Risk Prediction Model for Severe Postoperative Complication in Bariatric Surgery

Erik Stenberg1,2 · Yang Cao3,4 · Eva Szabo1 · Erik Näsland5 · Ingmar Näsland1 · Johan Ottosson1

Published online: 12 January 2018
© The Author(s) 2018. This article is an open access publication

Abstract

Background Factors associated with risk for adverse outcome are important considerations in the preoperative assessment of patients for bariatric surgery. As yet, prediction models based on preoperative risk factors have not been able to predict adverse outcome sufficiently.

Objective This study aimed to identify preoperative risk factors and to construct a risk prediction model based on these.

Methods Patients who underwent a bariatric surgical procedure in Sweden between 2010 and 2014 were identified from the Scandinavian Obesity Surgery Registry (SOREg). Associations between preoperative potential risk factors and severe postoperative complications were analysed using a logistic regression model. A multivariate model for risk prediction was created and validated in the SOReg for patients who underwent bariatric surgery in Sweden, 2015.

Results Revision surgery (standardized OR 1.19, 95% confidence interval (CI) 1.14–0.24, p < 0.001), age (standardized OR 1.10, 95% CI 1.03–1.17, p = 0.007), low body mass index (standardized OR 0.89, 95%CI 0.82–0.98, p = 0.012), operation year (standardized OR 0.91, 95%CI 0.85–0.97, p = 0.003), waist circumference (standardized OR 1.09, 95%CI 1.00–1.19, p = 0.059), and dyspepsia/GERD (standardized OR 1.08, 95% CI 1.02–1.15, p = 0.007) were all associated with risk for severe postoperative complication and were included in the risk prediction model. Despite high specificity, the sensitivity of the model was low.

Conclusion Revision surgery, high age, low BMI, large waist circumference, and dyspepsia/GERD were associated with an increased risk for severe postoperative complication. The prediction model based on these factors, however, had a sensitivity that was too low to predict risk in the individual patient case.
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Introduction

Bariatric surgery is currently the only treatment available for morbid obesity that has been shown to offer significant weight loss over time [1], reduce cardiovascular morbidity [2], diabetes [3–5], cancer [6], and improve quality-of-life [7–9]. Each year, approximately 500,000 bariatric procedures are performed worldwide [10]. In the preoperative evaluation of the patient, it is important to identify factors that may be associated with adverse outcome. A few risk prediction models for postoperative mortality have been described previously [11, 12], but mortality rates following bariatric surgery today are so low that it is more important to consider severe postoperative morbidity when assessing adverse outcome in the early
postoperative period [13–15]. Prediction models for postoperative complication could also enable case-mix comparison of results from different bariatric surgical centres. Risk prediction models for adverse postoperative outcome previously reported in the literature [14, 16, 17] have shown discriminatory values that are too low to be clinically useful in the individual assessment of patients [18].

The purpose of the present study was to construct and validate a risk prediction model using preoperatively available risk factors for severe postoperative complications.

**Methods**

**Design and Data Sources**

The Scandinavian Obesity Surgery Registry (SOReg) is a Swedish national quality and research register, and since 2010, it has covered virtually all bariatric surgical procedures performed in Sweden. The register has been described in detail elsewhere [13, 19]. Patients registered in the SOReg between 2010 and 2015 were included in the present study. All patients who underwent a bariatric procedure between 2010 and 2014 were included in the construction of the risk calculation model. Data from patients who underwent a bariatric surgical procedure in 2015 were used to validate the model’s performance in predicting serious postoperative complication within 30 days after surgery.

Historically, most bariatric procedures performed in Sweden are laparoscopic gastric bypass [13]. The surgical technique for this procedure is well standardized in Sweden with 99% being the antecolic, antegastric laparoscopic Roux-en-Y gastric bypass procedure described by Lönroth and Olbers [20]. Pharmacological prophylaxis for deep venous thrombosis is given on a routine basis [21].

Comorbidity was defined as a medical condition requiring ongoing pharmacological or positive airway pressure treatment (in the case of sleep apnoea). Previous venous thromboembolism was defined as previous treatment for deep venous thrombosis or pulmonary embolism. Smoking was defined as active smoking or a history of smoking.

