

# Laparoscopic Anterior 180-Degree Versus Nissen Fundoplication for Gastroesophageal Reflux Disease

## Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Clinical Trials

Joris A. Broeders, MD, PhD,\* David J. Roks, MD,\* Usama Ahmed Ali, MD,†  
David I. Watson, MBBS, MD, FRACS,‡ Robert J. Baigrie, MBBS, MD, FRCS,§ ZhanGuo Cao, MD,¶  
Jens Hartmann, MD,|| and Guy J. Maddern, FRACS, PhD\*

**Objective:** To compare short- and long-term outcome after 180-degree laparoscopic anterior fundoplication (180-degree LAF) with laparoscopic Nissen fundoplication (LNF).

**Summary of Background Data:** LNF is currently the most frequently performed surgical therapy for gastroesophageal reflux disease. Alternatively, 180-degree LAF has been alleged to reduce troublesome dysphagia and gas-related symptoms, with similar reflux control.

**Methods:** MEDLINE, EMBASE, Cochrane Library, and web of Knowledge CPCI-S were searched for randomized clinical trials comparing primary 180-degree LAF with LNF. The methodological quality was evaluated to assess bias risk. Primary outcomes were esophageal acid exposure, esophagitis, heartburn score, dilatation for dysphagia, modified Dakkak dysphagia score (0–45), and reoperation rate. Meta-analysis was conducted at 1 and 5 years.

**Results:** Five distinct randomized clinical trials comparing 180-degree LAF (n = 227) with LNF (n = 231) were identified. At 1 year, the Dakkak dysphagia score [2.8 vs 4.8; weighted mean difference:  $-2.25$ ; 95% confidence interval (CI):  $-2.66$  to  $-1.83$ ;  $P < 0.001$ ], gas bloating [11% vs 18%; relative risk (RR) 0.59; 95% CI: 0.36–0.97;  $P = 0.04$ ], flatulence (14% vs 25%; RR: 0.57; 95% CI: 0.35–0.91;  $P = 0.02$ ), inability to belch (19% vs 31%; RR: 0.63; 95% CI: 0.40–0.99;  $P = 0.05$ ), and inability to relieve bloating (34% vs 44%; RR: 0.74; 95% CI: 0.55–0.99;  $P = 0.04$ ) were lower after 180-degree LAF. Esophageal acid exposure (standardized mean difference: 0.19; 95% CI:  $-0.07$  to 0.46;  $P = 0.15$ ), esophagitis (19% vs 13%; RR: 1.42; 95% CI: 0.69–2.91;  $P = 0.34$ ), heartburn score (standardized mean difference: 1.27; 95% CI:  $-0.36$  to 2.90;  $P = 0.13$ ), dilatation rate (1.4% vs 2.8%; RR: 0.60; 95% CI: 0.19–1.91;  $P = 0.39$ ), reoperation rate (5.7% vs 2.8%; RR: 2.08; 95% CI: 0.80–5.41;  $P = 0.13$ ), perioperative outcome, regurgitation, proton pump inhibitor (PPI) use, lower esophageal sphincter pressure, and patient satisfaction were similar after 180-degree LAF and LNF. At 5 years, the Dakkak dysphagia score, flatulence, inability to belch, and inability to relieve bloating remained lower after 180-degree LAF. The 5-year heartburn score, dilatation rate, reoperation rate, PPI use, and patient satisfaction were similar.

**Conclusions:** At 1 and 5 years, dysphagia and gas-related symptoms are lower after 180-degree LAF than after LNF, and esophageal acid exposure and

esophagitis are similar, with no differences in heartburn scores, patient satisfaction, dilatations, and reoperation rate. These results lend level 1a support for the use of 180-degree LAF for the surgical treatment of gastroesophageal reflux disease.

**Keywords:** anterior fundoplication, gastroesophageal reflux disease, laparoscopic antireflux surgery, meta-analysis, Nissen fundoplication, randomized controlled trial, systematic review

(*Ann Surg* 2013;257: 850–859)

Laparoscopic fundoplication is the surgical approach of choice for gastroesophageal reflux disease (GERD). Total fundoplication according to Nissen provides excellent reflux control and is the most frequently performed operation for GERD.<sup>1–3</sup> However, laparoscopic Nissen fundoplication (LNF) is followed by a significant incidence of troublesome dysphagia and gas-related symptoms.<sup>4–6</sup> Partial fundoplications have been developed as alternatives and aim to reduce the incidence of these postfundoplication symptoms.

A fundoplication is created by wrapping the fundus of the stomach anteriorly or posteriorly around the esophagus. Total fundoplication according to Nissen is an example of a posterior fundoplication. Commonly used partial fundoplications are posterior 270-degree fundoplication, anterior 90-degree fundoplication, and anterior 180-degree fundoplication.<sup>7</sup> Several randomized clinical trials (RCTs) have evaluated whether partial wraps reduce postfundoplication symptoms and whether this is associated with inferior reflux control compared with LNF.<sup>7</sup> Systematic reviews have been performed to combine the results of these RCTs. Two meta-analyses have compared LNF with the pooled results of various types of partial fundoplications<sup>5,6</sup> and another review combined a mixture of posterior fundoplications and compared them with the pooled results of anterior fundoplications.<sup>8</sup> However, this year the long-term results of randomized trials demonstrated that 180-degree laparoscopic anterior fundoplication (LAF) offers similar reflux control compared with LNF, whereas reflux control after 90-degree LAF is less effective than after LNF.<sup>9</sup> Therefore, generalizing these 2 fundoplication types into 1 category in the setting of a meta-analysis is probably not appropriate. Comparing 1 partial fundoplication type head-to-head to LNF increases the validity of the analysis and facilitates application of the results in clinical practice. This study aims, therefore, to systematically review all RCTs comparing 180-degree LAF and LNF for GERD and to generate the highest level of evidence.

