RESEARCH

Open Access

Effect of sarcopenia in predicting postoperative mortality in emergency laparotomy: a systematic review and meta-analysis



Tao-ran Yang^{1†}, Kai Luo^{1†}, Xiao Deng^{2,3}, Le Xu¹, Ru-rong Wang¹ and Peng Ji^{4*}

Abstract

Background: While emergency laparotomy has been associated with high rates of postoperative mortality and adverse events, preoperative systematic evaluation of patients may improve perioperative outcomes. However, due to the critical condition of the patient and the limited operation time, it is challenging to conduct a comprehensive evaluation. In recent years, sarcopenia is considered a health problem associated with an increased incidence of poor prognosis. This study aimed to investigate the effect of sarcopenia on 30-day mortality and postoperative adverse events in patients undergoing emergency laparotomy.

Methods: We systematically searched databases including PubMed, Embase, and Cochrane for all studies comparing emergency laparotomy in patients with and without sarcopenia up to March 1, 2022. The primary outcome was of 30-day postoperative mortality. Secondary outcomes were the length of hospital stay, the incidence of adverse events, number of postoperative intensive care unit (ICU) admissions, and ICU length of stay. Study and outcome-specific risk of bias were assessed using the Quality in Prognosis Studies (QUIPS) tool. We rated the certainty of evidence using the Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluations (GRADE).

Result: A total of 11 eligible studies were included in this study. The results showed that patients with sarcopenia had a higher risk of death 30 days after surgery (OR = 2.42, 95% CI = 1.93–3.05, P < 0.00001). More patients were admitted to ICU after surgery (OR = 1.58, 95% CI = 1.11–2.25, P = 0.01). Both the ICU length of stay (MD = 0.55, 95% CI = 0.05–1.06, P = 0.03) and hospital length of stay (MD = 2.33, 95% CI = 1.33–3.32, P < 0.00001) were longer in the sarcopenia group. The incidence of postoperative complications was also significantly higher in patients with sarcopenia (OR = 1.78, 95% CI = 1.41–2.26, P < 0.00001).

Conclusion: In emergency laparotomy, sarcopenia was associated with increased 30-day postoperative mortality. Both the lengths of stay in the ICU and the total length of hospital stay were significantly higher than those in non-sarcopenic patients. Therefore, we concluded that sarcopenia can be used as a tool to identify preoperative high-risk patients, which can be considered to develop new postoperative risk prediction models.

[†]Tao-ran Yang and Kai Luo have contributed equally to this work

*Correspondence: drpengji@wchscu.cn

⁴ Department of Critical Care Medicine, West China Hospital, Sichuan University, No. 37, Guoxue Xiang, Chengdu 610041, Sichuan, China Full list of author information is available at the end of the article



© The Author(s) 2022. **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/. The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication waiver (http://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/) applies to the data made available in this article, unless otherwise stated in a credit line to the data.

Registration number Registered on Prospero with the registration number of CRD42022300132. **Keywords:** Sarcopenia, Emergency laparotomy, Postoperative mortality

Introduction

Emergency laparotomy is a time-sensitive procedure with a high mortality range from 8.8 to 18.6% [1-3], which is much higher than elective surgeries [4-6]. Elderly patients suffering worse morbidity and mortality following emergency laparotomy have been contributed to multiple medical comorbidities and nutrition status [7]. Effective identification of high-risk patients has been the key to improving perioperative outcomes [5]. However, due to the complexity of the patient's condition, the different variety of surgical types, and the tight operation preparation time, it has been challenging to predict the outcome after emergency surgery based on preoperative information. Several previous studies have used various scoring systems to predict the risk of emergency laparotomy [8, 9]. However, when patients' condition is too critical to complete functional tests and answer related questions in emergency conditions, the scores are usually subjective and inaccurate [10, 11]. Therefore, it is an urgent requirement to develop a new assessment tool to identify the patient at risk of emergency laparotomy and guide optimal perioperative management [9]. Body composition also plays an important role in predicting treatment outcomes in patients following surgery. Sarcopenia has been observed to be a strong prognostic indicator for perioperative complications [12, 13], including cognitive impairment [14], fractures [15], mental disorders [16], and even survival [17, 18].

Sarcopenia refers to the progressive and global decline in skeletal muscle mass and strength associated with aging, immobility, or illness status [19]. Although there are discrepancies in the diagnostic criteria of sarcopenia in different countries and regions, the cross-sectional area of the lumbar muscle on an abdominal computed tomography (CT) scan is an internationally recognized simple and reliable indicator [20]. It is assessed by measuring muscle mass at the level of the L3 vertebra, which has made a preoperative assessment of psoas major area (PMA) and total skeletal muscle area (SMA) possible based on the routine examination of an abdominal CT scan [21].

Studies have shown that sarcopenia increases the incidence of adverse events and mortality after elective esophageal cancer surgery, gastrectomy, and pancreatic surgery [22–24]. However, there has been no definite conclusion on the impact of 30-day mortality and postoperative adverse events on emergency laparotomy. Hajibandeh et al. pointed out that sarcopenia can be

used to predict mortality in both emergency and elective abdominal surgeries [25]. However, only four studies of emergency surgery were included, so it is unconvincing to draw reliable conclusions. We, therefore, performed further analysis to assess the impact of sarcopenia on 30-day mortality and postoperative complications in patients following emergency laparotomy.

Methods

This systematic review and meta-analysis were prepared in accordance with the latest PRISMA requirements and was registered with Prospero (registration number: CRD42022300132) [26]. Two researchers (T.Y. and K.L.) searched databases such as PubMed, Embase, and Cochrane. The search date was as of March 1, 2022. The search was not limited to language and region, and we provided a PRISMA checklist. PubMed's search strategy can be found in Table 1.

Study selection

We aimed to include all the studies comparing patients with sarcopenia and non-sarcopenic patients following emergency laparotomy. Inclusion and exclusion criteria were conducted in advance. The inclusion criteria were as follows:

- 1. Age \geq 18 years old;
- 2. Patients were treated by emergency laparotomies;
- 3. Preoperative abdominal/pelvic CT data were present.

Emergency operations in this study included segmental or total colectomy, small bowel resection, open cholecystectomy, open appendectomy, abscess drainage, exploratory laparotomy, etc. Our exclusion criteria were:

- 1. Elective surgery;
- 2. Traumatic abdominal surgery;
- 3. Emergency abdominal vascular surgery;
- 4. Studies with an unclear diagnosis of sarcopenia.

Two of our investigators (T.Y. and K.L.) selected studies that were compliant with a full-text reading by reviewing titles and abstracts. Any disagreements between investigators were independently resolved (R.W.). In addition, we searched the World Health Organization International Clinical Trials Registry and queried bibliographic lists of relevant articles and reviews for further potentially eligible studies.

Table 1 Search strategy of PubMed

Search	Query
#1	"Surgical Procedures, Operative"[MeSH Terms]
#2	"Operative Procedure"[All Fields] OR "Procedure, Operative"[All Fields] OR "Surgical Procedure, Operative"[All Fields] OR "Operative Surgical Procedures"[All Fields] OR "Operative Surgical Procedures"[All Fields] OR "Surgical Procedures"[All Fields] OR "Surgical Procedures"[All Fields] OR "Frocedures"[All Fields] OR "Surgical Procedures"[All Fields] OR "Surgical Procedures] OR "Surgical Procedures"[All Fields] OR "Surgical Procedures] OR "Surgical Procedures]
#3	#1 OR #2
#4	"Abdomen"[MeSH Terms] OR "Abdomens"[All Fields]
#5	#3 AND #4
#6	"Laparotomy"[MeSH Terms] OR "Laparotomies"[All Fields] OR "Minilaparotomy"[All Fields] OR "Minilaparotomies"[All Fields]
#7	#5 OR #6
#8	"Emergencies"[MeSH Terms] OR "Emergency"[All Fields]
#9	#7 AND #8
#10	"Sarcopenia"[MeSH Terms] OR "Sarcopenias"[All Fields]
#11	#9 AND #10

Data extraction

Two investigators (T.Y. and X.D.) independently extracted the following data: author name and publication year, literature type, the sample size for exposure and control groups, diagnostic criteria for sarcopenia, and characteristics of the included population. During this process, all disagreements were resolved by discussion, and if necessary, a third author (P.J.) was consulted.

