

1 Efficacy of preventive endoscopic balloon dilation for esophageal
2 stricture after endoscopic resection

3

4 Yasumasa Ezoe, M.D.¹, Manabu Muto, M.D., Ph.D.², Takahiro Horimatsu, M.D.², Shuko
5 Morita, M.D.², Shin'ichi Miyamoto, M.D., Ph.D.², Satoshi Mochizuki, M.D.³, Keiko Minashi,
6 M.D.³, Tomonori Yano, M.D.³, Atsushi Ohtsu, M.D., Ph.D.³, Tsutomu Chiba, M.D., Ph.D.²

7

8 ¹Department of Multidisciplinary Cancer Treatment, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan

9 ²Department of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan

10 ³Division of Digestive Endoscopy and Gastrointestinal Oncology, National Cancer Center

11 Hospital East, Kashiwa, Japan

12

13 Corresponding author:

14 Yasumasa Ezoe

15 54 Kawara-cho, Shogoin, Sakyo-ku, Kyoto 606-8507, Japan

16 e-mail: yasuzoe@kuhp.kyoto-u.ac.jp

17 telephone: +81-75-751-4319

18 Fax: +81-75-751-4303

19

20 Disclosures of potential conflicts of interest: none

21

22 Acknowledgement: none

23

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 **Background and Aim:** We previously reported that mucosal defect involving over
3 three-fourths of the circumference of the esophagus after endoscopic mucosal resection
4 (EMR) is a risk factor for the development of the stricture. Although endoscopic balloon
5 dilation (EBD) is a useful procedure to relieve the stricture, there is no standard strategy for
6 preventing development of the stricture. The aim of this study was to evaluate the efficacy
7 and the safety of preventive EBD.

8 **Methods:** From 1993 to 2008, 41 consecutive patients with extensive mucosal defect
9 involving over three-fourths of the esophageal circumference after EMR or endoscopic
10 submucosal dissection (ESD) were investigated. Preventive EBD was performed for 29 cases
11 within one week just after EMR/ESD and was repeated once a week until the mucosal defect
12 was completely healed. The remaining 12 cases were not underwent preventive EBD and
13 used as a historical control. If post-EMR/ESD stricture developed regardless of preventive
14 EBD, conventional EBD was given repeatedly until the stricture was completely relieved.

15 **Results:** Preventive EBD decreased the incidence of stricture [59% vs 92%, $p=0.04$],
16 reduced the severity of stricture [$\leq 2\text{mm}$; $>2\text{mm}$ and $\leq 5\text{mm}$; $>5\text{mm}$]= (1; 2; 14) vs (4; 4; 3),
17 $p=0.01$] and shortened the duration required for resolving the stricture [29 days vs 78 days,
18 $p=0.04$] even when stricture developed. There was no complication associated with
19 preventive EBD procedure.

20 **Conclusions:** Preventive EBD is an effective procedure to prevent post- EMR/ESD stricture.
21 Preventive EBD should be considered when EMR/ESD results in a mucosal defect with a
22 circumference greater than three-fourths of the esophageal lumen.

23

24 **Keywords:** endoscopic mucosal resection; endoscopic submucosal dissection; esophageal

1 stricture; endoscopic balloon dilation; prevention

2

3 INTRODUCTION

4 Endoscopic mucosal resection (EMR) is being increasingly accepted as one of the
5 standard treatment for superficial esophageal cancer because of its minimal invasiveness and
6 excellent survival rate.[1, 2] Furthermore, the endoscopic submucosal dissection (ESD)
7 technique has made it possible to perform *en-bloc* resection of wide-spread neoplasia, such as
8 a superficial spreading-type of esophageal squamous cell carcinoma and Barrett's esophageal
9 cancer.[3-7] However, extended removal of the esophageal mucosa frequently causes severe
10 stricture.[8, 9]

11 Esophageal stricture may markedly interfere with the oral intake of food and fluids, and
12 thus affect the patients' quality of life adversely. In addition, once severe esophageal stricture
13 has developed, it is difficult to resolve the condition. While endoscopic balloon dilation
14 (EBD) is usually indicated for benign stricture including the cicatricial stricture caused by
15 EMR/ESD, the effect of EBD is sometimes only temporary and the stricture would reappear.
16 [10,11]

17 Before 2002, we performed EBD only when the patients complained of dysphagia by
18 post-EMR/ESD stricture, and EBD was repeated until the dysphagia was completely
19 resolved. In 2003, we reported that mucosal defects greater than three-fourths of the
20 circumference of the esophagus after EMR are at high risk of developing esophageal stricture.
21 [12] Since then, we started preventive EBD not to develop stricture, before post-EMR/ESD
22 mucosal defects develop scarring.

