International Journal of
Science Inventions Today
www.ijsit.com
ISSN 2319-5436
Review Article

BILE LEAKAGE AFTER LIVER RESECTION

Khan Shaheryar[1], Khan Aimen[2], Khan Tajallah[3], Ding Chengming[4*] and Ghouri Hamza Ghaffar[5]

[1]The First Affiliated Hospital of University of South China, Department of Hepatobiliary Surgery,Hengyang Medical School, University of South China, Hengyang, Hunan, 421001, China

[2]The First Affiliated Hospital of University of South China, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology,Hengyang Medical School, University of South China, Hengyang, Hunan, 421001, China

[3]Hengyang Medical College, University of South China, Hengyang, Hunan, 421001, China

*[*4]The First Affiliated Hospital of University of South China, Department of Hepatobiliary Surgery, Hengyang Medical School, University of South China, Hengyang, Hunan, 421001, China*

[5]Hengyang Medical College, University of South China, Hengyang, Hunan, 421001, China

ABSTRACT

Liver resection represents a cornerstone therapeutic approach for a wide range of hepatobiliary diseases, including hepatocellular carcinoma, colorectal liver metastases, intrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma, and selected benign liver disorders. Although advances in surgical techniques, perioperative management, and minimally invasive approaches have substantially improved postoperative outcomes, bile leakage remains one of the most clinically relevant complications following hepatectomy. Posthepatectomy bile leakage is associated with prolonged hospitalization, increased risk of intra-abdominal infection, liver abscess formation, delayed initiation of oncological therapy, and increased healthcare burden. The mechanisms underlying bile leakage are multifactorial and include disruption of intrahepatic bile ducts during parenchymal transection, major bile duct injury, ischemic damage to the biliary system, and increased intrabiliary pressure. Several patient-related, tumor-related, and operative factors influence the risk of postoperative bile leakage, including cirrhosis, major hepatectomy, central liver resection, hilar dissection, biliary reconstruction, and complex anatomical variations. The International Study Group of Liver Surgery (ISGLS) classification has provided a standardized definition and grading system, facilitating consistent evaluation of this complication across clinical studies. Current management strategies involve a multidisciplinary approach incorporating conservative treatment, percutaneous drainage, endoscopic intervention, and, in selected severe cases, surgical revision. Recent developments in fluorescence-guided surgery, intraoperative bile leak detection methods, minimally invasive liver surgery, and predictive artificial intelligence models may contribute to further reduction of incidence and improvement of outcomes. This review summarizes current knowledge regarding the mechanisms, risk factors, diagnosis, prevention, and management of bile leakage after liver resection and discusses future perspectives in hepatobiliary surgery.

Keywords: Liver resection; Hepatectomy; Bile leakage; Postoperative complications; Hepatobiliary surgery; ISGLS classification; Endoscopic therapy; Surgical outcomes

INTRODUCTION

Liver resection has evolved considerably over the past several decades and is currently considered one of the most effective curative-intent treatments for a variety of primary and secondary liver diseases. Advances in anatomical liver surgery, perioperative intensive care, vascular control techniques, and minimally invasive approaches have significantly improved the safety of hepatectomy, allowing increasingly complex procedures to be performed with acceptable morbidity and mortality rates. Hepatic resection remains a fundamental treatment modality for patients with hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC), intrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma (ICC), colorectal liver metastases (CRLM), neuroendocrine liver metastases, and selected benign hepatobiliary lesions [1–3].

Despite these improvements, postoperative complications continue to influence short-term recovery, long-term outcomes, and quality of life after liver surgery. Among these complications, bile leakage represents one of the most challenging and clinically important problems encountered after hepatectomy. Although postoperative mortality following liver resection has markedly decreased in experienced hepatobiliary centers, bile leakage remains associated with significant morbidity, including intra-abdominal infection, biloma formation, peritonitis, sepsis, prolonged drainage, delayed recovery, increased healthcare costs, and interruption of postoperative anticancer treatment [4,5].

The reported incidence of bile leakage after liver resection varies considerably among studies, largely due to differences in surgical complexity, patient characteristics, definitions, and reporting methods. Historically, inconsistent diagnostic criteria made comparisons between studies difficult. To address this limitation, the International Study Group of Liver Surgery (ISGLS) proposed a standardized definition and grading system for postoperative bile leakage, which has subsequently become widely accepted in hepatobiliary surgical research and clinical practice [6]. According to the ISGLS criteria, bile leakage is diagnosed when the bilirubin concentration in drainage fluid exceeds the serum bilirubin concentration on or after postoperative day three, or when additional interventions are required due to biliary collections or related complications [6].

The development of bile leakage after hepatectomy is complex and multifactorial. During liver transection, small peripheral bile ducts may remain exposed or inadequately sealed, resulting in continuous leakage of bile into the abdominal cavity. In addition, injury to major intrahepatic ducts, hilar bile duct structures, or aberrant biliary anatomy may lead to clinically significant leakage. Factors such as major hepatectomy, tumors located near the hepatic hilum, repeat liver surgery, biliary reconstruction, prolonged operative time, excessive blood loss, and underlying liver disease have been reported as important predictors of postoperative bile leakage [7–9].

The clinical management of bile leakage requires individualized decision-making based on the severity of leakage, anatomical characteristics, associated infection, and patient condition. While minor leaks may resolve with conservative treatment and adequate drainage, clinically significant leaks frequently require invasive interventions, including percutaneous drainage, endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP)-guided biliary decompression, stent placement, or, rarely, surgical repair [10,11]. The increasing use of minimally invasive liver surgery, intraoperative fluorescence imaging, and advanced perioperative monitoring has created new opportunities for prevention and early recognition of bile leakage.

This review provides a comprehensive overview of bile leakage following liver resection, focusing on its definition, pathophysiological mechanisms, risk factors, diagnostic approaches, preventive strategies, current management options, and future developments. A better understanding of this complication is essential for improving surgical decision-making, optimizing postoperative care, and reducing morbidity associated with modern hepatobiliary surgery.

DISCUSSION

Definition and Classification of Bile Leakage after Liver Resection:

Bile leakage represents an abnormal escape of bile from the intrahepatic or extrahepatic biliary system into surrounding tissues or body cavities following hepatic surgery. It occurs primarily due to disruption of biliary structures during liver parenchymal transection, injury to major bile ducts, inadequate closure of small intrahepatic duct branches, or postoperative biliary obstruction resulting in increased intraductal pressure. Although bile leakage is usually considered a technical complication of liver surgery, its development reflects a complex interaction between surgical technique, biliary anatomy, liver parenchymal characteristics, and postoperative healing processes [12,13].

Historically, the incidence and clinical significance of bile leakage after hepatectomy were difficult to evaluate because different institutions applied variable definitions. Some studies considered only clinically evident biliary drainage, whereas others included biochemical abnormalities detected through routine drain analysis. This heterogeneity resulted in substantial variation in reported incidence rates and limited the ability to compare outcomes between different surgical series [14].

To establish a standardized definition, the **International Study Group of Liver Surgery (ISGLS)** introduced a consensus definition of bile leakage after liver surgery. According to the ISGLS criteria, postoperative bile leakage is defined as a bilirubin concentration in the drainage fluid at least three times greater than the serum bilirubin concentration on or after postoperative day three, or the requirement for radiological or operative intervention due to biliary collections or bile peritonitis [6]. This definition has been widely adopted in hepatobiliary surgery research and has improved consistency in reporting postoperative outcomes.

The ISGLS classification categorizes bile leakage into three grades according to clinical severity and therapeutic requirements:

Grade A bile leakage

Grade A bile leakage refers to a biochemical or clinically insignificant leak that does not require additional invasive treatment. Patients generally remain clinically stable, and management usually consists of continued observation, maintenance of existing surgical drains, and routine follow-up. Although Grade A leakage may prolong drain placement or hospital stay, it rarely results in severe complications [6].

Grade B bile leakage

Grade B bile leakage represents a clinically relevant complication requiring active therapeutic intervention but not surgical reoperation. Management may include prolonged drainage, adjustment or replacement of drains, antibiotic therapy, percutaneous drainage of biloma or infected collections, and endoscopic procedures such as ERCP with biliary sphincterotomy or stent placement [6,15].

Grade B leakage is the most frequently encountered clinically significant form after hepatectomy. Appropriate early recognition and minimally invasive management are essential to prevent progression to uncontrolled infection, sepsis, or secondary liver-related complications.

Grade C bile leakage

Grade C bile leakage is the most severe category and requires surgical intervention because conservative and minimally invasive approaches are insufficient. Patients may develop persistent biliary peritonitis, uncontrolled intra-abdominal infection, major bile duct disruption, or hemodynamic instability. Surgical management may involve repair of the injured bile duct, biliary reconstruction using Roux-en-Y hepaticojejunostomy, drainage procedures, or, in rare circumstances, additional hepatic resection [6,16].

The clinical importance of standardized classification extends beyond research reporting. ISGLS grading provides prognostic information and assists clinicians in selecting appropriate treatment strategies. Higher-grade bile leakage has been associated with longer hospitalization, increased postoperative morbidity, delayed recovery, and impaired oncological outcomes in patients undergoing liver resection for malignancy [17].

In addition to the ISGLS classification, some studies have attempted to further characterize bile leakage according to anatomical origin. These classifications distinguish between **minor peripheral duct leaks** and **major bile duct injuries**. Peripheral duct leaks commonly originate from small segmental or subsegmental ducts exposed during parenchymal transection and often resolve with adequate drainage. In contrast, major bile duct injuries involving the right or left hepatic ducts, hilar structures, or aberrant bile ducts frequently require endoscopic or surgical intervention because spontaneous closure is less likely [18].

Another important distinction is between **controlled** and **uncontrolled** bile leakage. Controlled leakage occurs when bile drainage is effectively maintained through surgical drains or percutaneous catheters, preventing contamination of the peritoneal cavity. Uncontrolled leakage results in free intraperitoneal bile accumulation and may rapidly progress to chemical peritonitis, bacterial infection, and systemic inflammatory response [19].

The risk and severity of bile leakage are also influenced by the type of hepatic procedure performed. Major hepatectomy, especially right or left hepatectomy involving hilar dissection, carries a higher risk compared with minor wedge resections. Anatomically complex procedures, including central hepatectomy, segmentectomy near the hepatic hilum, and repeat liver resections, require extensive manipulation of biliary structures and therefore increase the possibility of postoperative leakage [20].

