SUBMITTED 14 MAR 24
REVISION REQ. 5 MAY 24; REVISION RECD. 4 JUN 24
ACCEPTED 2 JUL 24
ONLINE-FIRST: JULY 2024
DOI: https://doi.org/10.18295/squmj.7.2024.045

Short-term Weight Loss Outcomes of 104 Mini Gastric Bypass or One Anastomosis Gastric Bypass Operations

Retrospective study

Nabaz H. Ismael,[1] *Nazar P. Shabila[2,3]

[1]Rizgary Teaching Hospital, Erbil Directorate of Health, Erbil, Iraq; [2]College of Health Sciences, Catholic University in Erbil, Erbil, Iraq; [3]Department of Community Medicine, College of Medicine, Hawler Medical University, Erbil, Iraq
**Corresponding Author's E-mail: nazarshabila@gmail.com*

Abstract

Objectives: This study aimed to examine the short-term effects of Mini gastric bypass (MGB) or one anastomosis gastric bypass (OAGB) procedures on weight loss in individuals with obesity. ***Methods:*** This retrospective study was conducted in Iraq from January 2019 to May 2020. 104 patients with obesity underwent MGB or OAGB surgery in a single center in Iraq. Preoperative body mass index (BMI), age, height, and preoperative weight were recorded as baseline measures. Weight-related changes were evaluated during a follow-up phase of 48 weeks. ***Results:*** The mean baseline parameters of the subjects before surgery included 1.64 meters for height, 122.9 kg for weight, and 45.6 kg/m² for BMI. During the 48-week follow-up period, there was a substantial reduction in mean weight, which dropped from 122.9 kg at baseline to 75.5 kg at week 48. The weight change (in percentage) gradually increased from -11.8% at week 12 to -37.9% at week 48, without statistically significant association with demographic factors or chronic diseases. From week 12 to week 48, the percentage of excess weight loss (%EWL) increased substantially from 26.8% to 86.1%. The results of the subgroup analysis indicated that the %EWL was considerably higher among those aged 30 or older at week 36 and singles at week 48. ***Conclusion:*** The results of this study illustrate the efficacy of

MGB or OAGB procedures in significantly reducing weight in the short term. The %EWL increased with the follow up time and it was significantly associated with age and marital status.

Keywords: Mini Gastric Bypass; One Anastomosis Gastric Bypass; obesity; weight reduction; Bariatric surgery.

Advances in Knowledge

- The findings of this study will serve as a guide for bariatric surgery teams regarding the efficacy of MGB or OAGB procedures in achieving a significant weight reduction in the short term among patients with obesity.

Application to Patient Care

- Knowing and addressing the factors that significantly affect the percentage of excess weight loss among the patients with obesity who underwent the MGB or OAGB procedure will help in selecting the patients for a better weight loss group.

Introduction

Globally, sleeve gastrectomy has emerged as the predominant bariatric intervention of choice for the treatment of morbid obesity, which is a complex chronic disease when person has a body mass index (BMI) of ≥40 or a BMI of ≥35 with obesity-related health conditions. Sleeve gastrectomy has exhibited encouraging results throughout its initial years, significantly bolstering the appeal of this procedure. However, recent criticism has focused on surgery in light of moderate long-term weight reduction and/or increased incidence of postoperative reflux.[1,2]

One anastomosis gastric bypass (OAGB) has become a well-recognized standard operation in bariatric surgery. It is currently ranked as the third most frequently performed bariatric procedure internationally.[3] An increasing body of research has documented favorable and lasting outcomes with weight reduction and resolution of comorbidities.[4] Parikh et al., in a literature review, revealed that OAGB is safe and feasible, with short operative times, low complication rates, and excellent weight loss outcomes.[5] Moreover, several randomized controlled trials have reported outstanding weight loss results following primary OAGB at 12 months, two years, and five years follow-up.[6,7] In addition, several comparative studies have been carried out between OAGB and other common procedures, including sleeve gastrectomy and Roux-en-Y gastric bypass (RYGB).[8,9] For example, Vrakopoulou et al. supported the use of OAGB over sleeve gastrectomy in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus (DM2) and super-obesity (BMI > 50 kg/m2) during short-term follow-up.[10]

