

Kosin Medical Journal 2022;37(4):261-263 pISSN: 2005-9531 • eISSN: 2586-7024 https://doi.org/10.7180/kmj.22.143



Which endoscopic treatment is effective for the treatment of benign esophageal stricture: balloon or incision?

Kyoungwon Jung

Department of Internal Medicine, Kosin University College of Medicine, Busan, Korea

See "Comparison of the efficacy and complications of endoscopic incisional therapy and balloon dilatation for benign esophageal strictures" by Eun Jeong Choi, Sam Ryong Jee, Sang Heon Lee, Ji Hyun Kim, Jun Sik Yoon, Jae Hyuk Heo, Seung Jung Yu, Hee Won Baek, Hong Sub Lee.

Benign esophageal stricture is a disease that occurs due to various causes [1]. First, it can occur as a complication of various inflammatory or infectious diseases such as gastroesophageal reflux disease, eosinophilic esophagitis, viral esophagitis, necrotizing esophagitis, Crohn's disease, or Behcet's disease. In addition, there are potential anastomosis site strictures after surgery for esophageal or gastric cancer, esophageal stricture after endoscopic resection of huge superficial esophageal cancer, and esophageal stricture after radiation therapy for esophageal, mediastinum, and lung cancers. It can occur as a late complication of various caustic injuries and, although rare, congenital, or developmental stricture of the esophagus [1]. Not all esophageal strictures cause symptoms, and symptoms such as dysphagia usually accompany when more than 50% of the esophageal lumen is narrowed [2]. Subsequently, dysphagia can lead to additional complications such as malnutrition, weight loss, and aspiration pneumonia in the long-term [3].

The classical treatment methods for benign esophageal stricture are radiologically guided balloon dilatation and dilatation using a bougie dilator. However, these methods have a high recurrence rate, and complications of perforation may occur upon repetitive treatments [4]. Due to the development of endoscopic accessories that can pass through an endoscope channel, many endoscopic treatments for esophageal stricture have recently been introduced [1]. Endoscopic balloon dilatation, which is widely performed, has the advantage that the degree of balloon inflation and mucosal laceration can be determined through an endoscope, and the presence of perforation can be directly confirmed. It is also common to schedule esophageal dilatation to gradually increase the size over a period of time (sessional dilatation) [5]. In addition, a method of injecting a steroid or mitomycin C into the surrounding area after balloon dilatation is also used [6,7].

Recently, with the advent of endoscopic resection of gastrointestinal tumors, various endoscopic treatment devices have been developed. Among them, a method of treating strictures using an endoscopic knife has been attempted. This endoscopic incisional therapy is a method of directly viewing the stricture site with an endoscope and making an incision in three to four areas to widen the stenosis [8]. This method is known to be particularly effective when the length of the stricture is about 1 to 2 cm. It was first applied

Received: November 28, 2022; Revised: December 7, 2022; Accepted: December 12, 2022 Corresponding Author: Kyoungwon Jung, MD, PhD

Department of Internal Medicine, Kosin University College of Medicine, 262 Gamcheon-ro, Seo-gu, Busan 49267, Korea Tel: +82-51-990-6103 Fax: +82-51-990-5055 E-mail: forjkw@gmail.com

^{© 2022} Kosin University College of Medicine

⁽⁽ⁱ⁾ This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

as a treatment for the Schatzki ring and later reported to be effective for esophageal stricture at the anastomosis site after surgery [9]. In particular, it has been reported that the risk of perforation is relatively low compared to balloon dilatation, because the procedure progresses while directly checking the extent of the incision [8]. Furthermore, additional balloon dilatation after endoscopic incisional therapy has been attempted as a method to prevent long-term restenosis [10].

In addition, stent implantation, which was mainly used for malignant esophageal stricture, is also performed [11]. The rationale for stent implantation in benign esophageal stenosis is that if an expanded stent is in place for a sufficient period of time, the inflammatory process at the stenosis site can be relieved and remodeled, resulting in continuous resolution of the stenosis [12]. However, there is a risk of bleeding, fistula, and perforation that occur after stent removal, and there is a risk of stent migration in the case of a fully covered metal stent. Therefore, the use of a stent is limited to refractory esophageal strictures that do not respond to other balloon or incisional therapies [11].

In this issue of *Kosin Medical Journal*, Choi et al. [13] compared balloon dilatation (n=16) versus endoscopic incisional therapy (n=14) in 30 patients with benign esophageal stricture. The degree of stricture was evaluated using the diameter of the endoscope, and the degree of dysphagia was evaluated based on functional oral intake scale. When comparing the two methods, although there was no statistical difference due to the small sample size, both the clinical failure and the occurrence of restenosis were high-

er in the balloon dilatation group. In addition, when comparing the group that performed balloon dilatation alone (n=13) and the group that performed endoscopic incisional therapy at least once (n=17), a difference in treatment effect was clearly shown at 69.2% versus 100% (p=0.026). In terms of complications, perforation was seen in one case in balloon dilatation, but no perforation case was seen in endoscopic incisional therapy. Therefore, when comparing the group of patients who received at least one incisional treatment with the group of patients who only received balloon dilatation, the dysphagia symptom significantly improved in the group that received incisional treatment, suggesting that incisional treatment is a safe and helpful method for improving symptoms. However, this study is a retrospective study with a small number of patients, and there is a limitation in that there is a difference in the cause of stricture between the two groups.