We extracted data directly from the original text for synthesis. If the data were presented in the form of a graph and could not be directly extracted, we used a Plot digitizer or contacted the corresponding author. We extracted continuous results as the mean and standard deviation, and if the median was displayed, we converted the median and interquartile range to mean and standard deviation using the statistical formula [27, 28].

Quality assessment and risk of bias

Two investigators (T.Y. and K.L.) independently used the Quality in Prognosis Studies (QUIPS) critical assessment tool to assess the risk of bias for including studies [29, 30]. This tool is designed for systematic reviews of prognostic factor studies. The scale mainly includes study participation, study attrition, prognostic factor measurement, outcome measurement, study confounding, and statistical analysis and reporting. Each domain is assessed against criteria, thereby resulting in a rating of 'high,' 'moderate,' or 'low' risk of bias. Any discrepancies between investigators were discussed at a consensus meeting, and any further disagreement was resolved by discussion with a third investigator.

We used the GRADE (Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development, and Evaluation) [31] approach to assess the quality of evidence for 30-day postoperative mortality, complication rates, ICU admission, the length of ICU stay, and the length of hospital stay. We rated the quality of the evidence as 'high,' moderate,' 'low,' and 'very low' based on risk of bias, inconsistency, indirectness, imprecision, and other considerations. And we used GRADEpro to generate the Summary of Finding (SoF).

Outcome

The primary outcome was 30-day mortality after emergency laparotomy. Secondary outcomes included incidence of postoperative complications, number of postoperative ICU admissions, and ICU and hospital length of stay, respectively.

Data analysis

We used Revman 5.3 for meta-analysis. For continuous variables, we used mean difference (MD) and 95% confidence interval (CI). For binary variables, the odds ratio (OR) value for statistics was implemented. In this study, considering that there was always heterogeneity in terms of the type of surgery, surgical technique, and experience of surgeons, all results in this study were performed using a random-effects model. For assessing the outcome, we performed a sensitivity analysis by using the leave-one-out approach to identify the possible sources of heterogeneity.

Result

Through systematic database searching, we identified 300 articles. After screening to remove duplicate literature, there were 260 articles in total. Thirty-three articles were reviewed for full text following evaluation of the titles and abstracts. Twenty-two articles were excluded due to non-emergency surgery and unclear diagnosis. Review and conference abstract were also excluded in terms of the study design. Overall, 11 articles with 3795 patients were included for further analysis. Fig 1 depicts a flowchart of the study selection process.

Table 2 summarizes the characteristics of the 11 articles that met the inclusion criteria. The total sample size ranged from 80 to 967, all of which were retrospective