23 In this study, we evaluated the effectiveness of preventive EBD for the patients with
24 superficial widespread esophageal cancer who developed mucosal defect extending more

1 than three-fourths of the circumference of the esophagus by EMR/ESD.

2

3 **PATIENTS AND METHODS**

4 **Patients**

5 From February 1993 to June 2008, we experienced 64 consecutive patients with
6 widespread mucosal defects greater than three-fourths of the esophageal circumference as a
7 result of EMR/ESD for esophageal cancer. Written informed consent was obtained from all
8 patients before performing EMR/ESD and EBD.

9 **Endoscopic resection technique**

10 To remove the lesions endoscopically, EMR [13, 14] or ESD [5-7] were performed.

11 **EBD technique**

12 All patients received administration of 17.5-35mg of pethidine hydrochloride in order
13 to reduce the suffering from EBD procedure. All EBD procedure was performed using direct
14 visualization and fluoroscopic monitoring. The balloon was positioned across the stenotic site,
15 and then it was inflated carefully with double-diluted contrast agent. During the procedure,
16 patients were closely observed with pulse, blood pressure, and oxygen saturation. When a
17 patient experienced pain during the dilation or when a notch of the balloon placed on the
18 stricture was gradually disappeared, dilation was stopped, and then the balloon was
19 maintained in its inflated state and held close to the tip of the endoscope, and was pushed
20 through the stenotic site like a bougie technique. If the notch of the balloon was rapidly
21 expanded, suggesting a tear at the stenotic site, dilation is immediately stopped and the
22 balloon was deflated, and then the endoscope and deflated balloon were removed.

23 Four CRE balloon dilators (Boston Scientific Corp. Natick, MA, USA) of different
24 sizes (10–12 mm, 12–15 mm, 15–18 mm, and 18–20 mm) were used according to the

1 severity of the stricture. A single balloon was used in each EBD session. When the endoscope
2 could be passed through the site of the mucosal defect, a balloon of 18-20mm was used.
3 When the stricture was less than 10 mm in diameter and larger than 5 mm, a 15–18 mm
4 balloon was used. When the stricture was less than 5 mm in diameter and larger than 2–3 mm,
5 a 12–15 mm balloon was used. When the stricture was a pinhole stricture, a 10–12 mm
6 balloon was used. We did not perform preventive EBD when the luminal diameter was
7 estimated to be greater than 20 mm because the diameter of the lumen would have been
8 greater than that of the fully expanded balloon.

9 In this study, we defined the EBD procedure performed immediately after EMR/ESD as
10 “preventive EBD” and that after the development of post-EMR/ESD cicatricial stricture as
11 “conventional EBD”.

12 **Protocol of the preventive EBD and conventional EBD**

13 Preventive EBD was commenced within one week after the EMR/ESD and repeated
14 weekly until the complete healing of mucosal defect was observed (Fig 1). Patients consumed
15 a regular diet during the period of mucosal healing and weekly preventive EBD.

16 If the post-EMR/ESD mucosal defects became scarred with stricture despite repeated
17 preventive EBD, conventional EBD was given repeatedly until the stricture was completely
18 resolved. The time interval of conventional EBD depended on patients’ symptom such as
19 dysphagea (usually 2 to 4 weeks). The strategy of conventional EBD has not been changed
20 throughout this study period, therefore, the time interval of conventional EBD is not different
21 between two groups.