Surgical procedures have emerged as crucial tools in the ongoing fight against obesity, offering effective resolution to people who are grappling with serious health complications associated with their weight. Mini gastric bypass (MGB) or OAGB has surfaced among the diverse array of bariatric surgeries as pioneering and effective methods, with prospects for enduring weight reduction and enhanced general well-being. MGB is a simplified alternative to traditional gastric bypass surgery.[11] During this minimally invasive operation, a slender tube-shaped structure is created from the stomach and directly attached to the small intestine. By rerouting the digestive system, MGB significantly affects nutritional absorption and reduces the amount of food consumed, leading to substantial weight loss. [11,12]

The possibility of MGB surgery producing results comparable to conventional gastric bypass surgery while reducing operating complexity has attracted attention due to its streamlined design. OAGB represents an additional notable progression within the domain of bariatric surgery.[13] This method establishes a single anastomosis or connection between the stomach and the small intestine. By simplifying the surgical procedure, OAGB aims to preserve the efficacy of gastric bypass while reducing the hazards typically associated with more intricate treatments. There is limited research evidence on its exact mechanisms of action, and this has led to often dangerous technical practices. Many surgeons believe malabsorption is a key action mechanism in this procedure.[12] It is also thought that similar to MGB, OAGB promotes weight loss through dietary restriction and modification of nutrient absorption in the digestive tract.[12,13] Research has shown that multiple factors affect weight loss success following MGB or OAGB surgery. Structural modifications, like stomach restriction and altered nutritional absorption, are crucial for reducing calorie intake and promoting weight loss.[14] Additionally, favorable hormonal changes post-surgery, such as increased satiety hormones and decreased appetite hormones, contribute to sustained weight loss in these procedures.[15]

MGB or OAGB is shown to be a promising surgical treatment for rapid weight reduction and management of obesity-related health conditions. However, research has reported different complications and side effects following MGB and OAGB, including complications occurring intraoperatively, immediate, early, and late postoperative complications, and other complications and side effects. Early complications that range from 3.5% to 7.5% are considered acceptable.[16,17] Major complications that might require reoperation or prolonged hospital stay are reported at a rate of 2% to 3% of patients with MGB and OAGB.[18] Leaks and hemorrhage can occur in the early postoperative period. The occurrence rate of these complications during the first couple of postoperative weeks is 0.7% to 2%.[17]

Both MGB and OAGB have attracted attention due to their potential to treat comorbidities such as sleep apnea, hypertension, and type 2 diabetes, in addition to obesity. According to recent studies, MGB and OAGB have shown promise as alternative surgical interventions for the effective management of obesity and its associated comorbidities with less surgical complexity.[19] This study aimed to examine the short-term effects of MGB or OAGB procedures on weight loss in patients with obesity.

Methods

This retrospective cohort study was carried out in a single medical facility in Iraq from January 2019 to May 2020. During this study period, 240 bariatric surgeries were carried out at this medical facility, including 115 MGB or OAGB surgeries. This study consisted of a total of 104 patients with obesity who underwent MGB or OAGB surgery. All the individuals aged 20 to 65 years who underwent MGB or OAGB surgery for morbid obesity at this specific center during the study period were included in the study. This age group was specifically selected as the ideal age for such a procedure. A total of 11 patients were excluded from the study. Exclusion criteria included loss to follow-up, pregnancy during follow-up periods, and revisional or conversational MGB or OAGB. Pregnant women were excluded as the change in weight did not reflect the actual change in weight related to the procedure. The sample size was calculated based on an average mean %EWL of 80, standard deviation of 20, and a margin of error of 4,[20], which resulted in 100.

The medical records of the patients from 6 August to 14 September 2023 were accessed. The medical records included the standardized paper forms used to record the patient data at the hospital and the follow-up data. These data were directly recorded by entering into an electronic Excel sheet. The authors had no access to information that could identify individual participants during or after data collection. Demographic information for each participant, as well as their clinical history, was meticulously recorded. Measurements taken at the beginning of the study comprised the patient's age (in years), height (in meters), presurgery weight (in kilograms), and body mass index (BMI) (in kg/m2). These parameters were methodically documented to develop an in-depth profile of the study participants.