Table 2 Characteristics of included studies

Mohammad 2018 Betrospective study n=452 Sarcopenia (No sercopenia Singery) 21(23-28) n=113 Breagency (No sercopenia Singery) Using CT to spacetory (ST) Colin 2021 Retrospective study n=88 Sarcopenia (ST) 55 (9.1) 21 (23-29) n=337 Imagency (ST) UK n=207 Colin 2021 Retrospective study n=88 Sarcopenia (ST) 55 (9.1) 21 (23-29) n=337 Imagency (ST)	Author, year	Study design	Total Sample	Diagnose	Age	ВМІ	Sample	The included surgery	Diagnostic criteria
Colin 2021 Remotypective study $n = 80$ $n = 80$ $5 \circ (n)$ $25 (2 - 20)$ $n = 30$ $2 - 20$ 2	Mohammad 2018	Retrospective study	n=452	Sarcopenia	62 (11.3)	23 [22–28]	n=113	Emergency laparotomy surgery	Using CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 level
Colin 2021 Retrospective surgery n=80 Sarcopenia (5.5) Soft/modian (5.5) UK n=20 Impactorpy Impactorpy surgery Using CT to assess the prosp muccle at the I.3 invested at the I.3 investe				No sarcopenia	55 (9.1)	25 [23–29]	n=339		
No sarcopenie Späce UK n=60 Trotter 2018 Retrospective n=248 Sarcopenia 72 (15.7) 24 46.1) n=61 Emergency surgery Using CT to surgers are stresposas muscle at the L3 Matsushima 2017 Retrospective n=89 Sarcopenia 70 (16.0) 25.6 (6.6) n=187 Matsushima 2017 Retrospective n=89 Sarcopenia 70 (16.0) 25.6 (6.6) n=187 Sarner 2019 Retrospective n=283 Sarcopenia 74 (50-52) UK n=57 Sarner 2019 Retrospective n=283 Sarcopenia 72 (50.75) UK n=107 Rebecca 2010 Retrospective n=593 Sarcopenia 72 (50.75) UK n=217 Emergency Insucle at the L3 Insucle at t	Colin 2021	Retrospective study	n=80	Sarcopenia	65.7(median 67.5)	UK	n=20	Emergency laparotomy surgery	Using CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 level
Trotter 2018 Rerospective sludy n=246 Sarcopenia 72 (15.7) 24.4 (6.1) n=61 Emegency loggery Using CT to assess the posa loggery Matsushima 2017 Retrospective sludy n=89 No sarcopenia 70 (16.0) 25.6 (6.6) n=17 No Sarcopenia 94 (50-62) UK n=63 muscle at the 1.3 loggery Matsushima assess the posa muscle at the 1.3 loggery Sarcopenia 44 (36-52) UK n=73 Emergency Emergency logatoromy suggery Using CT to assess the posa muscle at the 1.3 loger Sarcopenia At (36-52) UK n=73 Emergency Emergency logatoromy suggery Using CT to assess the posa muscle at the 1.3 loger Retrospective study n=593 Sarcopenia 655 (15.68) 266 (55.38) n=19 Emergency logatoromy suggery Using CT to assess the posa muscle at the 1.3 loger Du 2014 Retrospective study n=100 Sarcopenia 85 (16.69) 25 (24-28) n=27 Du 2014 Retrospective study n=150 Sarcopenia 86 (29) 25 (24-28) n=27 Isa 2018 Retrospective study n=167 Sarcopenia 70 (14.7) 250 (26.6) n=12 Isa 2018 Retrospective study n=967 Sarcopenia 70 (14.8) 30 (18.7)				No sarcopenia	59.6(median 60.0)	UK	n=60		
Matushima 2017Retrospective studyn=89No sarcopenia Sarcopenia9/16025.6 (6.6)n=187Acute colonic n=32Using C1 to sares the psoas muccle at the 13Samer 2019Retrospective studyn=283Sarcopenia41 (36-52)UKn=57UKn=57Samer 2019Retrospective studyn=593Sarcopenia75.6(7.75)UKn=210Emergency laparotomy surgeryUsing C1 to assess the psoas muccle at the 13Rebecca 2010Retrospective studyn=593Sarcopenia75.6(7.75)UKn=210Emergency laparotomy surgeryUsing C1 to assess the psoas muccle at the 14Du 2014Retrospective studyn=100Sarcopenia81.4(16.22) stropenia29.6/(8.01)n=396Using C1 to assess the psoas muccle at the 14Brandt 2019Retrospective studyn=100Sarcopenia83.6(2.9) stropenia25 (24-28) stropenian=27 stropeniaEmergency stropeniaUsing C1 to assess the psoas surgeryBrandt 2019Retrospective studyn=150Sarcopenia83.6(2.9) stropenia25 (24-28) stropenian=27 stropeniaEmergency stropeniaUsing C1 to assess the psoas stropeniaBrandt 2019Retrospective studyn=150Sarcopenia0.3(1.7)25 (24-28) stropenian=27 stropeniaEmergency stropeniaUsing C1 to assess the psoas stropeniaBrandt 2019Retrospective studyn=967No sarcopenia0.3(1.7) 	Trotter 2018	Retrospective study	n=248	Sarcopenia	72 (15.7)	24.4 (6.1)	n=61	Emergency laparotomy surgery	Using CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 level
Matsushima 2017 Retrospective study n=89 Sarcopenia Sarcopenia 54 (50-62) UK n=32 Acute colonic diverticuitis Using T to assess the paoa level Samer 2019 Retrospective study n=283 Sarcopenia 44 (36-52) UK n=57 Samer 2019 Retrospective study n=283 Sarcopenia 756(7.75) UK n=210 Rebecca 2016 Retrospective study n=593 Sarcopenia 65.65(15.68) 23.69(5.53) n=197 Emergency sugrey Using T to assess the paoa sugrey Du 2014 Retrospective study n=100 Sarcopenia 58.14(16.22) 29.67(8.01) n=396 Du 2014 Retrospective study n=100 Sarcopenia 84.3(3.9) 24 [22-27] n=73 Emergency sugrey Using T to assess the paoa muscle at the L3 level Brandt 2019 Retrospective study n=150 Sarcopenia 84.3(9) 25 [24-28] n=271 Using T to assess the paoa sugrey Masses the paoa muscle at the L3 level Lisa 2018 Retrospective study n=150 Sarcopenia 10.K UK n=112 Lisa 2018 No sarcopenia 01.2(16.8) 30.7(8.7) n=241 Sauer er sugrey Using T to asses the paoa sugrey Saraopenia No sarcopenia <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>No sarcopenia</td> <td>70 (16.0)</td> <td>25.6 (6.6)</td> <td>n=187</td> <td></td> <td></td>				No sarcopenia	70 (16.0)	25.6 (6.6)	n=187		
Samer 2019Retrospective studyn=283No sarcopenia Sarcopenia24 [36-52] Respective studyUKn=57Emergency laparotomy surgeryUsing CT to assess the poos muscle at the L3 levelRebecca 2016Retrospective studyn=593No sarcopenia7.56(7.75)UKn=10To surgeryUsing CT to assess the poos surgeryDu 2014Retrospective studyn=100Sarcopenia58.14(16.22)29.67(8.01)n=197Emergency general surgica operationUsing CT to assess the poos surgeryDu 2014Retrospective studyn=100Sarcopenia83.6(2.9)25 [24-28]n=27To surgeryUsing CT to assess the poos muscle at the L3 levelBrandt 2019Retrospective studyn=150Sarcopenia83.6(2.9)25 [24-28]n=121Using CT to assess the poos muscle at the L3 levelLisa 2018Retrospective studyn=150Sarcopenia0.7(14.7)25 (05.6)n=121 surgeryUsing CT to assess the poos muscle at the L3 levelLisa 2018Retrospective studyn=56Sarcopenia7.12(16.8)30.7(8.7)n=226Using CT to assess the poos muscle at the L3 levelSamantha 2021Retrospective studyn=56Sarcopenia7.12(16.8)30.7(8.7)n=226Using CT to assess the poos muscle at the L3 levelSamantha 2021Retrospective studyn=256Sarcopenia6.12(16.8)30.7(8.7)n=226Using CT to assess the	Matsushima 2017	Retrospective study	n = 89	Sarcopenia	54 [50–62]	UK	n=32	Acute colonic diverticulitis	Using CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 level
Samer 2019Retrospective studyn=283Sarcopenia78.92(7.6)UKn=73Emergency laparotomy surgeryUsing CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 levelRebecca 2016Retrospective studyn=593Sarcopenia65.65(15.68)23.69(5.53)n=197Emergency laparotomy surgeryUsing CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L4 levelDu 2014Retrospective studyn=100Sarcopenia84.3(3.9)24 [22-27]n=73Emergency general surgical assess the psoas muscle at the L3 levelUsing CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 levelDu 2014Retrospective studyn=100Sarcopenia83.6(2.9)25 [24-28]n=27mergency assess the psoas muscle at the L3 levelSarcopeniaBrandt 2019Retrospective studyn=150Sarcopenia83.6(2.9)25 [24-28]n=27mergency assess the psoas muscle at the L3 levelUsing CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 levelLisa 2018Retrospective studyn=967Sarcopenia70.3(14.7)25.0(5.6)n=121LLisa 2018Retrospective studyn=536Sarcopenia61.2(16.8)30.7(8.7)n=276mergency laparotomy surgeryUsing CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 levelSamantha 2021Retrospective studyn=56Sarcopenia61.2(16.8)30.7(8.7)n=276mergency laparotomy surgeryUsing CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 levelSamantha 2021 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>No sarcopenia</td><td>44 [36–52]</td><td>UK</td><td>n = 57</td><td></td><td></td></t<>				No sarcopenia	44 [36–52]	UK	n = 57		
Rebecca 2016 Retrospective studyn=593No sarcopenia Sarcopenia77.56(7.75) SarcopeniaUKn=210Du 2014 studyRetrospective studyn=10058.14(16.22) Sarcopenia29.67(8.01)n=396Using CT to assess the poos muscle at the L4 levelDu 2014Retrospective studyn=100Sarcopenia88.14(16.22) Sarcopenia29.67(8.01)n=396Emergency general surgical operationUsing CT to assess the poos muscle at the L3 levelBandt 2019Retrospective studyn=100Sarcopenia83.6(2.9)25 [24-28] No sarcopenian=27Using CT to assess the poos muscle at the L3 levelBrandt 2019Retrospective studyn=150SarcopeniaUKUKn=112No sarcopenia studyNo sarcopenia0.03(14.7)25.0(5.6)n=241 surgeryAcute care surgeryUsing CT to assess the poos muscle at the L3 levelSarcopenia studyn=536Sarcopenia61.2(16.8)30.7(8.7)n=726Using CT to assess the poos surgerySaranantha 2021 studyRetrospective studyn=536Sarcopenia61.2(16.8)30.7(8.7)n=726Emergency surgeryUsing CT to assess the poos surgerySaranantha 2021 studyRetrospective studyn=236Retrospective studyn=241Acute care surgeryUsing CT to assess the poos surgerySaranantha 2021 studyRetrospective studyn=237Sarcopenia68 [54-77] Sarcopenia <td< td=""><td>Samer 2019</td><td>Retrospective study</td><td>n=283</td><td>Sarcopenia</td><td>78.92(7.66)</td><td>UK</td><td>n=73</td><td>Emergency laparotomy surgery</td><td>Using CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 level</td></td<>	Samer 2019	Retrospective study	n=283	Sarcopenia	78.92(7.66)	UK	n=73	Emergency laparotomy surgery	Using CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 level
