

## 局部麻醉下经皮穿刺球囊压迫术治疗原发性三叉神经痛的方案选择

苗杨<sup>1</sup>, 何垒<sup>2</sup>, 董道松<sup>3</sup>, 郭欣欣<sup>2</sup>

(1. 郑州市妇幼保健院麻醉科, 郑州 450006; 2. 锦州医科大学附属第三医院疼痛科, 辽宁 锦州 121012; 3. 中国医科大学附属第一医院疼痛科, 沈阳 110001)

**摘要** **目的** 探讨局部麻醉下实施经皮穿刺球囊压迫术治疗原发性三叉神经痛的方案选择。**方法** 选取2018年8月至2022年8月就诊于锦州医科大学附属第三医院行经皮穿刺球囊压迫术的原发性三叉神经痛患者60例, 随机分成3组, A组在卵圆孔外口给予2%利多卡因1 mL, 入颅后给予0.5%利多卡因0.5 mL; B组在卵圆孔外口给予2%利多卡因1 mL, 入颅后给予0.25%利多卡因0.5 mL; C组在卵圆孔外口给予2%利多卡因0.5 mL, 入颅后给予0.25%利多卡因0.5 mL。记录患者术中疼痛、三叉神经心脏反射、术后面部疼痛及麻木情况。**结果** 术前3组视觉模拟疼痛量表(VAS)评分无统计学差异, 在卵圆孔穿刺时, C组VAS评分和三叉神经心脏反射发生率显著高于A、B组( $P < 0.05$ ); 而在球囊压迫时, 3组VAS评分和三叉神经心脏反射发生率无统计学差异( $P > 0.05$ ); 术后6个月和12个月随访显示, 3组患者面部疼痛和麻木程度无统计学差异( $P > 0.05$ )。**结论** 穿刺卵圆孔时应给予足量(2%利多卡因1 mL)局部麻醉药以保证患者镇痛效果和抑制不良反射, 在球囊压迫时, 低浓度局部麻醉药(0.25%利多卡因0.5 mL)同样可获得镇痛效果并抑制不良反射, 对远期手术效果无显著影响。

**关键词** 三叉神经痛; 经皮穿刺球囊压迫术; 三叉神经心脏反射; 局部麻醉

**中图分类号** R614.3 **文献标志码** A **文章编号** 0258-4646(2025)02-0161-06

**网络出版地址** <https://link.cnki.net/urlid/21.1227.R.20250115.1145.036>

**DOI:** 10.12007/j.issn.0258-4646.2025.02.012

### Clinical strategy of percutaneous balloon compression under local anesthesia for the treatment of primary trigeminal neuralgia

MIAO Yang<sup>1</sup>, HE Lei<sup>2</sup>, DONG Daosong<sup>3</sup>, GUO Xinxin<sup>2</sup>

(1. Department of Anesthesiology, Zhengzhou Maternal and Child Health Hospital, Zhengzhou 450006, China; 2. Department of Pain Medicine, The Third Affiliated Hospital of Jinzhou Medical University, Jinzhou 121012, China; 3. Department of Pain Medicine, The First Hospital of China Medical University, Shenyang 110001, China)

**Abstract** **Objective** To explore the strategy of percutaneous balloon compression under local anesthesia for the treatment of primary trigeminal neuralgia. **Methods** Sixty patients with primary trigeminal neuralgia who underwent percutaneous puncture balloon compression surgery at the Third Affiliated Hospital of Jinzhou Medical University between August 2018 and August 2022 were randomly divided into three groups. Group A received 2% lidocaine (1 mL) before puncturing the foramen ovale and 0.5% lidocaine (0.5 mL) after puncturing the skull, group B received 2% lidocaine (1 mL) before puncturing the foramen ovale and 0.25% lidocaine (0.5 mL) after entering the skull, and group C received 2% lidocaine (0.5 mL) externally and 0.25% lidocaine 0.5 mL upon intracranial injection. The pain and trigeminal-cardiac reflex as well as postoperative facial pain and numbness experienced by the patients were recorded. **Results** No statistically significant differences in the Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) scores among the groups were observed before surgical puncture. At the time before foramen ovale puncture, the VAS score and incidence of trigeminal-cardiac reflex in group C were significantly higher than those in groups A and B ( $P < 0.05$ ). No statistically significant differences were observed among the three groups during balloon compression ( $P > 0.05$ ). After 6 and 12 months of follow-up, no statistically significant differences were observed in the degree of facial pain and numbness among the three groups of patients ( $P > 0.05$ ). **Conclusion** A sufficient volume (2% lidocaine, 1 mL) of local anesthetic should be administered to ensure an analgesic effect and suppress adverse reflexes before puncturing the foramen ovale. During balloon compression, a low-concentration local anesthetic (0.25% lidocaine, 0.5 mL) can also achieve analgesic effects and significantly suppress adverse reflexes. Notably, various local anesthesia methods have no long-term effects.