**Outcome**

The primary outcome measure was severe postoperative complication occurring within the first 30 days after surgery. This was defined according to the Clavien-Dindo classification of postoperative complications [22]. A complication graded as IIIb–V on this scale, i.e. a complication requiring intervention under general anaesthesia, or resulting in organ failure or death of the patient, was considered to be a severe complication.

**Data Analysis**

Baseline data for the study group and the validation group are presented as number of individuals (n) and percentage of patients (%) for categorical values, and mean ± standard deviation (SD) for continuous variables. A logistic regression model was used to examine associations between potential risk factors and severe complications, measured as odds ratio (OR) and corresponding 95% confidence interval (CI). Continuous factors with skewed distribution were analysed on a logarithmic scale to approximate normal distribution.

Predetermined potential risk factors were examined in both univariate and multivariate analyses. All risk factors with a p < 0.10 in the multivariate analyses were then included in the design of a concise risk prediction model. Standardized coefficients were used to assess relative risk contribution of these factors. The standardized coefficient (β*) was calculated from the original coefficient (β) divided by the standard deviation of the corresponding explanatory variable. These standardized coefficients (β*’s) were then used to calculate a standardized OR for each factor and its contribution to the risk for severe complication.

Model discrimination values were evaluated using data from all patients operated during 2015 and success defined by the following: non-significance in the Hosmer and Lemeshow goodness of fit test, Nagelkerke R² ≥ 0.10, and an area ≥ 0.7 under the receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve.

All analyses were performed with SPSS version 22 (IBM Corporation, Armonk, New York, USA) and Stata version 14 (Stata Corp LP, College Station, Texas, USA).

**Ethics**

The study was approved by the Regional Ethics Committee in Stockholm and was conducted in accordance with the ethical standards of the Helsinki Declaration (6th revision).

**Results**

A total of 37,811 patients operated between January 1, 2010 and December 31, 2014 were identified in the SOReg. These patients were included in the study group. Follow-up at day 30 was 98.2% (n = 37,134). A further 6250 patients operated between January 1, 2015 and December 31, 2015 constituted the validation group. In this group, follow-up at day 30 was 94.7% (n = 5919).

The two groups were comparable with regard to baseline characteristics (Table 1). The most common primary bariatric procedure in the study group was gastric bypass (n = 34,161, 90.3%), followed by sleeve gastrectomy (n = 1774, 4.7%), duodenal switch (n = 252, 0.7%), gastric banding (n = 111, 0.3%).
In the present study, a number of factors known at the time of surgery were identified as being associated with increased risk for severe postoperative complication. In general, the risk prediction model based on these factors had a high specificity, but a low sensitivity. Despite the large study population, it was not possible to create a prediction model that was sensitive enough to be useful for individual patients in clinical practice.
Indeed, surgery-specific risk factors seem to be the most important factors when predicting severe postoperative complications [13, 18]. The present study supports the results of a review by Geubbels reporting that risk prediction models based on preoperatively known risk factors alone are inadequate in predicting postoperative severe complications [18]. There are, however, a number of preoperative factors associated with increased risk for severe postoperative complication.

In the present study, high age, dyspepsia/GERD, relatively low BMI, large waist circumference, and revision surgery were associated with increased risk for severe postoperative complication within 30 days after surgery. Age has previously been reported to be an important patient-specific risk factor for severe postoperative complication [13, 14, 17, 18]. An association between lower BMI and increased risk for postoperative complication has also been reported previously [13, 16]. The subgroup of patients with a relatively low BMI accepted for surgery may have a different metabolic profile than the average bariatric surgical patient. The combination of large waist circumference and a relatively low BMI indicates a fat distribution