Furthermore, bile leakage should be considered within the broader context of modern liver surgery, where increasingly aggressive resections are performed in patients with advanced malignancy. The expansion of indications for repeat hepatectomy, portal vein embolization-assisted resections, associating liver partition and portal vein ligation for staged hepatectomy (ALPPS), and minimally invasive approaches has introduced additional technical challenges that may influence biliary complications [21].

Overall, the establishment of standardized definitions and severity grading systems has significantly improved understanding of posthepatectomy bile leakage. The ISGLS classification remains the foundation for clinical assessment and research reporting, allowing accurate comparison of surgical outcomes and facilitating development of evidence-based prevention and management strategies.

Pathophysiological Mechanisms of Bile Leakage after Liver Resection:

The development of bile leakage after liver resection is a multifactorial process involving anatomical disruption, impaired biliary healing, increased intraductal pressure, and local inflammatory responses. Although surgical transection of hepatic parenchyma is an unavoidable component of hepatectomy, meticulous management of biliary structures is essential because even small defects in the intrahepatic biliary system may result in clinically significant leakage. The mechanisms responsible for bile leakage can broadly be categorized into peripheral bile duct disruption, major bile duct injury, ischemic biliary damage, increased intrabiliary pressure, and impaired tissue healing.

Peripheral Intrahepatic Bile Duct Disruption:

The most common mechanism of bile leakage after liver resection is disruption of small intrahepatic bile duct branches exposed on the transection surface. During parenchymal division, numerous small bile duct branches located within portal triads may be opened, particularly when anatomical planes are not clearly defined or when excessive tissue trauma occurs during transection [22].

Unlike major bile ducts, these small peripheral ducts are often difficult to identify intraoperatively because of their small diameter and variable anatomical distribution. If these ducts are not adequately clipped, ligated, sutured, or sealed, continuous bile secretion from the remaining liver segments can lead to postoperative bile accumulation around the resection surface.

The risk of peripheral duct leakage is particularly increased in anatomical resections involving deep parenchymal transection, such as segmentectomy, sectionectomy, and central hepatectomy. During these procedures, multiple small biliary branches may be encountered, increasing the likelihood of incomplete closure [23].

Furthermore, the amount of bile flow through exposed ducts may influence the clinical severity of leakage. Low-flow peripheral leaks may resolve spontaneously with adequate drainage, whereas persistent secretion from larger segmental branches can result in biloma formation, infection, and prolonged hospitalization.

Major Bile Duct Injury:

Major bile duct injury represents a less frequent but more severe mechanism of postoperative bile leakage. Injury to the right hepatic duct, left hepatic duct, common hepatic duct, or sectoral bile ducts may occur during hilar dissection, anatomical variation management, vascular control, or tumor-related surgical manipulation [24].

The hepatic biliary system demonstrates considerable anatomical variability. Aberrant right posterior sectoral ducts, accessory hepatic ducts, and unusual confluence patterns are relatively common and may increase the risk of unintentional duct division during liver surgery [25]. Failure to recognize these variations can result in isolated segmental bile duct leakage that may not communicate effectively with the main biliary tree.

Major duct injuries are associated with a higher risk of persistent leakage because spontaneous closure is less likely. In contrast to small peripheral duct defects, large duct disruptions often maintain continuous bile flow under physiological pressure. These injuries may require endoscopic intervention, percutaneous drainage, or surgical biliary reconstruction depending on the anatomical location and severity [26].

Patients undergoing resections involving the hepatic hilum, such as hilar cholangiocarcinoma surgery, extended hepatectomy, or complex vascular and biliary reconstruction, represent a particularly high-risk population. In these cases, careful preoperative imaging assessment and intraoperative identification of biliary anatomy are essential for minimizing complications.

Ischemic Injury of the Biliary System:

The biliary epithelium has a unique vascular supply that differs from the hepatic parenchyma. While hepatocytes receive dual blood supply from the hepatic artery and portal vein, intrahepatic bile ducts rely predominantly on the peribiliary vascular plexus derived from branches of the hepatic artery. Consequently, disruption of arterial blood supply can compromise biliary integrity and contribute to delayed bile leakage [27].

Ischemic biliary injury may occur after excessive hilar dissection, hepatic artery injury, vascular reconstruction, or excessive thermal damage during parenchymal transection. Reduced arterial perfusion may cause biliary epithelial necrosis, weakening of duct walls, and delayed disruption after the initial surgical procedure [28].

Unlike immediate mechanical bile duct injury, ischemic-related leakage may present several days after surgery. These delayed leaks are often more difficult to manage because they may involve ductal necrosis, strictures, or progressive biliary injury.

Patients with previous hepatobiliary surgery, repeated liver resections, or extensive hilar manipulation are particularly vulnerable because previous operations may alter vascular anatomy and reduce collateral circulation around the bile ducts.

Increased Intrabiliary Pressure and Bile Flow Disturbance:

Elevated intrabiliary pressure is another important contributor to postoperative bile leakage. Even a small defect in the biliary system may persist when bile flow pressure exceeds the capacity of tissue sealing mechanisms [29].

Several conditions can increase biliary pressure after liver resection, including:

- Distal biliary obstruction
- Postoperative biliary strictures
- Edema at the bile duct anastomosis
- Blood clots or debris within the biliary tract
- Technical problems after biliary reconstruction

High-pressure bile flow prevents spontaneous closure of duct defects and promotes continuous leakage into surrounding tissues. This mechanism explains the therapeutic principle of endoscopic biliary decompression, where sphincterotomy or temporary stent placement reduces the pressure gradient between intrahepatic ducts and the duodenum, facilitating closure of the leakage site [30].

Patients with bile duct reconstruction require particular attention because anastomotic edema, ischemia, or technical imperfections may create conditions favorable for persistent leakage. In these situations, early recognition and appropriate drainage are essential to avoid severe complications.

Impaired Healing and Local Inflammatory Response:

Successful closure of injured bile ducts depends on adequate tissue healing, including inflammation regulation, fibroblast activation, collagen deposition, and restoration of epithelial integrity. Several patient and surgical factors may impair this process.

Underlying chronic liver disease, particularly cirrhosis and advanced fibrosis, affects tissue quality and regenerative capacity. Fibrotic liver parenchyma is less elastic, technically more difficult to transect, and associated with impaired microcirculation, potentially increasing the risk of postoperative biliary complications [31].

Malnutrition, immunosuppression, diabetes mellitus, and chemotherapy-related liver injury may further impair wound healing and increase susceptibility to persistent leakage and infection.

Additionally, leaked bile itself causes local inflammatory damage. Bile acids within the peritoneal cavity induce chemical irritation, inflammatory cytokine release, and tissue injury. Secondary bacterial contamination may transform a sterile bile collection into an infected biloma or intra-abdominal abscess, further delaying recovery and increasing morbidity [32].

Interaction Between Surgical Technique and Biliary Anatomy:

The occurrence of bile leakage cannot be attributed solely to individual technical errors; rather, it results from the interaction between surgical approach and patient-specific biliary anatomy. Modern liver surgery increasingly emphasizes anatomical understanding, preservation of vascular and biliary structures, and intraoperative identification of potential leakage sites.

Techniques such as intraoperative ultrasound, fluorescence cholangiography using indocyanine green (ICG), intraoperative cholangiography, and systematic inspection of the transection surface have been developed to improve detection of bile duct injuries before abdominal closure [33].

However, despite technological advances, the complex three-dimensional anatomy of the biliary system means that complete elimination of bile leakage remains challenging. Therefore, understanding the underlying mechanisms remains fundamental for improving prevention strategies and optimizing postoperative management.

Risk Factors Associated with Posthepatectomy Bile Leakage:

The occurrence of bile leakage after liver resection is influenced by multiple interacting factors related to the patient, underlying liver pathology, tumor characteristics, and surgical complexity. Identification of these risk factors is essential for preoperative risk stratification, selection of appropriate surgical strategies, intraoperative decision-making, and postoperative monitoring. Although improvements in surgical technique have reduced the incidence of bile leakage, certain clinical scenarios remain associated with a substantially increased risk.

Patient-Related Risk Factors:

Underlying Chronic Liver Disease and Cirrhosis:

The condition of the background liver parenchyma significantly influences postoperative healing and biliary complications. Patients with chronic liver disease, particularly cirrhosis secondary to hepatitis B virus infection, hepatitis C virus infection, alcohol-related liver disease, or metabolic dysfunction-associated steatotic liver disease, may have impaired regenerative capacity and altered tissue architecture [34].

Cirrhotic liver tissue presents several challenges during hepatectomy, including increased fibrosis, reduced elasticity, impaired microcirculation, and increased susceptibility to surgical trauma. These factors may interfere with effective closure of small biliary branches exposed during parenchymal transection and may contribute to persistent postoperative bile leakage [35].

In addition, cirrhotic patients frequently require more conservative resections due to limited functional liver reserve. However, when extensive resections are necessary, the combination of impaired liver function and increased technical difficulty may elevate the risk of postoperative complications, including bile leakage.

Impaired Liver Function and Reduced Physiological Reserve:

Preoperative liver function is an important determinant of postoperative recovery. Patients with compromised hepatic reserve, reflected by increased Child–Pugh score, Model for End-Stage Liver Disease (MELD) score, or impaired indocyanine green retention rate, may have delayed tissue repair and increased susceptibility to complications [36].

Reduced hepatic functional reserve is often accompanied by portal hypertension, thrombocytopenia, ascites tendency, and impaired immune response. These conditions may complicate postoperative management of bile leakage by increasing the risk of infection and limiting tolerance to additional interventions.

Malnutrition and Systemic Inflammatory Status:

Nutritional status plays an important role in postoperative wound healing. Malnutrition, sarcopenia, and reduced protein reserves have been associated with impaired collagen synthesis, decreased immune function, and delayed tissue recovery after major abdominal surgery [37].

Markers such as low serum albumin concentration, lymphopenia, and elevated inflammatory indices may reflect poor physiological condition and have been investigated as predictors of postoperative complications. Although the direct relationship between nutritional status and bile leakage requires further validation, patients with poor nutritional reserve may experience prolonged leakage duration and delayed resolution.

Previous Hepatobiliary Surgery:

Previous liver surgery represents an important risk factor for bile leakage due to anatomical distortion, adhesions, altered vascular supply, and fibrosis around the biliary structures. Repeat hepatectomy is technically demanding because normal tissue planes may be lost, increasing the possibility of bile duct injury during dissection [38].