**Keywords** trigeminal neuralgia; percutaneous balloon compression; trigemino-cardiac reflex; local anesthesia

**基金项目:** 辽宁省博士科研启动基金(2019-BS-295)

**作者简介:** 苗杨(1982-), 女, 副主任医师, 本科。

**通信作者:** 郭欣欣, E-mail: mzguoxx@163.com

**收稿日期:** 2024-01-23

**网络出版时间:** 2025-01-15 17:58:45

三叉神经痛(trigeminal neuralgia, TN)是指局限于三叉神经区域的反复发作性的剧烈疼痛<sup>[1]</sup>,严重影响患者的生活质量<sup>[2]</sup>。经皮穿刺球囊压迫术(percutaneous balloon compression, PBC)作为TN常见的治疗手段,有效率达55%~80%<sup>[3]</sup>。在PBC的实施过程中患者可能出现三叉神经心脏反射(trigemino-cardiac reflex, TCR),既往通常采用全身麻醉<sup>[4]</sup>,但是大剂量的静脉镇痛药并不能完全抑制卵圆孔中的疼痛传导<sup>[5]</sup>。有研究<sup>[6-8]</sup>采用局部麻醉的方式进行PBC的术中麻醉,但卵圆孔内给予局部麻醉药可能会导致药物进入脑脊液,产生严重的中枢神经系统毒性作用。本研究探讨了局部麻醉下实施PBC的最优方案,旨在保证术中穿刺安全的同时,最大限度地减少患者的疼痛。

## 1 材料与方法

### 1.1 一般资料

选取2018年8月至2022年8月就诊于锦州医科大学附属第三医院并诊断为原发性TN的患者60例。纳入标准:(1)年龄>18岁;(2)明确诊断为TN<sup>[3]</sup>,病程≥6个月;(3)保守治疗无效,拒绝或不适合行外科手术手术治疗;(4)发作时视觉模拟疼痛量表(Visual Analogue Scale, VAS)评分>7分。排除标准:(1)因感染、凝血障碍等无法进行有创操作;(2)基础疾病较多或一般状态较差无法耐受手术;(3)存在精神心理疾病无法配合治疗或随访。所有受试者知情同意并签署知情同意书。采用随机数法,将患者随机分成3组。A组在卵圆孔外口给予2%利多卡因1 mL,入颅内后给予0.5%利多卡因0.5 mL;B组在卵圆孔外口给予2%利多卡因1 mL,入颅内后给予0.25%利多卡因0.5 mL;C组在卵圆孔外口给予2%利多卡因0.5 mL,入颅内后给予0.25%利多卡因0.5 mL。本研究获得锦州医科大学附属第三医院伦理委员会批准(JYDSY-KXYJ-IEC-2024-001)。

### 1.2 麻醉方法

患者取肩下垫枕颈部后仰位,静脉给予咪达唑仑1 mg镇静,密切监测生命体征,一旦出现血流动力学变化,立即静脉给予阿托品0.5 mg。C臂下使用H图法识别卵圆孔<sup>[9]</sup>,设定此时间点为T0。