The postoperative follow-up phase lasted 48 weeks, and the patient visited the hospital/clinic. The first visit was scheduled two weeks after bariatric surgery, the second visit four weeks after surgery, and the third visit 12 weeks after surgery. The subsequent visits were scheduled at 12-week intervals for the first year after surgery. Postoperative dietary advice was given to the patients, including eating and drinking slowly, chewing food thoroughly, keeping meals small, drinking liquids between meals, and taking recommended vitamin and mineral supplements.

To determine whether surgical treatments were successful, researchers measured the patient's weight throughout the study period (i.e., Week 12, 24, 36, and 48). Throughout the follow-up period, participants' average body weight was monitored at set intervals so that researchers could detect swings and patterns in their weight reduction. The weight was measured by a professional physician-grade digital scale. The scale was placed on firm flooring. After removing shoes and heavy clothing, the patient was weighted by standing with both feet in the center of the scale. The weight was recorded to the nearest decimal fraction (e.g., 65.7 kilograms).

The most important indicator of success was the decrease in the overall weight of the participant during the study's 48-week follow-up. The main outcome measures included the percentage of weight change and the percentage of excess weight loss (%EWL). The percentage of weight change refers to the amount of weight lost by an individual following the surgical procedure, typically expressed as a percentage of their initial body weight. It was calculated by the following formula: ((follow-up weight - presurgery weight) / (presurgery weight) X 100).

The percentage of excess weight loss (%EWL).is a metric used to quantify the amount of weight lost by an individual in relation to their excess weight. It is commonly utilized in the context of weight loss interventions, such as bariatric surgery, to assess the effectiveness of the treatment. It is calculated by dividing the difference between initial and final weight by the difference between initial weight and a "normal" target weight. The "normal" target weight is based on a BMI of 25 kg/m2, the upper limit of a "normal" BMI. Thus, the following formula was used to calculate %EWL: ((Initial weight− follow-up weight)/ (Ideal weight-

Initial weight) ×100). The ideal weight was determined by taking the patient's presurgery weight and dividing it by 25, which is the weight required to have a maximum normal BMI (i.e., 25 kg/m2).

The test-retest approach was used to assess the reliability of the questionnaire, and the Kappa statistic was calculated, which showed a reliability coefficient of 0.82. Ten experts in the field evaluated the content and face validity of the questionnaire; the calculated content validity index and content validity ratio were 0.87 and 0.89, respectively.

Statistical Analysis

Using descriptive statistics, a summary of the study participants, including their demographic and clinical information, was created. Means and standard deviations were used to describe continuous variables. The presentation included the frequencies and percentages of the categorical variables, the percentage of weight change, and the percentage of excess weight loss (%EWL). Tables were used to report the statistical results.

The distribution of continuous variables was assessed using the Kolmogorov-Smornov and Shapiro–Wilk tests, which showed that the data were normally distributed. Therefore, paired t-test was used to compare mean weight, mean percentage of weight loss, and mean %EWL at several time intervals. Also, the Student's t-test was used to compare the mean percentage of weight loss and the mean %EWL between two groups, and ANOVA was used to compare the means among three or more groups. A statistically significant result was considered to have a P value of less than 0.05.

Ethical Considerations

The research was carried out in accordance with the ethical standards and precepts outlined in the Declaration of Helsinki. The research ethics committee of the author(s) institute approved the research protocol for the study. No consent was required as secondary data were analyzed anonymously.

AI chatbot ChatGPT and Grammarly were used to improve the language and edit the English language in parts of the Introduction, Methods, and Discussion sections.

Results

This study included 104 patients with obesity who underwent MGB or OAGB surgery. Most of the participants were women (72.1%), 31-40 years of age (42.3%), and married (76.9%). Approximately 83% had chronic diseases (Table 1).

The presurgery age, height, weight, and BMI measures of patients who underwent MGB or OAGB due to obesity are shown in Table 2. The mean age±SD at baseline was 35.3±10.7 years (range 20-64). The mean±SD height was 1.6±0.1 meters (range 1.5-1.9). The mean±SD presurgery weight was 122.9±20.9 kg (range 88.0-201.0). The mean±SD presurgery BMI was 45.6±6.4 kg/m^2 (range 37.1-72.7).