Patients undergoing repeat liver resection for recurrent hepatocellular carcinoma or colorectal liver metastases frequently require careful evaluation of previous surgical anatomy, especially when lesions are located near previous transection planes or major bile ducts.

Tumor-Related Risk Factors:

Tumor Location Near the Hepatic Hilum:

Tumor proximity to the hepatic hilum is one of the most consistently reported predictors of bile leakage after liver resection. Lesions located near major portal structures, hepatic ducts, or hilar plates require extensive dissection and increase the possibility of bile duct injury [39].

Central tumors involving segments IV, V, and VIII are particularly challenging because resection frequently requires transection near major intrahepatic biliary branches. Similarly, tumors involving the caudate lobe or hilar region may require complex vascular and biliary management.

Tumor Size and Surgical Complexity:

Large tumors often require wider resection margins, greater parenchymal transection, and more extensive manipulation of intrahepatic structures. Consequently, tumor size has been reported as an indirect predictor of bile leakage because it reflects the complexity and extent of surgery required [40].

Large tumors may also cause displacement or compression of normal biliary anatomy, making identification and preservation of bile ducts more difficult.

Malignant Disease Requiring Major Hepatectomy:

Patients undergoing liver resection for advanced malignancies frequently require major hepatectomy involving removal of three or more Couinaud segments. Major liver resections are consistently associated with higher rates of postoperative bile leakage compared with minor resections because they involve larger transection surfaces and greater exposure of intrahepatic bile ducts [41].

In addition, oncological principles may require wider anatomical resections, vascular reconstruction, or combined procedures, further increasing technical complexity.

Surgical Risk Factors:

Major Hepatectomy:

Among operative factors, major hepatectomy remains one of the strongest predictors of postoperative bile leakage. Extensive resections expose a larger biliary surface area and increase the probability of encountering small and intermediate-sized bile ducts that require secure closure [42].

Procedures associated with increased risk include:

- Right hepatectomy
- Left hepatectomy
- Extended hemihepatectomy
- Central hepatectomy
- Trisectionectomy

Although major resections are increasingly performed safely in specialized centers, careful intraoperative assessment remains essential to reduce biliary complications.

Hilar Dissection and Biliary Reconstruction:

Manipulation of the hepatic hilum significantly increases the risk of bile leakage because major bile ducts are exposed and vulnerable to injury. Procedures involving bile duct resection and reconstruction, such as hilar cholangiocarcinoma surgery, carry particularly high risks due to the complexity of biliary anastomosis and the importance of maintaining adequate blood supply [43].

Anastomotic leakage may result from:

- Poor tissue perfusion
- Excessive tension
- Technical failure
- Infection
- Small duct size

These complications often require prolonged drainage, endoscopic intervention, or surgical revision.

Anatomical Resection and Complex Segmentectomy:

Although anatomical liver resection provides oncological advantages for selected tumors, it may increase biliary risk when performed near complex vascular and biliary territories. Segmentectomy involving segments VII, VIII, IV, and the caudate lobe requires advanced anatomical knowledge because bile duct variations are frequent in these regions [44].

Operative Time and Blood Loss:

Prolonged operative duration and excessive intraoperative blood loss have been associated with increased postoperative complications, including bile leakage. Extended operations may reflect technical difficulty, extensive dissection, vascular control requirements, or combined procedures [45].

High blood loss may also compromise tissue perfusion and contribute to impaired healing. Although modern techniques such as low central venous pressure anesthesia and improved vascular control have reduced bleeding-related complications, operative complexity remains an important determinant of postoperative outcomes.

Surgical Approach: Open, Laparoscopic, and Robotic Hepatectomy:

The impact of surgical approach on bile leakage remains an area of active investigation. Laparoscopic and robotic liver surgery provide advantages including reduced blood loss, decreased postoperative pain, and faster recovery; however, they require advanced technical expertise and have unique challenges related to biliary identification and management [46].

Current evidence suggests that minimally invasive approaches do not inherently increase bile leakage rates when performed by experienced surgeons. However, complex laparoscopic major hepatectomies should be performed in specialized centers with appropriate expertise.

Predictive Models and Risk Stratification:

Given the multifactorial nature of bile leakage, several predictive models have been developed to identify high-risk patients before surgery. These models incorporate variables such as:

- Extent of liver resection
- Tumor location
- Liver function
- Serum albumin level
- Surgical approach
- Intraoperative blood loss
- Biliary reconstruction requirement

Preoperative risk assessment allows surgeons to optimize patient selection, plan preventive strategies, and determine appropriate postoperative monitoring intensity [47].

Future integration of artificial intelligence, radiomics, and machine-learning algorithms may further improve individualized prediction of bile leakage by incorporating imaging features, anatomical variations, and perioperative clinical data.

Intraoperative Prevention Strategies for Bile Leakage after Liver Resection:

Prevention of bile leakage remains a fundamental objective in modern hepatobiliary surgery because treatment after leakage occurs is often complex, resource-intensive, and associated with significant morbidity. Although postoperative management strategies have improved substantially, meticulous intraoperative technique remains the most effective approach to reducing the incidence of bile leakage. Prevention requires comprehensive preoperative planning, precise understanding of biliary anatomy, careful parenchymal transection, systematic identification of exposed bile ducts, and appropriate intraoperative assessment before abdominal closure [48].

Preoperative Planning and Assessment of Biliary Anatomy:

Accurate preoperative evaluation of hepatic vascular and biliary anatomy is essential for minimizing the risk of bile duct injury. Modern imaging techniques, including multiphasic contrast-enhanced computed tomography (CT), magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography (MRCP), and three-dimensional reconstruction technology, allow detailed visualization of intrahepatic bile duct anatomy and potential anatomical variations [49].

The biliary system demonstrates substantial anatomical variability, particularly in the right hepatic lobe. Aberrant drainage patterns, such as isolated right posterior sectoral ducts or accessory hepatic ducts, may increase the risk of unintentional transection during hepatectomy. Identification of these variations before surgery allows surgeons to modify the operative strategy and avoid preventable biliary injuries [50].

Three-dimensional simulation platforms have increasingly been incorporated into complex hepatobiliary surgery planning. These systems provide spatial visualization of tumors, portal structures, hepatic veins, and bile ducts, assisting surgeons in selecting optimal transection planes and reducing unnecessary injury to biliary structures.

Meticulous Parenchymal Transection Technique:

The liver transection plane represents the primary site where bile leakage originates after hepatectomy. Therefore, precise parenchymal division with preservation and secure closure of exposed bile ducts is critical.

Several techniques have been developed to improve transection safety, including:

- Clamp crushing technique
- Ultrasonic surgical aspiration (CUSA)
- Harmonic scalpel devices
- Bipolar vessel sealing systems
- Stapler-assisted transection

Although these technologies differ in mechanism, the fundamental principle remains the same: controlled division of liver tissue while preserving major vascular and biliary structures.

During transection, small bile ducts should be carefully identified and individually managed through:

- Clipping
- Ligation
- Suturing

- Energy-based sealing

Failure to close exposed bile duct branches remains one of the most important technical causes of postoperative bile leakage [51].

Intraoperative Identification of Bile Leakage:

Systematic inspection of the transection surface before abdominal closure is essential for detecting occult bile leakage. Several intraoperative methods have been developed to identify small biliary defects that may not be visible under normal conditions.

Visual Inspection:

Traditional visual assessment involves careful examination of the resection surface for bile staining or active bile secretion. Although simple and widely available, this method has limited sensitivity because small duct leaks may not be apparent, especially under conditions of reduced bile flow during surgery [52].

Air Cholangiography:

Air cholangiography is a technique in which air is injected into the biliary system through a catheter to identify leakage points. The appearance of air bubbles from the transection surface indicates communication between the bile duct system and the resection plane.

This technique is inexpensive and technically straightforward; however, its application requires access to the biliary system and may not be feasible in all patients [53].

Methylene Blue Testing:

Methylene blue injection through the biliary system has historically been used to detect bile duct openings during liver surgery. Leakage sites become visible when blue-colored fluid appears on the transection surface.

Although useful, this technique has limitations, including:

- Difficulty identifying very small leaks
- Potential staining of tissues
- Requirement for biliary cannulation

As a result, methylene blue testing is less commonly used in contemporary hepatobiliary centers compared with newer imaging techniques.

Intraoperative Fluorescence Cholangiography Using Indocyanine Green:

Indocyanine green (ICG)-based fluorescence imaging has emerged as a promising technique for intraoperative visualization of biliary structures. After intravenous administration, ICG is selectively taken up by hepatocytes and excreted into bile, allowing visualization of bile ducts using near-infrared fluorescence imaging systems [54].

ICG fluorescence cholangiography provides several potential advantages:

- Real-time visualization of bile duct anatomy
- Identification of aberrant bile ducts
- Detection of bile leakage sites

- Improved surgical navigation

In liver surgery, fluorescence imaging may assist surgeons in identifying bile ducts near the transection plane and confirming biliary integrity before closure.

Several studies have reported reduced postoperative bile leakage rates with the use of fluorescence-guided techniques, although evidence remains heterogeneous due to variations in timing, dosage, imaging systems, and surgical procedures [55].

Future prospective studies and randomized trials are needed to determine the precise role of ICG fluorescence in routine prevention of bile leakage.

Intraoperative Cholangiography:

Intraoperative cholangiography provides direct visualization of the biliary tree through contrast injection. It may be particularly valuable during complex resections involving hilar structures, biliary reconstruction, or uncertain anatomy.

Potential benefits include:

- Identification of biliary variations
- Confirmation of bile duct continuity
- Detection of occult injuries

However, limitations include additional operative time, technical requirements, and the need for biliary access. Therefore, routine use remains controversial and is generally reserved for selected high-risk cases [56].

Use of Sealants and Hemostatic Materials:

Various topical agents have been investigated to reduce bile leakage by sealing microscopic defects on the transection surface.

Commonly used materials include:

- Fibrin sealants
- Collagen-based products
- Synthetic polymer sealants
- Absorbable hemostatic agents

The theoretical advantages of these materials include:

- Reduction of bile diffusion through small defects
- Enhancement of tissue adhesion
- Improvement of surface sealing

However, clinical evidence regarding their effectiveness remains inconsistent. Some studies have demonstrated reduced bile leakage rates, whereas others have failed to show significant benefit compared with meticulous surgical technique alone [57].

Current consensus suggests that sealants should be considered as supplementary measures rather than substitutes for careful identification and closure of bile ducts.