Rebecca 2016 Retrospective study n=593 Sarcopenia 65.65(15.68) 23.69(553) n=197 Emergency lapartomy surgery Using CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L4 level Du 2014 Retrospective study n=100 Sarcopenia 84.3(3.9) 24 [22-27] n=73 Emergency general surgical operation Using CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 level Du 2014 Retrospective study n=100 Sarcopenia 84.3(3.9) 25 [24-28] n=27 Brandt 2019 Retrospective study n=150 Sarcopenia UK UK n=38 Emergency general surgical paratomy Using CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 level Lisa 2018 Retrospective study n=967 Sarcopenia UK UK n=124 Acute care surgery Using CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 level Lisa 2018 Retrospective study n=967 Sarcopenia 61.2(16.8) 30.7(8.7) n=274 Acute care surgery Using CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 level Samantha 2021 Retrospective study n=536 Sarcopenia 61.2(16.8) 30.7(8.7) n=726 Imergency lapartomy surgery Using CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 level				No sarcopenia	77.56(7.75)	UK	n=210		
Du 2014Retrospective studyn=100No sarcopenia Sarcopenia84.3(3.9)24 [22-27]n=73Emergency general surgical bases the psoas muscle at the L3 levelUsing CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 levelBrandt 2019Retrospective studyn=150Sarcopenia83.6(2.9)25 [24-28]n=27USing CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 levelBrandt 2019Retrospective studyn=150SarcopeniaUKUKn=112Using CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 levelLisa 2018Retrospective studyn=967SarcopeniaUKUKn=124Acute care surgeryUsing CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 levelSamantha 2021Retrospective studyn=536Sarcopenia61.2(16.8)30.7(8.7)n=726Samantha 2021Retrospective studyn=536Sarcopenia68 [54-77]26.2 [22.7-30.1] n=241n=240Rangel 2016Retrospective studyn=297No sarcopenia68 [54-77]26.2 [22.7-30.1] n=75n=756Kotte abdomi- assess the psoas muscle at the L3 levelRangel 2016Retrospective studyn=297No sarcopenia68 [54-77] accopenia26.2 [22.7-30.1] accopenian=766No sarcopeniaNo sarcopenia78 [74-84] accopenia27 [24-31]n=220Using CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 levelNo sarcopeniaNo sarcopenia78 [74-83]27 [24-31]n=220	Rebecca 2016	Retrospective study	n=593	Sarcopenia	65.65(15.68)	23.69(5.53)	n=197	Emergency laparotomy surgery	Using CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L4 level
Du 2014Retrospective studyn = 100Sarcopenia84.3(3.9)24 [22-27]n = 73Emergency general surgical bases the psoas nuscle at the L3 levelUsing CT to asses the psoas nuscle at the L3 levelBrandt 2019Retrospective studyn = 150SarcopeniaUKUKn = 38Emergency plaparotomyUsing CT to asses the psoas muscle at the L3 levelLisa 2018Retrospective studyn = 967SarcopeniaUKUKn = 112Samantha 2021Retrospective studyn = 536Sarcopenia70.3(14.7)25.0(5.6)n = 241Acute care surgeryUsing CT to asses the psoas muscle at the L3 levelSamantha 2021Retrospective studyn = 536Sarcopenia61.2(16.8)30.7(8.7)n = 726Using CT to asses the psoas muscle at the L3 levelSamantha 2021Retrospective studyn = 536Sarcopenia61.2(16.8)30.7(8.7)n = 726Using CT to asses the psoas muscle at the L3 levelSamantha 2021Retrospective studyn = 536Sarcopenia61.2(16.8)30.7(8.7)n = 726Using CT to asses the psoas muscle at the L3 levelRangel 2016Retrospective studyn = 297Sarcopenia68 [54-77]262 [22.7-30.1]n = 726Using CT to asses the psoas muscle at the L3 levelNo sarcopenia68 [54-77] study26 [20-27]n = 75Acute abdomin al surgeryUsing CT to asses the psoas muscle at the L3 levelNo sarco				No sarcopenia	58.14(16.22)	29.67(8.01)	n=396		
Brandt 2019Retrospective studyn=150No sarcopeniaUKUKn=38Emergency laparotomy surgeryUsing CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 levelLisa 2018Retrospective studyn=967No sarcopeniaUKUKn=112No sarcopeniaNo sarcopenia01KUKn=241Acute care surgeryUsing CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 levelSamantha 2021Retrospective studyn=536No sarcopenia61.2(16.8)30.7(8.7)n=726Samantha 2021Retrospective studyn=536Sarcopenia61.2(16.8)30.7(8.7)n=726Samantha 2021Retrospective studyn=536Sarcopenia68.[54-77]26.2 [22.7-30.1]n=241Emergency assess the psoas muscle at the L3 levelRangel 2016Retrospective studyn=297Sarcopenia68.[54-77]26.2 [22.7-30.1]n=75Acute abdomi- assess the psoas muscle at the L3 levelNo sarcopenia68.[54-77]26.2 [22.7-30.1]n=75Acute abdomi- assess the psoas muscle at the L3 levelNo sarcopenia78.[74-84]22 [20-27]n=75Acute abdomi- al surgeryUsing CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 levelNo sarcopenia78.[74-83]27 [24-31]n=222	Du 2014	Retrospective study	n = 100	Sarcopenia	84.3(3.9)	24 [22–27]	n=73	Emergency general surgical operation	Using CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 level
Brandt 2019 Retrospective study n = 150 Sarcopenia UK UK n = 38 Emergency laparotomy surgery Using CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 level Lisa 2018 Retrospective study n = 967 Sarcopenia UK UK n = 112 Lisa 2018 Retrospective study n = 967 Sarcopenia 70.3(14.7) 25.0(5.6) n = 241 Acute care surgery Using CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 level Samantha 2021 Retrospective study n = 536 Sarcopenia 61.2(16.8) 30.7(8.7) n = 726 Using CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 level Samantha 2021 Retrospective study n = 536 Sarcopenia 75 [68-81] 23.4 [20.2-27.1] n = 241 Kemergency laparotomy laparotomy surgery Using CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 level Rangel 2016 Retrospective study n = 297 Sarcopenia 78 [74-84] 22 [20-27] n = 75 Acute abdomi- nal surgery Using CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 level No sarcopenia 78 [74-83] 27 [24-31] n = 222 Using CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 level				No sarcopenia	83.6(2.9)	25 [24–28]	n = 27		
Lisa 2018Retrospective studyn=967No sarcopeniaUKUKn=112No sarcopenia7.03(14.7)25.0(5.6)n=241Acute care surgeryUsing CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 levelSamantha 2021Retrospective studyn=536Sarcopenia61.2(16.8)30.7(8.7)n=726No sarcopenia75 [68-81]23.4 [20.2-27.1]n=241Emergency laparotomy surgeryUsing CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 levelRangel 2016Retrospective studyn=29768 [54-77]26.2 [22.7-30.1]n=726No sarcopenia78 [74-84]22 [20-27]n=75Acute abdomi al surgeryUsing CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 levelNo sarcopenia78 [74-83]27 [24-31]n=222	Brandt 2019	Retrospective study	n=150	Sarcopenia	UK	UK	n=38	Emergency laparotomy surgery	Using CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 level
Lisa 2018Retrospective studyn = 967Sarcopenia70.3(14.7)25.0(5.6)n = 241Acute care surgeryUsing CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 levelSamantha 2021Retrospective studyn = 53661.2(16.8)30.7(8.7)n = 726Samantha 2021Retrospective studyn = 536Sarcopenia75 [68-81]23.4 [20.2-27.1]n = 241Emergency laparotomy surgeryUsing CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 levelRangel 2016Retrospective studyn = 297No sarcopenia68 [54-77]26.2 [22.7-30.1]n = 726No sarcopenia78 [74-84]22 [20-27]n = 75Acute abdomi- nal surgeryUsing CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 levelNo sarcopenia78 [74-84]22 [20-27]n = 75Acute abdomi- nal surgeryUsing CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 levelNo sarcopenia78 [74-84]27 [24-31]n = 222				No sarcopenia	UK	UK	n=112		
Samantha 2021Retrospective studyn = 536No sarcopenia61.2(16.8)30.7(8.7)n = 726Samantha 2021Retrospective studyn = 536Sarcopenia75 [68-81]23.4 [20.2-27.1]n = 241Emergency laparotomy surgeryUsing CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 levelRangel 2016Retrospective studyn = 297Sarcopenia68 [54-77]26.2 [22.7-30.1]n = 726No sarcopenia68 [54-77]26.2 [22.7-30.1]n = 726No sarcopenia78 [74-84]22 [20-27]n = 75Acute abdomi- nal surgeryUsing CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 levelNo sarcopenia78 [74-83]27 [24-31]n = 222	Lisa 2018	Retrospective study	n=967	Sarcopenia	70.3(14.7)	25.0(5.6)	n=241	Acute care surgery	Using CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 level
Samantha 2021 Retrospective study n=536 Sarcopenia 75 [68-81] 23.4 [20.2-27.1] n=241 Emergency laparotomy surgery Using CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 level Rangel 2016 Retrospective study n=297 Sarcopenia 78 [74-84] 22 [20-27] n=75 Acute abdomi-nal surgery Using CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 level No sarcopenia 78 [74-84] 22 [20-27] n=75 Acute abdomi-nal surgery Using CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 level No sarcopenia 78 [74-83] 27 [24-31] n=222 Ne sarcopenia 78 [74-83] 27 [24-31] n=222				No sarcopenia	61.2(16.8)	30.7(8.7)	n = 726		
No sarcopenia 68 [54–77] 26.2 [22.7–30.1] n=726 Rangel 2016 Retrospective n=297 Sarcopenia 78 [74–84] 22 [20–27] n=75 Acute abdomi- nal surgery Using CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 level No sarcopenia 78 [74–83] 27 [24–31] n=222	Samantha 2021	Retrospective study	n=536	Sarcopenia	75 [68–81]	23.4 [20.2–27.1]	n=241	Emergency laparotomy surgery	Using CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 level
Rangel 2016 Retrospective study n = 297 Sarcopenia 78 [74–84] 22 [20–27] n = 75 Acute abdomi- nal surgery Using CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 level No sarcopenia 78 [74–83] 27 [24–31] n = 222				No sarcopenia	68 [54–77]	26.2 [22.7–30.1]	n=726		
No sarcopenia 78 [74–83] 27 [24–31] n = 222	Rangel 2016	Retrospective study	n=297	Sarcopenia	78 [74–84]	22 [20–27]	n=75	Acute abdomi- nal surgery	Using CT to assess the psoas muscle at the L3 level
				No sarcopenia	78 [74–83]	27 [24–31]	n=222		