使用15 cm长的套管针C臂进行引导下穿刺,到达卵圆孔外口,穿刺针进入卵圆孔前,各组给予不

同容量的局部麻醉药,以减轻穿刺针刺入卵圆孔瞬间的疼痛并抑制迷走反射。患者无不适后穿刺针进入卵圆孔,记录此时间点(T1)各组数据。

进入卵圆孔后,在球囊压迫开始前于卵圆孔内给予各组不同浓度和容量的局部麻醉药,以减少球囊压迫产生的疼痛。后置入4号Fogarty球囊导管,深度为超过穿刺针针尖约10~15 mm,记录此时间点(T2)各组患者数据。向导管内注射碘帕醇0.3~0.5 mL,影像下显示球囊位置及形状满意,压迫3~5 min,记录此时间点(T3)各组患者数据,后排空球囊,拔出导管及穿刺针,手术结束。

### 1.3 观察指标

采用VAS评分记录各组患者T0、T1、T2和T3各时间点的疼痛情况。以0~10分表示疼痛程度,0分为无痛,10分为无法忍受的疼痛。其中,1~3分为轻度疼痛,4~6分为中度疼痛,7~10分为重度疼痛。

记录各时间点出现TCR<sup>[10]</sup>(术中出现心率或平均动脉血压下降>20%)及应用血管活性药物的患者数量。

记录各组患者术前、术后6和12个月巴罗神经研究所(Barrow Neurological Institute, BNI)面部疼痛强度量表(I级,无疼痛,不需要药物治疗;II级,不需要药物治疗的偶尔疼痛;IIIa级,没有疼痛,但需服药;IIIb级,药物可控制的疼痛;IV,药物无法完全控制的疼痛;V级,剧烈疼痛或无疼痛缓解)分级及各组患者术后6个月、12个月面部麻木程度分级(I级,无麻木;II级,轻度麻木,不影响日常生活;III级,麻木较重,已影响生活;IV级,麻木严重,对日常生活已造成严重影响)。术后面部疼痛评分I~IIIb级为治疗有效,IV或V级为治疗无效,需要再次干预<sup>[11]</sup>。

### 1.4 统计学分析

采用SPSS 23.0对所有遵循意向治疗(intent to-treat, ITT)原则的患者数据进行统计分析。正态分布计量资料以 $\bar{x} \pm s$ 表示,采用单因素方差分析进行组间比较,非正态分布计量资料以 $M(P_{25} \sim P_{75})$ 表示,采用非参数检验;计数资料采用 $\chi^2$ 检验或Fisher精确概率法,等级资料采用秩和检验, $P < 0.05$ 为差异有统计学意义。

## 2 结果

### 2.1 3组患者一般资料比较

共纳入60例患者。其中,58例患者(58/60,96.67%)完成试验,2例患者术后因不可预测因素(死亡或中

风)中止随访。各组在年龄、性别、疼痛部位和病程等方面无统计学差异( $P > 0.05$ ),见表1。

表1 患者基本情况

Tab.1 Baseline data of patients

Item	Group A (n = 20)	Group B (n = 20)	Group C (n = 20)	P
Age (year)	67.7 ± 6.21	63.4 ± 7.37	67.7 ± 6.89	0.080
Sex [n (%)]				0.334
Male	9 (45)	13 (65)	13 (65)	
Female	11 (55)	7 (35)	7 (35)	
Pain location [n (%)]				0.760
Left	11 (55)	13 (65)	11 (55)	
Right	9 (45)	7 (35)	9 (45)	
Affected nerve [n (%)]				0.889
I	1 (5)	1 (5)	3 (15)	
II	7 (35)	8 (40)	8 (40)	
III	10 (50)	9 (45)	8 (40)	
IV	2 (10)	2 (10)	1 (5)	
Disease duration (month)	13.50 ± 5.42	14.15 ± 4.40	11.25 ± 5.87	0.201
Comorbidities [n (%)]				0.212
Hypertension	8 (40)	4 (20)	3 (15)	
Coronary heart disease	1 (5)	4 (20)	7 (35)	
Diabetes	2 (10)	4 (20)	2 (10)	