### Table 2: Risk for severe postoperative complication

|                             | Unadjusted analyses |                      | Adjusted analyses |                      |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
|                             | n (%) | OR (95%CI) | P      | OR (95%CI) | P         |
| Sex                         |       |            |        |            |           |
| Men                         | 304 (3.4%) | Reference | Reference | Reference | Reference |
| Women                       | 916 (3.3%) | 0.96 (0.84–1.10) | 0.549 | 1.07 (0.88–1.30) | 0.491 |
| Age                         |        |            |        |            |           |
| <30 years                   | 161 (2.5%) | Reference | Reference |          |           |
| 30–40 years                 | 283 (3.0%) | 1.18 (0.97–1.44) | 0.093 | 1.01 (1.00–1.02) | 0.009 |
| 40–50 years                 | 424 (3.5%) | 1.41 (1.18–1.70) | <0.001 |            |           |
| 50–60 years                 | 289 (3.9%) | 1.58 (1.30–1.92) | <0.001 |            |           |
| >60 years                   | 63 (3.7%) | 1.47 (1.09–1.98) | 0.011 |            |           |
| Waist circumference         |        |            |        |            |           |
| <110 cm                     | 92 (2.8%) | Reference | Reference |          |           |
| 110–125 cm                  | 360 (3.2%) | 1.15 (0.91–1.45) | 0.235 |            |           |
| 125–140 cm                  | 358 (3.3%) | 1.18 (0.94–1.49) | 0.158 |            |           |
| >140 cm                     | 152 (3.1%) | 1.11 (0.86–1.45) | 0.419 |            |           |
| Body mass index             |        |            |        |            |           |
| <40 kg/m²                   | 496 (3.5%) | Reference | Reference |          |           |
| 40–50 kg/m²                 | 630 (3.2%) | 0.93 (0.82–1.05) | 0.220 |            |           |
| 50–60 kg/m²                 | 84 (2.9%) | 0.83 (0.66–1.05) | 0.116 |            |           |
| >60 kg/m²                   | 10 (2.9%) | 0.82 (0.43–1.54) | 0.534 |            |           |
| Ln HbA1c                    | 1.32 (1.03–1.70) | 0.031 |            | 1.07 (0.71–1.61) | 0.751 |
| Comorbidity                 |        |            |        |            |           |
| Sleep apnoea                | 136 (3.6%) | 1.12 (0.94–1.35) | 0.208 | 0.95 (0.74–1.22) | 0.659 |
| Hypertension                | 356 (3.7%) | 1.18 (1.04–1.34) | 0.010 | 0.96 (0.80–1.16) | 0.705 |
| Diabtes                     | 203 (3.8%) | 1.19 (1.02–1.39) | 0.026 | 1.05 (0.80–1.38) | 0.705 |
| Dyslipidaemia               | 135 (3.6%) | 1.10 (0.92–1.32) | 0.298 | 0.81 (0.62–1.05) | 0.105 |
| Dyspepsia/GERD              | 167 (4.3%) | 1.36 (1.15–1.60) | <0.001 | 1.25 (1.02–1.54) | 0.034 |
| Depression                  | 200 (3.6%) | 1.15 (0.97–1.32) | 0.113 | 1.15 (0.95–1.39) | 0.152 |
| Musculoskeletal pain        | 151 (3.1%) | 0.95 (0.80–1.13) | 0.535 | 0.90 (0.69–1.19) | 0.471 |
| Other comorbidity           | 178 (3.7%) | 1.16 (0.99–1.36) | 0.075 | 1.02 (0.78–1.33) | 0.887 |
| Previous venous thromboembolism | 43 (4.8%) | 1.52 (1.11–2.07) | 0.009 | 1.29 (0.87–1.92) | 0.205 |
| History of smoking          | 322 (3.3%) | 1.04 (0.91–1.19) | 0.558 |            |           |
| Surgical year               |        |            |        |            |           |
| 2010                        | 276 (3.7%) | Reference | Reference |          |           |
| 2011                        | 279 (3.4%) | 0.90 (0.76–1.06) | 0.215 |            |           |
| 2012                        | 255 (3.4%) | 0.91 (0.77–1.08) | 0.293 |            |           |
| 2013                        | 241 (3.2%) | 0.86 (0.72–1.02) | 0.091 |            |           |
| 2014                        | 169 (2.6%) | 0.69 (0.57–0.83) | <0.001 |            |           |
| Surgical access             |        |            |        |            |           |
| Laparoscopic                | 1123 (3.1%) | Reference | Reference |          |           |
| Open                        | 68 (6.7%) | 2.21 (1.72–2.85) | <0.001 | 1.38 (0.89–2.15) | 0.147 |
| Conversion                  | 29 (12.5%) | 4.42 (2.98–6.55) | <0.001 | 3.22 (1.89–5.51) | <0.001 |
| Operation method            |        |            |        |            |           |
| Gastric bypass              | 1071 (3.2%) | Reference | Reference |          |           |
| Sleeve gastrectomy          | 29 (1.7%) | 0.53 (0.37–0.77) | 0.001 | 0.72 (0.48–1.06) | 0.096 |
| Duodenal switch             | 8 (3.2%) | 1.00 (0.50–2.04) | 0.989 | 1.38 (0.33–5.77) | 0.658 |
| Gastric banding             | 1 (0.9%) | 0.28 (0.04–2.00) | 0.204 | 0.72 (0.10–5.25) | 0.747 |
| Other                       | 5 (4.3%) | 1.36 (0.55–3.33) | 0.505 | 1.26 (0.46–3.45) | 0.649 |
| Revisional surgery          | 106 (7.9%) | 2.68 (2.18–3.30) | <0.001 | 2.27 (1.65–3.10) | <0.001 |
associated with higher metabolic burden [23, 24]. This could also be associated with increased insulin resistance as a response to the surgical trauma, or simply the cause of more technically demanding surgery. Insulin resistance has previously been suggested as a factor associated with postoperative complications [25, 26]. Dyspepsia/GERD may increase the risk for severe pulmonary complications following surgery [27]. In the present study, an association between dyspepsia/GERD and severe postoperative complication was also seen, and likely explained by the increased risk for postoperative gastric and pulmonary complications. However, dyspepsia/GERD may also serve as a confounder for other risk factors, such as psychosomatic disorders, not measured within this study [28–30].