22 **Definition of the stricture**

23 “Stricture” was defined when a standard 11-mm-diameter endoscope (Q240, 1T240;
24 Olympus Optical Co. Ltd., Tokyo, Japan) could not be passed through the site, or when the
25 patients complaint of dysphagea. Whereas, “complete resolution of the stricture” was defined

1 when a standard diameter endoscope could be passed through the site, and patients' symptom
2 of dysphagia were completely relieved.

3 In each EBD sessions in all cases, diameter of stricture was measured by comparing
4 with the diameter of inflated balloon under the fluoroscopic monitoring, and it was classed
5 into 3 groups: ≤ 2 mm; > 2 mm and ≤ 5 mm; > 5 mm. The duration required for resolving the
6 stricture was defined as the time interval between the day when the stricture was first
7 observed and the day of complete resolution.

8 **Evaluation of preventive EBD**

9 The efficacy of preventive EBD was evaluated retrospectively by comparing the
10 following three points between the patients with preventive EBD and those without it (Fig 2);
11 the occurrence rate of stricture, the diameter of stricture, and the duration required for
12 resolving the stricture by repeated conventional EBD.

13 **Statistical analysis**

14 Fisher's exact test, or its extension when there were more than two categories, was used
15 for categorical variables and the Mann-Whitney *U* test was used for continuous variables.
16 Cox's proportional hazard model was used for the multivariate analysis. A *p* value of ≤ 0.05
17 was considered significant. All statistical analyses were performed using the Dr. SPSS II
18 Statistics software package (SPSS Japan Inc., Tokyo, Japan).

19

20 **RESULTS**

21 **Patient background**

22 Among the 64 patients with mucosal defects greater than three-fourths of the
23 circumference of the esophagus after EMR/ESD, three patients did not attend follow-up
24 consultations, 17 received additional treatment for primary lesions (chemoradiation for deep

1 invasion of the carcinoma or EMR/ESD for local recurrence and incomplete resection), and
2 three underwent surgical resection for metachronous gastric cancer immediately after
3 EMR/ESD. We excluded these 23 patients because additional treatments had the potential to
4 make the stricture worse. Finally, we used data from 41 lesions in 41 patients to evaluate the
5 efficacy of the preventive EBD.

6 Thirty-six lesions were removed by EMR and five lesions were removed by ESD
7 procedure. A histopathological diagnosis of squamous cell carcinoma was found in all lesions
8 and 40 lesions were mucosal cancers but one submucosal cancer.

9 Of the 41 patients, 29 underwent preventive EBD and 12 did not. There were no
10 statistical differences in the characteristics of the patients and the mucosal defects except for
11 the endoscopic resection method between patients who underwent preventive EBD and those
12 who did not. Because the ESD was recently established technique, there are no patients
13 treated by ESD in the historical control group. Although the difference was not statistically
14 significant, the rate of circumferential resections tended to be greater in conventional EBD
15 group [10/29 (34%) vs 6/12 (50%), $p=0.49$]. (Table 1)

16 **Profile of preventive EBD sessions**

17 Among the 29 patients who underwent preventive EBD, the median number of
18 preventive EBD sessions was six (range, 3–9) and the period of preventive EBD was 45 days
19 (range, 16–65). (Table 3)

20 **Efficacy of preventive EBD**

21 The number of patients who developed stricture after EMR/ESD was significantly
22 lower in patients who were given preventive EBD than those who were not given preventive
23 EBD [12/29 (59%) vs 11/12 (92%), $p=0.04$] (Table 2).

24 The narrowest diameter of stricture in each patient was significantly larger in patients

1 who were given preventive EBD than those who were not given preventive EBD [≤ 2 mm;
2 >2 mm and ≤ 5 mm; >5 mm)= (1; 2; 14) vs (4; 4; 3), $p=0.01$] (Table 2).

3 The number of days to development of stricture was 23 days (21–49) in patients
4 without preventive EBD. Similarly, in patients who were given preventive EBD, tendency of
5 stricture development was observed within 2 weeks after EMR/ESD. However, preventive
6 EBD could prevent the patients' symptom such as dysphagia because dilation was performed
7 at short intervals (once a week) in all patients. Therefore, no patients suffered from
8 dysphagia during the preventive EBD period in this study. Since the patients with preventive
9 EBD complained the symptom of dysphagia after the completion of weekly preventive EBD,
10 the number of days to development of stricture was 51 days (30–72). It was significantly
11 longer in patients who underwent preventive EBD than those who did not ($p < 0.001$).

