

肿瘤防治研究

Cancer Research on Prevention and Treatment

不同麻醉镇静深度BIS闭环靶控输注对腹腔镜胃癌根治术老年患者围术期Th1/Th2平衡的影响

江华勇, 劳伟龙, 周国忠, 宋棋梁, 蒋宗明, 俞渭生, 陈忠华

引用本文:

江华勇, 劳伟龙, 周国忠, 宋棋梁, 蒋宗明, 俞渭生, 陈忠华. 不同麻醉镇静深度BIS闭环靶控输注对腹腔镜胃癌根治术老年患者围术期Th1/Th2平衡的影响[J]. 肿瘤防治研究, 2022, 49(5): 444–447.

JIANG Huayong, LAO Weilong, ZHOU Guozhong, SONG Qiliang, JIANG Zongming, YU Weisheng, CHEN Zhonghua. Different Anesthesia and Sedation Depths of BIS-guided Closed-loop Target-controlled Infusion on Perioperative Th1/Th2 Balance in Elderly Patients Undergoing Laparoscopic Radical Gastrectomy[J]. Zhong Liu Fang Zhi Yan Jiu, 2022, 49(5): 444–447.

在线阅读 View online: <https://doi.org/10.3971/j.issn.1000-8578.2022.21.0860>

您可能感兴趣的其他文章

Articles you may be interested in

全腹腔镜与辅助腹腔镜下远端胃癌根治术的近期疗效和安全性研究

Short-term Efficacy and Safety of Total Laparoscopic and Laparoscopic-assisted Radical Gastrectomy on Distal Gastric Cancer
肿瘤防治研究. 2018, 45(11): 900–904 <https://doi.org/10.3971/j.issn.1000-8578.2018.18.0427>

达芬奇机器人胃癌根治术对患者胃肠动力及胃肠激素的影响

Effect of Da Vinci Robot Radical Gastrectomy on Gastrointestinal Motility and Gastrointestinal Hormones of Gastric Cancer Patients
肿瘤防治研究. 2019, 46(12): 1085–1090 <https://doi.org/10.3971/j.issn.1000-8578.2019.19.1099>

阴茎癌腹腔镜下腹股沟淋巴结清扫术与开放手术的临床疗效比较

Clinical Effect of Laparoscopic Inguinal Lymph Node Dissection Versus Open Surgery for Penile Cancer
肿瘤防治研究. 2019, 46(04): 355–357 <https://doi.org/10.3971/j.issn.1000-8578.2019.18.1285>

黄芪多糖对气阴两虚Lewis肺癌荷瘤小鼠肿瘤生长、转移及细胞周期的影响

Effects of Astragalus Polysaccharides on Growth, Metastasis and Cell Cycle of Lewis Lung Cancer in Tumor-bearing Mice with Qi and Yin Deficiency
肿瘤防治研究. 2018, 45(03): 131–137 <https://doi.org/10.3971/j.issn.1000-8578.2018.17.0220>

纳米碳标记在全腹腔镜远端胃癌根治术delta吻合中的应用

Application of Carbon Nano Label in Delta Anastomosis of Total Laparoscopic Radical Gastrectomy for Distal Gastric Cancer
肿瘤防治研究. 2018, 45(07): 492–493 <https://doi.org/10.3971/j.issn.1000-8578.2018.17.1505>



杂志官网



微信公众号

不同麻醉镇静深度BIS闭环靶控输注对腹腔镜胃癌根治术老年患者围术期Th1/Th2平衡的影响

江华勇¹, 劳伟龙^{1,2}, 周国忠³, 宋棋梁¹, 蒋宗明¹, 俞渭生¹, 陈忠华¹

Different Anesthesia and Sedation Depths of BIS-guided Closed-loop Target-controlled Infusion on Perioperative Th1/Th2 Balance in Elderly Patients Undergoing Laparoscopic Radical Gastrectomy