## METHODS

### Study Selection


A systematic literature search with predefined search terms (Fig. 1) was carried out in MEDLINE (from 1960),<sup>10</sup> EMBASE (from 1980),<sup>11</sup> Cochrane Library (issue 1, 2012), and the Web of

From the \*Discipline of Surgery, University of Adelaide, The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, Woodville South, South Australia; †Department of Surgery, Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, OH; ‡Flinders University Department of Surgery, Flinders Medical Centre, Bedford Park, South Australia; §Gastrointestinal Surgical Unit, University of Cape Town, Kingsbury Hospital, Cape Town, South Africa; ¶TianJin Mini-invasive Surgery Center, TianJin Medical University, TianJin NanKai Hospital, TianJin, China; and ||Department of General, Visceral, Vascular and Thoracic Surgery, University Medicine Berlin, Berlin, Germany.

Disclosure: Support for the randomized clinical trial from Adelaide has been provided by Research Project grants from the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) of Australia (grant nos. 157986 and 375111).

Reprints: Joris A.J.L. Broeders, MD, PhD, The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, DX465314, Woodville South, South Australia 5011, Australia. E-mail: joris.broeders@adelaide.edu.au.

Copyright © 2013 by Lippincott Williams & Wilkins  
ISSN: 0003-4932/13/25705-0850  
DOI: 10.1097/SLA.0b013e31828604dd



**FIGURE 1.** Flowchart illustrating the details of the search strategy and study selection process according to the QUOROM statement<sup>17-19</sup> CPCI-S indicates Conference Proceedings Citation Index—Science; MeSH, Medical Subject Heading.

Knowledge Conference Proceedings Citation Index-Science (CPCI-S; from 1990) databases on April 14, 2012 (Fig. 1). All identified articles were screened for cross-references. Language restrictions were not applied.

### Inclusion Criteria

Title and abstract of all identified articles were screened and selected according to the following inclusion criteria: study population—adult patients with established GERD undergoing primary antireflux surgery; intervention—clearly documented surgical technique of 180-degree LAF<sup>12</sup> and LNF,<sup>13</sup> irrespective of division of the short gastric vessels<sup>5</sup>; study outcomes—at least one of the outcome measures reported below; study design—patients assigned to either 180-degree LAF or LNF by random allocation; and publication—published as a full article in a peer-reviewed journal.

### Exclusion Criteria

Studies were excluded from analysis if they did not meet the inclusion criteria or if the corresponding author was not able to provide data requested and it was impossible to extract or calculate appropriate data from the published results. Abstracts of RCTs were excluded as the fundoplication circumference, surgical technique, methodological quality, and the risk of bias of these studies could not be assessed.

### Outcomes of Interest and Definitions

Primary outcomes were esophageal acid exposure on pH monitoring (total esophageal acid exposure time or DeMeester score<sup>14</sup>), endoscopic esophagitis, presence of heartburn, severity of heartburn [an analog score (0 = no heartburn; 10 = severe heartburn)], dilatation for dysphagia, presence of dysphagia, severity of dysphagia (validated modified Dakkak dysphagia score: 0, no dysphagia; 45, severe dysphagia),<sup>15</sup> and reoperation rate. Secondary outcomes

included operating time, conversion rate, in-hospital complications, length of hospital stay, regurgitation, proton pump inhibitor (PPI) use, inability to belch, gas bloating, ability to relieve bloating, and increased flatulence. Patient satisfaction was scored using an analog score (0 = dissatisfied; 10 = satisfied), the percentage of patients who were satisfied with outcome, a Visick score (1 = no symptoms; 2 = mild symptoms; 3 = moderate symptoms; 4 = moderate symptoms interfering with life; 5 = symptoms as bad or worse after surgery),<sup>16</sup> and willingness to undergo surgery again. One-year results (6–18 months), 5-year outcome, and results at 5 years and beyond were pooled separately in meta-analysis.

### Data Extraction

Titles and abstracts of all retrieved records, and subsequently full-text articles, were examined independently by 2 authors (J.A.B. and D.J.R.) according to the Quality of Reporting of Meta-analyses guidelines.<sup>17–19</sup> The following data were extracted separately by the same 2 authors (J.A.B. and D.J.R.) for all studies meeting the inclusion criteria: reference of study, study population characteristics, study design, inclusion and exclusion criteria, and number of participating subjects for each endpoint. For dichotomous outcomes, the number of events was recorded and for continuous outcomes, means and standard deviations (SDs) were registered. In case of discrepancies, a third author (U.A.A.) was consulted and agreement was reached by consensus.

Authors of all the original RCTs were contacted and agreed to provide missing data. When authors could not provide missing data, the following methods of handling missing data were applied. If the number of patients per arm was missing for an outcome, an equal distribution between both arms was assumed. Missing SDs were imputed either on the basis of ranges when available<sup>20</sup> or on the basis of the average SDs reported by other RCTs for the same outcome.<sup>10</sup> If both means and SDs were missing, they were imputed on the basis of the medians and ranges<sup>20</sup> or on the basis of medians and interquartile ranges,<sup>10</sup> according to availability.