## 2.2 3组患者术中疼痛情况

对各组患者进行VAS评分,结果显示,T0时刻3组VAS评分无统计学差异( $P > 0.05$ );T1时刻C组VAS

评分显著高于A组和B组( $P < 0.05$ );而T2和T3时刻A组VAS评分虽较B组和C组有下降趋势,但无统计学差异( $P > 0.05$ ),见表2。

表2 术中各时间点患者VAS评分( $\bar{x} \pm s$ )Tab.2 VAS scores of patients at various time points during surgery ( $\bar{x} \pm s$ )

Time	Group A	Group B	Group C
T0	2.30 ± 1.03	2.35 ± 1.09	2.15 ± 1.14
T1	3.25 ± 1.29 <sup>1)</sup>	3.05 ± 0.94 <sup>1)</sup>	4.70 ± 1.87
T2	2.80 ± 0.77	3.55 ± 1.15	3.50 ± 1.15
T3	3.25 ± 1.25	3.75 ± 1.29	3.75 ± 1.25

1)  $P < 0.05$  vs. group C.

## 2.3 3组患者术中血流动力学情况

记录各组在T1和T3时刻TCR的发生情况(表3),T1时刻C组TCR的发生率显著升高( $P < 0.05$ ),T3时刻颅内不同浓度的局部麻醉药对TCR发生的影响无统计学差异( $P > 0.05$ )。

## 2.4 3组患者术前和术后面部疼痛分级

记录各组术前、术后6个月和12个月患者面部疼痛分级,结果显示,在术前和远期的随访中,各组患者面部疼痛分级比较无统计学差异( $P > 0.05$ ),见表4。

表3 TCR发生情况 [n (%) ]  
Tab.3 Incidence of TCR [n (%) ]

Time	Group A	Group B	Group C	P
T1	2 (10)	3 (15)	8 (40)	0.048
T3	3 (15)	6 (30)	7 (35)	0.330

表4 患者术前及术后面部疼痛情况 [n (%) ]  
Tab.4 Preoperative and postoperative facial pain in patient [n (%) ]

Item	Group A	Group B	Group C	P
Before surgery				0.337
III b	3 (15)	3 (15)	2 (10)	
IV	12 (60)	9 (45)	16 (80)	
V	5 (25)	8 (40)	2 (10)	
6 months after surgery				0.723
I	8 (40)	11 (55)	9 (45)	
II	7 (35)	5 (25)	7 (35)	
III a	2 (10)	2 (10)	1 (5)	
III b	2 (10)	0	0	
IV	1 (5)	2 (10)	3 (15)	
V	0	0	0	
12 months after surgery				0.798
I	7 (35)	6 (32)	4 (21)	
II	6 (30)	4 (21)	9 (47)	
III a	2 (10)	1 (5)	1 (5)	
III b	2 (10)	4 (21)	1 (5)	
IV	2 (10)	4 (21)	2 (11)	
V	1 (5)	0	2 (11)	

2.5 3组患者术后面部麻木分级  
术后6个月、12个月对各组患者面部麻木程度

进行随访,结果显示,在远期的随访中,各组面部麻木分级无统计学差异 ( $P > 0.05$ ),见表5。

表5 患者术后面部麻木情况 [n (%) ]  
Tab.5 Postoperative facial numbness in patient [n (%) ]

Item	Group A	Group B	Group C	P
6 months after surgery				0.848
I	1 (5)	3 (15)	3 (15)	
II	6 (30)	5 (25)	4 (20)	
III	8 (40)	7 (35)	10 (50)	
IV	5 (25)	5 (25)	3 (15)	
12 months after surgery				0.822
I	5 (25)	5 (26)	3 (16)	
II	4 (20)	6 (32)	8 (42)	
III	8 (40)	6 (32)	6 (32)	
IV	3 (15)	2 (11)	2 (11)	