JIANG Huayong¹, LAO Weilong^{1,2}, ZHOU Guozhong³, SONG Qiliang¹, JIANG Zongming¹, YU Weisheng¹, CHEN Zhonghua¹

1. Department of Anesthesiology, Shaoxing People's Hospital, Shaoxing 312000, China;

2. Shaoxing University School of Medicine, Shaoxing 312000, China; 3. Department of

Laboratory, Shaoxing People's Hospital, Shaoxing 312000, China

Corresponding Author: CHEN Zhonghua, E-mail: chenbeijing116@163.com

Abstract: Objective To investigate the effect of BIS-guided closed-loop target-controlled infusion on perioperative Th1/Th2 balance in elderly patients undergoing laparoscopic radical gastrectomy under different anesthesia and sedation depths. **Methods** We applied random number table method to divide 73 elderly patients undergoing elective laparoscopic radical gastrectomy into BIS closed-loop target-controlled infusion group with BIS value of 55 (group H, $n=36$) and BIS value of 45 (group L, $n=37$). Intravenous blood samples were collected immediately before surgery (T1), 2h after surgery (T2), 24h after surgery (T3) and 72h after surgery (T4). IL-2, IL-4, IL-6, IL-10, TNF- α and IFN- γ were determined by flow cytometry microsphere array. We compared operation duration, postoperative PACU stay time and postoperative hospitalization time between two groups. **Results** Compared with T1, IL-6 and IL-10 concentration in group H at T2, T3 and T4 significantly increased ($P<0.05$), IL-4 and TNF- α in group H at T4 were significantly increased ($P<0.05$), IL-2 and IFN- γ in group H at T2 and T4 were significantly increased ($P<0.05$), the concentration of IL-6 and IL-10 in group L at T2, T3 and T4 were increased ($P<0.05$), IL-2 in group L at T4 was decreased ($P<0.05$), and IFN- γ /IL-6 in two groups were decreased at T2, T3 and T4 ($P<0.05$). Compared with group L, IL-6 and IL-10 in group H were significantly increased at T2 ($P<0.05$), IFN- γ /IL-6 in group H was significantly decreased ($P<0.05$), IL-2 and IL-10 in group H were significantly increased at T4 ($P<0.05$). Operation duration, postoperative PACU stay time and postoperative hospitalization time had no statistical significance between two groups ($P>0.05$). **Conclusion** The anesthesia and sedation depth of BIS-guided closed-loop target-controlled infusion set at 45 is better than 55 in maintaining Th1/Th2 balance in elderly patients undergoing laparoscopic radical gastrectomy, but it has no obvious effect on long-term prognosis.

Key words: Bispectral index; Target-controlled infusion; Sedation deep; Laparoscopic radical gastrectomy; Elderly patients; Th1/Th2 balance

Funding: Shaoxing Health Science and Technology Project (No. 2017CX009)

Competing interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

摘要: 目的 探讨BIS闭环靶控输注在不同麻醉镇静深度对腹腔镜胃癌根治术老年患者围术期Th1/Th2

平衡的影响。**方法** 对73例择期腹腔镜胃癌根治术的老年患者进行随机数字表法分组, 分为BIS闭环靶控输注BIS值55组(H组, 36例)和BIS值45组(L组, 37例)。分别于手术开始前即刻(T1)、术后2 h(T2)、术后24 h(T3)及72 h(T4)采集静脉血样, 流式细胞术微球阵列法测定IL-2、IL-4、IL-6、IL-10、TNF- α 和IFN- γ 。比较两组患者的手术时间、恢复室停

收稿日期: 2021-07-27; 修回日期: 2021-09-27

基金项目: 绍兴市卫生计生科技计划项目(2017CX009)

作者单位: 1. 312000 绍兴, 绍兴市人民医院麻醉科; 2. 312000 绍兴, 绍兴文理学院医学院; 3. 312000 绍兴, 绍兴市人民医院检验科