### Risk of Bias Assessment

Risk of bias was assessed for all articles using both The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias<sup>10</sup> and the Jadad scoring system.<sup>21</sup>

### Statistical Analysis

Statistical analyses were performed following the recommendations of The Cochrane Collaboration and Quality of Reporting of Meta-analyses guidelines.<sup>17–19</sup> Outcomes reported by 2 or more studies were pooled in meta-analyses. Short- and long-term results

were analyzed separately. Dichotomous and continuous outcomes were presented as risk ratios (RRs) and weighted mean differences (WMDs), respectively. Results were pooled using standardized mean differences (SMDs) if trials reported different scales for a continuous outcome measure. Data were pooled using the Mantel-Haenszel and the inverse-variance method for dichotomous outcomes and for continuous outcomes, respectively. Trials with zero events in both arms were excluded from meta-analysis. Trials with zero events in 1 arm were included in the analysis by adding a continuity correction of 0.5 to all cells in the  $2 \times 2$  table of that study. As a robustness assessment, meta-analyses with RCTs with zero events in 1 arm were also performed using risk differences in a sensitivity analysis. For all analyses, the 95% confidence interval (CI) was calculated.

Heterogeneity was calculated using Higgins  $\chi^2$  test,<sup>22</sup> and inconsistency in study effects was quantified by  $I^2$  values.<sup>10,23</sup> The fixed-effects model was used if no heterogeneity was present ( $\chi^2 P > 0.100$  and  $I^2 < 50\%$ ). If excessive heterogeneity was present, data were first rechecked and the DerSimonian random-effects model was used when heterogeneity persisted.<sup>24</sup> Funnel plots were used to help identify the presence of publication or other types of bias.<sup>25–27</sup> Review Manager software (RevMan© v. 5.0.16) provided by The Cochrane Collaboration was used for data management and statistical analyses.

## RESULTS

### Description of Studies

A total of 188 potential relevant publications were identified (Fig. 1). Twenty-four articles comparing 180-degree LAF with LNF were identified. Nine studies did not randomly allocate patients. An Italian trial randomly allocated patients with achalasia to Heller myotomy followed by either 180-degree LAF or LNF.<sup>28</sup> This trial was excluded because the indication for surgery was not primary fundoplication for established GERD. One potentially relevant RCT that had been published as an abstract only without a peer-reviewed publication was excluded.<sup>29</sup> Finally, 8 publications from 5 original RCTs<sup>30–34</sup> comparing laparoscopic anterior with posterior fundoplication were identified. Five publications reported 1-year results,<sup>30–34</sup> 3 articles evaluated 5-year outcome,<sup>9,31,35</sup> and there was 1 trial<sup>36</sup> with 10-year follow-up (Fig. 1).

The 5 included trials were published between 1999 and 2012, all with at least 6 months of follow-up. A total of 458 funduplications (180-degree LAF,  $n = 227$ ; LNF,  $n = 231$ ) were performed. Hiatal repair was performed in all patients, followed by either a standardized LAF with a circumferential range of 180 degrees and fixation to right crus or a standardized LNF with a circumference of 360 degrees. One trial divided the short gastric vessels in the LNF group (Table 1).<sup>33</sup>

**TABLE 1.** Details of Included RCTs Comparing 180-Degree LAF With LNF

Authors	Year	Period	Method	n	Hiatal Repair	DSGV	Bougie	Fixation to Right Crus/Esoophagus†	1-Yr FU	5-Yr FU
Baigrie et al <sup>9,30</sup>	2005	1999–2001	180-degree LAF	79	Yes	No	None	Yes/No	12 <sup>30</sup>	60 <sup>9</sup>
			LNF	84	Yes	No	56 Fr	No/No		
Cao et al <sup>31</sup>	2012	2002–2007	180-degree LAF	50	Yes	No	52 Fr	Yes/Yes	12 <sup>31</sup>	60 <sup>31</sup>
			LNF	50	Yes	No	52 Fr	No/No		
Chrysos et al <sup>32</sup>	2004	1999–2002	180-degree LAF	12	Yes	No	None	Yes/Yes	6 <sup>32</sup>	
			LNF	12	Yes	No	None	No/Yes		
Raue et al <sup>33</sup>	2011	2005–2007	180-degree LAF	32	Yes	No	42 Fr	Yes/Yes	18 <sup>33</sup>	
			LNF	32	Yes	Yes	42 Fr	No/Yes		
Watson et al <sup>34–36</sup>	1999/2004/2008	1995–1997	180-degree LAF	54	Yes	No	None	Yes/Yes	6 <sup>34</sup>	60 <sup>35</sup>
			LNF	53	Yes	No	52 Fr	No/Yes		120 <sup>36</sup>

\*Circumference of the wrap.

†Fixation of the fundoplication to the right crus/esophagus.

DSGV indicates division of the short gastric vessels; Fr, French; FU, follow-up (months); NR, not reported.

Patient characteristics are listed in Table 2. All patients had proof of GERD on upper endoscopy and/or 24-hour pH monitoring. Two trials enrolled some patients with esophageal dysmotility, and these patients were divided equally between both arms.<sup>31,34</sup>

### Methodological Quality of Included Studies

The trials had good methodological quality, with a mean Jadad score of 4 (range, 2–5) (Table 3). All trials had adequate sequence generation. Two trials<sup>31,32</sup> did not report double blinding and allocation concealment and one of these did not report loss to follow-up<sup>32</sup>. Two trials reported a sample size calculation.<sup>33,34</sup>