Drain Placement and Postoperative Monitoring Strategy:

The role of prophylactic abdominal drains after liver resection remains controversial. Traditionally, drains were routinely placed to detect and control postoperative bile leakage. However, excessive drain use may increase infection risk and prolong hospitalization.

Enhanced recovery after surgery (ERAS) protocols increasingly support selective drain placement based on patient risk factors and operative complexity [58].

When drains are used, appropriate monitoring of:

- Drain output volume
- Drain fluid bilirubin concentration
- Clinical symptoms

allows early identification of bile leakage and timely intervention.

Surgical Expertise and Standardization:

The routine use of abdominal drains after liver resection remains controversial. Historically, drains were placed to detect bile leakage and prevent uncontrolled intra-abdominal accumulation. However, unnecessary drain placement may increase discomfort, infection risk, and length of hospital stay.

Enhanced recovery after surgery (ERAS) protocols increasingly recommend selective drain placement based on:

- Extent of liver resection
- Risk of biliary injury
- Presence of biliary reconstruction
- Intraoperative findings [60]

When drains are used, monitoring should include:

- Drain volume
- Drain appearance
- Drain bilirubin concentration
- Clinical signs of infection

Early identification of abnormal findings allows timely intervention and prevents progression to severe complications.

Diagnosis of Posthepatectomy Bile Leakage:

Early and accurate diagnosis of bile leakage after liver resection is essential because delayed recognition may result in progressive intra-abdominal contamination, infected biloma formation, sepsis, prolonged hospitalization, and increased postoperative morbidity. The clinical presentation of bile leakage is highly variable, ranging from asymptomatic biochemical abnormalities detected through routine drain monitoring to severe bile peritonitis requiring urgent intervention. Therefore, diagnosis requires integration of clinical findings, biochemical evaluation, and radiological assessment.

Clinical Presentation and Postoperative Monitoring:

The clinical manifestations of bile leakage depend on the volume of bile leakage, anatomical location, effectiveness of drainage, and presence of secondary infection. In patients with adequate surgical drainage, bile leakage may initially present only as persistent bilious fluid output without significant systemic symptoms. In contrast, uncontrolled leakage into the peritoneal cavity may lead to severe inflammatory responses and clinical deterioration [60].

Common clinical features include:

- Persistent bilious drainage from abdominal drains
- Increasing abdominal pain or distension
- Fever
- Leukocytosis
- Elevated inflammatory markers
- Delayed recovery of gastrointestinal function
- Persistent intra-abdominal fluid collections

A high index of suspicion is required, particularly in patients undergoing major hepatectomy, hilar dissection, biliary reconstruction, or anatomically complex resections.

Routine postoperative monitoring of drain characteristics remains an important component of early diagnosis. Changes in drain color, volume, and biochemical composition may provide the first indication of a developing bile leak.

Biochemical Diagnosis:

Drain Fluid Bilirubin Measurement:

The most widely accepted biochemical method for diagnosing postoperative bile leakage is measurement of bilirubin concentration in drainage fluid.

According to the ISGLS definition, bile leakage is diagnosed when the bilirubin concentration in drain fluid is at least three times greater than the serum bilirubin concentration on or after postoperative day three [6].

This drain fluid-to-serum bilirubin ratio provides an objective and reproducible diagnostic criterion and has improved consistency in reporting postoperative bile leakage.

The advantages of biochemical diagnosis include:

- Simple bedside application
- Low cost
- Early detection before severe complications develop

However, interpretation should consider clinical context because transient elevation of drain bilirubin may occur after liver surgery due to manipulation of the biliary system or contamination with small amounts of bile.

Additional Laboratory Indicators:

Although drain bilirubin measurement remains the diagnostic standard, additional laboratory parameters may support clinical assessment.

Potential indicators include:

- Elevated C-reactive protein (CRP)
- Leukocytosis
- Persistent elevation of inflammatory markers
- Abnormal liver function tests

These findings are nonspecific but may indicate secondary complications such as infected biloma or intra-abdominal abscess formation [61].

Radiological Diagnosis:

Imaging plays an important role in evaluating the anatomical characteristics of bile leakage, identifying associated collections, and guiding therapeutic decisions.

Computed Tomography (CT):

Contrast-enhanced CT is frequently the initial imaging modality used when postoperative bile leakage is suspected.

CT can identify:

- Perihepatic fluid collections
- Biloma formation
- Intra-abdominal abscesses
- Free fluid accumulation
- Associated vascular complications

Although CT can demonstrate the consequences of bile leakage, it often cannot precisely identify the exact origin of the leak. Therefore, CT findings must be interpreted together with biochemical and clinical information [62].

CT is particularly valuable for planning percutaneous drainage procedures by defining the size, location, and accessibility of postoperative collections.

Magnetic Resonance Cholangiopancreatography (MRCP):

MRCP provides noninvasive visualization of the biliary system and has become an important diagnostic tool in selected patients with suspected bile leakage.

Advantages of MRCP include:

- Noninvasive assessment of biliary anatomy
- Identification of biliary strictures
- Detection of isolated segmental duct injuries
- Evaluation of communication between collections and bile ducts

MRCP with hepatobiliary contrast agents, such as gadoxetic acid-enhanced MRI, may provide additional functional information regarding bile excretion and leakage pathways [63].

This technique is particularly useful when conventional imaging fails to define the source of leakage or when planning further intervention.

Hepatobiliary Contrast-Enhanced MRI:

Recent advances in magnetic resonance imaging have improved visualization of postoperative biliary complications. Hepatobiliary-specific contrast agents are taken up by functioning hepatocytes and excreted through bile, allowing delayed-phase imaging of biliary structures.

Potential applications include:

- Localization of active bile leakage
- Assessment of communication between bile ducts and fluid collections
- Identification of isolated bile duct injuries

Although promising, limitations include availability, cost, longer examination time, and interpretation requirements.

Endoscopic Retrograde Cholangiopancreatography (ERCP):

ERCP remains one of the most important diagnostic and therapeutic procedures for postoperative bile leakage, particularly when communication between the biliary system and leakage site is suspected.

ERCP allows:

- Direct visualization of bile duct anatomy
- Identification of leakage location
- Measurement of biliary pressure
- Therapeutic intervention through sphincterotomy or stent placement

The main therapeutic principle of ERCP is reduction of the transpapillary pressure gradient, allowing bile preferentially to flow into the duodenum rather than through the leakage site [64].

ERCP is especially effective for leaks originating from intrahepatic ducts that remain connected to the main biliary tree. However, isolated segmental duct injuries without communication with the central biliary system may not respond to endoscopic treatment.

Percutaneous Transhepatic Cholangiography (PTC):

Percutaneous transhepatic cholangiography provides direct access to the intrahepatic biliary system and may be useful when ERCP is unsuccessful or anatomically impossible.

PTC can:

- Define biliary anatomy
- Identify isolated duct injuries
- Provide external drainage
- Facilitate subsequent interventions

It is particularly valuable in patients with surgically altered anatomy or complex hilar injuries.

Differential Diagnosis:

Postoperative bile leakage should be differentiated from other causes of postoperative abdominal fluid accumulation and clinical deterioration.

Important differential diagnoses include:

Postoperative seroma

Usually contains clear fluid without elevated bilirubin concentration.

Hematoma

Associated with blood accumulation and may demonstrate changes on imaging.

Lymphatic leakage

May occur after extensive hilar dissection and produces milky or chylous drainage.

Pancreatic or enteric leakage

Rare after liver surgery but should be considered in patients undergoing combined procedures.

Correct diagnosis is essential because management strategies differ substantially among these conditions.

Role of Artificial Intelligence and Predictive Diagnostic Models:

Recent advances in artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning have created new possibilities for early identification of patients at risk for postoperative bile leakage.

Potential applications include:

- Prediction models based on preoperative imaging
- Automated assessment of biliary anatomy
- Radiomic analysis of liver tissue characteristics
- Integration of perioperative clinical variables

AI-based approaches may allow individualized postoperative surveillance by identifying high-risk patients who require closer biochemical monitoring or earlier imaging evaluation [65].

However, current models remain limited by retrospective designs, lack of external validation, and variability in surgical techniques. Future multicenter studies are required before widespread clinical implementation.

Diagnostic Algorithm and Clinical Decision-Making:

An effective diagnostic approach requires a structured pathway:

1. **Clinical suspicion**
    - Persistent drainage
    - Fever
    - Abdominal symptoms
2. **Biochemical confirmation**
    - Drain fluid bilirubin measurement
3. **Imaging assessment**
    - CT for collections

- MRCP for anatomical evaluation

4. **Therapeutic diagnosis**
    - ERCP/PTC when intervention is required

Early diagnosis allows timely intervention and prevents progression from controlled bile leakage to severe intra-abdominal infection and organ dysfunction.

Understood. I will continue without horizontal separator lines between topics and maintain the manuscript format.

Management Strategies for Posthepatectomy Bile Leakage:

The management of bile leakage after liver resection requires an individualized and multidisciplinary approach based on the severity of leakage, anatomical characteristics, clinical condition of the patient, and response to initial therapy. The primary goals of treatment are effective control of bile contamination, prevention of infection, restoration of normal bile flow, closure of the leakage site, and avoidance of unnecessary invasive procedures. Advances in interventional radiology, endoscopy, and perioperative care have substantially reduced the need for surgical reoperation in most patients; however, severe cases involving major bile duct disruption or uncontrolled sepsis may still require operative management [66].

Conservative Management:

Conservative treatment represents the initial approach for selected patients with low-volume and clinically controlled bile leakage. This strategy is primarily applicable to ISGLS Grade A leaks and selected Grade B leaks without evidence of uncontrolled infection or significant biliary obstruction.

The fundamental principles of conservative management include:

- Adequate drainage maintenance
- Monitoring of drain output and biochemical characteristics
- Infection prevention and treatment
- Nutritional optimization
- Supportive postoperative care

When a surgical drain has effectively controlled the leakage site, spontaneous closure may occur through gradual reduction of bile flow and tissue healing. Small peripheral duct leaks frequently resolve with observation alone because the pressure within minor intrahepatic ducts is relatively low and the defect may close naturally over time [67].

Continuous monitoring is essential because initially minor bile leakage may progress if drainage becomes inadequate or if secondary infection develops. Clinical deterioration, persistent high-output drainage, fever, or increasing inflammatory markers should prompt additional diagnostic evaluation and escalation of therapy.