通信作者: 陈忠华(1970-), 男, 硕士, 主任医师, 主要从事临床麻醉及管理工作, E-mail: chenbeijing116@163.com

作者简介: 江华勇(1979-), 男, 本科, 副主任医师, 主要从事临床麻醉工作

留时间和住院时间。**结果** 与T1比较, T2、T3、T4时H组IL-6、IL-10浓度明显升高 ($P<0.05$), T4时H组IL-4和TNF- α 明显升高 ($P<0.05$), T2、T4时H组IL-2、IFN- γ 明显升高 ($P<0.05$), T2、T3、T4时L组IL-6、IL-10浓度明显升高 ($P<0.05$), T4时L组IL-2明显降低 ($P<0.05$), T2、T3、T4时H组和L组IFN- γ /IL-6明显降低 ($P<0.05$); 与L组比较, T2时H组IL-6、IL-10明显升高 ($P<0.05$), H组IFN- γ /IL-6明显降低 ($P<0.05$), T4时H组IL-2和IL-10明显升高 ($P<0.05$), 两组患者的手术时间、恢复室停留时间、住院时间差异均无统计学意义 ($P>0.05$)。**结论** BIS闭环靶控输注的麻醉镇静深度值45比55更有利于维持胃癌根治术老年患者术后Th1/Th2的平衡状态, 但是对于改善患者预后不明显。

关键词: 脑电双频指数; 靶控输注; 镇静深度; 腹腔镜胃癌根治术; 老年患者; Th1/Th2平衡

中图分类号: R735.2

开放科学(资源服务)标识码(OSID):



0 引言

2017年全球有超过120万例胃癌患者和高达86.5万例的胃癌患者死亡^[1]。手术治疗是胃癌患者获得根治的唯一可能方法。脑电双频指数 (eeg bispectral index, BIS) 闭环靶控输注在重大手术、长时间手术中使用的可行性和有效性已经得到证明, 它在术中能够更精确地控制麻醉镇静深度和镇静药物的用量, 减少麻醉医生个人因素造成的差异^[2-3]。癌症患者免疫系统本身存在不平衡, 加之手术创伤和刺激的影响, Th1/Th2细胞因子失衡可导致病理改变、清除感染效率低下以及宿主对免疫介导疾病的敏感度, 故对老年胃癌根治术患者围术期保持Th1/Th2的平衡很有必要。本研究评价BIS闭环靶控输注在不同麻醉镇静深度下对腹腔镜胃癌根治术老年患者围术期Th1/Th2平衡的影响, 为腹腔镜胃癌根治术老年患者麻醉及其预后提供参考。

1 资料与方法

1.1 患者资料

选取绍兴市人民医院择期胃癌根治术的老年患者73例, 平均年龄 ≥ 65 岁, ASA分级 I 级或 II 级。患者无神经系统和精神疾病, 未长期服用镇静剂或抗抑郁药, 无酗酒史或药物依赖史。对73例患者进行随机数字表法分组, 分为BIS靶控输注值55组 (H组, 36例) 和45组 (L组, 37例)。本研究已经得到本院伦理委员会批准, 并与患者及家属签署知情同意书。