### One-Year Outcome

One-year outcome was available for 448 of 458 (97.8%) of the patients. All primary and secondary outcome measures were reported by 3 or more trials. Operating time, in-hospital complications, and length of hospital stay were similar for both groups (Table 4). The included trials reported no mortality. The prevalence (15% vs 27%; RR: 0.56; 95% CI: 0.38–0.81;  $P = 0.002$ ; Fig. 2A) and severity (2.8 vs 4.8; WMD:  $-2.25$ ; 95% CI:  $-2.66$  to  $-1.83$ ;  $P < 0.001$ ; Fig. 2B) of dysphagia were lower after 180-degree LAF than after LNF. Esophageal acid exposure on 24-hour pH monitoring (SMD: 0.19; 95% CI:  $-0.07$  to 0.46;  $P = 0.15$ ; Fig. 3A) and prevalence of esophagitis (19% vs 13%; RR: 1.42; 95% CI: 0.69–2.91;  $P = 0.34$ ; Fig. 3B) were similar after both procedures. This was accompanied by a comparable prevalence (10% vs 6%; RR: 1.39; 95% CI: 0.43–4.46;  $P = 0.58$ ; Fig. 4A) and severity of heartburn (SMD: 1.27; 95% CI:  $-0.36$  to 2.90;  $P = 0.13$ ; Fig. 4B) and prevalence of regurgitation and PPI use (Table 4). Dilatation (1.4% vs 2.8%; RR: 0.60; 95% CI: 0.19–1.91;  $P = 0.39$ ; Fig. 5A) and reoperation rates were similar (5.7% vs 2.8%; RR: 2.08; 95% CI: 0.80–5.41;  $P = 0.13$ ; Fig. 5B).

Gas bloating (11% vs 18%; RR: 0.59; 95% CI: 0.36–0.97;  $P = 0.04$ ), flatulence (14% vs 25%; RR: 0.57; 95% CI: 0.35–0.91;  $P =$

0.02), inability to belch (19% vs 31%; RR: 0.63; 95% CI: 0.40–0.99;  $P = 0.05$ ), and inability to relieve bloating (34% vs 44%; RR: 0.74; 95% CI: 0.55–0.99;  $P = 0.04$ ) were lower after 180-degree LAF (Table 4). Mean lower esophageal sphincter (LES) resting and relaxation pressure were similar (Table 4). There were no differences in the number of patients who were satisfied with outcome, satisfaction scores, willingness to undergo surgery again, and the percentage of patients with resolved or mild symptoms (Table 4). Sensitivity analysis of outcomes with zero events in 1 arm (dilatation, in-hospital complications) yielded similar results. Funnel plots did not demonstrate evidence of publication bias (Fig. 6).

### Five-Year Outcome

Five-year outcome was available for 347 of 370 (93.8%) patients. At 5 years, PPI use and the number of patients who was satisfied with intervention were reported by 2 trials. All the remaining primary and secondary outcome measures were reported by 3 or more trials. In line with the 1-year results, the prevalence (21% vs 33%; RR: 0.67; 95% CI: 0.47–0.94; Fig. 7A) and severity (5.0 vs 8.3; WMD:  $-2.33$ ; 95% CI:  $-3.32$  to  $-1.34$ ;  $P < 0.00$ ; Fig. 7B) of dysphagia remained lower after 180-degree LAF than after LNF. The prevalence (17% vs 12%; RR: 1.40; 95% CI: 0.83–2.36; Fig. 8A) and severity (1.7 vs 1.5; WMD: 0.13; 95% CI:  $-0.19$  to 0.46;  $P = 0.43$ ; Fig. 8B) of heartburn and PPI use were comparable. Dilatation (2.4% vs 5.6%; RR: 0.44; 95% CI: 0.15–1.30;  $P = 0.14$ ; Fig. 9A) and reoperation rates (9.5% vs 6.2%; RR: 1.53; 95% CI: 0.73–3.19;  $P = 0.26$ ; Fig. 9B) were similar.

Flatulence (37% vs 50%; RR: 0.75; 95% CI: 0.60–0.94;  $P = 0.01$ ), inability to belch (16% vs 34%; RR: 0.47; 95% CI: 0.32–0.70;  $P < 0.001$ ), and inability to relieve bloating (31% vs 44%; RR: 0.69; 95% CI: 0.53–0.92;  $P = 0.01$ ) remained lower after 180-degree LAF. The difference in gas bloating that was identified at 1 year was no longer present at 5 years (Table 5). Again, there were no differences in the number of patients who were satisfied with outcome, satisfaction

**TABLE 2.** Patient Characteristics

Authors	Method	Age, yr	Male/Female	Esophageal	Indication for Surgical Treatment
			Sex	Dysmotility/ Total	
Baigrie et al <sup>9,30</sup>	180-degree LAF	45	45/34	NR	pH or endoscopically proven GERD
	LNF	43	49/34	NR	
Cao et al <sup>31</sup>	180-degree LAF	57	16/34	8/50	pH or endoscopically proven GERD
	LNF	59	21/29	6/50	
Chrysos et al <sup>32</sup>	180-degree LAF	58	4/8	0/12	pH or endoscopically proven GERD
	LNF	52	9/3	0/12	
Raue et al <sup>33</sup>	180-degree LAF	53	14/16	0/30	pH or endoscopically proven GERD
	LNF	50	16/11	0/27	
Watson et al <sup>34–36</sup>	180-degree LAF	45	34/30	11/54	pH or endoscopically proven GERD
	LNF	47	36/17	11/53	

NR indicates not reported; pH or endoscopically proven GERD, GERD proven on upper endoscopy or 24-hour pH monitoring.