12 Seventeen patients with preventive EBD and 11 patients without preventive EBD
13 developed esophageal stricture. Then, they were given conventional EBD repeatedly until the
14 stricture was completely relieved. Among them, the duration required conventional EBD was
15 significantly shorter in patients given preventive EBD than in those not given it (29 days vs
16 78 days; $p=0.04$). The number of conventional EBD sessions was smaller in patients with
17 preventive EBD than in those without it, although the difference was not statistically
18 significant (2 times vs 4.5 times; $p=0.5$) (Table 3).

19 The number of total EBD sessions was greater in patients with preventive EBD than in
20 those without it, however, the difference was not statistically significant (8 times vs 4.5 times;
21 $p=0.42$) (Table 3).

22 **Safety of EBD procedure**

23 Among a total of 166 preventive EBD sessions for 29 patients, no complication
24 occurred during the procedure (complication rate of preventive EBD: 0%). Among a total of
25 189 conventional EBD sessions for 28 patients, a perforation was occurred in one

1 conventional EBD session in one patient (0.5% per total conventional EBD sessions, 3.6%
2 per patient). The patient was immediately hospitalized and administered intravenous
3 antibiotics. The patient had no symptoms or signs of mediastinitis. The fasting period was
4 three days and hospital stay was only one week after causal EBD. No other major
5 complication occurred.

6 **Clinical course of all patients after EMR/ESD**

7 Follow up period was calculated between the day of EMR/ESD and the day of patients'
8 final visit. After the complete resolution of stricture, endoscopic examination was performed
9 every 6 months in all patients. Median follow up period of all patients was 84 months. There
10 were no patients who suffered from dysphagia due to the recurrence of stricture.

11 Risk of stricture

12 **Risk factors for stricture among patients with preventive EBD**

13 The method of endoscopic resection (EMR) and the longitudinal length of mucosal
14 defect (>30 mm in length) were significantly associated with the increased risk for
15 development of stricture by multivariate analysis (Odds ratio: 20.8, 95%CI 1.3-328.9 and
16 12.7, 95%CI 1.3-126.9, respectively). Circumferential mucosal defects showed a higher rate
17 of stricture than semi-circumferential mucosal defects; however, the difference was not
18 statistically significant (Odds ratio: 3.0, 95%CI 0.2-40.5). (Table 4)

19

20 **DISCUSSION**

21 Technically, extended esophageal mucosal resection could be performed. However, the
22 development of the esophageal stricture is one of the most important problems to be solved.

23 To date, there are no well-established methods to prevent the stricture after EMR/ESD. If we

1 can prevent the development of the stricture after EMR/ESD by preventive EBD, the ability
2 of the patients' oral intake would be dramatically improved.

3 In this study, we demonstrated that the preventive EBD reduced the incidence of
4 esophageal stricture in patients who underwent an extensive EMR/ESD. In our preventive
5 EBD protocol, EBD was performed once a week for about 6 weeks [median; 44 days (16-65
6 days)] until the mucosal defect completely developed scar. Because of this strategy, the
7 number of EBD sessions tended to be greater. Although it did not reach statistical
8 significance ($p=0.42$), the total number of EBD sessions was nearly twice as high compared
9 to the conventional EBD group (8.0 vs 4.5). However, the narrowest diameter of stricture was
10 significantly mild in the preventive EBD group compared to the group without it (Table 2),
11 while 60% of the patients in the preventive EBD group develop stricture. Clinically, the
12 severity of the stricture is very important, because it critically affects the oral intake condition.
13 Furthermore, the preventive EBD shortened the period to relieve the stricture even when the
14 stricture was developed. These data indicated that the preventive EBD was a beneficial
15 method, and thus should be considered to perform for the patients who underwent extensive
16 EMR/ESD as a supportive treatment.