The mean weight of the participants decreased remarkably from 122.9 kg at baseline to 108.1 kg at week 12, 94.5 kg at week 24, 83.1 kg at week 36, and 75.5 kg at week 48. The weight loss was statistically significant from one follow-up time point to another at P <0.001, as shown in Table 3.

The weight change (%) was -11.8% at week 12 and increased remarkably during the follow-up period to -22.7% at week 24, -31.8% at week 36, and -37.9% at week 48. The weight change (%) was statistically significant from one follow-up time point to another at P <0.001. The weight change (%) was not significantly associated with demographic variables or the presence of chronic diseases (Table 4).

The %EWL was 26.8% at week 12, which increased remarkably during the follow-up period to 51.5% at week 24, 72.3% at week 36, and 86.1% at week 48. The increase in %EWL was statistically significant from one follow-up time point to another at P <0.001. The %EWL at week 36 was significantly higher among age groups 20-30 compared to 31-40 and >40 groups (75.9% vs 71.4% and 69.7%, P = 0.048). % EWL at week 48 was significantly higher among single than married patients (90.1% vs 84.9%, P = 0.022). Details of %EWL during the follow-up period and the association with different demographic variables are shown in Table 5.

Discussion

In the current study, the significant decrease in mean weight observed in participants who received MGB or OAGB surgery over the 48-week follow-up period is consistent with the expected effects of bariatric procedures. These findings are consistent with previous research on the effectiveness of these methods in achieving significant weight loss. The decrease in mean weight from 122.9 kg at baseline to 75.5 kg at week 48 is considered a significant and constant weight loss, showing that the MGB or OAGB operations effectively support short-term weight management. Comparable studies, such as the 5-year prospective study conducted by Magro et al.,[8] revealed comparable weight loss patterns after bariatric surgery, highlighting the long-term success of these therapies.

The observed weight loss trajectory, with consistent declines in each follow-up period, reflects the expected pattern of steady weight loss after bariatric surgery. This is consistent with the findings of Schauer et al., who highlighted the gradual nature of weight loss after gastric bypass surgery in a 5-year prospective outcome study.[21] The findings are also consistent with those of Adams et al., who reported sustained weight loss during a similar follow-up in a prospective cohort study.[22]

While there was a significant and gradual decrease in mean weight post-MGB-OAGB surgery, we should consider potential confounders such as adherence to postoperative care and lifestyle changes. Adherence to postoperative dietary and lifestyle recommendations has a significant impact on weight loss outcomes. Research has shown that patient compliance with dietary modifications has an essential role in sustaining long-term weight loss post-surgery.[23]

Several factors influence the success of weight loss after MGB or OAGB surgery. The structural modifications of these treatments, such as stomach restriction and altered nutritional absorption, play a critical role in reducing calorie intake and facilitating weight loss.[14] Furthermore, positive hormonal changes after surgery, such as increased satiety hormones and decreased appetite hormones, contribute to the long-term weight loss found in these studies.[15]

In addition to post-surgery hormonal changes contributing to weight loss, other potential mechanisms, such as altered gut microbiota and metabolic adaptations, may influence weight reduction. Research has shown that preoperative gut microbiota can influence bariatric surgery outcomes. The Prevotella to Bacteroides ratio is significantly higher in those who respond to surgical procedures.[24]

Individual disparities in weight reduction exist, and factors such as adherence to postoperative food and lifestyle advice, metabolic differences, and genetic predispositions can influence outcomes.[23] As a result, ongoing research and comparisons with similar studies can provide a more comprehensive understanding of the factors that impact weight reduction following MGB or OAGB procedures. Metabolic differences are crucial in determining how individuals respond to bariatric surgery and achieve weight loss goals. Pre-existing insulin resistance, dyslipidemia, and low resting metabolic rate impact a patient's ability to achieve sustained weight loss post-surgery (Ragavan, Keshavjee).[25,26] Genetic factors play a significant role in influencing weight loss responses post-bariatric surgery. Genetic predispositions towards increased appetite, slower metabolism, and reduced insulin sensitivity may contribute to the patient’s challenges in achieving sustained weight loss following surgery (Keshavjee).[26]