**TABLE 3.** Risk of Bias Summary

	Baigrie et al <sup>9,30</sup>	Cao et al <sup>31</sup>	Chrysos et al <sup>32</sup>	Raue et al <sup>33</sup>	Watson et al <sup>34–36</sup>
Adequate sequence generation	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Allocation concealment	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Blinding (observer)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Blinding (patient)	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Adequate report on loss to follow-up	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Free of other sources of bias	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Jadad score	5	3	2	5	5

**TABLE 4. 1-Year Outcome**

	RCT	180-Degree LAF	LNF	RR	WMD	95% CI	P
Operating time, min	4	79.7 (n = 205)	78.8 (n = 206)		-1.07	-12.8 to 10.7	0.86
In-hospital complications	4	8/213 (3.8%)	3/214 (1.4%)	2.18		0.69-6.93	0.19
Length of hospital stay, d	4	3.1 (n = 181)	3.0 (n = 182)		0.02	-0.10 to 0.13	0.76
Regurgitation	3	9/145 (6.2%)	7/142 (4.9%)	1.25		0.48-3.23	0.65
PPI use	3	7/127 (5.5%)	9/121 (7.4%)	0.74		0.29-1.91	0.54
Gas bloating	5	21/196 (11%)	36/201 (18%)	0.59		0.36-0.97	0.04
Increased flatulence	3	19/133 (14%)	33/130 (25%)	0.57		0.35-0.91	0.02
Inability to belch	3	24/124 (19%)	37/120 (31%)	0.63		0.40-0.99	0.05
Inability to relieve bloating	3	39/116 (34%)	54/122 (44%)	0.74		0.55-0.99	0.04
LES resting pressure (mm Hg)	4	16.7 (n = 123)	20.1 (n = 116)		-3.58	-9.93 to 2.77	0.27
LES relaxation pressure (mm Hg)	3	5.6 (n = 94)	7.9 (n = 92)		-2.48	-8.48 to 3.51	0.42
Satisfied with outcome	3	159/177 (90%)	163/183 (89%)	1.01		0.94-1.08	0.84
Satisfaction score	3	9.1 (n = 177)	8.9 (n = 183)		0.27	-0.52 to 1.05	0.50
Willingness for repeat surgery	3	162/173 (94%)	160/179 (89%)	1.05		0.99-1.12	0.13
Resolved or mild symptoms	4	181/209 (87%)	188/213 (88%)	0.99		0.92-1.06	0.68

LES indicates lower esophageal sphincter; PPI, proton pump inhibitor.



**FIGURE 2.** One-year prevalence (A) and severity of dysphagia (B).

scores, willingness to undergo surgery again, and the percentage of patients with resolved or mild symptoms (Table 5). Sensitivity analysis of outcomes with zero events in 1 arm (dilatation) yielded similar results.

**Outcome at 5 Years and Beyond**

One trial reported both 5- and 10-year results.<sup>35,36</sup> An additional analysis was performed on the basis of the latest follow-up of the 3 trials that reported outcome at 5 years and beyond. Outcome at 5 years and beyond was available for 335 of 370 (90.5%) patients. This analysis yielded similar results compared with the 5-year analysis. The only discrepancy was that the difference in inability to relieve bloating that was identified by the 5-year analysis was no longer present in the analysis that included 10-year data (Table 6). Sensitivity analysis of outcomes with zero events in 1 arm (dilatation) yielded similar results.

**DISCUSSION**

Antireflux surgery aims to provide durable reflux control with minimal postoperative dysphagia and gas-related symptoms. Partial funduplications have been proposed to reduce the risk of side effects that are associated with LNF. In 2010, American guidelines for surgical treatment of GERD have evaluated partial and Nissen fundoplication. These guidelines concluded that there is “paucity of long-term follow-up data” and recommended “controlled studies with long-term follow-up.”<sup>7</sup> Posterior 270-degree, anterior 90-degree, and anterior 180-degree fundoplication have all been described.<sup>7</sup> Last year, the long-term results of randomized trials demonstrated that 180-degree LAF offers similar reflux control compared with LNF, whereas reflux control after 90-degree LAF is less effective than after LNF.<sup>9</sup> A systematic review that directly compared posterior 270-degree fundoplication with LNF concluded that it reduces dysphagia and gas-related symptoms compared with LNF, with similar reflux




FIGURE 3. One-year esophageal acid exposure (A) and esophagitis (B).




FIGURE 4. One-year prevalence (A) and severity of heartburn (B).

control up to 5 years.<sup>4</sup> A similar meta-analysis comparing outcome after 180-degree LAF and LNF has not been reported previously.

In the past year, 2 RCTs<sup>31,33</sup> have been published comparing 180-degree LAF with LNF in addition to the 3 trials<sup>30,32,34</sup> that had been reported earlier, with 5-year results of 2 of these trials reported as well.<sup>9,31</sup> Some of these individual trials were inconclusive as they were underpowered and hence too small to identify significant differences regarding the most important determinants of successful antireflux surgery: objective reflux control, dilatations for dysphagia, and the need for surgical reintervention. The results from all of these trials, however, have not been previously pooled in meta-analysis

comparing 180-degree LAF with LNF. This meta-analysis aims to provide this evidence.

The methodological quality of the 5 RCTs included in this meta-analysis was good, with a mean Jadad score of 4. Surgical techniques of the included trials were standardized and similar. In all patients, hiatal repair was performed, followed by either 180-degree LAF with fixation to right hiatal pillar or LNF. One trial divided the short gastric vessels in the LNF group.<sup>33</sup> This is not likely to introduce any bias because it has previously been demonstrated that division of the short gastric vessels does not influence outcome.<sup>5</sup> Two trials enrolled an equal number of patients with esophageal dysmotility




FIGURE 5. One-year dilatation (A) and reoperation rate (B).




FIGURE 6. Funnel plot 1-year esophageal acid exposure.

in both arms.<sup>31,34</sup> This study analyzed patients with and without esophageal dysmotility together, as 4 RCTs have shown that outcome of fundoplication is similar in patients with normal and abnormal esophageal motility.<sup>37–40</sup> Study population and surgical interventions were similar between trials in all other aspects.

There are no significant differences in perioperative outcome measures. The 1-year outcomes demonstrate that 180-degree LAF is followed by less dysphagia and gas-related symptoms compared with LNF. Both procedures similarly increased LES pressure, which was accompanied by comparable subjective and objective reflux control. Patient satisfaction, endoscopic dilatation, and reoperation rates are similar in the short term as well. The 5-year outcomes show that the differences in dysphagia and gas-related symptoms persist at longer-term follow-up. Extension of follow-up to 5 years does not demonstrate differences in reflux symptoms, PPI use, patient satisfaction, dilatation, or reoperation rates.

