLT. LDLT is feasible for a patient with ELKD on hemodialysis.

Kazutoyo Morita, MD
Department of Surgery and Science
Graduate School of Medical Sciences, Kyushu University
3-1-1 Maidashi, Higashi-ku, Fukuoka 812-8582 (Japan)
E-Mail kamorita@surg2.med.kyushu-u.ac.jp

KARGER

Introduction

Peritransplant renal failure is an indicator of poor prognosis after liver transplantation [1–4]. End-stage liver and kidney disease (ELKD) on hemodialysis is an indication for deceased donor simultaneous liver-kidney transplantation (LKT) [4, 5]. On the other hand, living donation of liver and a kidney is generally too challenging and invasive to be performed, and only a few cases of living donor simultaneous or sequential LKT for ELKD have been reported [6–10]. In living donor transplantation settings, the safer alternative approach is living donor liver transplantation (LDLT) and continuation of hemodialysis. However, LDLT for a patient on hemodialysis has never been reported, and thus the indications for LDLT in such patients are also unknown.

Here we present a case of successful LDLT for a patient with ELKD on hemodialysis. The indications for LDLT in patients on hemodialysis are presented and discussed.

Case Report

The recipient was a 63-year-old Japanese male who had been suffering from hepatitis C cirrhosis since the age of 37 years. He had undergone endoscopic variceal ligation for esophageal varices at the age of 58 years. His liver function had gradually become decompensated and he had developed hepatic encephalopathy 5 months before admission. He had had cryptogenic chronic nephritis from the age of 19 years and started hemodialysis at the age of 60 years. He had no other complications such as diabetes, hypertension or hemodialysis-related complications. His height was 159 cm and his weight was 53 kg before hemodialysis and 51 kg after hemodialysis. His Child-Pugh score was 10 (grade C) with a total bilirubin level of 0.9 mg/dl, an albumin level of 3.4 g/dl and a prothrombin time of 68% (international ratio 1.25). He was seropositive for hepatitis C virus (HCV) antibodies but seronegative for HCV RNA. The levels of blood urea nitrogen and creatinine were 61 and 9.01 mg/dl, respectively. His model for end-stage liver disease score was 22. A computed tomography scan revealed the presence of liver cirrhosis, splenomegaly and developed collateral vessels such as splenorenal shunt, recanalized paraumbilical vein and gastric varices. No definite hepatocellular carcinomas were detected (fig. 1a). The bilateral kidneys were very atrophic, which was consistent with irreversible renal failure (fig. 1b). In summary, he had decompensated hepatitis C cirrhosis without serum HCV RNA. He had non-diabetic renal failure after 3 years on hemodialysis. He showed good general function except for the liver and kidney failure. Therefore, the patient was expected to have a good prognosis after LDLT.

The donor was his healthy 58-year-old wife with identical blood type to the recipient. The right lobe graft was procured using a typical method described elsewhere [1, 11–14]. The actual graft weight was 546 g, which accounted for 50.4% of the recipient's standard liver volume.

In the recipient, intraoperative continuous hemodiafiltration (CHDF) without water removal was started immediately via the right femoral vein after laparotomy. The CHDF provided a stable acid-base and electrolyte balance. A total hepatectomy and implantation were performed under stable hemodynamics using an extracorporeal veno-venous bypass. The V5, right inferior hepatic vein and right hepatic vein of the right lobe graft were reconstructed to have a co-orifice using the left internal jugular vein and explanted portal vein grafts of the recipient at the backtable according to our usual method [15, 16]. Operative time was 14 h 22 min. The anhepatic, cold ischemic and warm ischemic times were 140, 169

and 65 min, respectively. The blood loss was 2,000 g, for which 10 units of red cell concentrate, 10 units of fresh-frozen plasma and 30 units of platelet concentrate were transfused.

The postoperative courses of the recipient and the donor were uneventful. CHDF was continued until postoperative day 4, at which point CHDF was converted to hemodialysis. The amount of water removal was appropriately adjusted according to blood pressure, central venous pressure and body weight. The drained ascites was below 500 ml/day and all abdominal drains were removed by postoperative day 6 except for the biliary stents (table 1). Other than the renal replacement therapy and dose modulation of renal excretory drugs such as acyclovir, the perioperative management of the recipient was typical, as previously described [1, 11–14]. Immunosuppression was induced with intravenous methylprednisolone and then switched to oral prednisolone, cyclosporin A and mycophenolate mofetil. He left the intensive care unit on postoperative day 5 and was discharged on postoperative day 36 with good hepatic function.

Discussion

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first report of LDLT for a patient on chronic hemodialysis. Deceased donor LKT is a standard therapy for ELKD [4, 5]. The posttransplant 2-year survival rates are 75.9% for deceased donor LKT and 70.8% for deceased donor isolated liver transplantation for ELKD on hemodialysis [5]. On the other hand, living donor LKT is invasive for the donor and is not established. An alternative strategy is LDLT and continuation of hemodialysis. However, LDLT for a patient on hemodialysis is potentially risky, and most surgeons hesitate to perform the procedure. In fact, LDLT for a patient on hemodialysis has never been reported, and thus the indications are unknown.

In the present case, there were three indications for LDLT. First, the patient was seronegative for HCV RNA. Undetectable serum HCV RNA before liver transplantation has been shown to decrease the rate of posttransplant disease recurrence [17, 18]. Nudo et al. [18] reported that patients with sustained viral response for interferon therapy, as determined by a sensitive assay (lower limit <600 IU/ml), had no virological recurrence, histological recurrence or graft failure. The present patient was determined to be seronegative for HCV RNA by an even more sensitive assay (lower limit <15 IU/ml). Therefore, he was expected to have a good prognosis without hepatitis C recurrence after LDLT. Second, the etiology for the renal failure was non-diabetic. Non-diabetic patients on hemodialysis show much better survival rates than diabetic patients on hemodialysis [19]. Third, the patient had only been on hemodialysis for 3 years and had no other complications. He had good general functions including cardiac and pulmonary functions. Taking these three factors into consideration, LDLT was indicated for this patient.

Simultaneous or sequential LKT from the donor was not indicated for two reasons. First, liver-kidney donation from a single donor has not been established and is very invasive, especially for the relatively old donor in this case (58 years of age). Second, the recipient was expected to continue hemodialysis because he had only been on hemodialysis for 3 years.

The intraoperative and postoperative points were use of CHDF, care of in-out balance and drug dose modulation. CHDF was very useful as a peritransplant renal replacement therapy with stable hemodynamics. The other managements did not need to be specialized.

In conclusion, to the best of our knowledge, this is the first report of LDLT for a patient on chronic hemodialysis. Being on hemodialysis is no contraindication for LDLT. Isolated LDLT is a feasible option for a patient with ELKD on hemodialysis.