1.2 方法

术前访视患者, 禁食6 h以上, 禁饮3 h, 无术前

用药。患者入手术室后监测心电图、血压、心率、脉搏氧饱和度, 开放上肢静脉, 16 G穿刺针穿刺输液, 给予乳酸钠林格液500 ml (20~25 min滴完), 左桡动脉穿刺置管监测有创血压, 连接BIS监测仪 (BISXP, Aspect Medical Systems, 美国) 监测BIS。静脉缓慢依次注射咪达唑仑0.02 mg/kg, 顺苯磺酸顺式阿曲库铵0.3 mg/kg, 依托咪酯0.2~0.3 mg/kg, 舒芬太尼0.5 μ g/kg; 气管插管后行机械通气, 调节潮气量8~10 ml/kg, 呼吸频率12~14次/分钟, 吸呼比1:2, 维持EtCO₂于35~40 mmHg, 调整氧流量2 L/min。麻醉维持: 两组均静脉输注瑞芬太尼0.1~0.3 μ g/(kg·min) 及闭环靶控输注丙泊酚, 间断追加顺苯磺酸顺式阿曲库铵维持肌松。两组均根据术前设定的BIS值, 在BIS监测仪上设定相应的值并连接靶控输注泵。手术结束前30 min, 所有患者给予昂丹司琼0.1 mg/kg术后止吐, 手术结束时对所有患者联接静脉镇痛泵 (舒芬太尼2 μ g/kg+氟比洛芬酯200 mg) 送入麻醉后监测治疗室 (post anesthesia care unit, PACU)。转出PACU指征参照七版《米勒麻醉学》标准。分别于手术开始前即刻 (T₁)、术后2 h (T₂)、24 h (T₃) 及72 h (T₄) 采集静脉血样。

1.3 检测指标

使用不加抗凝剂的采血管采集受试对象静脉血2 ml, 分离血清, 于-80℃条件下保存备用。采用流式细胞术微球阵列法 (flow cytometry microsphere array, CBA) 检测血清中Th1/Th2型细胞因子 (IL-2、IL-4、IL-6、IL-10、TNF- α 、IFN- γ) 水平。试剂盒细胞因子标准品的制备: 将细胞因子标准品 (2 500 pg/ml) 置于15 ml的离心管中。标记8个流式管, 分别为1:2、1:4、1:8、1:16、1:32、1:64、1:128、1:256。以上每管先加入300 μ l稀释液, 从15 ml的离心管开始进行倍比稀释。制备混合捕获微球: 每种捕获微球吸取的体积为10 μ l×需要检测的样本数, 混合6种微球, 200 g离心5 min, 去上清液, 加入血清增强液, 充分混匀, 室温避光静置30 min。样本中6种细胞因子水平的检测: 每个试验管中加入50 μ l混合捕获微球, 标准品管中加入50 μ l倍比稀释的标准品, 样本管中加入50 μ l的待测样本。所有试验管中加入50 μ l Th1/Th2检测试剂, 室温避光孵育2.5 h。随后加入1 ml洗液, 200 g离心5 min。去上清液并加入100 μ l洗液混匀。待机检测, 上机检测前充分混匀, 采集流式图谱。

1.4 统计学方法

采用SPSS25.0统计学软件进行分析。分类变量以百分数表示, 用卡方检验或Fisher's exact test进行

检验。正态分布的连续变量以均数±标准差 ($\bar{x} \pm s$) 描述, 非正态分布资料以中位数和四分位数间距 ($M(QR)$) 表示。连续变量的比较采用方差分析或 Mann-Whitney。回归结果以相对危险度及其95%可信区间表示。 $P < 0.05$ 为差异有统计学意义。

2 结果

2.1 患者一般情况

两组患者在性别构成比、体重、年龄、身高、PACU停留时间、手术时间、住院时间、术中知晓及术后肺部并发症发生率方面差异无统计学意义 (均 $P > 0.05$) , 两组患者均正常出院, 术后30天差异无统计学意义, 见表1。

表1 两组患者围术期一般情况比较 ($\bar{x} \pm s$, $M(QR)$)

Table 1 Comparison of perioperative general conditions between two groups ($\bar{x} \pm s$, $M(QR)$)

Group	Group H ($n=36$)	Group L ($n=37$)	P
Gender (male/female)	27/9	26/11	0.651
Weight (kg)	58.14±9.40	60.46±9.36	0.294
Age (years)	75.17±6.70	73.08±5.37	0.146
Height (cm)	162.36±7.42	164.51±6.56	0.193
PACU stay time (min)	59.00(25.00)	58.00(35.50)	0.712
Operation time (min)	206.50(57.50)	215.00(95.00)	0.787
Postoperative hospitalization time (d)	11.00(3.00)	10.00(2.50)	0.123
Postoperative pulmonary complications ($n(\%)$)	9(22.50)	5(13.51)	0.343
Intraoperative awareness ($n(\%)$)	0	0	1

