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Abstract

Background: With an increase in life expectancy all over the globe, morbid obesity and obesity-related diseases negatively impact the overall quality of life (QoL). Aim: The study aimed to assess the QoL post-Diverted Mini Gastric Bypass (dMGB), focusing on weight loss achieved, comorbidity resolution, and change in QoL after the surgery. Setting: Single private institute, India Methods: Data from patients who underwent a laparoscopic primary dMGB from August 2020 to August 2021 by one surgeon were retrospectively analyzed. The patients were followed up at 3, 6, 9, and 12 months from the surgery date. Data were assessed using the Bariatric Analysis and Reporting Outcome System- II (BAROS- II) form based on three major areas: percentage weight loss, comorbidity resolution, and QoL. The variation in QoL was assessed using the Moorehead Ardelt QoL questionnaire, which addresses self-esteem, physical activity, social gathering, and sexual life. Results: Forty-one patients were included in the final analysis. The average age and pre-operative body mass index (BMI) was 45.5 yrs. and 44.5 kg/m², respectively. The cohort had 60.9% of males and 39.1% females. The pre-operative average total QoL score was 0.65 ± 0.2. At 12 months, the average BMI and average total QoL were 28.03 kg/m² and 5.35 ± 0.3, respectively, p<0.001. Conclusion: At one year, the dMGB surgery effectively improves the overall QoL.
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Introduction

Morbid obesity is still a significant concern in India, especially with a large population living below the poverty line 1-2. Treatment options for obesity vary, from medical management to dietary interventions and surgical procedures 3-4. Bariatric surgery is the only proven long-term treatment of choice for obesity and obesity-related comorbidities 5-6. One Anastomosis Gastric bypass (OAGB), Mini Gastric Bypass (MGB), was first introduced in 1997 to manage obesity. Many long-term studies on MGB have shown its safety and effectiveness in patients with morbid obesity 7-10. Diverted MGB (dMGB) is a relatively new procedure; however, it is a slightly modified version of the traditional MGB surgery 11, 12. This variation in MGB was initially named “sleeved gastric bypass” because of the long and
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thin pouch resembling the “sleeve gastrectomy” in the upper GI series. It was later called diverted MGB—“dMGB” 12-14. It involves the OAGB-MGB with the Roux-en-Y diversion on the top of a long pouch with a non-calibrated anastomosis 12, 15. It has a long, narrow pouch and a wide anastomosis, resulting in mild restriction, eventually minimizing the potential risk of postoperative biliary reflux and marginal ulcer seen with traditional MGB surgery 16 (Figure 1). Also, the biliopancreatic limb is long (usually 150–200 cm or more), providing some fat malabsorption. In all aspects, except in reducing the daily bowel movements, dMGB is like MGB-OAGB regarding morbi-mortality, post-operative course, weight loss, and metabolic control considered better procedure 12, 17-20.

The later questionnaire (BAROS- II) incorporates the Moorehead-Ardelt Quality of Life Questionnaire 24, 27. The study aimed to assess the QoL pre and post-dMGB using the BAROS- II.

Materials and Methods

Enrollment and Randomization of the Study

A group of 41 subjects who underwent Laparoscopic dMGB were enrolled between August 2020 to August 2021 and were followed up at 3,6,9, and 12 months after surgery. Written informed consent was obtained from all the subjects before inclusion in the current research. The study participants were informed about all the possible benefits, side effects, and risks associated with the surgical interventions and the purpose of the study and future publication. Additionally, the best form of treatment, its efficacy, and any potential consequences were explained and reviewed with the patient, family, and the treating surgeon if the patient qualified as a candidate for surgical treatment. All the patients underwent a thorough examination that included anthropometric measures, diet history with a 24-hour. Diet recall and medical history.

They included subjects aged 18–73 years who had failed to achieve sustained weight loss through medical management and lifestyle measures. The study subjects were both genders, with a median (IQR) pre-operative BMI of = 44.35 kg/m2. Exclusion criteria were a history of previous weight loss surgery, severe cardiopulmonary disease, cancer, oral steroid treatment, and psychiatric illness. These requirements align with the recommended bariatric surgery indications 28-31. All subjects were analyzed using the BAROS-II form. The scores are based on a range of +0.5 to -0.5 points scale (+0.5= Best and -5= Worst) (Figure 2). The questionnaire gives a total quality of life score where each category is scored individually. A final score of 0-9 is calculated, and the outcome is interpreted as a failure, fair, good, very good, and excellent 32. The higher the score in the questionnaire, the higher the patient’s quality of life.