Table 2 (continued)

The number represents the mean (standard deviation) or median (interquartile range) or mean (median) UK, unknown; BMI, body mass index

studies [5, 17, 18, 32–39]. Of the studies, 10 of them examined muscle mass at the level of the L3 vertebral body on CT scans to diagnose sarcopenia [5, 17, 32–37, 39] and only one assessed the muscle mass at the level of the L4 vertebral body on CT scans [38].

Risk of bias

Table 3 shows the risk of bias for the 11 included studies assessed according to the QUIPS tool, of which almost all were rated moderate to high for potential risk of bias in study attrition and study confounding domains. This was the most common methodological weakness.

Quality of evidence

Based on the GRADE approach, we found the moderate quality of evidence for 30-day postoperative mortality and length of hospital stay. The quality of evidence was low for the need for ICU admission and the incidence of postoperative complications, and the quality of evidence for the length of stay in the ICU was very low (Fig. 2).

Primary outcome

30-day mortality

Nine articles with a total of 3626 patients reported 30-day mortality following emergency laparotomy [5, 17, 32–34, 36–39]. Compared with non-sarcopenic patients, sarcopenic patients had a higher risk of death 30 days after surgery (Fig. 3; OR=2.42, 95% CI=1.93–3.05, P<0.00001). There was slight heterogeneity among the included kinds of literature (I^2 =8%, P=0.37).

Secondary outcome Lenath of ICU stav

There were four articles documenting the length of stay in the ICU, in which data were reported for 1374 cases [5, 34–36]. The sarcopenia group was found to have longer ICU stays (Fig. 4; MD=0.55, 95% CI=0.05–1.06, P=0.03), with acceptable heterogeneity between articles ($I^2=47\%$, P=0.13).

Need for ICU admission

Four articles with a total of 1385 patients documented the number of postoperative ICU admissions required [5, 34, 36, 37]. There was a significant difference between sarcopenia and non-sarcopenic groups (Fig. 5; OR = 1.58, 95% CI = 1.11-2.25, P=0.01). Patients diagnosed with sarcopenia were more likely to be admitted to the ICU after emergency surgery. Among all included articles, the identity was high and there was no heterogeneity (I^2 =0%, P=0.54).

Total complications

A total of six articles reported the incidence of postoperative complications in the emergency department, with a total of 2737 patients [5, 17, 35–38]. There was low heterogeneity among the included articles (I^2 =33%, P=0.19). Patients with sarcopenia were more likely to have certain complications after emergency laparotomy (Fig. 6; OR=1.78, 95% CI=1.41–2.26, P<0.00001).

Table 3 Risk of bias summary: judgment of each domain for all included studies using the Quality of Prognostic Studies (QUIPS) tool

Study	Study participation	Study attrition	Prognostic factor measurement	Outcome measurement	Study confounding	Statistical analysis and reporting
Mohammad 2018	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Low	Moderate	Moderate
Colin 2021	Low	High	Moderate	Low	High	Low
Trotter 2018	Low	Moderate	Low	Low	High	Low
Matsushima 2017	Low	High	Low	Low	Moderate	Low
Samer 2019	Low	Moderate	Low	Low	High	Moderate
Rebecca 2016	Low	High	Low	Low	High	Low
Du 2014	Low	Moderate	Low	Low	High	Moderate
Brandt 2019	Low	High	Low	Low	High	Low
Lisa 2018	Low	High	Low	Low	Moderate	Low
Samantha 2021	Low	High	Low	Low	Moderate	Low
Rangel 2016	Low	Moderate	Low	Low	Moderate	High

Summary of findings:

Sacropenic compared to Non-sarcopenic for emergency abdominal surgery

Patient or population: emergency abdominal surgery Setting: Inpatient Intervention: Sacropenic Comparison: Non-sarcopenic

	•								
	Anticipated absolute effects [*] (95% Cl)		Anticipated absolute effects* (95% Cl)			N. of	Cortainty of		
Outcomes	Risk with Non- sarcopenic	Risk with Sacropenic	Relative effect (95% CI)	participants (studies)	the evidence (GRADE)	Comments			
30-day mortality	95 per 1,000	204 per 1,000 (169 to 244)	OR 2.42 (1.93 to 3.05)	3626 (9 observational studies)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ Moderate	a,b,c			
Incidence of total complications	474 per 1,000	616 per 1,000 (560 to 671)	OR 1.78 (1.41 to 2.26)	2737 (6 observational studies)		a,b			
Need for ICU admission	179 per 1,000	256 per 1,000 (195 to 329)	OR 1.58 (1.11 to 2.25)	1385 (4 observational studies)		a,b			
Length of hospital stay		MD 2.39 higher (1.35 higher to 3.43 higher)	-	3317 (9 observational studies)	⊕⊕⊕O Moderate	b,d			
Length of ICU stay		MD 0.55 higher (0.05 higher to 1.06 higher)	-	1374 (4 observational studies)	⊕OOO Very low	a,e,f			

*The risk in the intervention group (and its 95% confidence interval) is based on the assumed risk in the comparison group and the relative effect of the intervention (and its 95% CI).

CI: confidence interval; MD: mean difference; OR: odds ratio

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence

High certainty: we are very confident that the true effect lies close to that of the estimate of the effect.

Moderate certainty: we are moderately confident in the effect estimate: the true effect is likely to be close to the estimate of the effect, but there is a possibility that it is substantially different.

Low certainty: our confidence in the effect estimate is limited: the true effect may be substantially different from the estimate of the effect. Very low certainty: we have very little confidence in the effect estimate: the true effect is likely to be substantially different from the estimate of effect.

Explanations

- a. One study includs adults of all ages, unlike other studies that included only middle-aged and older adults
- b. One study has different diagnostic criteria for sarcopenia
- c. Large effect (upgraded)
- d. Statistical heterogeneity I² = 62% (not downgraded)
- e. Included literature and sample size were both small
- f. Statistical heterogeneity $I^2 = 47\%$ (not downgraded)

Fig 2. Certainty of the evidence and summary of findings

	Sarcop	enic	No sarco	penic		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
Brandt 2019	18	38	29	112	8.5%	2.58 [1.20, 5.53]	_
Du 2014	17	73	1	27	1.2%	7.89 [1.00, 62.53]	
Lisa 2018	56	241	58	726	26.4%	3.49 [2.33, 5.21]	
Mohammad 2018	4	113	7	339	3.3%	1.74 [0.50, 6.06]	
Rangel 2016	26	75	43	222	14.1%	2.21 [1.24, 3.95]	_ _
Rebecca 2016	26	197	36	396	16.2%	1.52 [0.89, 2.60]	+
Samantha 2021	17	179	13	357	8.9%	2.78 [1.32, 5.85]	
Samer 2019	23	73	42	210	13.3%	1.84 [1.01, 3.35]	
Trotter 2018	13	61	17	187	8.0%	2.71 [1.23, 5.97]	
Total (95% CI)		1050		2576	100.0%	2.42 [1.93, 3.05]	•
Total events	200		246				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect	= 0.01; Chi : Z = 7.53 (² = 8.71 P ≺ 0.0	, df = 8 (P = 0001)	= 0.37);	≈ =8%		0.005 0.1 1 10 200 Favours Sarcopenic Favours No sarcopeni
ia 3. Forest plot show	/ing 30-day	/ mortal	itv				