表2 两组患者各时间点炎症反应因子水平的比较 (pg/ml, $M(QR)$)

Table 2 Comparison of inflammatory cytokines levels between two groups at each time point (pg/ml, $M(QR)$)

Inflammatory factor	n	T1	T2	T3	T4
IL-6					
H	36	6.48(7.36)	396.15(561.32) ^{ab}	110.54(403.86) ^b	22.18(34.93) ^b
L	37	6.45(5.98)	165.97(245.67) ^b	75.91(136.53) ^b	13.57(31.74) ^b
IL-10					
H	36	3.06(1.48)	18.05(67.94) ^{ab}	7.34(15.02) ^b	5.26(4.19) ^{ab}
L	37	3.67(1.44)	10.18(17.11) ^b	8.75(6.61) ^b	3.98(1.95) ^b
TNF- α					
H	36	3.22(1.76)	3.19(1.56)	3.10(1.84)	3.81(2.72) ^b
L	37	3.09(1.27)	3.17(1.27)	3.26(2.25)	3.26(1.77)
IL-2					
H	36	1.94(1.07)	2.40(1.11) ^b	1.88(0.90)	2.28(0.95) ^{ab}
L	37	2.18(0.59)	1.76(0.72)	1.85(1.04)	1.91(0.52) ^b
IL-4					
H	36	3.98(2.58)	4.02(2.51)	4.06(2.98)	4.49(2.67) ^b
L	37	4.07(2.09)	3.97(1.99)	4.18(2.11)	4.30(3.10)
IFN- γ					
H	36	7.28(3.98)	9.26(7.30) ^b	7.11(6.09)	8.84(7.88) ^b
L	37	8.22(3.15)	7.51(2.32)	7.51(4.89)	8.36(3.36)
IFN- γ /IL-6					
H	36	1.0666(1.25)	0.0226(0.03) ^{ab}	0.0796(0.07) ^b	0.4047(0.47) ^b
L	37	1.1670(1.15)	0.0457(0.08) ^b	0.0863(0.10) ^b	0.4286(0.61) ^b

Notes: H: BIS closed-loop target controlled infusion group with BIS value of 55; L: BIS value is 45; a: $P < 0.05$, compared with group L; b: $P < 0.05$, compared with T1.

2.2 患者各时间点炎症反应因子水平

与T1时比较, T2、T3、T4时H组Th2型细胞因子IL-6、IL-10浓度都有不同程度的升高 ($P < 0.05$) , T2、T3、T4时H组和L组IFN- γ /IL-6均有不同程度的降低 ($P < 0.05$) ; 与L组比较, T2时H组Th2型细胞因子IL-6、IL-10明显升高 ($P < 0.05$) , H组IFN- γ /IL-6明显降低 ($P < 0.05$) , 见表2。

2.3 患者围术期血流动力学

两组患者围术期血流动力学比较差异无统计学意义 ($P > 0.05$) , 见表3。

3 讨论

BIS闭环靶控输注系统是利用BIS监测系统

设定一个期望BIS值范围, 再通过反馈自动控制系统来调节给药速度和给药量^[4]。自20世纪80年代第一次应用闭环靶控输注技术以来, 各闭环靶控研究小组对闭环靶控不断进行改进, 如今的BIS闭环靶控能比较精准地控制给药速度和给药量, 相对精准地把握好麻醉镇静深度^[2,5-6]。