As in this study, the results of studies that performed endoscopic incisional therapy were summarized (Table 1) [14-20]. With the development of therapeutic endoscopic instruments, the endoscopic incisional therapy for benign esophageal stricture is being recommended as a safe and effective method, and is used as a preferential treatment especially when the length of esophageal stricture is as short as 1 to 2 cm. However, in the future, large-scale studies are needed to identify effective causative disease groups, standardized methods, effects of combination therapy with balloon dilatation or drug injection therapy, and long-term effects for endoscopic incision therapy of benign esophageal strictures.

Table 1. Previous study results of endoscopic incisional therapy for benign esophageal stricture

	1 17	5 1 5				
No. of patients	Reason of stricture	Refractory or treatment naive	Technical success rate	Clinical success rate	Major complication	Restenosis rate
24	Postoperative anastomosis site	Naive	100 (24/24)	87.5 (21/24)	0	12.5 (3/24)
31	Postoperative anastomosis site	Naive	96.8 (30/31)	80.6 (25/31)	NA	NA
32	Postoperative anastomosis site	Refractory	100 (32/32)	61.9 (13/21) ^{a)}	2 Perforations	NA
22	Postoperative anastomosis site	Naive	NA	95.5 (21/22)	NA	63.6 (14/22)
9	Postoperative anastomosis site	Naive	100 (9/9)	100 (9/9)	0	0
101	Postoperative anastomosis site	Naive	98 (99/101)	NA	2 Perforations, 1 bleeding	59.4 (60/101) ^{a)}
28	Caustic injury, postoperative anastomosis site	Refractory	96.4 (27/28)	89.3 (25/27)	3 Perforations	75 (21/28)
14	Caustic injury, postoperative anastomosis site	Naive	100 (14/14)	100 (14/14)	1 Bleeding	14.3 (2/14)
	No. of patients 24 31 32 22 9 101 28 14	No. of patientsReason of stricture24Postoperative anastomosis site31Postoperative anastomosis site32Postoperative anastomosis site32Postoperative anastomosis site32Postoperative anastomosis site39Postoperative anastomosis site101Postoperative anastomosis site28Caustic injury, postoperative anastomosis site14Caustic injury, postoperative anastomosis site	No. of patientsReason of strictureRefractory or treatment naive24Postoperative anastomosis siteNaive31Postoperative anastomosis siteNaive32Postoperative anastomosis siteNaive32Postoperative anastomosis siteNaive32Postoperative anastomosis siteNaive9Postoperative anastomosis siteNaive101Postoperative anastomosis siteNaive28Caustic injury, postoperative anastomosis siteRefractory14Caustic injury, postoperative anastomosis siteNaive	No. of patientsReason of strictureRefractory or treatment naiveTechnical success rate24Postoperative anastomosis siteNaive100 (24/24)31Postoperative anastomosis siteNaive96.8 (30/31)32Postoperative anastomosis siteRefractory100 (32/32)22Postoperative anastomosis siteNaiveNA9Postoperative anastomosis siteNaive100 (9/9)101Postoperative anastomosis siteNaive98 (99/101)28Caustic injury, postoperative anastomosis siteRefractory96.4 (27/28)14Caustic injury, postoperative anastomosis siteNaive100 (14/14)	No. of patientsReason of strictureRefractory or treatment naiveTechnical success rateClinical success rate24Postoperative anastomosis siteNaive100 (24/24)87.5 (21/24)31Postoperative anastomosis siteNaive96.8 (30/31)80.6 (25/31)32Postoperative anastomosis siteRefractory100 (32/32)61.9 (13/21)^a)22Postoperative anastomosis siteNaiveNA95.5 (21/22)9Postoperative anastomosis siteNaive100 (9/9)100 (9/9)101Postoperative anastomosis siteNaive98 (99/101)NA28Caustic injury, postoperative anastomosis siteRefractory96.4 (27/28)89.3 (25/27)14Caustic injury, postoperative anastomosis siteNaive100 (14/14)100 (14/14)	No. of patientsReason of strictureRefractory or treatment naiveTechnical success rateClinical success rateMajor complication24Postoperative anastomosis siteNaive100 (24/24)87.5 (21/24)031Postoperative anastomosis siteNaive96.8 (30/31)80.6 (25/31)NA32Postoperative anastomosis siteRefractory100 (32/32)61.9 (13/21) ^{al} 2 Perforations22Postoperative anastomosis siteNaiveNA95.5 (21/22)NA9Postoperative anastomosis siteNaive100 (9/9)100 (9/9)0101Postoperative anastomosis siteNaive98 (99/101)NA2 Perforations, 1 bleeding28Caustic injury, postoperative anastomosis siteRefractory96.4 (27/28)89.3 (25/27)3 Perforations14Caustic injury, postoperative anastomosis siteNaive100 (14/14)100 (14/14)1 Bleeding

NA, not available.