Anthropometric Evaluation

The anthropometric evaluation was done using weight, height, and BMI. The patients were weighed on a Bioelectrical Impedance machine (In Body 770). The size was measured with a BSM 170 Body measuring scale.

Figure 1: Demonstrates the advantages of One Anastomosis Gastric Bypass Surgery over other Traditional Gastric Bypass Surgery. This figure has been drawn with the premium version of BioRender (https://biorender.com/ accessed on 26 July 2023) with license number SE25NJJS62. Image credit: Rahnuma Ahmad.
Figure 2: Illustrates the flow chart for the study method performed to observe the quality of life following Diverted Mini Gastric Bypass Surgery. dMGB: Diverted Mini Gastric Bypass Surgery. This figure has been drawn with the premium version of BioRender (https://biorender.com/ Accessed on 27 July 2023) with license number KF25NPJ6R2. Image credit: Rahnuma Ahmad.

Surgical Intervention

The procedure was carried out laparoscopically. Pneumoperitoneum is created using a 5 mm Endopath at Palmer’s point, remaining the 3 ports – 11 mm supra-umbilical port, 12mm right of side correct Rectus muscle port, and 5 mm port in right of Hypochondrium. Gastroesophageal junction dissection started by retracting the fundus and dividing the peritoneum overlying the GE junction using the Goldfinger instrument. The greater omentum was divided vertically to the upper border of the transverse colon and further divided transversely. DJ flexure was identified, and a loop of small bowel was traced from there up to 125 cm. Loop pulled up colic and anchored to the greater curvature opposite the incisura. Dissection for the gastric pouch started by creating a window in the lesser curve near the incisura. A subsequent stapler firing multiple purple and blue staples made the required stomach pouch of around 100 ml. 36 Fr Gastric Calibration Tube was used. Gastro-jejunostomy (GJ) stoma of 5 cm was created by a blue stapler, and enterotomy was closed with another blue stapler. The BP limb was divided proximal to GJ anastomosis, and a Jeunno-jejunostomy was formed 100 cm distal to GJ to make a Roux-type anastomosis. Staple line hemostasis secured. Skin closed using staplers. Dressing applied.

Statistical Analysis

All calculations were performed using SPSS 26 software (IBM Corp. Released 2019. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 26.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp). Quantitative variables were defined by mean and standard deviation. Qualitative variables were determined by percentage. The paired t-test was used to study the differences between meanings over time. The significance was set at p<0.05.

Ethics Statement

This study was conducted in a high-volume bariatric center in India. The study was approved by the Institutional ethics committee Human Research- Asian Bariatrics Hospital, SG Highways, Ahmedabad, Gujarat, India, with Reference No.: IECHR-AB/2020/09, Dated November 26th, 2020.

Project Details

This is the second paper of the principal author of the Bariatric Surgery project. The earlier Paper-I was published in the Bangladesh Journal of Medical Science (https://www.banglajol.info/index.php/BJMS/article/view/66965 33).

Results

The sample included 41 patients who underwent dMGB and completed 12-month follow-ups, with a median (IQR) age of 45.5 (18,73) years. The median (IQR) pre-operative BMI was 44.35 (41.14, 49.09) kg/m², and the median (IQR) pre-operative excess weight (EW) was 51.23 (42.87, 65.03) Kg.