免疫系统是人体的重要系统之一, 它能够抵抗并消除进入人体的病原体及异常细胞, 以维持机体的稳态。免疫反应大致分为: 促炎性因子, 如Th1和Th17型细胞因子, 主要是由杀死病原体和自身异常细胞的促炎介质组成; 抑炎性因子, 如Th2型细胞因子, 主要由修复组织损伤的抗炎介质组成^[7]。免疫系统平衡紊乱将继发多种临床损伤, 如自身免疫或变态反应而引起的损伤, 免疫状态不佳可使病原体和癌症细胞造成机体损伤^[8]。总体上讲, 肿瘤患者本身免疫反应受到抑制, 无法很好地清除自身异常的癌细胞。Th1/Th2的失衡将影响肿瘤的发生发展^[9]。再加上手术的强烈刺激及炎症反应, 机体的免疫受抑状态会更加明显。手术切除仍是胃癌的主要治疗方式之一, 但是一部分患者切除原发肿瘤后会出现局部复发和远处转移等不良预后, 导致5年生存率低^[10]。研究表明^[11]较高

表3 两组患者围术期血流动力学比较 ($\bar{x}\pm s$, M(QR))

Table 3 Comparison of perioperative hemodynamics between two groups ($\bar{x}\pm s$, M(QR))

Time	Mean arterial pressure (mmHg)			Heart rate (bpm)		
	Group H	Group L	P	Group H	Group L	P
Entering operating room	107.17±11.42	106.05±10.10	0.66	73±14	75±11	0.71
During endotracheal intubation	85.50(21.42)	96.33(30.33)	0.36	63(26)	62(22)	0.96
Into abdomen	97.40±11.79	98.65±11.22	0.64	63(17)	60(11)	0.97
Extubation of trachea	106.33(17.67)	109.33(23.00)	0.39	78±14	74±13	0.28

的Th1/Th2比值预示着更好的预后，所以提高Th1/Th2比值可能会提高胃癌根治术患者5年生存率。

本研究通过BIS闭环靶控输注系统，比较不同麻醉镇静深度对腹腔镜胃癌根治术老年患者围术期Th1/Th2平衡的影响。结果表明，术中丙泊酚用量H组小于L组，是因为L组麻醉深度大于H组，但两组患者围术期血流动力学和术中瑞芬太尼用量差异无统计学意义，可能与及时使用血管活性药物调节有关。H组相对L组Th2型细胞因子IL-6、IL-10升高更显著，免疫功能抑制显著。Th2型细胞因子IL-6不仅能够抑制免疫功能从而促进胃癌细胞的生长，而且还能通过促进成纤维细胞的活化来介导肿瘤细胞和肿瘤相关成纤维细胞之间的紊乱^[12]。CAR-T三代细胞技术治疗实体胃癌主要措施是通过释放高水平Th1型细胞因子IFN- γ 和IL-2对胃癌细胞起杀伤作用，可见Th1型细胞因子对胃癌患者的预后有积极意义^[13]。术后2 h H组比L组的IFN- γ /IL-6值低，提示H组的患者Th1/Th2向Th2偏移明显，虽然这种偏移在手术结束后24和72 h差异无统计学意义，但是术后短时间内L组能够维持更有利于自身预后的免疫微环境。这与当下麻醉术后快速康复（ERAS）理念一致，也提示了新的麻醉接入点加速胃癌患者的术后康复^[14]。

综上所述，将BIS闭环靶控输注设定值为45较55的麻醉镇静深度，老年患者更能在胃癌根治术后短期内维持Th1/Th2适应肿瘤预后的状态，这不仅给胃癌手术麻醉用药提供了新的参考，还给胃癌术后快速康复在麻醉角度增添新元素提供了依据。