The reduction in gas-related symptoms after 180-degree LAF, with similar reflux control at up to 5 years compared with LNF, is supported by a study that has evaluated the physiological effects of fundoplication. It is commonly assumed that impairment of ventilation of swallowed air from the stomach causes gas bloating and flatulence after fundoplication.<sup>41</sup> The first author recently reported that air venting is easier after partial fundoplication than Nissen fundoplication.<sup>42</sup> In addition, partial and Nissen fundoplications were found to reduce acid and weakly acidic reflux to a similar extent.<sup>42</sup> These results are in line with the current observation that reflux control is similar after 180-degree LAF and LNF at 1 and 5 years. This is in contrast with findings of RCTs that report that 90-degree LAF and 120-degree LAF are associated with inferior reflux control in both the short term<sup>43–45</sup> and the long term.<sup>9,46</sup> The 2 main differences between 90-degree LAF and 120-degree LAF versus 180-degree LAF are the reduced circumference of the wrap and the lack of fixation of the wrap to the right hiatal pillar. Fixation to the right hiatal pillar is probably the main factor that accounts for differences in the risk of recurrent reflux between various anterior fundoplications and probably accounts for the good results after 180-degree LAF demonstrated by this meta-analysis. Supporting this is the experience of some of us when undertaking revision surgery for recurrent reflux. During revision for recurrent reflux an anterior 180-degree fundoplication always remains securely attached to the right hiatal pillar and failure is due to proximal migration of the gastroesophageal junction, whereas in lesser degrees of anterior partial fundoplications such as 90 degrees and 120 degrees the fundoplication seems to unravel and loosen in some patients. Hence, it seems reasonable to speculate that this is due to the lack of anchorage of the fundus to the right hiatal pillar.

The 5-year reoperation rates of this study were 9.5% for 180-degree anterior fundoplication and 6.2% for Nissen fundoplication. Reoperation rates in case series with less than complete follow-up can differ considerably from the randomized controlled trials with high follow-up rates that have been included this review. Publication bias and selection bias probably help explain the difference in these





FIGURE 7. Five-year prevalence (A) and severity of dysphagia (B).





FIGURE 8. Five-year prevalence (A) and severity of heartburn (B).





FIGURE 9. Five-year dilatation (A) and reoperation rate (B).

**TABLE 5. 5-year Outcome**

	RCT	180-Degree LAF	LNF	RR	WMD	95% CI	P
PPI use	2	7/99 (7.1%)	10/98 (10%)	0.69		0.27–1.75	0.44
Gas bloating	3	61/168 (36%)	86/178 (48%)	0.71		0.41–1.12	0.20
Increased flatulence	3	58/158 (37%)	82/165 (50%)	0.75		0.60–0.94	0.01
Inability to belch	3	27/168 (16%)	61/178 (34%)	0.47		0.32–0.70	<0.001
Inability to relieve bloating	3	52/168 (31%)	78/178 (44%)	0.69		0.53–0.92	0.01
Satisfied with outcome	2	89/99 (90%)	86/98 (88%)	1.01		0.86–1.19	0.91
Satisfaction score	3	8.4 (n = 167)	8.3 (n = 178)		–0.08	–0.46 to 0.30	0.69
Willingness repeat surgery	3	151/164 (92%)	154/174 (89%)	1.04		0.97–1.12	0.27
Resolved or mild symptoms	3	138/165 (84%)	144/177 (81%)	1.03		0.93–1.13	0.57

PPI indicates proton pump inhibitor.

**TABLE 6. Outcome at 5 Years and Beyond**

	RCT	180-Degree LAF	LNF	RR	WMD	95% CI	P
Presence of dysphagia	3	41/160 (26%)	70/175 (40%)	0.67		0.49–0.90	0.009
Severity of dysphagia	3	5.3 (n = 159)	8.4 (n = 175)		–2.23	–3.23 to –1.23	<0.001
Prevalence of heartburn	3	26/159 (16%)	23/175 (13%)	1.23		0.74–2.07	0.42
Severity of heartburn	3	1.7 (n = 159)	1.4 (n = 175)		0.17	–0.16 to 0.49	0.31
Dilatation rate	3	4/160 (2.5%)	10/175 (5.7%)	0.46		0.16–1.35	0.16
Reoperation rate	3	18/160 (11%)	13/175 (7.4%)	1.54		0.78–3.02	0.21
PPI use	2	16/90 (18%)	13/95 (14%)	1.35		0.70–2.62	0.37
Gas bloating	3	58/159 (36%)	62/175 (35%)	1.03		0.59–1.79	0.92
Increased flatulence	3	58/158 (37%)	82/165 (50%)	0.75		0.60–0.94	0.01
Inability to belch	3	31/159 (19%)	63/175 (36%)	0.55		0.38–0.79	0.001
Inability to relieve bloating	3	68/159 (43%)	87/175 (50%)	0.86		0.69–1.07	0.17
Satisfied with outcome	2	84/90 (93%)	91/95 (96%)	0.97		0.91–1.04	0.44
Satisfaction score	3	8.3 (n = 158)	8.4 (n = 175)		–0.18	–0.56 to 0.21	0.37
Willingness to repeat surgery	3	144/155 (93%)	153/171 (89%)	1.04		0.97–1.11	0.27
Resolved or mild symptoms	3	138/165 (84%)	144/177 (81%)	1.03		0.93–1.13	0.57

PPI indicates proton pump inhibitor.

results. A benchmark meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials demonstrated that 9.6% of patients who had a Nissen fundoplication underwent surgical reintervention at mean follow-up of 2½ years.<sup>5</sup> The reoperation rate in this study is consistent with these results, especially considering the extended length of follow-up.