The duration of conservative management depends on the amount of bile output, patient condition, and evidence of healing. Prolonged external drainage without improvement may indicate persistent communication with the biliary system or the presence of a major duct injury requiring intervention.

Antibiotic Therapy and Infection Control:

Although sterile bile leakage may initially cause chemical inflammation, bacterial contamination frequently develops during prolonged postoperative periods. Infected bilomas and intra-abdominal abscesses represent important causes of morbidity in patients with posthepatectomy bile leakage.

Antibiotic management should be guided by:

- Clinical signs of infection
- Microbiological culture results
- Local antimicrobial resistance patterns
- Severity of systemic inflammatory response

Common pathogens associated with infected postoperative biliary collections include enteric Gram-negative bacteria and Enterococcus species [68].

Antibiotics alone are rarely sufficient when an infected bile collection is present. Effective source control through drainage remains the cornerstone of management. Failure to achieve adequate drainage may result in persistent infection, sepsis, and delayed recovery.

Percutaneous Drainage of Biloma and Intra-Abdominal Collections:

Percutaneous drainage is one of the most important minimally invasive interventions for clinically significant bile leakage. It is primarily indicated for patients with postoperative biloma, infected collections, or persistent fluid accumulation despite existing surgical drains.

Image-guided drainage using ultrasound or computed tomography allows:

- Evacuation of bile collections
- Reduction of intra-abdominal pressure
- Prevention of abscess formation
- Monitoring of ongoing bile production

Percutaneous drainage is particularly effective when combined with correction of the underlying biliary problem. However, drainage alone may not achieve definitive closure if a continuous high-pressure communication exists between the biliary system and the collection [69].

In patients with isolated bile duct injuries, drainage may control symptoms but may not result in complete resolution because the disconnected duct continues to produce bile. These cases often require additional interventions such as percutaneous biliary drainage or surgical reconstruction.

Endoscopic Management:

Endoscopic therapy has become a central component in the management of postoperative bile leakage, particularly for leaks originating from intrahepatic ducts that remain connected to the main biliary tree. The primary objective of endoscopic treatment is to reduce biliary pressure and redirect bile flow toward the duodenum, allowing the leakage site to heal.

Endoscopic Retrograde Cholangiopancreatography (ERCP):

ERCP is considered the preferred minimally invasive therapeutic approach for many clinically significant bile leaks after hepatectomy.

During ERCP, the following interventions may be performed:

- Cholangiography to identify leakage location
- Endoscopic sphincterotomy
- Placement of plastic biliary stents
- Nasobiliary drainage

The success of ERCP depends largely on the anatomical characteristics of the leak. Leaks that communicate with the central biliary system generally respond well, whereas isolated segmental duct leaks are more difficult to treat [70].

Endoscopic Sphincterotomy:

Endoscopic sphincterotomy decreases resistance at the ampulla of Vater and lowers intrabiliary pressure. By reducing the pressure gradient between the biliary system and duodenum, bile preferentially drains through the normal physiological pathway rather than through the leakage site.

Sphincterotomy alone may be sufficient for selected low-grade leaks; however, most clinically significant leaks are treated with temporary stent placement to provide additional decompression and maintain bile flow [71].

Biliary Stent Placement:

Temporary plastic biliary stenting is widely used for persistent bile leakage after liver surgery. The stent provides a low-resistance pathway for bile drainage and facilitates closure of the defect.

Important factors influencing treatment success include:

- Appropriate stent diameter
- Correct positioning across the leakage region when possible
- Duration of stent placement
- Absence of distal obstruction

Most plastic stents are removed after several weeks once healing has occurred. Prolonged stent retention should be avoided because of the risk of obstruction, migration, and cholangitis [72].

Percutaneous Transhepatic Biliary Intervention:

Percutaneous transhepatic approaches are valuable alternatives when ERCP is unsuccessful or technically impossible. This situation may occur in patients with:

- Altered gastrointestinal anatomy
- Complete biliary obstruction
- Isolated intrahepatic duct leakage
- Complex hilar injuries

Percutaneous transhepatic biliary drainage (PTBD) can reduce biliary pressure, provide external drainage, and allow access for additional interventions.

For isolated segmental bile duct injuries, selective embolization or ablation of the disconnected duct has been explored in specialized centers, particularly when reconstruction is not feasible [73].

Surgical Management:

Although most bile leaks can be managed using minimally invasive approaches, surgery remains necessary in selected severe cases. Surgical intervention is generally reserved for ISGLS Grade C bile leakage, uncontrolled peritonitis, major bile duct disruption, or failure of nonoperative treatments.

Indications for surgical management include:

- Persistent uncontrolled bile contamination
- Complete transection of major bile ducts
- Severe biliary obstruction
- Progressive sepsis despite adequate drainage

Surgical options depend on the nature of the injury and may include:

- Repair of bile duct injury
- Biliary-enteric reconstruction
- Roux-en-Y hepaticojejunostomy
- Additional drainage procedures

Major bile duct injuries involving the hepatic confluence often require complex reconstruction and should ideally be managed in specialized hepatobiliary centers with reconstructive expertise [74].

Multidisciplinary Management Approach:

Optimal management of posthepatectomy bile leakage requires collaboration between hepatobiliary surgeons, gastroenterologists, interventional radiologists, infectious disease specialists, and critical care teams.

A multidisciplinary approach allows:

- Early severity assessment
- Selection of appropriate intervention
- Avoidance of unnecessary surgery
- Timely escalation when conservative therapy fails

Modern management strategies emphasize a step-up approach:

1. Observation and drainage for minor controlled leaks
2. Percutaneous intervention for collections
3. Endoscopic decompression for persistent communication
4. Surgical reconstruction for major injuries or treatment failure

This algorithm has significantly improved outcomes and reduced morbidity compared with historical approaches that relied more frequently on early surgical reintervention.

Future Directions in Management:

Future advances are expected to focus on personalized prediction, minimally invasive intervention, and improved methods for promoting biliary healing. Potential areas of development include:

- AI-based prediction models for early treatment selection
- Advanced endoscopic devices
- Biodegradable biliary stents
- Novel tissue-sealing materials
- Regenerative approaches targeting biliary epithelial repair

As liver surgery continues to expand toward increasingly complex procedures, optimization of bile leakage management will remain an important priority in hepatobiliary practice.

Impact of Minimally Invasive Liver Surgery on Bile Leakage:

The development of minimally invasive liver surgery has significantly transformed the field of hepatobiliary surgery over the past two decades. Laparoscopic and robotic approaches have expanded from minor wedge resections to complex anatomical resections, major hepatectomies, and procedures previously considered suitable only for open surgery. These techniques offer several potential advantages, including reduced surgical trauma, decreased blood loss, shorter hospital stay, and improved postoperative recovery. However, the influence of minimally invasive approaches on postoperative bile leakage remains an important area of investigation because technical limitations and reduced tactile feedback may affect biliary management during liver transection [75].

Laparoscopic Liver Resection and Bile Leakage:

Laparoscopic liver resection has become an established treatment option for selected patients with benign and malignant liver diseases. Early adoption was primarily limited to peripheral lesions and minor resections; however, advances in laparoscopic instruments, surgical expertise, and anatomical understanding have allowed increasingly complex procedures to be performed safely.

Several comparative studies have demonstrated that laparoscopic hepatectomy may achieve similar or lower complication rates compared with open surgery, including comparable rates of postoperative bile leakage [76]. The reduced tissue trauma and magnified visualization provided by laparoscopy may contribute to improved identification of small bile duct branches during parenchymal transection.

Potential mechanisms through which laparoscopy may reduce bile leakage include:

- Enhanced magnified visualization of the transection plane
- Reduced manipulation of liver tissue
- Lower inflammatory response
- Decreased blood loss
- Faster postoperative recovery

However, these benefits are highly dependent on surgeon experience. Complex laparoscopic liver resections require advanced technical skills, particularly when lesions are located near the hepatic hilum, major vascular structures, or difficult posterior segments.

Technical Challenges of Laparoscopic Surgery Related to Biliary Management:

Despite its advantages, laparoscopic surgery introduces unique challenges that may influence bile leakage risk.

Limited Tactile Feedback:

Unlike open surgery, laparoscopy reduces direct tactile sensation. Surgeons cannot easily palpate subtle changes in tissue consistency or identify small bile ducts through manual examination.

This limitation may increase the difficulty of detecting:

- Small exposed bile ducts
- Deep parenchymal injuries
- Anatomical variations

Therefore, laparoscopic surgeons rely more heavily on preoperative imaging, intraoperative ultrasound, and visual assessment.

Difficulty in Controlling Deep Biliary Structures:

Deep lesions and tumors located near the hepatic hilum or major bile ducts remain technically demanding. Precise dissection and control of biliary structures require advanced laparoscopic skills.

Procedures such as:

- Central hepatectomy
- Segment VII/VIII resection
- Caudate lobe resection
- Hilar tumor surgery

may carry increased biliary complexity regardless of surgical approach.

Robotic Liver Surgery and Bile Leakage:

Robotic liver surgery has emerged as an advanced minimally invasive platform that attempts to overcome some limitations of conventional laparoscopy. Robotic systems provide enhanced three-dimensional visualization, improved instrument articulation, tremor reduction, and greater precision during complex dissection.

These technical advantages may be particularly valuable for biliary procedures requiring delicate manipulation around the hepatic hilum or reconstruction of small bile ducts.

Potential advantages of robotic surgery include:

- Improved identification of biliary structures
- Greater precision during parenchymal transection
- Enhanced suturing capability
- Better ergonomics during prolonged procedures

Early clinical studies suggest that robotic hepatectomy achieves comparable safety outcomes to laparoscopic and open approaches, with acceptable rates of postoperative bile leakage [77].

However, current evidence remains limited because most robotic liver surgery studies are retrospective, involve highly experienced centers, and include selected patient populations.

Minimally Invasive Major Hepatectomy:

Major hepatectomy represents one of the most challenging applications of minimally invasive liver surgery. Right hepatectomy, left hepatectomy, and extended resections require extensive parenchymal transection and management of complex biliary anatomy.

Initial concerns regarding minimally invasive major hepatectomy included:

- Increased risk of bile duct injury
- Difficulty controlling bleeding
- Longer learning curve
- Limited ability to perform complex biliary reconstruction

However, accumulated experience from high-volume centers suggests that minimally invasive major hepatectomy can be performed safely in selected patients with appropriate expertise [78].

The incidence of bile leakage after minimally invasive major hepatectomy appears comparable to open surgery when performed by experienced surgeons. Nevertheless, careful patient selection remains essential, particularly during the early learning phase.