### 3 讨论

PBC治疗TN可缓解疼痛并避免药物带来的不良反应<sup>[12-13]</sup>。PBC常采用全身麻醉,但是部分患者因无法耐受全身麻醉而采用局部麻醉。

PBC术中刺激三叉神经颅内段、三叉神经节及颅外段均可引发TCR<sup>[14]</sup>,刺激传导到三叉神经感觉核,在核团内通过联络纤维将冲动传至疑核和迷走神经背核,激活心脏抑制性副交感神经,从而抑制心脏功能。临床表现为突发性血压下降和心率减慢,可伴有呼吸受累及胃肠道反应<sup>[15]</sup>。研究<sup>[6]</sup>表明,局部麻醉阻断传入通路可能会阻止TCR的发生,但是如何避免局部麻醉药产生的神经系统毒性是亟待解决的重要问题。局部麻醉药中毒初期表现为眩晕、口周麻木、耳鸣、视物不清、多语、寒战、惊恐不安和定向障碍,后期表现为癫痫、意识丧失、昏迷、呼吸抑制、心律失常甚至死亡<sup>[16]</sup>,引起神经系统毒性的局部麻醉药存在时间和剂量依赖性<sup>[17]</sup>,局部麻醉药直接注入颅内,可能出现严重的中毒症状。

本研究结果显示,在穿刺进入卵圆孔之前给予局部麻醉药,可以避免穿刺卵圆孔颅底部带来的剧烈疼痛和TCR。如果进入卵圆孔之前给予固定浓度的局部麻醉药(2%利多卡因)容量不足(0.5 mL),则无法得到良好的镇痛效果,抑制的TCR的作用也不充分,而足够容量(1 mL)的局部麻醉药不仅可以有效抑制穿刺疼痛,TCR的发生率也随之减低,提示在进入卵圆孔之前,麻醉药物容量应达到1 mL;入颅后,为防止局部麻醉药中毒,应将局部麻醉药容量控制为0.5 mL,本研究发现0.25%利多卡因与0.5%利多卡因在同样容量的情况下可获得相似的效果,提示颅内给予0.25%利多卡因0.5 mL可达到麻醉效果。为了防止术前应用镇痛药和阿托品对术中结果造成影响,本研究并未应用舒芬太尼和阿托品,但是在实际的手术操作之中,建议术前给予3 μg舒芬太尼和0.5 mg阿托品,以保证手术顺利完成。

PBC术中球囊的形状、压力和压迫时间是影响术后效果和并发症的主要因素。全身麻醉下无法个性化设定,而局部麻醉可以根据患者术中情况,灵活设定压力和压迫时间,以达到没有过度损伤的疼痛缓解。本研究3组患者远期面部疼痛和麻木无统计学差异,与文献<sup>[18]</sup>报道一致,表明术中的麻醉方

法对术后的治疗效果无影响。

综上所述,PBC术中穿刺针进入卵圆孔时应给予足量(2%利多卡因1 mL)局部麻醉药,以保证患者镇痛效果和抑制TCR;在球囊压迫时,低浓度局部麻醉药(0.25%利多卡因0.5 mL)同样可获得镇痛效果并抑制TCR。合理的局部麻醉策略可保证PBC术中镇痛效果和血流动力学稳定,术中应用局麻药方案对远期手术效果无明显影响。