The internal validity of this study is high because the analysis was based on high-quality RCTs, with high follow-up rates and low risk of bias. The fact that the trials were performed across 4 continents increases the external validity of this meta-analysis. It is notable that the senior authors of every trial agreed to provide both short- and long-term missing data. The principal investigators of the South African and Chinese RCT worked with the Australian research group during the first trial<sup>34</sup> and subsequently applied identical surgical techniques and questionnaires for their trials.<sup>30,31</sup> Consequently, a complete set of identical outcome measures and scales could be pooled. These 3 trials comprise 81% of the included patients and reported both 1- and 5-year results. This analysis is limited by the fact that 5-year follow-up was not yet available for the 2 remaining trials. However, these 2 trials were the smallest and of limited size, contributing only 19% of the included patients. Another flaw is that physiological studies were performed in only 50% of patients.

A recent meta-analysis concluded that posterior 270-degree fundoplication offers similar reflux control up to 5 years but fewer dysphagia and gas-related symptoms than LNF.<sup>4</sup> This study has similar methodology and demonstrates that 180-degree LAF has similar advantages over Nissen fundoplication up to 5 years. There is 1 RCT that has compared 180-degree LAF with posterior 180-degree fundoplication for the surgical treatment of GERD, but in this study follow-up was incomplete (57%) and short term.<sup>47</sup> Two parallel RCTs are

currently being conducted in Australia and The Netherlands to evaluate differences between 180-degree LAF and posterior 270-degree fundoplication, and it is hoped that they will address this question better.

In conclusion, dysphagia and gas-related symptoms are lower after 180-degree LAF than after LNF at 1 and 5 years. Esophageal acid exposure and prevalence of esophagitis are similar after both procedures. Control of reflux symptoms, PPI use, patient satisfaction, dilatations, and reoperation rate are similar in both the short term and the long term. These results lend level 1a support for the use of 180-degree LAF for the surgical treatment of GERD.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors thank Professor E. Xynos for providing additional data on the Greek trial.

## REFERENCES

- Broeders JA, Rijnhart-de Jong HG, Draaisma WA, et al. Ten-year outcome of laparoscopic and conventional Nissen fundoplication: randomized clinical trial. *Ann Surg*. 2009;250:698–706.
- Salminen PT, Hiekkänen HI, Rantala AP, et al. Comparison of long-term outcome of laparoscopic and conventional Nissen fundoplication: a prospective randomized study with an 11-year follow-up. *Ann Surg*. 2007;246:201–206.
- Draaisma WA, Rijnhart-de Jong HG, Broeders IA, et al. Five-year subjective and objective results of laparoscopic and conventional Nissen fundoplication: a randomized trial. *Ann Surg*. 2006;244:34–41.
- Broeders JA, Mauritz FA, Ahmed AU, et al. Systematic review and meta-analysis of laparoscopic Nissen (posterior total) versus Toupet (posterior partial) fundoplication for gastro-oesophageal reflux disease. *Br J Surg*. 2010;97:1318–1330.