The significant weight reduction, as measured by weight change (%) and %EWL over the follow-up period, reflects the effectiveness of MGB or OAGB surgery in inducing and maintaining significant weight loss. The percentage change in weight increased significantly from -11.8% at week 12 to -37.9% at week 48. This trend is consistent with earlier prospective studies on bariatric surgery results, demonstrating the slow and prolonged nature of postoperative weight loss.[8,21] The constant increase in weight loss size over time demonstrates the durability and effectiveness of MGB or OAGB procedures to achieve long-term weight loss.

The %EWL, a key indicator in determining the efficacy of bariatric therapy, followed a similar pattern of consistent improvement throughout the study. The considerable increase from 26.8 percent at week 12 to 86.1 percent at week 48 underscores the long-term influence of the MGB-OAGB procedures on excess weight loss. These findings are consistent with the goals of bariatric surgery, which are to reduce total body weight and address the health hazards associated with obesity.[21]

The correlation analysis with demographic factors found some interesting trends. The significantly higher %EWL among the age group 20-30 years at week 36 compared to the 31-40 and >40 age groups is consistent with previous research.[28] This finding might indicate potential age-related changes in weight loss response, with younger patients losing a greater amount of excess weight than older patients after bariatric surgery. Another prospective comparative study reported this tendency, which is useful as a postoperative predictor for weight loss in patients undergoing bariatric surgery.[28] A case series study revealed that positive social support leads to significantly more weight loss through appropriate lifestyle change.[29] In this sense, there is expected to be more weight loss in married than in unmarried patients. However, our study revealed a considerably higher %EWL among unmarried patients at week 48 compared to married patients, a finding that requires further exploration. These findings highlight the multidimensional character of weight loss outcomes, which are impacted by factors other than the surgical process. Although the procedures were generally beneficial, knowing demographic differences can help personalize postoperative care and support for more personalized results.[30]

Strengths and Limitations

The main strengths of the current study include having a robust follow-up period and detailed data collection. This study has several limitations, including limitations and biases inherent in the study design and methods, such as having a retrospective design, small sample size, selection bias, measurement bias, and a single-center setting that limit the robustness of the study and generalizability of the findings. This study only assessed the weight reduction outcome of MGB or OAGB and did not assess the complications encountered in these patients. A good weight reduction procedure would be useful if associated with a low complication rate. The current study also has limitations or constraints associated with the statistical analysis sample size limitations, missing data, and lack of sensitivity analysis and association or confounding analysis.

Conclusion

Essentially, this study supports the promising role of MGB or OAGB operations in addressing the complex challenges of obesity. The significant and persistent weight loss outcomes of this study provide clinicians and patients with helpful information for successful and sustainable decision-making about weight management. The practical implications of this study for clinical practice include helping establish patients' selection criteria and postoperative monitoring, especially with the demographic trends of age and marital status identified by this study. This can help in having personalized treatment approaches post-MGB-OAGB surgery. Future research should address the longer-term weight reduction of MGB or OAGB and the associated complications.

Authors' contribution

NHI and NPS conceptualized and designed the study. NHI collected the data. NPS performed data analysis. NHI and NPS wrote the manuscript. Both authors read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Funding

No funding was received for this study.

References

1. Rodríguez F, Herrera A, Sepúlveda EM, Guilbert L, Hernández LA, Peñuñuri LF, et al. Weight loss before bariatric surgery and its impact on poor versus excellent outcomes at 2 years. La Langenbecks Arch Surg 2022; 407(3):1047-53. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00423-021-02399-z.

2. El-Hadi M, Birch DW, Gill RS, Karmali S. The effect of bariatric surgery on gastroesophageal reflux disease. Can J Surg 2014; 57(2):139-44. https://doi.org/10.1503/cjs.030612.

3. Angrisani L, Santonicola A, Iovino P, Ramos A, Shikora S, Kow L. Bariatric Surgery Survey 2018: Similarities and Disparities Among the 5 IFSO Chapters. Obes Surg 2021; 31(5):1937–48. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11695-020-05207-7.

