CLINICAL VIGNETTE

Colonic Conduit Adenocarcinoma Following Esophagectomy and Colonic Interposition

Mark Ovsiowitz, MD and Carl Nordstrom, MD

Case Presentation

A 62-year-old male presented for outpatient gastroenterology evaluation. At the age of 16 months old he drank oven cleaner, resulting in severe esophageal injury and subsequent esophageal stricture. He underwent esophagectomy with colonic interposition and had been doing very well without symptoms until a few months prior to his appointment. He noted onset of intermittent dysphagia with solid foods with 10 pounds of weight loss over the preceding three to four months. He denied abdominal pain, nausea, or vomiting, melena or hematochezia. He reported a normal colonoscopy four years prior and an unremarkable upper endoscopy fifteen years prior. The patient did not have other significant past medical or surgical history. His family history included colorectal cancer in his mother. On physical examination, vital signs were normal and abdomen was soft, non-tender with normal bowel sounds. examination revealed normal breath sounds and no wheezing. The remainder of the examination was unremarkable. Upper endoscopy was recommended and scheduled. The upper endoscopy revealed esophagocolonic anastomosis at 20 cm with colonic interposition. There was luminal narrowing with mucosal irregularity at 45cm, concerning for a mass lesion and biopsies were obtained. Due to the luminal narrowing, the scope could not be advanced beyond this area. The biopsies revealed moderately differentiated adenocarcinoma, arising from colonic type mucosa. The patient received neoadjuvant therapy and surgical resection of the colon adenocarcinoma in the interposition graft with end to side cologastrostomy. He continues to undergo surveillance upper endoscopy and colonoscopy procedures, which have remained free of tumor recurrence.

Discussion

Esophageal injury following caustic ingestion is important to recognize. Approximately half of all caustic ingestions occur in young children, and commonly involve household cleaning products. One treatment option to manage complications following caustic ingestion is esophageal resection with colonic interposition. This involves mobilization of a portion of the colon (including vascular supply), which is then positioned in the chest to replace the resected esophagus. The decision regarding which segment of the colon to use, is surgeon dependent. There are a number of potential procedure related complications, including anastomotic leak, ischemia of the con-

duit, anastomotic stricture, and gastroesophageal reflux.³⁻⁵ One of the main risk factors for complications is decreased perfusion. Patients are often maintained on dopamine and nitroglycerine infusions for the first 72 hours after surgery, to assist with perfusion. Preoperative angiography is generally performed, however, some surgeons suggest that this may prevent surgical dissection, with some adopting this practice.

Our case illustrates the importance of screening for colon polyps and colon cancer in the colonic conduit, following esophagectomy and colonic interposition. Although these are considered rare, cases have been reported. Tranchart et al reported less than 0.5% of patients who undergo esophagectomy and colon interposition following caustic ingestion develop adenocarcinoma arising in the interposed colon. ⁶ There are no clear guidelines providing optimal intervals for endoscopic screening for this situation, only that screening should be performed on a regular basis. Colonoscopy should be performed prior to colonic interposition to rule out pre-existing lesions. There are limited treatment options for this, and because of the rarity, specialized surgical expertise is required. If the lesion is localized, the most common surgery includes resection of the lesion with cologastrostomy.8 Patients with localized disease usually do well after surgery. However, the need for continued screening and surveillance should be reinforced.

REFERENCES

- Gummin DD, Mowry JB, Beuhler MC, Spyker DA, Brooks DE, Dibert KW, Rivers LJ, Pham NPT, Ryan ML. 2019 Annual Report of the American Association of Poison Control Centers' National Poison Data System (NPDS): 37th Annual Report. Clin Toxicol (Phila). 2020 Dec;58(12):1360-1541. doi: 10.1080/15563650.2020. 1834219. PMID: 33305966.
- 2. **Yeo CJ**. *Shackelford's Surgery of the Alimentary Tract*, 8th edition. Philadelpia: Elsevier; 2019.
- 3. **Biere SS, Maas KW, Cuesta MA, van der Peet DL**. Cervical or thoracic anastomosis after esophagectomy for cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Dig Surg*. 2011;28(1):29-35. doi: 10.1159/000322014. Epub 2011 Feb 4. PMID: 21293129.

- 4. Briel JW, Tamhankar AP, Hagen JA, DeMeester SR, Johansson J, Choustoulakis E, Peters JH, Bremner CG, DeMeester TR. Prevalence and risk factors for ischemia, leak, and stricture of esophageal anastomosis: gastric pull-up versus colon interposition. *J Am Coll Surg.* 2004 Apr;198(4):536-41; discussion 541-2. doi: 10.1016/j.jamcollsurg.2003.11.026. PMID: 15051003.
- Saluja SS, Ray S, Pal S, Sanyal S, Agrawal N, Dash NR, Sahni P, Chattopadhyay TK. Randomized trial comparing side-to-side stapled and hand-sewn esophagogastric anastomosis in neck. *J Gastrointest Surg*. 2012 Jul;16(7):1287-95. doi: 10.1007/s11605-012-1885-7. Epub 2012 Apr 24. PMID: 22528571.
- Tranchart H, Chirica M, Munoz-Bongrand N, Sarfati E, Cattan P. Adenocarcinoma on colon interposition for corrosive esophageal injury: case report and review of literature. *J Gastrointest Cancer*. 2014 Dec;45 Suppl 1:205-7. doi: 10.1007/s12029-014-9629-4. PMID: 24943871.
- 7. **Kohli PS, Mangal H, Neduvanchery S, Penumadu P**. Carcinoma in a Colonic Conduit Post Esophagectomy: a Case Report. *Indian J Surg Oncol*. 2019 Jun;10(2):406-409. doi: 10.1007/s13193-019-00903-y. Epub 2019 Mar 16. PMID: 31168274; PMCID: PMC6527620.
- 8. Andrews CW Jr, Jessup JM, Goldman H, Hayes DF, Kufe DW, O'Hara CJ, Steele GD Jr. Localization of tumor-associated glycoprotein DF3 in normal, inflammatory, and neoplastic lesions of the colon. *Cancer*. 1993 Dec 1;72(11):3185-90. doi: 10.1002/1097-0142(19931201)72:11<3185::aid-cncr2820721109>3.0.co;2-7. PMID: 7694786.