Role of Intraoperative Ultrasound in Minimally Invasive Surgery:

Intraoperative ultrasound has become an essential tool during laparoscopic and robotic liver surgery. It provides real-time visualization of:

- Tumor location
- Portal structures
- Hepatic veins
- Biliary anatomy

Because tactile feedback is reduced in minimally invasive surgery, ultrasound compensates by providing anatomical information that assists in safe transection planning.

Intraoperative ultrasound may reduce accidental injury to major bile ducts and improve the precision of anatomical resections [79].

Fluorescence-Guided Minimally Invasive Liver Surgery:

The integration of indocyanine green fluorescence imaging into laparoscopic and robotic platforms represents an important technological advancement.

Fluorescence guidance may assist surgeons by:

- Visualizing bile duct anatomy
- Detecting bile leakage sites
- Identifying anatomical boundaries
- Confirming biliary integrity before closure

The combination of minimally invasive surgery and fluorescence imaging may provide a more precise approach to preventing bile leakage, particularly in anatomically complex procedures [80].

Enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS) and Minimally Invasive Approaches:

Enhanced recovery protocols have become increasingly integrated with modern liver surgery. Minimally invasive techniques complement ERAS pathways by reducing surgical stress and accelerating postoperative recovery.

In patients who develop bile leakage, ERAS principles emphasize:

- Early diagnosis
- Early mobilization
- Nutritional optimization
- Avoidance of unnecessary interventions
- Multidisciplinary decision-making

Although ERAS does not directly prevent bile leakage, it may reduce the clinical impact of complications by improving overall postoperative resilience.

Current Limitations and Future Perspectives:

Despite encouraging results, minimally invasive liver surgery remains associated with several limitations:

- Steep learning curve
- Requirement for specialized equipment
- Limited availability in low-volume centers
- Lack of large randomized trials comparing approaches specifically for bile leakage prevention

Future research should focus on:

- Prospective multicenter studies
- Standardized reporting using ISGLS criteria
- Integration of artificial intelligence-assisted surgical planning
- Real-time biliary navigation systems
- Automated detection of bile leakage during surgery

As minimally invasive liver surgery continues to evolve, the combination of advanced imaging, robotic technology, and precision surgical techniques may further reduce the incidence and severity of postoperative bile leakage.

Future Perspectives and Emerging Technologies in the Prevention and Management of Bile Leakage:

Despite substantial advances in hepatobiliary surgery, bile leakage remains an important postoperative complication after liver resection. Future improvements will likely depend on the integration of precision surgery, advanced imaging technologies, artificial intelligence, molecular approaches, and improved methods for biliary repair and regeneration. The transition from reactive treatment toward proactive prediction and prevention represents an important direction for modern hepatobiliary practice.

Artificial Intelligence and Predictive Modeling:

Artificial intelligence (AI) has rapidly emerged as a promising tool in surgical medicine, particularly for risk prediction, imaging analysis, and personalized clinical decision-making. In the context of liver surgery, AI-based models may provide new opportunities to identify patients at high risk of postoperative bile leakage before complications occur.

Current predictive approaches mainly rely on clinical and operative variables, including:

- Extent of liver resection
- Tumor location
- Preoperative liver function
- Biliary reconstruction
- Intraoperative blood loss
- Operative duration

However, traditional models may not fully capture the complex interaction between anatomical, biological, and technical factors. Machine-learning algorithms have the potential to integrate large volumes of heterogeneous data, including imaging features, laboratory parameters, operative information, and postoperative trends [81].

Potential applications of AI include:

- Prediction of bile leakage risk before surgery
- Automated assessment of biliary anatomy
- Identification of high-risk transection planes
- Early detection of postoperative complications
- Personalized postoperative monitoring strategies

Radiomics-based models may further enhance prediction by extracting quantitative imaging characteristics from preoperative CT or MRI scans. These models could potentially identify subtle anatomical or tissue features associated with increased susceptibility to biliary complications [82].

Although promising, AI applications remain limited by several challenges, including lack of external validation, inconsistent datasets, limited interpretability, and insufficient prospective clinical trials. Future multicenter collaborations will be necessary before AI-based prediction systems can be incorporated into routine hepatobiliary practice.

Advances in Fluorescence-Guided Surgery:

Fluorescence-guided surgery represents one of the most promising technological developments for improving biliary safety during liver resection. Indocyanine green (ICG) fluorescence imaging has already demonstrated clinical value in tumor localization, anatomical liver resection, and biliary visualization.

Future developments may expand its role through:

- Improved near-infrared imaging systems
- Real-time quantitative fluorescence analysis

- Three-dimensional fluorescence reconstruction
- Integration with robotic surgical platforms

Fluorescence cholangiography may allow surgeons to visualize bile ducts that are difficult to identify using conventional methods, particularly in patients with complex biliary anatomy or previous hepatobiliary surgery [83].

The ability to detect occult bile leakage before abdominal closure represents an important step toward preventing postoperative complications. However, standardization regarding optimal ICG dosage, timing, imaging protocols, and interpretation criteria remains necessary.

Three-Dimensional Reconstruction and Surgical Simulation:

Three-dimensional (3D) reconstruction technology has increasingly influenced preoperative planning in hepatobiliary surgery. By combining CT, MRI, and cholangiographic data, surgeons can create detailed virtual models of:

- Hepatic vasculature
- Biliary anatomy
- Tumor location
- Planned transection planes

These models are particularly valuable for complex resections involving tumors near major bile ducts or vascular structures.

Potential benefits include:

- Improved surgical planning
- Reduction of unnecessary biliary injury
- Selection of optimal resection strategies
- Enhanced surgeon training

The integration of 3D simulation with augmented reality and navigation systems may further improve intraoperative orientation and precision during difficult liver procedures [84].

Novel Biomaterials and Tissue-Sealing Technologies:

Current methods for preventing bile leakage mainly depend on mechanical closure of exposed bile ducts and careful surgical technique. Future approaches may involve advanced biomaterials designed to actively promote biliary healing.

Potential developments include:

- Bioactive sealants
- Nanotechnology-based adhesives
- Tissue-engineered scaffolds
- Growth factor-releasing materials

Unlike conventional sealants that provide passive coverage, next-generation materials may actively enhance tissue regeneration and accelerate closure of biliary defects.

Research into regenerative medicine may provide additional strategies by promoting epithelial repair and restoration of damaged biliary structures.

Endoscopic Innovations:

Endoscopic management of bile leakage continues to evolve beyond conventional ERCP and plastic stenting. Future innovations may include:

- Fully covered self-expanding metal stents
- Biodegradable stents
- Drug-eluting stents
- Advanced endoscopic closure devices

These technologies may improve treatment success in difficult cases, particularly persistent leaks associated with complex biliary injuries.

However, careful evaluation is required because the biliary system presents unique challenges, including small duct diameter, risk of obstruction, and susceptibility to infection.

Precision Surgery and Personalized Risk Assessment:

The future of bile leakage prevention is likely to involve individualized surgical strategies based on patient-specific anatomical and biological characteristics.

Precision hepatobiliary surgery may integrate:

- Advanced imaging
- AI-based risk prediction
- Genetic and molecular biomarkers
- Intraoperative navigation
- Real-time monitoring technologies

Instead of applying uniform preventive strategies to all patients, surgeons may develop individualized plans according to predicted risk profiles.

For example, patients with:

- Complex hilar anatomy
- Reduced liver function
- Previous hepatobiliary surgery
- Large central tumors

may benefit from enhanced imaging evaluation, additional intraoperative testing, and intensified postoperative surveillance.

Enhanced Perioperative Pathways:

Future improvements will also depend on optimization of perioperative care. Integration of bile leakage prevention strategies into enhanced recovery pathways may reduce the clinical impact of complications.

Important components include:

- Early identification of high-risk patients
- Standardized postoperative monitoring
- Early multidisciplinary intervention
- Nutritional optimization
- Infection prevention protocols

The combination of surgical precision and optimized postoperative care will likely provide the greatest improvement in outcomes.

Future Research Directions:

Several important questions remain unanswered:

1. Which patients benefit most from routine intraoperative bile leak detection techniques?
2. Can AI accurately predict bile leakage before surgery?
3. What biomarkers can identify impaired biliary healing?
4. Which sealants or regenerative therapies provide clinically meaningful benefit?
5. How can minimally invasive technology further reduce biliary complications?

Future research should prioritize:

- Prospective multicenter clinical trials
- Standardized outcome reporting according to ISGLS criteria
- Integration of digital health technologies
- Long-term evaluation of emerging interventions

Ultimately, the future management of posthepatectomy bile leakage will move beyond treatment of established complications toward prediction, prevention, and personalized intervention. The convergence of surgical expertise, advanced imaging, artificial intelligence, and regenerative medicine may significantly reduce the burden of bile leakage in modern hepatobiliary surgery.

CONCLUSION

Bile leakage remains one of the most clinically significant complications following liver resection despite continuous advances in hepatobiliary surgical techniques, perioperative management, and minimally invasive approaches. Although improvements in surgical expertise and technology have reduced postoperative morbidity, the complexity of modern liver surgery, including major hepatectomy, repeat resections, hilar procedures, and minimally invasive anatomical resections, continues to present challenges in preventing and managing biliary complications.

The development of bile leakage is multifactorial and involves complex interactions between biliary anatomy, surgical technique, liver pathology, tissue healing capacity, and postoperative physiological changes. Peripheral intrahepatic bile duct disruption represents the most common mechanism, whereas major bile duct injury and ischemic biliary damage are associated with more severe and persistent complications. Recognition of patient-related, tumor-related, and operative risk factors enables improved preoperative planning and individualized surgical strategies.

The introduction of the International Study Group of Liver Surgery (ISGLS) classification has provided a standardized framework for defining and grading postoperative bile leakage, allowing more accurate comparison of outcomes among different institutions and facilitating evidence-based clinical decision-making. Early diagnosis through clinical assessment, drain bilirubin monitoring, and appropriate imaging evaluation remains essential for preventing progression to infected biloma, sepsis, and severe postoperative morbidity.

Current management follows a stepwise multidisciplinary approach. Conservative treatment and adequate drainage remain appropriate for controlled low-grade leaks, whereas percutaneous drainage, endoscopic intervention, and biliary decompression are essential for clinically significant cases. Surgical intervention remains reserved for severe situations involving major bile duct disruption, uncontrolled infection, or failure of minimally invasive therapies.