4. Cadena D, Ramírez C, Ferreira A, Albarran A, Sosa E, Molina M, et al. Are there really any predictive factors for successful weight loss after bariatric surgery? BMC Endocr Disord 2020; 20:20. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12902-020-0499-4.

5. Parikh M, Eisenberg D, Johnson J, El-Chaar M. American Society for Metabolic and Bariatric Surgery review of the literature on one-anastomosis gastric bypass. Surg Obes Relat Dis 2018; 14:1088-92. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soard.2018.04.017.

6. Lee WJ, Chong K, Lin YH, Wei JH, Chen SC. Laparoscopic sleeve gastrectomy versus single anastomosis (mini-) gastric bypass for the treatment of type 2 diabetes mellitus: 5-year results of a randomized trial and study of incretin effect. Obes Surg 2014; 24(9):1552–62. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11695-014-1344-5.

7. Seetharamaiah S, Tantia O, Goyal G, et al. LSG vs OAGB—1 Year Follow-up Data—a Randomized Control Trial. Obes Surg 2017; 27:948-54. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11695-016-2403-x.

8. Magro DO, Geloneze B, Delfini R, Pareja BC, Callejas F, Pareja JC. Long-term weight regain after gastric bypass: a 5-year prospective study. Obes Surg 2008; 18(6):648-51. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11695-007-9265-1.

9. Reynolds K, Barton LJ, Basu A, Fischer H, Arterburn DE, Barthold D, et al. Comparative effectiveness of gastric bypass and vertical sleeve gastrectomy for hypertension remission and relapse: the ENGAGE CVD study. Hypertension 2021; 78(4):1116-25. https://doi.org/10.1161/HYPERTENSIONAHA.120.16934.

10. Vrakopoulou GZ, Theodoropoulos C, Kalles V, Zografos G, Almpanopoulos K. Type 2 diabetes mellitus status in obese patients following sleeve gastrectomy or one anastomosis gastric bypass. Sci Rep 2021; 11(1):4421. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-83807-8.

11. Elnahas AI, Jackson TD, Hong D. Management of failed laparoscopic Roux-en-Y gastric bypass. Bariatr Surg Pract Patient Care 2014; 9(1):36-40. https://doi.org/10.1089/bari.2013.0012.

12. Ahuja A, Mahawar K. Laparoscopic OAGB/MGB: Mechanism of Action. In: Agrawal, S. (eds) Obesity, Bariatric and Metabolic Surgery. Springer: Cham; 2021.

13. Nickel F, de la Garza JR, Werthmann FS, Benner L, Tapking C, Karadza E, et al. Predictors of risk and success of obesity surgery. Obes Facts 2019; 12(4):427–39. https://doi.org/10.1159/000496939.

14. Ponti F, Santoro A, Mercatelli D, Gasperini C, Conte M, Martucci M, et al. Aging and imaging assessment of body composition: from fat to facts. Front Endocrinol 2020; 10:861. https://doi.org/10.3389/fendo.2019.0086.

15. Simati S, Kokkinos A, Dalamaga M, Argyrakopoulou G. Obesity Paradox: Fact or Fiction? Curr Obes Rep 2023:12(2):75-85. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13679-023-00497-1.

16. Carbajo MA, Luque-de-León E, Jiménez JM, Ortiz-de-Solórzano J, Pérez-Miranda M, Castro-Alija MJ. Laparoscopic One-Anastomosis Gastric Bypass: Technique, Results, and Long-Term Follow-Up in 1200 Patients. Obes Surg 2017; 27:1153-67. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11695-016-2428-1.

17. Aleman R, Lo Menzo E, Szomstein S, Rosenthal RJ. Efficiency and risks of one-anastomosis gastric bypass. Ann Transl Med. 2020; 8(Suppl 1):S7. https://doi.org/10.21037/atm.2020.02.03.

18. Piazza L, Ferrara F, Leanza S, Coco D, Sarvà S, Bellia A. Laparoscopic mini-gastric bypass: short-term single-institute experience. Updates Surg 2011; 63:239-42. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13304-011-0119-y.