#### 参考文献:

- [1] INTERNATIONAL HEADACHE SOCIETY. Headache classification committee of the international headache society (IHS) the international classification of headache disorders, 3rd edition [J]. *Cephalalgia*, 2018, 38 (1): 1-211. DOI: 10.1177/0333102417738202.
- [2] ZAKRZEWSKA JM, WU JH, MON-WILLIAMS M, et al. Evaluating the impact of trigeminal neuralgia [J]. *Pain*, 2017, 158 (6): 1166-1174. DOI: 10.1097/j.pain.0000000000000853.
- [3] BENDTSEN L, ZAKRZEWSKA JM, HEINSKOU TB, et al. Advances in diagnosis, classification, pathophysiology, and management of trigeminal neuralgia [J]. *Lancet Neurol*, 2020, 19 (9): 784-796. DOI: 10.1016/S1474-4422 (20) 30233-7.
- [4] WANG CM, GUAN ZY, WANG QC, et al. The effect of depth of anesthesia on hemodynamic changes induced by therapeutic compression of the trigeminal ganglion [J]. *J Neurosurg Anesthesiol*, 2020, 32 (4): 344-348. DOI: 10.1097/ANA.0000000000000612.
- [5] SWEET WH, POLETTI CE, ROBERTS JT. Dangerous rises in blood pressure upon heating of trigeminal rootlets; increased bleeding times in patients with trigeminal neuralgia [J]. *Neurosurgery*, 1985, 17 (5): 843-844. DOI: 10.1227/00006123-198511000-00022.
- [6] TIBANO AT, DE SIQUEIRA SRDT, DA NÓBREGA JCM, et al. Cardiovascular response during trigeminal ganglion compression for trigeminal neuralgia according to the use of local anesthetics [J]. *Acta Neurochir*, 2010, 152 (8): 1347-1351. DOI: 10.1007/s00701-010-0664-z.
- [7] ZHAO DL, LI J, MA C, et al. Cardiovascular response to gasserian ganglion ablation on trigeminal neuralgia under local anesthesia: a retrospective single-blind case-control study [J]. *BMC Anesthesiol*, 2022, 22 (1): 104. DOI: 10.1186/s12871-022-01644-2.
- [8] ZHI D, GUO YN, HE LL, et al. Percutaneous balloon compression of trigeminal ganglion under conscious sedation local anesthesia for the treatment of primary trigeminal neuralgia—a prospective cohort study [J]. *Front Neurol*, 2023, 14: 1144034. DOI: 10.3389/fneur.2023.1144034.
- [9] XIA YH, YU G, MIN FX, et al. The focus and new progress of percutaneous balloon compression for the treatment of trigeminal neuralgia [J]. *J Pain Res*, 2022, 15: 3059-3068. DOI: 10.2147/JPR.S374433.
- [10] SCHALLER B, CORNELIUS JF, PRABHAKAR H, et al. The trigemino-cardiac reflex: an update of the current knowledge [J]. *J Neurosurg Anesthesiol*, 2009, 21 (3): 187-195. DOI: 10.1097/ANA.0b013e3181a2bf22.
- [11] PRZYBYLowski CJ, COLE TS, BARANOSKI JF, et al. Radiosurgery for multiple sclerosis-related trigeminal neuralgia: retrospective review of long-term outcomes [J]. *J Neurosurg*, 2018, 131 (5): 1583-1590. DOI: 10.3171/2018.5.JNS173194.

- [12] SPATZ AL, ZAKRZEWSKA JM, KAY EJ. Decision analysis of medical and surgical treatments for trigeminal neuralgia: how patient evaluations of benefits and risks affect the utility of treatment decisions [J]. *Pain*, 2007, 131 (3): 302-310. DOI: 10.1016/j.pain.2007.02.009.
- [13] BENDTSEN L, ZAKRZEWSKA JM, ABBOTT J, et al. European Academy of Neurology guideline on trigeminal neuralgia [J]. *Eur J Neurol*, 2019, 26 (6): 831-849. DOI: 10.1111/ene.13950.
- [14] SCHALLER B, CHOWDHURY T. The trigeminocardiac reflex and implications for neuroanesthesia [J]. *J Neurosurg Anesthesiol*, 2021, 33 (1): 5-7. DOI: 10.1097/ANA.0000000000000735.
- [15] MEUWLY C, GOLANOV E, CHOWDHURY T, et al. Trigeminal cardiac reflex: new thinking model about the definition based on a literature review [J]. *Medicine*, 2015, 94 (5): e484. DOI: 10.1097/MD.0000000000000484.
- [16] WU CL, BERENHOLTZ SM, PRONOVOST PJ, et al. Systematic review and analysis of postdischarge symptoms after outpatient surgery [J]. *Anesthesiology*, 2002, 96 (4): 994-1003. DOI: 10.1097/0000542-200204000-00030.
- [17] VERLINDE M, HOLLMANN MW, STEVENS MF, et al. Local anesthetic-induced neurotoxicity [J]. *Int J Mol Sci*, 2016, 17 (3): 339. DOI: 10.3390/ijms17030339.
- [18] LI MW, JIANG XF, NIU CS. Efficacy of and risk factors for percutaneous balloon compression for trigeminal neuralgia in elderly patients [J]. *Br J Neurosurg*, 2021, 35 (3): 280-284. DOI: 10.1080/02688697.2020.1787341.