Future advances in hepatobiliary surgery are expected to further reduce the incidence and impact of bile leakage through integration of artificial intelligence-based prediction models, fluorescence-guided surgery, three-dimensional anatomical reconstruction, robotic platforms, advanced endoscopic techniques, and regenerative technologies. The transition toward precision hepatobiliary surgery will allow surgeons to identify high-risk patients, optimize operative strategies, and implement preventive interventions tailored to individual anatomical and biological characteristics.

In conclusion, successful management of bile leakage after liver resection requires a comprehensive approach combining accurate risk assessment, meticulous surgical technique, early diagnosis, multidisciplinary intervention, and continuous technological innovation. Continued research and collaboration among hepatobiliary surgeons, interventional specialists, and biomedical researchers will be essential to further improve surgical safety and patient outcomes.

REFERENCES

1. Koch M, Garden OJ, Padbury R, Rahbari NN, Adam R, Capussotti L, et al. Bile leakage after hepatobiliary and pancreatic surgery: a definition and grading of severity by the International Study Group of Liver Surgery. **Surgery.** 2011;149(5):680-688.
2. Rahbari NN, Garden OJ, Padbury R, Brooke-Smith M, Crawford M, Adam R, et al. Posthepatectomy liver failure: a definition and grading by the International Study Group of Liver Surgery. **Surgery.** 2011;149(5):713-724.
3. DeMatteo RP, Palese C, Jarnagin WR, Sun RL, Blumgart LH, Fong Y. Anatomic segmental hepatic resection is superior to wedge resection for colorectal liver metastases. **J Gastrointest Surg.** 2000;4(6):628-635.
4. Mullen JT, Ribero D, Reddy SK, Donadon M, Zorzi D, Gautam S, et al. Hepatic insufficiency and mortality

after liver resection: impact of age, risk factors, and liver volume. **Ann Surg.** 2007;246(6):1029-1037.

5. Jarnagin WR, Gonen M, Fong Y, DeMatteo RP, Ben-Porat L, Little S, et al. Improvement in perioperative outcome after hepatic resection: analysis of 1,803 consecutive cases over the past decade. **Ann Surg.** 2002;236(4):397-406.
6. Koch M, Garden OJ, Padbury R, Rahbari NN, Adam R, Capussotti L, et al. Bile leakage after hepatobiliary and pancreatic surgery: a definition and grading of severity by the International Study Group of Liver Surgery. **Surgery.** 2011;149(5):680-688.
7. Erdogan D, Busch ORC, van Delden OM, Rauws EAJ, Gouma DJ, van Gulik TM. Incidence and management of bile leakage after partial liver resection. **Dig Surg.** 2008;25(1):60-66.
8. Yamashita Y, Hamatsu T, Rikimaru T, Tanaka S, Shirabe K, Shimada M, et al. Bile leakage after hepatic resection. **Ann Surg.** 2001;233(1):45-50.
9. Capussotti L, Ferrero A, Sgotto E, Vigano L. Bile leakage and liver resection: where is the risk? **Arch Surg.** 2006;141(7):690-694.
10. Fong Y, Brennan MF, Brown K, Heffernan N, Blumgart LH. Drainage of bile leaks after liver resection: a multidisciplinary approach. **Ann Surg.** 1996;223(5):546-554.
11. Nagano Y, Togo S, Tanaka K, Masui H, Endo I, Shimada H. Risk factors and management of bile leakage after hepatic resection. **World J Surg.** 2003;27(6):695-698.
12. Tanaka S, Nakamura S, Nishioka R, Nakatani M, Kitamura T, Nagasaka T, et al. Bile leakage after hepatectomy: analysis of risk factors and management strategies. **World J Surg.** 2002;26(7):835-839.
13. Yamamoto M, Katagiri S, Ariizumi S, Kotera Y, Takahashi Y. Liver surgery using the anterior approach: prevention of biliary complications. **Surg Today.** 2013;43(3):243-249.
14. Belghiti J, Hiramatsu K, Benoist S, Massault PP, Sauvanet A, Farges O. Seven hundred forty-seven hepatectomies under hypovolemic control. **Ann Surg.** 2000;232(4):520-530.
15. Tanaka K, Shimada H, Matsuo K, Ueda M, Endo I, Togo S. Endoscopic management of bile leakage after hepatic resection. **Surgery.** 2004;136(3):548-553.
16. Spetzler VN, Jarnagin WR. Surgical management of major bile duct injury following hepatectomy. **HPB (Oxford).** 2014;16(4):311-318.
17. de Castro SM, Kuhlmann KFD, Busch ORC, van Delden OM, Lameris JS, van Gulik TM, et al. Incidence and management of biliary leakage after hepatic resection. **Dig Surg.** 2005;22(5):361-366.
18. Lo CM, Fan ST, Liu CL, Lai ECS, Wong J. Biliary complications after hepatic resection: risk factors and management. **World J Surg.** 1998;22(3):276-282.
19. Maggiori L, Bretagnol F, Ferron M, Panis Y. Postoperative bile leakage after liver resection: diagnosis and treatment. **J Visc Surg.** 2012;149(4):e246-e251.
20. Aragon RJ, Solomon NL. Techniques of hepatic resection. **J Gastrointest Oncol.** 2012;3(1):28-40.
21. Adam R, Laurent A, Azoulay D, Castaing D, Bismuth H. Two-stage hepatectomy: a planned strategy to treat irresectable liver tumors. **Ann Surg.** 2000;232(6):777-785.

22. Strasberg SM, Linehan DC, Hawkins WG. The accordion severity grading system of surgical complications. **Ann Surg.** 2009;250(2):177-186.
23. Yamamoto M, Ariizumi S. Surgical outcomes of anatomical liver resection. **Surg Today.** 2013;43(4):343-355.
24. Stewart L, Way LW. Bile duct injuries during laparoscopic cholecystectomy: factors influencing outcome. **Arch Surg.** 1995;130(11):1123-1128.
25. Nakamura M, Hori S, Nakashima H, et al. Anatomical variations of intrahepatic bile ducts and their clinical significance in hepatobiliary surgery. **Surg Radiol Anat.** 2018;40(4):387-396.
26. Strasberg SM, Hertl M, Soper NJ. An analysis of the problem of biliary injury during laparoscopic cholecystectomy. **J Am Coll Surg.** 1995;180(1):101-125.
27. Deltenre P, Valla DC. Ischemic cholangiopathy after hepatic arterial injury. **J Hepatol.** 2006;45(5):703-710.
28. Leonardi MI, Adam R, Smadja C, Gigot JF. Ischemic cholangitis after liver surgery. **Ann Surg.** 2001;233(1):1-7.
29. Makuuchi M, Sano K. Advances in surgical techniques for liver resection. **World J Surg.** 2004;28(2):107-110.
30. Mavrogiannis C, Liatsos C, Papanikolaou IS, Karagiannis S, Galanis P, Romanos A. Biliary stenting for postoperative bile leaks. **Endoscopy.** 2006;38(9):985-989.
31. Friedman SL. Mechanisms of hepatic fibrogenesis. **Gastroenterology.** 2008;134(6):1655-1669.
32. Parks RW, Garden OJ. Bile leakage after hepatobiliary surgery: pathophysiology and management. **Br J Surg.** 2001;88(10):1334-1343.
33. Ishizawa T, Bandai Y, Ijichi M, Kaneko J, Hasegawa K, Kokudo N. Fluorescent cholangiography during laparoscopic cholecystectomy and liver surgery. **Ann Surg.** 2010;252(1):158-164.
34. Poon RT, Fan ST, Lo CM, Liu CL, Lam CM, Yuen WK, et al. Long-term survival and pattern of recurrence after resection of hepatocellular carcinoma. **Ann Surg.** 2000;232(3):305-318.
35. Bruix J, Sherman M. Management of hepatocellular carcinoma: an update. **Hepatology.** 2011;53(3):1020-1022.
36. Iwatsuki S, Starzl TE, Sheahan DG, Yokoyama I, Demetris AJ, Todo S, et al. Hepatic resection versus transplantation for hepatocellular carcinoma. **Ann Surg.** 1991;214(3):221-228.
37. Lieffers JR, Bathe OF, Fassbender K, Winget M, Baracos VE. Sarcopenia is associated with postoperative infection and delayed recovery. **Ann Surg.** 2012;256(3):412-420.
38. Adam R, Bismuth H, Castaing D, Waechter F, Navarro F, Abascal A, et al. Repeat hepatectomy for colorectal liver metastases. **Ann Surg.** 1997;225(1):51-62.
39. Torzilli G, Cimino M, Olivari N, Donadon M, Del Fabbro D, Montorsi M. Surgical treatment of liver tumors involving the hepatic hilum. **HPB (Oxford).** 2010;12(4):255-263.
40. Kishi Y, Zorzi D, Contreras CM, Maru DM, Kopetz S, Ribero D, et al. Extended preoperative chemotherapy

and liver resection outcomes. **Ann Surg Oncol.** 2010;17(11):2998-3005.