19. Hagström H, Ekstedt M, Olbers T, Peltonen M, Carlsson L. Bariatric surgery versus standard obesity treatment and the risk of severe liver disease: data from the Swedish Obese Subjects study. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol 2021; 19(12):2675-6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cgh.2020.11.009.

20. Slagter N, de Heide LJM, Jutte EH, Kaijser MA, Damen SL, van Beek AP, et al. Outcomes of the One Anastomosis Gastric Bypass with Various Biliopancreatic Limb Lengths: a Retrospective Single-Center Cohort Study. Obes Surg 2021; 31(10):4236-42. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11695-021-05555-y.

21. Schauer PR, Bhatt DL, Kirwan JP, Wolski K, Aminian A, Brethauer SA, et al. Bariatric surgery versus intensive medical therapy for diabetes—5-year outcomes. N Engl J Med 2017; 376(7):641-51. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1600869.

22. Adams KF, Schatzkin A, Harris TB, Kipnis V, Mouw T, Ballard-Barbash R, et al. Overweight, obesity, and mortality in a large prospective cohort of persons 50 to 71 years old. N Engl J Med 2006; 355(8):763-78. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa055643.

23. Cornejo-Pareja I, Molina-Vega M, Gómez-Pérez AM, Damas-Fuentes M, Tinahones FJ. Factors Related to Weight Loss Maintenance in the Medium–Long Term after Bariatric Surgery: A Review. J Clin Med 2021; 10(8):1739. https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm10081739.

24. Gutiérrez-Repiso C, Garrido-Sánchez L, Alcaide-Torres J, Cornejo-Pareja I, Ocaña-Wilhelmi L, García-Fuentes E, Moreno-Indias I, Tinahones FJ. Predictive Role of Gut Microbiota in Weight Loss Achievement after Bariatric Surgery. J Am Coll Surg 2022; 234(5):861-71. https://doi.org/10.1097/XCS.0000000000000145.

25. Ragavan S, Elhelw O, Majeed W, Alkhaffaf B, Senapati S, Ammori BJ, et al. Weight Loss Following Bariatric Surgery in People with or without Metabolic Syndrome: A 5-Year Observational Comparative Study. J Clin Med 2024; 13(1):256. https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm13010256.

26. Keshavjee SH, Schwenger KJP, Yadav J, Jackson TD, Okrainec A, Allard JP. Factors Affecting Metabolic Outcomes Post Bariatric Surgery: Role of Adipose Tissue. J Clin Med 2021; 10(4):714. https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm10040714.

27. Rheinwalt KP, Schipper S, Plamper A, Alizai PH, Trebicka J, Brol MJ, et al. Roux-en-Y Versus One Anastomosis Gastric Bypass as Redo-Operations Following Sleeve Gastrectomy:

A Retrospective Study. World J Surg 2022; 46(4):855–64. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00268-021-06424-6.

28. Contreras JE, Santander C, Court I, Bravo J. Correlation between age and weight loss after bariatric surgery. Obes Surg 2013; 23(8):1286-9. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11695-013-0905-3.

29. Mehta A, Hutfless S, Blair AB, Karcher M, Nasatka S, Schweitzer M, Magnuson T, Nguyen HT. Outcomes of Partnered Individuals Undergoing Bariatric Surgery Together: A Single Institution Case Series. Obes Surg 2017; 27(8):2207-10. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11695-017-2728-0.

30. Jain M, Tantia O, Goyal G, Chaudhuri T, Khanna S, Poddar A, et al. LSG vs MGB-OAGB: 5-Year Follow-up Data and Comparative Outcome of the Two Procedures over Long Term-Results of a Randomised Control Trial. Obes Surg 2021; 31(3):1223–32. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11695-020-05119-6.

Table 1: Demographic characteristics of patients with obesity who underwent mini gastric bypass or one anastomosis gastric bypass surgery.

Characteristics	**No.**	**(%)**
Gender		
Male	29	(27.9)
Female	75	(72.1)
Age group (years)		
20-30	31	(29.8)
31-40	44	(42.3)
>40	29	(27.9)
Marital status		
Single	24	(23.1)
Married	80	(76.9)
Chronic diseases		
No	18	(17.3)
Yes	86	(82.7)
Total	104	(100.0)

Table 2: Baseline characteristics of patients with obesity who underwent mini gastric bypass or one anastomosis gastric bypass surgery.