(编辑 于 溪)

(上接第160页)

- jso.26844.
- [2] AJANI JA, D'AMICO TA, BENTREM DJ, et al. Gastric cancer, version 2.2022, NCCN clinical practice guidelines in oncology [J]. *J Natl Compr Canc Netw*, 2022, 20 (2): 167-192. DOI: 10.6004/jncn.2022.0008.
- [3] SIEGEL R, MILLER KD, WAGLE NS, et al. Cancer statistics, 2023 [J]. *CA A Cancer J Clin*, 2023, 73: 17-48. DOI: 10.3322/caac.21763.
- [4] USMAN M, OKLA MK, ASIF HM, et al. A pan-cancer analysis of GINS complex subunit 4 to identify its potential role as a biomarker in multiple human cancers [J]. *Am J Cancer Res*, 2022, 12 (3): 986-1008.
- [5] 王元花, 彭小燕, 刘晓君, 等. PD-1/PD-L1抑制剂对比常规疗法治疗癌症的有效性和安全性的Meta分析 [J]. *现代肿瘤医学*, 2020, 28 (10): 1731-1738. DOI: 10.3969/j.issn.1672-4992.2020.10.028.
- [6] YI M, ZHENG XL, NIU MK, et al. Combination strategies with PD-1/PD-L1 blockade: current advances and future directions [J]. *Mol Cancer*, 2022, 21 (1): 28. DOI: 10.1186/s12943-021-01489-2.
- [7] JIN DH, YUAN LG, LI F, et al. GINS4 might be a novel prognostic immune-related biomarker of not only esophageal squamous cell carcinoma and other cancers [J]. *BMC Med Genomics*, 2022, 15 (1): 75. DOI: 10.1186/s12920-022-01223-x.
- [8] 中华医学会肿瘤学分会, 中华医学会杂志社. 中华医学会胃癌临床诊疗指南 (2021版) [J]. *中华医学杂志*, 2022, 102 (16): 1169-1189. DOI: 10.3760/cma.j.cn112137-20220127-00197.
- [9] HUANG CM, LIU H, HU YF, et al. Laparoscopic vs open distal gastrectomy for locally advanced gastric cancer: five-year outcomes from the CLASS-01 randomized clinical trial [J]. *JAMA Surg*, 2022, 157 (1): 9-17. DOI: 10.1001/jamasurg.2021.5104.
- [10] FAGHFURI E, SHADBAD MA, FAGHFOURI AH, et al. Cellular immunotherapy in gastric cancer: adoptive cell therapy and dendritic cell-based vaccination [J]. *Immunotherapy*, 2022, 14 (6): 475-488. DOI: 10.2217/imt-2021-0285.
- [11] ZHANG KX, ZHOU J, WU T, et al. Combined analysis of expression, prognosis and immune infiltration of GINS family genes in human sarcoma [J]. *Aging*, 2022, 14 (14): 5895-5907. DOI: 10.18632/aging.204191.
- [12] SHAN DD, ZHENG QX, CHEN Z. Go-ichi-Ni-San 2: a potential biomarker and therapeutic target in human cancers [J]. *World J Gastrointest Oncol*, 2022, 14 (10): 1892-1902. DOI: 10.4251/wjgo.v14.i10.1892.
- [13] YUKAMI H, KAWAZOE A, LIN YT, et al. Updated efficacy outcomes of anti-PD-1 antibodies plus multikinase inhibitors for patients with advanced gastric cancer with or without liver metastases in clinical trials [J]. *Clin Cancer Res*, 2022, 28 (16): 3480-3488. DOI: 10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-22-0630.
- [14] LI X, ZHAI J, SHEN YK, et al. Tumor-derived IL-8 facilitates lymph node metastasis of gastric cancer via PD-1 up-regulation in CD8<sup>+</sup>T cells [J]. *Cancer Immunol Immunother*, 2022, 71 (12): 3057-3070. DOI: 10.1007/s00262-022-03223-3.
- [15] QIN L, WANG L, ZHANG JC, et al. Therapeutic strategies targeting uPAR potentiate anti-PD-1 efficacy in diffuse-type gastric cancer [J]. *Sci Adv*, 2022, 8 (21): eabn3774. DOI: 10.1126/sciadv.abn3774.

(编辑 于 溪)