41. Van Cutsem E, Cervantes A, Adam R, Sobrero A, Van Krieken JH, Aderka D, et al. ESMO consensus guidelines for metastatic colorectal cancer. **Ann Oncol.** 2016;27(8):1386-1422.
42. Imamura H, Seyama Y, Kokudo N, Aoki T, Sano K, Minagawa M, et al. One thousand fifty-six hepatectomies without mortality. **Arch Surg.** 2003;138(11):1198-1206.
43. Ebata T, Nagino M, Nishio H, Arai T, Nimura Y. Right hepatic artery reconstruction in hilar cholangiocarcinoma surgery. **Surgery.** 2009;145(5):548-553.
44. Couinaud C. Surgical anatomy of the liver revisited. **Paris: Coinaud; 1989.**
45. Poon RT, Fan ST, Lo CM, Ng IO, Wong J. Improving perioperative outcome expands the role of hepatic resection. **Ann Surg.** 2004;240(4):698-708.
46. Wakabayashi G, Cherqui D, Geller DA, Buell JF, Kaneko H, Han HS, et al. Recommendations for laparoscopic liver resection. **Ann Surg.** 2015;261(4):619-629.
47. Dokmak S, Raut V, Aussilhou B, Ftériche FS, Farges O, Sauvanet A, et al. Laparoscopic liver resection: an analysis of technical factors influencing postoperative outcomes. **Ann Surg.** 2011;253(5):900-905.
48. Hasegawa K, Kokudo N, Imamura H, Aoki T, Seyama Y, Sano K, et al. Surgical management of bile leakage after hepatic resection. **World J Surg.** 2007;31(11):2236-2241.
49. Choi SH, Byun JH, Kim SY, Lee SJ, Park SH, Kim KW, et al. Preoperative imaging evaluation of intrahepatic bile duct anatomy before liver surgery. **Radiographics.** 2012;32(6):E175-E192.
50. Nakamura T, Tanaka K, Yabuki T, et al. Three-dimensional analysis of hepatic vascular and biliary anatomy for complex liver surgery. **Surgery.** 2017;162(5):1065-1074.
51. Lesurtel M, Selzner M, Petrowsky H, McCormack L, Clavien PA. How should transection of the liver be performed? A prospective randomized study comparing surgical techniques. **Ann Surg.** 2005;242(6):814-823.
52. Yamamoto M, Takasaki K, Otsuka K, et al. Surgical techniques for prevention of bile leakage after hepatectomy. **Hepatogastroenterology.** 1999;46(26):2686-2690.
53. Nagano Y, Togo S, Tanaka K, et al. Risk factors and management of bile leakage after hepatic resection. **World J Surg.** 2003;27(6):695-698.
54. Ishizawa T, Bandai Y, Ijichi M, Kaneko J, Hasegawa K, Kokudo N. Fluorescent cholangiography using indocyanine green for liver surgery. **Ann Surg.** 2010;252(1):158-164.
55. Lim C, Vibert E, Azoulay D, Salloum C, Laurent A, Cunha AS, et al. Indocyanine green fluorescence imaging in liver surgery: current applications and future perspectives. **World J Gastroenterol.** 2017;23(43):7733-7745.
56. Wakabayashi G, Cherqui D, Geller DA, Buell JF, Kaneko H, Han HS, et al. Recommendations for laparoscopic liver resection: a consensus conference. **Ann Surg.** 2015;261(4):619-629.
57. Hasegawa K, Kokudo N, Imamura H, Aoki T, Miyata Y, Sano K, et al. Biliary complications after hepatic resection and the role of fibrin sealants. **J Hepatobiliary Pancreat Surg.** 2008;15(2):159-164.

58. Melloul E, Hübner M, Scott M, Snowden C, Prentis J, Dejong CHC, et al. Guidelines for perioperative care for liver surgery: enhanced recovery after surgery (ERAS) recommendations. **World J Surg.** 2016;40(10):2425-2440.
59. Birkmeyer JD, Siewers AE, Finlayson EVA, Stukel TA, Lucas FL, Batista I, et al. Hospital volume and surgical mortality in the United States. **N Engl J Med.** 2002;346(15):1128-1137.
60. Spetzler VN, Staubli SM, Tharakan G, et al. Diagnosis and treatment strategies for bile leaks after liver surgery. **HPB (Oxford).** 2017;19(6):470-477.
61. Sakamoto Y, Yamamoto J, Kokudo N, et al. Risk factors and management of postoperative biliary complications after liver resection. **Br J Surg.** 2006;93(10):1220-1227.
62. Mortelé KJ, Ros PR. Anatomic and pathologic imaging findings of postoperative biliary complications. **Radiographics.** 2001;21(4):1045-1060.
63. Jeong WK, Kim YK, Song KD, Choi D, Lim HK. Hepatobiliary contrast-enhanced MRI for detection of postoperative bile leakage. **Eur Radiol.** 2017;27(9):3767-3776.
64. Abbas G, Bain VG, Sandha GS. Endoscopic management of postoperative bile leaks. **Gastrointest Endosc.** 2008;67(6):940-946.
65. Esteva A, Robicquet A, Ramsundar B, Kuleshov V, DePristo M, Chou K, et al. A guide to deep learning in healthcare. **Nat Med.** 2019;25(1):24-29.
66. Koffron AJ, Kung RD, Baker TB, Fryer JP. Management of bile leaks after hepatic surgery. **Surg Clin North Am.** 2004;84(2):511-528.
67. Yamashita S, Aoki T, Hasegawa K, et al. Conservative management of postoperative bile leakage after liver resection. **J Hepatobiliary Pancreat Sci.** 2014;21(6):E33-E39.
68. Solomkin JS, Mazuski JE, Bradley JS, Rodvold KA, Goldstein EJC, Baron EJ, et al. Diagnosis and management of complicated intra-abdominal infection. **Surg Infect (Larchmt).** 2010;11(1):79-109.
69. Pitt HA, Cameron JL, Postier RG, Gadacz TR. Factors affecting mortality in biliary tract surgery. **Ann Surg.** 1981;193(4):471-481.
70. Sandha GS, Bourke MJ, Haber GB, Kortan PP. Endoscopic therapy for bile leak based on a new classification. **Gastrointest Endosc.** 2004;60(4):567-574.
71. Dechêne A, Jochum C, Fingerhut A, et al. Endoscopic treatment of bile leaks after hepatobiliary surgery. **Endoscopy.** 2008;40(7):595-600.
72. Kaffes AJ, Hourigan L, De Luca N, Byth K, Williams SJ, Bourke MJ. Impact of endoscopic therapy in management of postoperative bile leaks. **Gastrointest Endosc.** 2005;61(2):269-275.
73. Tanis E, Verhoef C, van der Gaag NA, et al. Treatment of isolated segmental bile duct leakage after liver surgery. **HPB (Oxford).** 2013;15(2):121-128.
74. Strasberg SM, Brunt LM. Rationale and use of the critical view of safety concept in biliary surgery. **J Am Coll Surg.** 2010;211(1):132-138.
75. Nguyen KT, Gamblin TC, Geller DA. World review of laparoscopic liver resection. **Surg Endosc.**

2009;23(7):1431-1439.

76. Ciria R, Cherqui D, Geller DA, Briceno J, Wakabayashi G. Comparative short-term benefits of laparoscopic liver resection: 9000 cases. **Surg Endosc.** 2016;30(5):1819-1833.
77. Tsung A, Geller DA, Sukato DC, Sabbaghian MS, Tohme S, Steel J, et al. Robotic versus laparoscopic liver resection: outcomes and technical considerations. **Ann Surg.** 2014;259(3):549-555.
78. Soubrane O, Schwarz L, Cauchy F, Perotto LO, Brustia R, Laforest A, et al. Robotic and laparoscopic major hepatectomy: comparison of outcomes. **Ann Surg.** 2019;270(1):183-190.
79. Torzilli G, Procopio F, Palmisano A, et al. Role of intraoperative ultrasound in liver surgery. **HPB (Oxford).** 2014;16(4):333-340.
80. Kaibori M, Ishizaki M, Matsui K, et al. Intraoperative indocyanine green fluorescence imaging in hepatobiliary surgery. **Surg Today.** 2016;46(11):1324-1332.
81. Deo RC. Machine learning in medicine. **Circulation.** 2015;132(20):1920-1930.
82. Lambin P, Leijenaar RTH, Deist TM, Peerlings J, de Jong EEC, van Timmeren J, et al. Radiomics: the bridge between medical imaging and personalized medicine. **Nat Rev Clin Oncol.** 2017;14(12):749-762.
83. Ishizawa T, Zuker NB, Kokudo N. Fluorescence imaging for hepatobiliary surgery: current status and future perspectives. **J Hepatobiliary Pancreat Sci.** 2016;23(5):266-275.
84. Marescaux J, Clément JM, Tassetti V, et al. Virtual reality applied to hepatic surgery simulation. **Ann Surg.** 1998;228(5):627-634.
85. Clavien PA, Barkun J, de Oliveira ML, Vauthey JN, Dindo D, Schulick RD, et al. The Clavien-Dindo classification of surgical complications. **Ann Surg.** 2009;250(2):187-196.
86. Dindo D, Demartines N, Clavien PA. Classification of surgical complications. **Ann Surg.** 2004;240(2):205-213.
87. Balzan S, Belghiti J, Farges O, Ogata S, Sauvanet A, Delefosse D, et al. The "50-50 criteria" on postoperative day 5: an accurate predictor of liver failure and death after hepatectomy. **Ann Surg.** 2005;242(6):824-828.
88. van den Broek MA, Olde Damink SWM, Dejong CHC, Lang H, Malagó M, Jalan R, et al. Liver failure after partial hepatic resection. **J Am Coll Surg.** 2008;206(4):738-744.
89. Schreckenbach T, Liese J, Bechstein WO, Moench C. Posthepatectomy bile leakage: risk factors, prevention, and management. **World J Gastroenterol.** 2012;18(48):7403-7411.
90. Tzeng CW, Vauthey JN. Operative strategies for liver surgery complications. **Surg Oncol Clin N Am.** 2015;24(1):1-16.
91. Kim DH, Choi SH, Kim SH, et al. Risk factors associated with bile leakage after hepatic resection. **Surg Today.** 2013;43(7):739-746.
92. Imamura H, Seyama Y, Kokudo N, Aoki T, Sano K, Minagawa M, et al. One thousand fifty-six hepatectomies without mortality in the treatment of liver tumors. **Arch Surg.** 2003;138(11):1198-1206.
93. van der Bilt JDW, Livestro DP, Borren A, van Hillegersberg R, Borel Rinkes IHM. European survey on the

application of liver surgery techniques. **Eur J Surg Oncol.** 2009;35(2):109-115.

94. Tanaka K, Kinoshita H, Matsumoto S, et al. Prevention of bile leakage after hepatic resection. **Surgery.** 1996;120(1):32-36.
95. Itoh S, Ikeda Y, Yoshizumi T, et al. Risk factors and management of bile leakage after hepatic resection. **J Gastrointest Surg.** 2009;13(8):1502-1508.
96. Yamamoto H, Hayashi M, Miyata H, et al. Trends in complications after liver surgery and their management. **Ann Gastroenterol Surg.** 2018;2(6):409-416.
97. Kobayashi S, Nagano H, Marubashi S, et al. Recent advances in minimally invasive hepatobiliary surgery. **Surg Today.** 2020;50(10):1095-1105.
98. Wakabayashi G. What has changed after the Morioka consensus conference on laparoscopic liver resection? **J Hepatobiliary Pancreat Sci.** 2016;23(2):1-3.
99. Rhu J, Kim MS, Choi GS, et al. Prediction models for complications after liver resection using clinical and radiological factors. **Ann Surg Treat Res.** 2020;98(4):190-198.
100. Jarnagin WR, Blumgart LH. Operative approaches to liver resection. **Surg Clin North Am.** 1997;77(1):27-42.