Sarcopenic				No sa	rcope	nic		Mean Difference	Mean Difference		
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95% Cl		
Matsushima 2017	1.71	3.1	32	1.06	2.28	57	13.0%	0.65 [-0.58, 1.88]			
Mohammad 2018	1.7	1.5	113	1.35	0.74	339	48.3%	0.35 [0.06, 0.64]	-		
Rangel 2016	4.05	6.8	75	1.75	3.73	222	8.3%	2.30 [0.68, 3.92]			
Samantha 2021	2.35	3.74	179	2	2.98	357	30.3%	0.35 [-0.28, 0.98]			
Total (95% CI)			399			975	100.0%	0.55 [0.05, 1.06]	◆		
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	= 0.12; C	hi² = 5	.61, df:	= 3 (P =	0.13);	l ² = 479	6				
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.14 (P = 0.03)									-4 -2 U 2 4 Favours Sarcopenic Favours No sarcopenic		
Fig 4. Forest plot show	ving the	length	n of ICU	l stay							

r	Sarcop	enic	No sarco	penic		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
Du 2014	24	73	5	27	10.5%	2.16 [0.73, 6.39]	
Mohammad 2018	15	113	37	339	30.2%	1.25 [0.66, 2.37]	
Rangel 2016	50	75	111	222	41.5%	2.00 [1.16, 3.46]	
Samantha 2021	9	179	16	357	17.8%	1.13 [0.49, 2.61]	
Total (95% CI)		440		945	100.0%	1.58 [1.11, 2.25]	◆
Total events	98		169				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	: 0.00; Chi	² = 2.16	, df = 3 (P =	= 0.54);1	²=0%		
Test for overall effect:	Z= 2.54 (P = 0.0	1)			Favours Sarcopenic Favours No sarcopenci	
Fig 5. Forest plot show	ing the ne	ed for IC	U admissic	n			

Length of hospital stay

There were nine articles with a total of 3565 patients reporting postoperative hospital stays [5, 17, 32–38]. There was a significant difference in the length of hospital stay between the sarcopenia group and the non-sarcopenic group (Fig. 7; MD = 2.33, 95% CI = 1.33–3.32, P < 0.00001; $I^2 = 56\%$). This suggested that patients with sarcopenia had longer hospital stays after emergency

surgery. Due to significant heterogeneity, we further performed a sensitivity analysis. In the study by Samer, only the duration of hospital stay in patients who survived within the first 30 days after surgery was counted [32]. After excluding this article, there was still a significant difference in the length of hospital stay between the two groups, but the heterogeneity between articles was reduced (Table 4; MD = 1.94, 95% CI = 1.23–2.65, P < 0.00001; $I^2 = 30\%$).

	Sarcop	copenic No sarcopenic		Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
Du 2014	33	73	4	27	3.9%	4.74 [1.49, 15.09]	
Lisa 2018	198	241	509	726	23.4%	1.96 [1.36, 2.83]	
Matsushima 2017	20	32	21	57	6.2%	2.86 [1.17, 7.00]	
Mohammad 2018	44	113	87	339	18.2%	1.85 [1.18, 2.90]	
Rebecca 2016	90	197	133	396	24.6%	1.66 [1.17, 2.36]	
Samantha 2021	85	179	148	357	23.8%	1.28 [0.89, 1.83]	
Total (95% CI)		835		1902	100.0%	1.78 [1.41, 2.26]	•
Total events	470		902				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.03; Chi	² = 7.44					
Test for overall effect:	Z=4.79 (P < 0.0	0001)			Favours Sarcopenic Favours No sarcopenic	

Fig 6. Forest plot showing the incidence of total complications

	Sa	rcopeni	c	No s	arcope	nic		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95% Cl
Du 2014	15.47	12.86	73	11.43	10.96	27	3.4%	4.04 [-1.04, 9.12]	+
Lisa 2018	9.7	5.94	241	8.7	5.97	726	23.3%	1.00 [0.13, 1.87]	-
Matsushima 2017	12.36	6.98	32	10.35	5.32	57	8.8%	2.01 [-0.77, 4.79]	+
Mohammad 2018	6.65	3.75	113	5	2.98	339	24.3%	1.65 [0.89, 2.41]	•
Rangel 2016	17.17	14.36	75	12.4	8.95	222	6.4%	4.77 [1.31, 8.23]	—•—
Rebecca 2016	10.4	7.47	197	7.88	6.45	396	19.9%	2.52 [1.30, 3.74]	
Samantha 2021	18.46	15.7	179	15.05	9.68	357	10.1%	3.41 [0.90, 5.92]	
Samer 2019	35.7	29.88	73	22.2	29.88	210	1.5%	13.50 [5.54, 21.46]	
Trotter 2018	15	22.3	61	14	20.5	187	2.3%	1.00 [-5.32, 7.32]	
Total (95% CI)			1044			2521	100.0%	2.33 [1.33, 3.32]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau² = Test for overall effect	= 0.92; C : Z = 4.57	hi² = 18 ² (P < 0.	.31, df: 00001)	= 8 (P =	0.02); l²	°= 56%			-20 -10 0 10 20 Favours Sarcopenic Favours No sarcopeni
ig 7. Forest plot show	wing the	length	of hos	oital stay	ý				

Study	Statistics	with study removed				
	MD	Lower limit	Upper limit	Z value	P value	l ² value
Du 2014	2.28	1.25	3.3	4.34	0.01	60%
Lisa 2018	2.77	1.58	3.96	4.56	0.06	49%
Matsushima 2017	2.41	1.31	3.5	4.29	0.01	62%
Mohammad 2018	2.78	1.36	4.2	3.84	0.01	61%
Rangel 2016	2.12	1.14	3.1	4.25	0.03	54%
Rebecca 2016	2.37	1.17	3.57	3.86	0.02	58%
Samantha 2021	2.2	1.15	3.26	4.1	0.02	58%
Samer 2019	1.94	1.23	2.65	5.35	0.19	30%
Trotter 2018	2.39	1.35	3.43	4.49	0.01	62%

MD, mean difference

Discussion

Emergency laparotomy surgery had high morbidity and mortality. There were few studies investigating the impact of sarcopenia in patients following emergency laparotomy. Our study aimed to assess the risk of death after emergency laparotomy in patients with preoperative sarcopenia. We performed a systematic review and meta-analysis. Eleven eligible studies involving 3795 patients were included. The results showed that sarcopenia was associated with increased postoperative 30-day mortality. There was mild heterogeneity among the nine studies, which were considered high quality. In addition, patients with sarcopenia significantly increased postoperative ICU duration, number of ICU admissions, incidence of postoperative complications.

Patients with preoperative sarcopenia had significantly longer hospital length of stay, but there was large heterogeneity between studies. One of the studies included patients who survived more than or equal to 30 days after surgery in the overall length of stay calculation. The author believed that the impact of early death should be excluded. However, patients that died during the study period were included so as to not overestimate the total duration result. In fact, hospital length of stay in this study was significantly longer than others, which showed that overstated time was a variable of heterogeneity in our study. Considering ICU admissions and hospital length of stay, it was reasonable to presume that patients with sarcopenia following emergency laparotomy were at risk of high medical costs and excessive heavy illness burden.

Our systematic review and meta-analysis independently investigated the association of sarcopenia with prognosis after emergency laparotomy. An efficient and simple assessment tool to identify high-risk surgical patients may be extremely valuable for medical teams' awareness, especially in time-sensitive situations. Our findings were consistent with previous observative studies confirming that sarcopenia was associated with increased 30-day postoperative mortality in patients undergoing emergency laparotomy [25, 40, 41]. Some studies identified the effect of sarcopenia on mortality and morbidity after elective and emergency abdominal surgeries. However, the quality of evidence is low due to the small number of included studies and participants [25]. In recent years, the impact of sarcopenia on postoperative outcomes has received extensive attention, especially in emergency laparotomy. Therefore, we performed an update of this topic including 11 studies of 3795 patients, and we used the QUIPS and GRADE tools, respectively, to assess the risk of bias and quality of evidence in the included studies. In our study, heterogeneity was low with a dramatically expanded sample size, and the methodological quality of the studies in our review was reliable, increasing the representativeness, and generalizability of our conclusions.