Revision surgery is more technically demanding than primary surgery and complication rates are also known to be higher [31]. Finally, our model included year of surgery. This factor is not relevant when considering risk in a specific case, but since complication rates improve with time, it is an important factor to consider when designing a prediction model.

This study was based on data from almost all bariatric surgery patients operated in Sweden during the study period. Follow-up at 30 days after surgery was also high. There are, however, a number of limitations that must be acknowledged. HbA1c did not fit in the present risk prediction model. Although an association between HbA1c and risk has been established in diabetic non-obese subjects undergoing cardiovascular surgery [26], for morbidly obese patients undergoing bariatric surgery the association has only been established in non-diabetic patients [25]. Since our aim was to create one model for all bariatric surgery patients, both diabetic and non-diabetic patients were grouped together, though it is possible that risk association is somewhat different in diabetic compared to non-diabetic morbidly obese patients. A model incorporating several potential predictor variables may have multicollinearity problems. However, in our model, multicollinearity did not affect how well the model fitted.

The study was a register-based observational study. A register-based study is limited to the specific definitions of the register and to the quality of registration. Registration in the SOReg is subjected to continuous validation, and so far, the validity has been shown to be very high [19]. Cardiovascular comorbidity and pulmonary comorbidity other than sleep

### Table 3 Adjusted risk for severe postoperative complication based on standardised parameters

|                           | Full model          | Concise model         |
|---------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
|                           | Contribution to risk | Contribution to risk  |
|                           | OR (95%CI) P %       | OR (95%CI) P %        |
| Female sex                | 1.03 (0.95–1.12) 0.520 2.77 | 1.10 (1.03–1.17) 0.007 9.70 |
| Age                       | 1.12 (1.03–1.22) 0.008 12.24 | 1.09 (1.00–1.19) 0.059 8.81 |
| Waist circumference       | 1.10 (0.99–1.23) 0.078 10.35 | 0.89 (0.82–0.98) 0.012 10.76 |
| Body mass index           | 0.99 (0.89–1.09) 0.036 1.08 | 0.89 (0.82–0.98) 0.012 10.76 |
| Ln HbA1c                  | 1.02 (0.98–1.06) 0.700 1.95 | 0.98 (0.95–1.02) 0.661 1.65 |
| Coexisting medical condition |                     |                       |
| Sleep apnoea              | 0.98 (0.95–1.02) 0.661 1.65 | 0.98 (0.95–1.02) 0.661 1.65 |
| Hypertension              | 1.01 (0.96–1.01) 0.727 1.46 | 1.01 (0.96–1.01) 0.727 1.46 |
| Diabetes                  | 1.02 (0.98–1.07) 0.652 2.36 | 1.02 (0.98–1.07) 0.652 2.36 |
| Dyslipidaemia             | 0.94 (0.83–1.06) 0.120 6.14 | 0.94 (0.83–1.06) 0.120 6.14 |
| Dyspepsia/GERD            | 1.08 (0.93–1.06) 0.029 7.65 | 1.08 (0.93–1.06) 0.029 7.65 |
| Depression                | 1.05 (0.98–1.12) 0.176 3.30 | 1.05 (0.98–1.12) 0.176 3.30 |
| Musculoskeletal pain      | 0.97 (0.90–1.04) 0.381 3.30 | 0.97 (0.90–1.04) 0.381 3.30 |
| Previous venous thromboembolism | 1.04 (0.98–1.11) 0.190 4.25 | 1.04 (0.98–1.11) 0.190 4.25 |
| Surgical year             | 0.92 (0.85–0.98) 0.016 8.42 | 0.91 (0.85–0.97) 0.003 9.49 |
| Revisional surgery        | 1.19 (1.14–1.25) <0.001 19.23 | 1.19 (1.14–1.24) <0.001 18.96 |