参考文献：

- [1] Global Burden of Disease Cancer Collaboration, Fitzmaurice C, Abate D, *et al.* Global, Regional, and National Cancer Incidence, Mortality, Years of Life Lost, Years Lived With Disability, and Disability-Adjusted Life-Years for 29 Cancer Groups, 1990 to 2017: A Systematic Analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study[J]. JAMA Oncol, 2019, 5(12): 1749-1768.
- [2] Puri GD, Mathew PJ, Biswas I, *et al.* A Multicenter Evaluation of a Closed-Loop Anesthesia Delivery System: A Randomized Controlled Trial[J]. Anesth Analg, 2016, 122(1): 106-114.
- [3] Neckebroek M, Ionescu CM, van Amsterdam K, *et al.* A comparison of propofol-to-BIS post-operative intensive care sedation by means of target controlled infusion, Bayesian-based

and predictive control methods: an observational, open-label pilot study[J]. J Clin Monit Comput, 2019, 33(4): 675-686.

- [4] Brogi E, Cyr S, Kazan R, *et al.* Clinical Performance and Safety of Closed-Loop Systems: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials[J]. Anesth Analg, 2017, 124(2): 446-455.
- [5] Sethi N, Dutta A, Puri GD, *et al.* Evaluation of Automated Delivery of Propofol Using a Closed-Loop Anesthesia Delivery System in Patients Undergoing Thoracic Surgery: A Randomized Controlled Study[J]. J Cardiothorac Vasc Anesth, 2021, 35(4): 1089-1095.
- [6] Neckebroek M, Boldingh JHL, De Smet T, *et al.* Influence of Remifentanyl on the Control Performance of the Bispectral Index Controlled Bayesian-Based Closed-Loop System for Propofol Administration[J]. Anesth Analg, 2020, 130(6): 1661-1669.
- [7] Rahat MA, Shakya J. Parallel Aspects of the Microenvironment in Cancer and Autoimmune Disease[J]. Mediators Inflamm, 2016, 2016: 4375120.
- [8] Bretscher P. On Analyzing How the Th1/Th2 Phenotype of an Immune Response Is Determined: Classical Observations Must Not Be Ignored[J]. Front Immunol, 2019, 10: 1234.
- [9] Hamilton DH, Bretscher PA. Different immune correlates associated with tumor progression and regression: implications for prevention and treatment of cancer[J]. Cancer Immunol Immunother, 2008, 57(8): 1125-1136.
- [10] Tan YE, Wang PL, Yin SC, *et al.* Thirty-year trends in clinicopathologic characteristics and prognosis after gastrectomy for gastric cancer: A single institution in Northern China[J]. J Cancer, 2020, 11(5): 1056-1062.
- [11] Chang WJ, Du Y, Zhao X, *et al.* Inflammation-related factors predicting prognosis of gastric cancer[J]. World J Gastroenterol, 2014, 20(16): 4586-4596.
- [12] Karakasheva TA, Lin EW, Tang Q, *et al.* IL-6 Mediates Cross-Talk between Tumor Cells and Activated Fibroblasts in the Tumor Microenvironment[J]. Cancer Res, 2018, 78(17): 4957-4970.
- [13] Zhao W, Jia L, Zhang M, *et al.* The killing effect of novel bi-specific Trop2/PD-L1 CAR-T cell targeted gastric cancer[J]. Am J Cancer Res, 2019, 9(8): 1846-1856.
- [14] 中国研究型医院学会机器人与腹腔镜外科专业委员会.胃癌胃切除手术加速康复外科专家共识(2016版)[J]. 中华消化外科杂志, 2017, 16(1): 14-17. [Robotic and Laparoscopic Surgery Committee of Chinese Research Hospital Association. Expert consensus on enhanced recovery after gastrectomy for gastric cancer (2016 edition)[J]. Zhonghua Xiao Hua Wai Ke Za Zhi, 2017, 16(1): 14-17.]

[编辑：尤婷婷；校对：刘红武]

作者贡献：

江华勇、劳伟龙、蒋宗明：试验实施、数据分析、论文撰写及修改
周国忠：检测细胞因子及标准品制备
宋棋梁、俞渭生：临床病例收集、试验实施
陈忠华：课题设计、数据审核及指导论文撰写