Previous studies found that sarcopenia was associated with multiple adverse outcomes, including falls, functional decline, and postoperative mortality [42]. Sarcopenia was assessed by abdominal computed tomography (CT) L3 pyramid or L4 pyramid total psoas area (TPA) or total psoas index (TPI). TPA < 3.64 cm/m^2 in women and TPA < 4.55 cm/m^2 in men or TPI < 1.50 cm/m^2 in women and TPI < 2.16 cm/m^2 in men were defined as sarcopenia [43–46]. Therefore, sarcopenia by abdomen CT scan was

used to easily identify the high-risk patients without evaluating them from complicated scales or questionnaires, which is both costly for time and inaccurate in terms of patients' severeness and degree of cooperation. Meanwhile, most of the patients treated by emergency laparotomy had abdominal CT scan before surgeries. Therefore, sarcopenia was simple, objective, and efficient to be a perioperative risk stratification tool in emergency clinical practice.

The reasons for poor prognosis of patients with sarcopenia after emergency laparotomy were multifactorial, including preoperative frailty, previous malnutrition, and complex comorbidities. In addition, emergency laparotomy surgeries were often insufficiently prepared due to rapid and even life-threatening disease progression. In the postoperative stage, surgical strikes, pain, respiratory failure, circulatory compromise, sepsis, and multiple organ dysfunction also increased the incidence of postoperative complications and mortality.

Although CT-identified sarcopenia can help to predict perioperative risk, we cannot improve patient outcomes through preoperative nutrition and physical activity, as practiced in elective surgery [47]. To these patient groups, we likely pay more attention throughout treatment, such as complications prevention, nutrition intervention in early post-procedure phase, and even immediate intensive care post-surgery. Therefore, preoperative diagnosis of sarcopenia undoubtedly provided important predictive information for general medical management strategies, nursing goals, family awareness, and rehabilitation expectations [48].

There were some limitations in our study. Firstly, the 11 included studies were all retrospective cohort studies. The retrospective design caused them to solely assess muscle mass without measurement of muscle function (grip strength, walking speed, physical activity), which may exaggerate the predictive power of sarcopenia. In our opinion, given that sarcopenia is a serious disease state, we would rather overestimate than underdiagnose. Secondly, there were no clear definition and classification of surgical types in the included literature, so we could not perform subgroup analysis according to surgical procedures specifically, which may have influenced the results of this study. Further research is required to be addressed on specific procedures later. In addition, positive results were more likely to be published and there may be a risk of reporting bias. Most important, in the emergency setting, we have demonstrated that sarcopenia can effectively predict adverse postoperative outcomes.

Recently, some studies argued that patients with sarcopenia cannot be diagnosed by preoperative CT efficiently because of the costs, radiations, and body position restrictions. The point-of-care ultrasound had the advantages of high operability, repeatability, and convenient portability (49). Therefore, point-of-care ultrasound instead of CT scan may be a future research direction to assess the feasibility of sarcopenia diagnosis before emergency surgeries. Exploration of randomized controlled trials is also needed if early targeted interventions on sarcopenia can improve patient outcomes based on our prediction findings.

Conclusion

We found that preoperative CT scan-derived sarcopenia was associated with increased postoperative 30-day mortality and ICU admissions. ICU and hospital length of stay and incidence of postoperative adverse events were also significantly elevated. Further research should demonstrate if dedicated intervention for sarcopenia will improve patient outcomes.

Abbreviations

OR: Odds ratio; CI: Confidence interval; MD: Mean difference; PRISMA: Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses; MeSH: Medical Subject Headings; ICU: Intensive care unit; PMA: Psoas major area; SMA: Skeletal muscle area; CT: Computed tomography; TPA: Total psoas area; TPI: Total psoas index; QUIPS: Quality in prognosis studies; GRADE: Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluations; SoF: Summary of finding.

Supplementary Information

The online version contains supplementary material available at https://doi. org/10.1186/s13017-022-00440-0.

Additional file 1. PRISMA checklist.

Acknowledgements

Not applicable.

Author contributions

TY, KL, and PJ made substantial contributions to conception and design of the study; TY, XD, and LX searched literature, extracted data from the collected literature, and analyzed the data; TY and KL wrote the manuscript; and PJ and RW revised the manuscript. All the authors approved the final version of the manuscript.

Funding

This work was supported by the Health Planning Committee of Sichuan Province (20PJ052).

Availability of data and materials

The datasets generated and analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate Not applicable.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Author details

¹Department of Anesthesiology, West China Hospital, Sichuan University, No. 37, Guoxue Xiang, Chengdu 610041, Sichuan, China. ²Department of Anesthesiology, West China Second University Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu, Sichuan, China. ³Key Laboratory of Birth Defects and Related Diseases of Women and Children, Ministry of Education, Sichuan University, Chengdu, Sichuan, China. ⁴Department of Critical Care Medicine, West China Hospital, Sichuan University, No. 37, Guoxue Xiang, Chengdu 610041, Sichuan, China.

Received: 1 May 2022 Accepted: 14 June 2022 Published online: 25 June 2022

References

- 1. Etzioni DA, Liu JH, Maggard MA, Ko CY. The aging population and its impact on the surgery workforce. Ann Surg. 2003;238(2):170–7.
- Vashistha N, Singhal D, Budhiraja S, Aggarwal B, Tobin R, Fotedar K. Outcomes of Emergency Laparotomy (EL) care protocol at Tertiary Care Center from Low-Middle-Income Country (LMIC). World J Surg. 2018;42(5):1278–84.
- Peden CJ, Stephens T, Martin G, Kahan BC, Thomson A, Rivett K, et al. Effectiveness of a national quality improvement programme to improve survival after emergency abdominal surgery (EPOCH): a stepped-wedge cluster-randomised trial. Lancet. 2019;393(10187):2213–21.
- Fagan G, Barazanchi A, Coulter G, Leeman M, Hill AG, Eglinton TW. New Zealand and Australia emergency laparotomy mortality rates compare favourably to international outcomes: a systematic review. ANZ J Surg. 2021;91(12):2583–91.
- Body S, Ligthart MAP, Rahman S, Ward J, May-Miller P, Pucher PH, et al. Sarcopenia and myosteatosis predict adverse outcomes after emergency laparotomy: a multi-centre observational cohort study. Ann Surg. 2021;275:1103.
- Pearse RM, Moreno RP, Bauer P, Pelosi P, Metnitz P, Spies C, et al. Mortality after surgery in Europe: a 7 day cohort study. Lancet. 2012;380(9847):1059–65.
- Aitken RM, Partridge JSL, Oliver CM, Murray D, Hare S, Lockwood S, et al. Older patients undergoing emergency laparotomy: observations from the National Emergency Laparotomy Audit (NELA) years 1–4. Age Ageing. 2020;49(4):656–63.
- Kenig J, Zychiewicz B, Olszewska U, Barczynski M, Nowak W. Six screening instruments for frailty in older patients qualified for emergency abdominal surgery. Arch Gerontol Geriatr. 2015;61(3):437–42.
- Havens JM, Columbus AB, Seshadri AJ, Brown CVR, Tominaga GT, Mowery NT, et al. Risk stratification tools in emergency general surgery. Trauma Surg Acute Care Open. 2018;3(1):e000160.
- Church S, Rogers E, Rockwood K, Theou O. A scoping review of the Clinical Frailty Scale. BMC Geriatr. 2020;20(1):393.
- 11. Ko FC. Preoperative frailty evaluation: a promising risk-stratification tool in older adults undergoing general surgery. Clin Ther. 2019;41(3):387–99.
- Weerink LBM, van der Hoorn A, van Leeuwen BL, de Bock GH. Low skeletal muscle mass and postoperative morbidity in surgical oncology: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle. 2020;11(3):636–49.
- Aleixo GFP, Shachar SS, Nyrop KA, Muss HB, Malpica L, Williams GR. Myosteatosis and prognosis in cancer: Systematic review and metaanalysis. Crit Rev Oncol Hematol. 2020;145:102839.
- Chang KV, Hsu TH, Wu WT, Huang KC, Han DS. Association between sarcopenia and cognitive impairment: a systematic review and metaanalysis. J Am Med Dir Assoc. 2016;17(12):1164.e7-e15.
- Yeung SSY, Reijnierse EM, Pham VK, Trappenburg MC, Lim WK, Meskers CGM, et al. Sarcopenia and its association with falls and fractures in older adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle. 2019;10(3):485–500.
- Chang KV, Hsu TH, Wu WT, Huang KC, Han DS. Is sarcopenia associated with depression? A systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies. Age Ageing. 2017;46(5):738–46.
- Francomacaro LM, Walker C, Jaap K, Dove J, Hunsinger M, Widom K, et al. Sarcopenia predicts poor outcomes in urgent exploratory laparotomy. Am J Surg. 2018;216(6):1107–13.