Apnea are not mandatory variables in the SOReg and could thus not be evaluated as potential risk factors in this study. Although cardiovascular disease is over-represented in obese patients [32], the prevalence of severe cardiovascular comorbidity in this group of patients at the time of surgery is not that high in European studies [18]. Furthermore, patient-specific socio-economic factors such as level of education, employment/unemployment, married or not, or immigration, could play an important role. Such data were not available for this study as they are not entered in the SOReg.

Although prediction models based on preoperative factors have not been found to be useful in the preoperative assessment of patients prior to bariatric surgery, the results of the present study indicate that dyspepsia/GERD, high age, and large waist circumference relative to BMI (signalling significant amount of visceral fat) should be considered as risk factors in the individual case, in particular patients considered for revision surgery. To optimize these patients, pharmacological treatment for dyspepsia/GERD and a preoperative weight loss of 5–10% TBW [33] may be considered.

Although our prediction model had too low a sensitivity for use at the individual level, the specificity was very high and our results could be used for case-mix adjustments on a group level. This could be useful when comparing results between different units or in reimbursement systems. For prediction, classification and pattern recognition purposes, when traditional statistical modelling methods (dealing with finding relationship between variables to predict an outcome) do not work, machine learning methods (which deals with building systems that can learn from data, instead of explicitly programmed instructions) may be promising alternatives.

Conclusion

Revision surgery, age, low BMI, waist circumference, and dyspepsia/GERD were associated with a higher risk for severe postoperative complication. However, a prediction model based on these factors, despite its high specificity, had a low sensitivity for severe postoperative complications.

Funding This work was supported by grants from the Örebro County Council, Örebro University, Stockholm County Council, SRP diabetes, and the NovoNordisk foundation.

Compliance with Ethical Standards

Conflict of Interest Ingmar Näslund has received consultant fees from Baricol Bariatrics AB, Sweden. Authors 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Ethical Approval The study was conducted in accordance with the ethical standards of the 1964 Helsinki Declaration and its later amendments and with the approval of the regional research committee of the Uppsala-Orebro region.

Previous Presentation No previous presentation.

Open Access This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made.

References

1. Sjostrom L, Lindroos AK, Peltonen M, et al. Lifestyle, diabetes, and cardiovascular risk factors 10 years after bariatric surgery. N Engl J Med. 2004;351(26):2683–93. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa035622.
2. Sjostrom L, Peltonen M, Jacobson P, et al. Bariatric surgery and long-term cardiovascular events. JAMA. 2012;307(1):56–65. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2011.1914.

3. Sjostrom L, Peltonen M, Jacobson P, et al. Association of bariatric surgery with long-term remission of type 2 diabetes and with microvascular and macrovascular complications. JAMA. 2014;311(22):2297–304. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2014.5988.