5. Catarci M, Gentileschi P, Papi C, et al. Evidence-based appraisal of antireflux fundoplication. *Ann Surg.* 2004;239:325–337.
6. Varin O, Velstra B, De SS, et al. Total vs partial fundoplication in the treatment of gastroesophageal reflux disease: a meta-analysis. *Arch Surg.* 2009;144:273–278.
7. Stefanidis D, Hope WW, Kohn GP, et al. Guidelines for surgical treatment of gastroesophageal reflux disease. *Surg Endosc.* 2010;24:2647–2669.
8. Broeders JA, Roks DJ, Ahmed AU, et al. Laparoscopic anterior versus posterior fundoplication for gastroesophageal reflux disease: systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials. *Ann Surg.* 2011;254:39–47.
9. Broeders JA, Roks DJ, Jamieson GG, et al. Five-year outcome after laparoscopic anterior partial versus Nissen fundoplication: four randomized trials. *Ann Surg.* 2012;255:637–642.
10. Higgins JP, Green S. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions.* Chichester, West Sussex, England: John Wiley & Sons; 2008.
11. BMJ Clinical Evidence Web site. Search Filter. <http://clinicalevidence.bmj.com/x/set/static/ebm/learn/665076.html>. Accessed April 14, 2012.
12. Gatenby PA, Bright T, Watson DI. Anterior 180 degrees partial fundoplication—how I do it. *J Gastrointest Surg.* 2012;16:2297–2303.
13. Jamieson GG, Watson DI, Britten-Jones R, et al. Laparoscopic Nissen fundoplication. *Ann Surg.* 1994;220:137–145.
14. Johnson LF, Demeester TR. Twenty-four-hour pH monitoring of the distal esophagus. A quantitative measure of gastroesophageal reflux. *Am J Gastroenterol.* 1974;62:325–332.
15. Dakkak M, Bennett JR. A new dysphagia score with objective validation. *J Clin Gastroenterol.* 1992;14:99–100.
16. Watson DI, Pike GK, Baigrie RJ, et al. Prospective double-blind randomized trial of laparoscopic Nissen fundoplication with division and without division of short gastric vessels. *Ann Surg.* 1997;226:642–652.
17. Moher D, Cook DJ, Eastwood S, et al. Improving the quality of reports of meta-analyses of randomised controlled trials: the QUOROM statement. Quality of Reporting of Meta-analyses. *Lancet.* 1999;354:1896–1900.
18. Stroup DF, Berlin JA, Morton SC, et al. Meta-analysis of observational studies in epidemiology: a proposal for reporting. Meta-analysis of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) group. *JAMA.* 2000;283:2008–2012.
19. Clarke M, Horton R. Bringing it all together: Lancet-Cochrane collaborate on systematic reviews. *Lancet.* 2001;357:1728.
20. Hozo SP, Djulbegovic B, Hozo I. Estimating the mean and variance from the median, range, and the size of a sample. *BMC Med Res Methodol.* 2005;5:13.
21. Jadad AR, Moore RA, Carroll D, et al. Assessing the quality of reports of randomized clinical trials: is blinding necessary? *Control Clin Trials.* 1996;17:1–12.
22. Higgins JP, Thompson SG. Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. *Stat Med.* 2002;21:1539–1558.
23. Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, et al. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ.* 2003;327:557–560.
24. DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. *Control Clin Trials.* 1986;7:177–188.
25. Begg CB, Mazumdar M. Operating characteristics of a rank correlation test for publication bias. *Biometrics.* 1994;50:1088–1101.
26. Egger M, Davey SG, Schneider M, et al. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. *BMJ.* 1997;315:629–634.
27. Macaskill P, Walter SD, Irwig L. A comparison of methods to detect publication bias in meta-analysis. *Stat Med.* 2001;20:641–654.
28. Rebecchi F, Giaccone C, Farinella E, et al. Randomized controlled trial of laparoscopic Heller myotomy plus Dor fundoplication versus Nissen fundoplication for achalasia: long-term results. *Ann Surg.* 2008;248:1023–1030.
29. Boutelier P. A double-blind, randomized prospective trial of Nissen fundoplication and anterior partial fundoplication using laparoscopy. *Chirurgie.* 1999;124:459–461.
30. Baigrie RJ, Cullis SN, Ndhluni AJ, et al. Randomized double-blind trial of laparoscopic Nissen fundoplication versus anterior partial fundoplication. *Br J Surg.* 2005;92:819–823.
31. Cao Z, Cai W, Qin M, et al. Randomized clinical trial of laparoscopic anterior 180 degrees partial versus 360 degrees Nissen fundoplication: 5-year results. *Dis Esophagus.* 2012;25:114–120.
32. Chrysos E, Athanasakis E, Pechlivanides G, et al. The effect of total and anterior partial fundoplication on antireflux mechanisms of the gastroesophageal junction. *Am J Surg.* 2004;188:39–44.
33. Raue W, Ordemann J, Jacobi CA, et al. Nissen versus Dor fundoplication for treatment of gastroesophageal reflux disease: a blinded randomized clinical trial. *Dig Surg.* 2011;28:80–86.
34. Watson DI, Jamieson GG, Pike GK, et al. Prospective randomized double-blind trial between laparoscopic Nissen fundoplication and anterior partial fundoplication. *Br J Surg.* 1999;86:123–130.
35. Ludemann R, Watson DI, Jamieson GG, et al. Five-year follow-up of a randomized clinical trial of laparoscopic total versus anterior 180 degrees fundoplication. *Br J Surg.* 2005;92:240–243.
36. Cai W, Watson DI, Lally CJ, et al. Ten-year clinical outcome of a prospective randomized clinical trial of laparoscopic Nissen versus anterior 180 (degrees) partial fundoplication. *Br J Surg.* 2008;95:1501–1505.
37. Rydberg L, Ruth M, Lundell L. Mechanism of action of antireflux procedures. *Br J Surg.* 1999;86:405–410.
38. Fibbe C, Layer P, Keller J, et al. Esophageal motility in reflux disease before and after fundoplication: a prospective, randomized, clinical, and manometric study. *Gastroenterology.* 2001;121:5–14.
39. Chrysos E, Tsiaoussis J, Zoras OJ, et al. Laparoscopic surgery for gastroesophageal reflux disease patients with impaired esophageal peristalsis: total or partial fundoplication? *J Am Coll Surg.* 2003;197:8–15.
40. Booth MI, Stratford J, Jones L, et al. Randomized clinical trial of laparoscopic total (Nissen) versus posterior partial (Toupet) fundoplication for gastroesophageal reflux disease based on preoperative oesophageal manometry. *Br J Surg.* 2008;95:57–63.
41. Woodward ER, Thomas HF, McAlhany JC. Comparison of crural repair and Nissen fundoplication in the treatment of esophageal hiatus hernia with peptic esophagitis. *Ann Surg.* 1971;173:782–792.
42. Broeders JA, Bredenoord AJ, Hazebroek EJ, et al. Reflux and belching after 270 degree versus 360 degree laparoscopic posterior fundoplication. *Ann Surg.* 2012;255:59–65.
43. Hagedorn C, Jonson C, Lonroth H, et al. Efficacy of an anterior as compared with a posterior laparoscopic partial fundoplication: results of a randomized, controlled clinical trial. *Ann Surg.* 2003;238:189–196.
44. Spence GM, Watson DI, Jamieson GG, et al. Single center prospective randomized trial of laparoscopic Nissen versus anterior 90 degrees fundoplication. *J Gastrointest Surg.* 2006;10:698–705.
45. Watson DI, Jamieson GG, Lally C, et al. Multicenter, prospective, double-blind, randomized trial of laparoscopic Nissen vs anterior 90 degrees partial fundoplication. *Arch Surg.* 2004;139:1160–1167.
46. Engström C, Lönroth H, Mardani J, et al. An anterior or posterior approach to partial fundoplication? Long-term results of a randomized trial. *World J Surg.* 2007;31:1221–1225.
47. Khan M, Smythe A, Globe J, et al. Randomized controlled trial of laparoscopic anterior versus posterior fundoplication for gastro-oesophageal reflux disease. *ANZ J Surg.* 2010;80:500–505.