Table 1 shows the trends of weight-loss outcomes (TWL%, WL, EWL%, BMI, and change in BMI) during a 12-month postoperative period. In these 12 months, postoperative weight, BMI, and EW had significant decreasing trends, whereas WL, TWL%, EWL%, and BMI loss had substantial increasing trends (p<0.001 for all).
Table 1: Measure of Change in The Variants throughout The Study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables*</th>
<th>Before surgery (n=41)</th>
<th>1 month (n=41)</th>
<th>3 months (n=38)</th>
<th>6 months (n=35)</th>
<th>9 months (n=32)</th>
<th>12 months (n=41)</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weight (kg), median (IQR)</td>
<td>120(108, 136)</td>
<td>105.9(95, 120)</td>
<td>94(84, 107)</td>
<td>85(75.7, 96)</td>
<td>79(70, 89)</td>
<td>75.5(67, 85)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI (kg/m2), median (IQR)</td>
<td>44.5 (41.10, 49.30)</td>
<td>39.41 (36.14, 43.50)</td>
<td>35.1(31.95, 39.98)</td>
<td>31.51 (28.60, 32.53)</td>
<td>29.13 (25.39, 31.41)</td>
<td>28.03 (25.39, 31.41)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI loss (kg/m2), median (IQR)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.12(4.25, 6.23)</td>
<td>9.55(8.32, 10.95)</td>
<td>13.22 (11.42, 15.06)</td>
<td>15.43 (13.3, 17.58)</td>
<td>16.88 (14.15, 19.34)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EW (kg), median (IQR)</td>
<td>51.23 (42.87, 65.03)</td>
<td>38.34 (29.79, 50.31)</td>
<td>26.61(18.76, 37.33)</td>
<td>17.29 (9.57, 26.37)</td>
<td>10.98 (4.52, 20.24)</td>
<td>7.98(1.0, 17.28)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WL (kg), median (IQR)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14(11, 17)</td>
<td>26(22, 30)</td>
<td>35(30, 41)</td>
<td>41(35, 47.5)</td>
<td>45(37, 52)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWL %, median (IQR)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11.48 (9.73, 13.46)</td>
<td>21.3(18.60, 24.31)</td>
<td>29.26 (26.05, 32.79)</td>
<td>34.31 (30.52, 38.09)</td>
<td>36.92 (32.98, 41.67)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWL %, median (IQR)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26.5 (21.28, 32.72)</td>
<td>48.76(40.74, 58.10)</td>
<td>66.89 (56.37, 77.90)</td>
<td>78.34 (67.09, 90.58)</td>
<td>84.94 (71.40, 97.65)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *Data are given as median (IQR). IQR=Interquartile range; BMI=Body mass index; EW=Excess weight; WL=Weight loss; EWL=Excess WL; TWL=Total WL.

Comorbidities pre-surgery noted in patients were Hypertension in 26.8%, type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) in 53.6%, and obstructive sleep apnea (OSA) in 12.1% of the cases. Table 2 shows the patients’ demographic and clinical characteristics, comorbidities, and pre-operative data.

Table 2: Number of Patients with Conditions Enrolled in The Study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N=41</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (years), median (IQR)</td>
<td>45.5(18, 73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male, n (%)</td>
<td>25 (60.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight (kg), median (IQR)</td>
<td>120.00 (108, 135)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2DM, n (%)</td>
<td>22 (53.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension, n (%)</td>
<td>11 (26.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleep apnea, n (%)</td>
<td>5 (12.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: BMI=Body mass index; IQR=Interquartile range; T2DM=Type 2 diabetes mellitus.

Resolution of OSA was noted in 100% of patients at 12 months. T2D and HTN resolution was reported in 91% and 81.8% of the patients, respectively, at 12 months (Figure 3).

Patients completed the BAROS-II questionnaire, and the results were used to calculate their pre-operative quality of life score and % weight change. The pre-operative average total QoL score was 0.65 ± 0.2. At 12 months, the average total QoL score was 5.35 ± 0.3 (Figure 4). Each parameter is better, with a slight dip in the middle.
QOL has been shown to improve following bariatric surgery. It is also likely that pre-existing and/or post-surgical anthropometrics, psychological and social factors interact with weight loss to influence the improvement in QOL following bariatric surgery. The values in Table 3 below show that all subjects included demonstrated improvements in QOL following bariatric surgery when evaluated based on the BAROS-II form. A significant weight loss was seen post-12 months of the surgery, leading to a decrease in the BMI while increasing the overall QOL. This was statically confirmed by the Karls Coefficient of Correlation, where a positive correlation (r-value = 0.8) was calculated.