4. Dixon JB, O’Brien PE, Playfair J, et al. Adjustable gastric banding and conventional therapy for type 2 diabetes: a randomized controlled trial. JAMA. 2008;299(3):316–23. https://doi.org/10.1001/ jama.299.3.316.

5. Sundbom M, Hedberg J, Marsk R, et al. Substantial decrease in morbidity 5 years after gastric bypass: a population-based study from the Scandinavian Obesity Surgery Registry. Ann Surg 2017;265(6):1166–1171. https://doi.org/10.1097/SLA.0000000000001920.

6. Sjostrom L, Gummesson A, Sjostrom CD, et al. Effects of bariatric surgery on cancer incidence in obese patients in Sweden (Swedish Obese Subjects Study): a prospective, controlled intervention trial. Lancet Oncol. 2009;10(7):653–62. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1470-4684(09)70159-7.

7. Adams TD, Pendleton RC, Strong MB, et al. Health outcomes of gastric bypass patients compared to nonsurgical, nonintervened severely obese. Obesity, 2010;18(1):121–30. https://doi.org/10.1038/oby.2009.178.

8. Karlsson J, Taft C, Ryden A, et al. Ten-year trends in health-related quality of life after surgical and conventional treatment for severe obesity: the SOS intervention study. Int J Obes. 2007;31(8):1248-61. https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.ijo.0803573.

9. Kolotkin RL, Davidson LE, Crosby RD, et al. Six-year changes in health-related quality of life in gastric bypass patients versus obese comparison groups. Surg Obes Relat Dis. 2012;8(5):625–33. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soard.2012.01.011.

10. Angrisani L, Santonicola A, Iovino P, et al. Bariatric surgery worldwide 2013. Obes Surg. 2015;25(10):1822–32. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11695-015-1657-z.

11. DeMaria EJ, Demartines N, Clavien PA. Classification of surgical complications: a new proposal with evaluation in a cohort of 6336 patients and results of a survey. Ann Surg. 2004;240(2):205–13. https://doi.org/10.1097/01.sla.0000133083.54934.ae.

12. Nguyen NT, Nguyen B, Smith B, et al. Proposal for a bariatric surgery world-wide 2013. Obes Surg. 2015;25(10):1893–900. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11695-015-1619-5.

13. Stenberg E, Szabo E, Agren G, et al. Scandinavian Obesity Surgery Registry Study G. Is glycosylated hemoglobin A1c associated with increased risk for severe early postoperative complications in non-diabetics after laparoscopic gastric bypass? Surg Obes Relat Dis. 2014;10(5):801–5. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soard.2014.05.005.

14. Angrisani L, Schiozeri A, Nesti C, et al. Long-term mortality risk classification system for patients undergoing bariatric surgery. Ann Surg. 2015;261(5):909–13. https://doi.org/10.1097/SLA.0000000000001920.

15. DeMario EJ, Portenier D, Wolfe L. Obesity surgery mortality risk score: proposal for a clinically useful score to predict mortality risk in patients undergoing gastric bypass. Surg Obes Relat Dis. 2007;3(2):134–40. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soard.2007.01.005.

16. Nguyen NT, Nguyen B, Smith B, et al. Proposal for a bariatric mortality risk classification system for patients undergoing bariatric surgery. Surg Obes Relat Dis. 2013;9(2):239–46. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soard.2012.12.010.

17. Stenberg E, Szabo E, Agren G, et al. Early complications after laparoscopic gastric bypass surgery: results from the scandinavian obesity surgery registry. Ann Surg. 2014;260(6):1040–7. https://doi.org/10.1097/SLA.0000000000000431.

18. Geubbels N, de Brauw LM, Acherman YI, et al. Risk stratification models: how well do they predict adverse outcomes in a large Dutch bariatric cohort? Obes Surg. 2015; 25(12):2290–301. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11695-015-1699-2.

19. Hedenbro JL, Naslund E, Boman L, et al. Formation of the Scandinavian Obesity Surgery Registry, SOReg. Obes Surg. 2015;25(10):1893–900. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11695-015-1619-5.

20. Olbers T, Lonroth H, Fagevik-Olsen M, et al. Laparoscopic gastric bypass: development of technique, respiratory function, and long-term outcome. Obes Surg. 2003;13(3):364–70. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s11695-002-9091-4.