Variable	**Mean**	**SD**	**Minimum**	**Maximum**
Age at baseline (years)	35.3	10.7	20.0	64.0
Height in meters	1.6	0.1	1.5	1. 9
Presurgery weight in Kg	122.9	20.9	88.0	201.0
Presurgery BMI (kg/m2)	45.6	6.4	37.1	72.7

Table 3: Changes in mean weight during the follow-up period for patients with obesity who underwent mini gastric bypass or one anastomosis gastric bypass surgery.

Weight (Kg)	**Mean**	**SD**	***P* value***
Baseline	122.9	20.9	
Week 12	108.1	17.3	<0.001
Week 24	94.5	13.9	<0.001
Week 36	83.1	10.9	<0.001
Week 48	75.5	9.9	<0.001

* The *P* value compares each follow-up period with the previous period.

Table 4: Change in weight (%) during the follow-up period for patients with obesity who underwent mini gastric bypass or one anastomosis gastric bypass surgery and association with different demographic variables.

Variable	**Weight change (%)**							
	Weak 12		**Weak 24**		**Weak 36**		**Weak 48**	
	Mean	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**
Total	-11.8	4.1	-22.7	5.0	-31.8	5.6	-37.9	6.0
P value*	-		<0.001		<0.001		<0.001	
Age group (years)								
20-30	-12.4	3.9	-22.9	4.4	-32.5	4.6	-38.2	5.9
31-40	-11.5	4.4	-22.2	5.4	-31.0	5.9	-37.4	6.5
>40	-11.5	4.0	-23.1	5.0	-32.2	6.0	-38.4	5.4
P value	0.248		0.280		0.680		0.678	
Gender								
Male	-12.0	4.3	-23.1	5.6	-31.9	6.1	-38.3	6.5
Female	-11.7	4.1	-22.5	4.7	-31.7	5.4	-37.8	5.8
P value	0.719		0.563		0.860		0.677	
Marital status								
Single	-12.3	4.0	-22.7	3.8	-32.7	5.1	-39.5	6.3
Married	-11.7	4.2	-22.7	5.3	-31.5	5.7	-37.4	5.8
P value	0.522		0.990		0.375		0.132	
Chronic diseases								
No	-12.4	4.5	-22.7	4.0	-31.9	4.6	-38.2	6.4
Yes	-11.7	4.1	-22.7	5.2	-31.8	5.8	-37.9	6.0
P value	0.525		0.979		0.934		0.839	

* This *P* value compares each follow-up period with the previous period.

Table 5: Percentage of excess weight loss during the follow-up period for patients with obesity who underwent mini gastric bypass or one anastomosis gastric bypass surgery and the association with different demographic variables.

Variable	**Percentage of excess weight loss**							
	Week 12		**Week 24**		**Week 36**		**Week 48**	
	Mean	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**
Total	26.8	8.7	51.5	9.5	72.3	10.2	86.1	9.7
P value*	-		<0.001		<0.001		<0.001	
Age group (years)								
20-30	29.1	9.0	53.4	8.1	75.9	10.0	88.6	6.9
31-40	26.3	8.7	51.1	9.9	71.4	9.9	86.1	11.1
>40	25.0	8.0	50.2	10.1	69.7	10.1	83.6	9.7
P value	0.159		0.385		0.048		0.140	
Gender								
Male	27.0	9.0	52.1	11.1	71.9	10.0	86.2	9.8
Female	26.7	8.6	51.3	8.8	72.4	10.3	86.1	9.7
P value	0.852		0.694		0.805		0.950	
Marital status								
Single	28.5	10.3	52.2	9.4	74.9	11.8	90.1	9.7
Married	26.3	8.1	51.3	9.5	71.5	9.6	84.9	9.5
P value	0.266		0.681		0.146		0.022	
Chronic diseases								
No	28.5	10.5	52.4	10.2	73.4	12.5	87.2	11.9
Yes	26.4	8.3	51.3	9.3	72.0	9.7	85.9	9.2
P value	0.357		0.663		0.608		0.606	

*This *P* value compares each follow-up period with the previous period.