^{a)}At 12 months.

Article information

Conflicts of interest

No potential conflict of interest relevant to this article was reported.

Funding

None.

Author contributions

All the work was done by KJ.

ORCID

Kyoungwon Jung, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5324-7803

References

- 1. Fugazza A, Repici A. Endoscopic management of refractory benign esophageal strictures. Dysphagia 2021;36:504–16.
- 2. Adler DG, Siddiqui AA. Endoscopic management of esophageal strictures. Gastrointest Endosc 2017;86:35–43.
- **3.** Repici A, Small AJ, Mendelson A, Jovani M, Correale L, Hassan C, et al. Natural history and management of refractory benign esophageal strictures. Gastrointest Endosc 2016;84:222–8.
- Chiu YC, Hsu CC, Chiu KW, Chuah SK, Changchien CS, Wu KL, et al. Factors influencing clinical applications of endoscopic balloon dilation for benign esophageal strictures. Endoscopy 2004;36:595–600.
- Pereira-Lima JC, Ramires RP, Zamin I Jr, Cassal AP, Marroni CA, Mattos AA. Endoscopic dilation of benign esophageal strictures: report on 1043 procedures. Am J Gastroenterol 1999;94:1497– 501.
- **6.** Zhang YW, Wei FX, Qi XP, Liu Z, Xu XD, Zhang YC. Efficacy and safety of endoscopic intralesional triamcinolone injection for benign esophageal strictures. Gastroenterol Res Pract 2018;2018:7619298.
- 7. Bartel MJ, Seeger K, Jeffers K, Clayton D, Wallace MB, Raimondo M, et al. Topical mitomycin C application in the treatment of refractory benign esophageal strictures in adults and comprehensive literature review. Dig Liver Dis 2016;48:1058–65.
- **8.** Siersema PD. How to approach a patient with refractory or recurrent benign esophageal stricture. Gastroenterology 2019;156:7–10.
- 9. Wills JC, Hilden K, Disario JA, Fang JC. A randomized, prospec-

tive trial of electrosurgical incision followed by rabeprazole versus bougie dilation followed by rabeprazole of symptomatic esophageal (Schatzki's) rings. Gastrointest Endosc 2008;67:808–13.

- **10.** Simmons DT, Baron TH. Electroincision of refractory esophagogastric anastomotic strictures. Dis Esophagus 2006;19:410–4.
- 11. Spaander MC, van der Bogt RD, Baron TH, Albers D, Blero D, de Ceglie A, et al. Esophageal stenting for benign and malignant disease: European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ESGE) Guideline: update 2021. Endoscopy 2021;53:751–62.
- 12. Vleggaar FP, Siersema PD. Stents for benign esophageal strictures. Tech Gastrointest Endosc 2010;12:231–6.
- 13. Choi EJ, Jee SR, Lee SH, Kim JH, Yoon JS, Heo JH, et al. Comparison of the efficacy and complications of endoscopic incisional therapy and balloon dilatation for benign esophageal strictures . Kosin Med J 2022;37:291-8
- 14. Lee TH, Lee SH, Park JY, Lee CK, Chung IK, Kim HS, et al. Primary incisional therapy with a modified method for patients with benign anastomotic esophageal stricture. Gastrointest Endosc 2009;69:1029–33.
- 15. Hordijk ML, van Hooft JE, Hansen BE, Fockens P, Kuipers EJ. A randomized comparison of electrocautery incision with Savary bougienage for relief of anastomotic gastroesophageal strictures. Gastrointest Endosc 2009;70:849–55.
- 16. Muto M, Ezoe Y, Yano T, Aoyama I, Yoda Y, Minashi K, et al. Usefulness of endoscopic radial incision and cutting method for refractory esophagogastric anastomotic stricture (with video). Gastrointest Endosc 2012;75:965–72.
- 17. Jie MM, Hu CJ, Tang B, Xie X, Lin H, Yu J, et al. Circular incision and cutting, a novel treatment for patients with esophageal cancer with anastomotic stricture after esophagectomy. J Dig Dis 2019;20:25–30.
- 18. Pih GY, Kim DH, Na HK, Ahn JY, Lee JH, Jung KW, et al. Comparison of the efficacy and safety of endoscopic incisional therapy and balloon dilatation for esophageal anastomotic stricture. J Gastrointest Surg 2021;25:1690–5.
- 19. Zhang ZC, Xu JQ, Xu JX, Xu MD, Chen SY, Zhong YS, et al. Endoscopic radial incision versus endoscopic balloon dilation as initial treatments of benign esophageal anastomotic stricture. J Gastroenterol Hepatol 2022;37:2272–81.
- 20. Zhu Y, Shrestha SM, Yu T, Shi R. Modified endoscopic radial incision and cutting method (M-RIC) for the treatment of refractory esophageal stricture. Surg Endosc 2022;36:1385–93.