**Table 3**: Change in Quality of Life Score Versus Weight.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Life</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Value’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preoperative</td>
<td>0.65 ± 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>5.35 ± 0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**: Value expressed as mean ± standard deviation.

**Value expressed as median IQR=Interquartile range.**

**Discussion**

Obesity is a chronic disease, and bariatric surgery is proven to be the most effective modality of treatment for the same. Bariatric surgery, despite its well-documented successes, can fail in some patients, particularly in primary restrictive procedures. Diverted OAGB-MGB is now an established bariatric procedure and has shown to be an effective primary procedure (Figure 5). It is reported that OAGB-MGB is comparable to or better than sleeve gastrectomy (SG) and Roux en Y Gastric Bypass (RYGB) in the super-obese population. A recent publication has concluded it to be a safe and effective metabolic procedure in patients with lower BMI.

This study aimed to evaluate the effect of dMGB on QoL concerning short-term outcomes. There was a significant positive effect on the quality of life owing to substantial weight loss, resolution of comorbidities, and generalized improvement in self-esteem in the first year. Complications associated are primarily due to decreased intake amounts of specific nutrients. Our findings were in the same line as earlier studies. Macronutrient deficiencies can include severe protein-calorie malnutrition and fat malabsorption. The most common micronutrient deficiencies are vitamin B₁₂, iron, calcium, and vitamin D. Other micronutrient deficiencies that can lead to severe complications include thiamine, folate, and fat-soluble vitamins (Figure 6). Reassurance, solace, and keeping an eye on regarding nutrients and mineral boosting are essential for treating and preventing nutritional and metabolic impediments after bariatric surgery.

**Figure 5**: Schematic diagram showing various effects of one anastomosis gastric bypass- mini gastric bypass (OAGB-MGB) in obese patients. This figure has been drawn with the premium version of BioRender (https://biorender.com/ Accessed on 29 July 2023) with license number VN25O0VY3B. Image credit: Susmita Sinha.

**Figure 6**: Chart showing nutrient deficiencies following OAGB-MGB surgery. This figure has been drawn with the premium version of BioRender (https://biorender.com/ Accessed on 29 July 2023) with license number RK25O11YHT. Image credit: Susmita Sinha.

Although BAROS-II is intended to be used after 1 year, this study also wanted to assess how QoL changed over time, which can only be studied if...
prospective data is collected at regular intervals. Significant weight loss can explain the increase in QoL score during the first year. The current study was similar to earlier research reports 49, 50. Patients experience more mobility due to fewer complications like joint pain. The current findings are also similar to earlier research reports 51, 52. We noticed that the scores were low for the group between 6 to 9 months, probably when the initial euphoria of weight loss settles down, and some of them might have issues with food intake and static weight. But this trend was again reversed after 9 months when they had a clear picture of themselves and their comorbidities.

It is noted that patients on dietary attempts for weight loss stopped eating for apparent health and cosmetic reasons, and the same happens for post-bariatric patients for fear of vomiting 53, 54. This fear of vomiting in post-op patients primarily develops from the restrictive bariatric procedures, which offer marked restrictions in eating patterns 55, 56. Lap adjustable gastric band (LAGB), Lap Sleeve Gastrectomy (LSG), and to some extent, Lap RYGB are the standard procedures for this post-operative change. Diverted Mini Gastric Bypass evolved as a combined restrictive and malabsorptive procedure, relying more on malabsorption than restriction for weight loss and maintenance 57, 58. Also, the stoma size in dMGB is more than that of RYGB, making Diverted MGB a relatively lower-pressure gastric pouch 12, 41, 59, 60.

**Conclusion**

Diverted MGB seems to be a promising modification of MGB or, for that matter, an amendment of an RYGB with an extended pouch. It avoids bile in the esophagus and its potential consequences. dMGB combines the advantages of the MGB-OAGB (mild restriction and moderate malabsorption) with the anti-reflux effect of the Roux-en-Y diversion, which aids in maintaining a good quality of life. The short-term results of Diverted MGB show a favorable response from the patients. A more comprehensive multicentric study with a long-term follow-up would help establish it as a Gold standard procedure.
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