17 Perforation and massive bleeding were the most severe complications during the EBD
18 procedure. However, there was no complication associated with preventive EBD procedure in
19 this study. Thus, we could conclude that the preventive EBD was a feasible procedure. Not to
20 develop perforation, we carefully performed preventive EBD under fluoroscopic monitoring,
21 to confirm with both of the size of the stricture and the inflated balloon. When patients
22 complained of pain or when the balloon expanded exponentially, we stopped dilating the
23 balloon immediately not to develop deep tear or perforation.

24 There were some imbalances of the characteristics of mucosal defect between two
25 groups; the rate of circumferential resections [10/29 (34%) vs 6/12 (50%), $p=0.49$] and the

1 rate of ESD resections [5/29 (17%) vs 0/12 (0%), $p<0.001$]. Although the difference of the
2 rate of circumferential resections was not statistically significant, the possibility that the
3 results of this study might be influenced by the difference cannot be denied. However, the
4 “circumferential resection” and “non-circumferential resection” were not associated with the
5 risk of development of stricture by the multivariate analysis even in the preventive EBD
6 group. Therefore, it seemed that the imbalance about the rate of circumferential resection
7 between two groups was not a major problem. As for the different rate of ESD resections,
8 there are no patients treated by ESD in the historical control group because the ESD was
9 recently established technique. These imbalances between two groups are unavoidable
10 limitations of the retrospective review with small sample size.

11 The rate for stricture was lower in patients who underwent ESD than those who
12 received EMR [1/5 (20.0%) vs 16/24 (66.7%), $p=0.03$]. Although the reason for this
13 difference is unknown, one possibility is that the potent cautery effect of EMR compared to
14 that of ESD might cause more severe submucosal injury resulting in an increased risk for
15 development of stricture. [15] Clarification of the precise mechanisms for developing
16 stricture after EMR/ESD is warranted in future studies. In addition, the difference of rate for
17 stricture between two groups might be influenced by the lower rate for stricture in ESD
18 patients. However, there are no ESD patients who did not undergo preventive EBD, it is
19 therefore impossible to evaluate the real influence from ESD patients for the results of this
20 study.

21 Temporary stent placement may also be a promising strategy for preventing
22 post-EMR/ESD stricture. Self-expandable removable stents or biodegradable stents have
23 been reported to be useful for the treatment of benign stricture such as anastomotic stricture
24 and cicatricial stricture by esophagitis. [16] However, there has been no report on the use of
25 self-expandable removable stents for preventing the post-EMR/ESD stricture. Although the

1 biodegradable stents have been reportedly applied for prevention of the post-EMR/ESD
2 stricture, a small number of patients, short-term follow-up periods, and a high frequency of
3 stent migration obscured its usefulness. [17, 18] Thus, further evaluation of these methods is
4 required to compare their usefulness with the EBD.

5 The multivariate analysis in patients with preventive EBD revealed that the longer
6 longitudinal mucosal defects (>30mm) was the significant risk factor for development of the
7 stricture; on the other hand, the circumferential mucosal defect was not a significant risk
8 factor. To avoid the treatment induced esophageal stricture, these data are informative when
9 we select the treatment modalities for the extended esophageal cancer; such as EMR/ESD,
10 chemoradiotherapy, radiotherapy or surgical resection. If patients prefer the remaining the
11 sufficient ability of oral intake, extensive EMR/ESD should not be indicated, because the
12 long term EBD would be needed and the symptom of dysphagia afflicts the patients.

13 In conclusion, preventive EBD could be a useful and acceptable strategy to reduce the
14 incidence of post-EMR/ESD stricture. Because there is no other effective method to prevent
15 stricture after extensive EMR/ESD at present, preventive EBD should be considered for all
16 patients who undergo extensive EMR/ESD. While almost 60% of patient developed stricture
17 despite the preventive EBD, the severity of the stricture was clearly reduced even when the
18 stricture was developed. Since the number of patients in this study is rather small, and
19 moreover, this was the retrospective study, a prospective study with a large number of cases
20 is required to confirm the effectiveness of preventive EBD procedure for the prevention of
21 post-EMR/ESD stricture in patients with early stage esophageal cancer.