- McQuade C, Kavanagh DO, O'Brien C, Hunter K, Nally D, Hickie C, et al. CT-determined sarcopenia as a predictor of post-operative outcomes in patients undergoing an emergency laparotomy. Clin Imaging. 2021;79:273–7.
- Tosato M, Marzetti E, Cesari M, Savera G, Miller RR, Bernabei R, et al. Measurement of muscle mass in sarcopenia: from imaging to biochemical markers. Aging Clin Exp Res. 2017;29(1):19–27.
- Jones KI, Doleman B, Scott S, Lund JN, Williams JP. Simple psoas crosssectional area measurement is a quick and easy method to assess sarcopenia and predicts major surgical complications. Colorectal Dis. 2015;17(1):O20–6.
- Hanaoka M, Yasuno M, Ishiguro M, Yamauchi S, Kikuchi A, Tokura M, et al. Morphologic change of the psoas muscle as a surrogate marker of sarcopenia and predictor of complications after colorectal cancer surgery. Int J Colorectal Dis. 2017;32(6):847–56.
- Wang PY, Xu LD, Chen XK, Xu L, Yu YK, Zhang RX, et al. Sarcopenia and short-term outcomes after esophagectomy: a meta-analysis. Ann Surg Oncol. 2020;27(8):3041–51.
- Shen Y, Hao Q, Zhou J, Dong B. The impact of frailty and sarcopenia on postoperative outcomes in older patients undergoing gastrectomy surgery: a systematic review and meta-analysis. BMC Geriatr. 2017;17(1):188.
- Ratnayake CB, Loveday BP, Shrikhande SV, Windsor JA, Pandanaboyana S. Impact of preoperative sarcopenia on postoperative outcomes following pancreatic resection: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Pancreatology. 2018;18(8):996–1004.
- Hajibandeh S, Hajibandeh S, Jarvis R, Bhogal T, Dalmia S. Meta-analysis of the effect of sarcopenia in predicting postoperative mortality in emergency and elective abdominal surgery. Surg J R Coll Surg Edinb Irel. 2019;17(6):370–80.
- Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ. 2021;372:n71.
- Luo D, Wan X, Liu J, Tong T. Optimally estimating the sample mean from the sample size, median, mid-range, and/or mid-quartile range. Stat Methods Med Res. 2018;27(6):1785–805.
- Wan X, Wang W, Liu J, Tong T. Estimating the sample mean and standard deviation from the sample size, median, range and/or interquartile range. BMC Med Res Methodol. 2014;14:135.
- Hayden JA, Côté P, Bombardier C. Evaluation of the quality of prognosis studies in systematic reviews. Ann Intern Med. 2006;144(6):427–37.
- Hayden JA, van der Windt DA, Cartwright JL, Côté P, Bombardier C. Assessing bias in studies of prognostic factors. Ann Intern Med. 2013;158(4):280–6.
- Brozek JL, Akl EA, Alonso-Coello P, Lang D, Jaeschke R, Williams JW, et al. Grading quality of evidence and strength of recommendations in clinical practice guidelines—part 1 of 3: an overview of the GRADE approach and grading quality of evidence about interventions. Allergy. 2009;64(5):669–77.
- Salem SA, Almogy G, Lev-Cohain N, Bala M, Cohen N, Issachar O, et al. Psoas attenuation and mortality of elderly patients undergoing nontraumatic emergency laparotomy. J Surg Res. 2021;257:252–9.
- Trotter J, Johnston J, Ng A, Gatt M, MacFie J, McNaught C. Is sarcopenia a useful predictor of outcome in patients after emergency laparotomy? A study using the NELA database. Ann R Coll Surg Engl. 2018;100(5):377–81.
- Rangel EL, Rios-Diaz AJ, Uyeda JW, Castillo-Angeles M, Cooper Z, Olufajo OA, et al. Sarcopenia increases risk of long-term mortality in elderly patients undergoing emergency abdominal surgery. J Trauma Acute Care Surg. 2017;83(6):1179–86.
- Matsushima K, Inaba K, Jhaveri V, Cheng V, Herr K, Siboni S, et al. Loss of muscle mass: a significant predictor of postoperative complications in acute diverticulitis. J Surg Res. 2017;211:39–44.
- Hamidi M, Ho C, Zeeshan M, O'Keeffe T, Hamza A, Kulvatunyou N, et al. Can sarcopenia quantified by computed tomography scan predict adverse outcomes in emergency general surgery? J Surg Res. 2019;235:141–7.
- Du Y, Karvellas CJ, Baracos V, Williams DC, Khadaroo RG. Sarcopenia is a predictor of outcomes in very elderly patients undergoing emergency surgery. Surgery. 2014;156(3):521–7.
- Dirks RC, Edwards BL, Tong E, Schaheen B, Turrentine FE, Shada A, et al. Sarcopenia in emergency abdominal surgery. J Surg Res. 2017;207:13–21.

- Brandt E, Tengberg LT, Bay-Nielsen M. Sarcopenia predicts 90-day mortality in elderly patients undergoing emergency abdominal surgery. Abdom Radiol (NY). 2019;44(3):1155–60.
- Simonsen C, de Heer P, Bjerre ED, Suetta C, Hojman P, Pedersen BK, et al. Sarcopenia and postoperative complication risk in gastrointestinal surgical oncology: a meta-analysis. Ann Surg. 2018;268(1):58–69.
- Jones K, Gordon-Weeks A, Coleman C, Silva M. Radiologically determined sarcopenia predicts morbidity and mortality following abdominal surgery: a systematic review and meta-analysis. World J Surg. 2017;41(9):2266–79.
- 42. Papadopoulou SK. Sarcopenia: a contemporary health problem among older adult populations. Nutrients. 2020;12(5):1293.
- Joglekar S, Asghar A, Mott SL, Johnson BE, Button AM, Clark E, et al. Sarcopenia is an independent predictor of complications following pancreatectomy for adenocarcinoma. J Surg Oncol. 2015;111(6):771–5.
- Englesbe MJ, Patel SP, He K, Lynch RJ, Schaubel DE, Harbaugh C, et al. Sarcopenia and mortality after liver transplantation. J Am Coll Surg. 2010;211(2):271–8.
- 45. Amini N, Spolverato G, Gupta R, Margonis GA, Kim Y, Wagner D, et al. Impact total psoas volume on short- and long-term outcomes in patients undergoing curative resection for pancreatic adenocarcinoma: a new tool to assess sarcopenia. J Gastrointest Surg. 2015;19(9):1593–602.
- 46. Yoo T, Lo WD, Evans DC. Computed tomography measured psoas density predicts outcomes in trauma. Surgery. 2017;162(2):377–84.
- Whittle J, Wischmeyer PE, Grocott MPW, Miller TE. Surgical prehabilitation: nutrition and exercise. Anesthesiol Clin. 2018;36(4):567–80.
- Susano MJ, Grasfield RH, Friese M, Rosner B, Crosby G, Bader AM, et al. Brief preoperative screening for frailty and cognitive impairment predicts delirium after spine surgery. Anesthesiology. 2020;133(6):1184–91.
- Canales C, Mazor E, Coy H, Grogan TR, Duval V, Raman S, et al. Preoperative point-of-care ultrasound to identify frailty and predict postoperative outcomes: a diagnostic accuracy study. Anesthesiology. 2022;136(2):268–78.

Publisher's Note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Ready to submit your research? Choose BMC and benefit from:

- fast, convenient online submission
- thorough peer review by experienced researchers in your field
- rapid publication on acceptance
- support for research data, including large and complex data types
- gold Open Access which fosters wider collaboration and increased citations
- maximum visibility for your research: over 100M website views per year

At BMC, research is always in progress.

Learn more biomedcentral.com/submissions