22

1 REFERENCES

- 2 1 Inoue H, Tani M, Nagai K, et al. Treatment of esophageal and gastric tumors.
3 *Endoscopy*. 1999; **31**: 47-55.
- 4 2 Fujita H, Sueyoshi S, Yamana H, et al. Optimum treatment strategy for superficial
5 esophageal cancer: endoscopic mucosal resection versus radical esophagectomy. *World*
6 *J Surg*. 2001; **25**: 424-31.
- 7 3 Satodate H, Inoue H, Yoshida T, et al. Circumferential EMR of carcinoma arising in
8 Barrett's esophagus: case report. *Gastrointest Endosc*. 2003; **58**: 288-92.
- 9 4 Seewald S, Akaraviputh T, Seitz U, et al. Circumferential EMR and complete removal
10 of Barrett's epithelium: a new approach to management of Barrett's esophagus
11 containing high-grade intraepithelial neoplasia and intramucosal carcinoma.
12 *Gastrointest Endosc*. 2003; **57**: 854-9.
- 13 5 Soetikno R, Kaltenbach T, Yeh R, et al. Endoscopic mucosal resection for early cancers
14 of the upper gastrointestinal tract. *J Clin Oncol*. 2005; **23**: 4490-8.
- 15 6 Fujishiro M, Yahagi N, Kakushima N, et al. *En bloc* resection of a large semicircular
16 esophageal cancer by endoscopic submucosal dissection. *Surg Laparosc Endosc*
17 *Percutan Tech*. 2006; **16**: 237-41.
- 18 7 Fujishiro M, Yahagi N, Kakushima N, et al. Endoscopic submucosal dissection of
19 esophageal squamous cell neoplasms. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2006;**4**:688-94.
- 20 8 Chiu YC, Hsu CC, Chiu KW, et al. Factors influencing clinical applications of
21 endoscopic balloon dilation for benign esophageal strictures. *Endoscopy*. 2004; **36**:
22 595-600.
- 23 9 Kim SH, Lee SO. Circumferential intramural esophageal dissection successfully treated
24 by endoscopic procedure and metal stent insertion. *J Gastroenterol*. 2005; **40**: 1065-9.

- 1 10 Lew RJ, Kochman ML. A review of endoscopic methods of esophageal dilation. *J Clin*
2 *Gastroenterol.* 2002; **35**: 117–26.
- 3 11 Pereira-lima JC, Ramires RP, Zamin I Jr., et al. Endoscopic dilation of benign
4 esophageal strictures: Report on 1043 procedures. *Am J Gastroenterol.* 1999; **94**:
5 1497–501.
- 6 12 Katada C, Muto M, Manabe T, et al. Esophageal stricture after endoscopic mucosal
7 resection of superficial esophageal lesions. *Gastrointest Endosc.* 2003; **57**: 165-9.
- 8 13 Monma K, Sakaki N, Yoshida M. Endoscopic mucosectomy for precise evaluation and
9 treatment of esophageal intraepithelial cancer (in Japanese with English abstract).
10 *Endoscopia Digestiva.* 1990; **2**: 501-6.
- 11 14 Makuuchi H. Endoscopic mucosal resection for early esophageal cancer - Indications
12 and techniques. *Digestive Endoscopy.* 1996; **8**: 175-9.
- 13 15 Conio M, Sorbi D, Batts KP, et al. Endoscopic circumferential esophageal
14 mucosectomy in a porcine model: an assessment of technical feasibility, safety, and
15 outcome (short communication). *Endoscopy.* 2001; **33**: 791-4
- 16 16 Karbowski M, Schembre D, Kozarek R, et al. Polyflex self-expanding, removable
17 plastic stents: assessment of treatment efficacy and safety in a variety of benign and
18 malignant conditions of the esophagus. *Surg Endosc.* 2008; **22**: 1326-33.
- 19 17 Saito Y, Tanaka T, Andoh A, et al. Usefulness of biodegradable stents constructed of
20 poly-l-lactic acid monofilaments in patients with benign esophageal stricture. *World J*
21 *Gastroenterol.* 2007; **13**: 3977-80.
- 22 18 Saito Y, Tanaka T, Andoh A, et al. Novel biodegradable stents for benign esophageal
23 strictures following endoscopic submucosal dissection. *Dig Dis Sci.* 2008; **53**: 330-3.
24

1 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

2 Figure 1. A representative case who received preventive EBD after a
3 semi-circumferential ESD.

4 (a) Semi-circumferential mucosal defect immediately after the ESD.

5 (b) Mucosal defect one week after the ESD. The site gradually developed scarring with mild
6 stricture.

7 (c) Mucosal defect one month after the ESD. The site developed scarring furthermore, but the
8 stricture was mild.

9 (d) Post-ESD site two months after the ESD. The complete healing of the post-ESD mucosal
10 defect was observed without stricture. The endoscope could be passed through the site and
11 the patient did not complain of any symptoms associated with esophageal stricture.

12

13 Figure 2. Diagram of patients flow.

14

Figure 1 (a)




Figure 1 (b)




Figure 1 (c)




Figure 1 (d)





Figure 2



1

Table 1. Comparison of the characteristics of mucosal defects after endoscopic resection in patients with and without preventive EBD

	Preventive EBD		p value
	(+) n= 29	(-) n= 12	
Sex			
male	28	11	0.50
female	1	1	
Age			
median (range)	64 years (50–74)	60 years (48–80)	0.21
Circumference of the lumen			
Circumferential	10	6	0.49
Semi-circumferential	19	6	
Depth of resected lesion			
Mucosa	28	12	0.34
Submucosa	1	0	
Location			
Upper	3	1	0.30
Middle	13	5	
Lower	13	6	
Length of mucosal defect			
30 mm or less	6	4	0.30
more than 30 mm	23	8	
median (range)	40 mm (10–110)	45 mm (20–70)	0.38
Endoscopic resection procedure			

EMR	24	12	<0.001
ESD	5	0	

Number of patients are shown unless specified

EBD: endoscopic balloon dilation, EMR: endoscopic mucosal resection, ESD: endoscopic submucosal dissection

1

Table 2. Comparison of the occurrence rate and the diameter of esophageal stricture between patients with and without preventive EBD

	Preventive EBD		p value
	(+)	(-)	
Number of patients who developed stricture	17/29 (59%)	11/12 (92%)	0.04
The narrowest diameter of the stricture			
< 2mm	1/17 (6%)	4/11 (36%)	0.01
2mm< and < 5mm	2/17 (12%)	4/11 (36%)	
5mm <	14/17 (82%)	3/11 (28%)	

Number of patients are shown unless specified

†Median (range)

EBD: endoscopic balloon dilation

2

3

1

Table 3. Comparison of the duration and the number of EBD sessions required for resolving the stricture by conventional EBD between patients with and without preventive EBD

	Preventive EBD		p value
	(+)	(-)	
Period of preventive EBD [†]	45 days (16–65)	(-)	(-)
Number of days to development of the stricture [†]	51 days (30–72)	23 days (21–49)	< 0.001
Duration required for resolving the stricture [†]	29 days (15–169)	78 days (8–1093)	0.04
Number of preventive EBD sessions [†]	6.0 sessions (3–9)	(-)	(-)
Number of conventional EBD sessions [†]	2.0 sessions (2–20)	4.5 sessions (2–35)	0.5
Number of total EBD sessions [†]	8.0 sessions (3–29)	4.5 sessions (0–35)	0.42
Number of patients whose stricture was relieved	17/17 (100%)	11/11 (100%)	1

Number of patients are shown unless specified

[†]Median (range)

EBD: endoscopic balloon dilation

2

3

1

Table 4. Predictive factors for development of stricture after endoscopic resection in patients who received preventive EBD

	Odds Ratio (95% CI)	p value
Method of Endoscopic resection		
ESD	1.0 (reference)	0.03
EMR	20.8 (1.3–328.9)	
Longitudinal length of mucosal defect involving over three-fourth of the esophageal circumference		
≤30 mm	1.0 (reference)	0.03
>30 mm	12.7 (1.3–126.9)	
Circumference of mucosal defect		
Semi-circumferential	1.0 (reference)	0.4
Circumferential	3.0 (0.2–40.5)	

EBD: endoscopic balloon dilation

2