## of the periampullary diverticulum on Post ERCP pancreatitis

Jai Hoon Yoon, Seong Ji Choi,, Ho Soon Choi Department of internal medicine, Hanyang University College of Medicine, Seoul, Korea

## Background

Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP) is now the exclusive endoscopic therapeutic modality for biliary as well as pancreatic diseases. The correlation between Post-ERCP pancreatitis (PEP) and periampullar diverticulum was evaluated in many studies. However, the incidence of Post-ERCP pancreatitis, according to the types of diverticulum was not elucidated. The aim of this study was to investigate risk factors for post-ERCP pancreatitis including types of diverticulum.

## Results

Following the ERCP, 62 (31%) patients suffered PEP. In univariate analysis, periampullary diverticulum (especially type 1 and 2), canulation time and procedure time had correlation with post-ERCP pancreatitis (p-values= 0.016, 0.005, and 0.017, respectively). The other hand, the angle of CBD, EST were not meaning risk factors in this study (p-values= 0.676, and 0.585, respectively). Age-sex adjusted multivariate analysis showed age, periampullary diverticulum, canulation time, and duration of procedure as independent risk factors for PEP (p-values = 0.032, 0.041 and 0.003, respectively). Type 1 and 2 of periampullary diverticulum were main risk factor for PEP (area under receiver operator characteristic curve (AUROC) 0.698; p=0. 002), followed by procedure time (AUROC 0.670; p=0. 007), canulation time (AUROC 0.665; p=0. 009).

| Factors                        | PAD Abscent (n=155) | PAD Present (n=128) | P-value |                       |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------|-----------------------|
| Mean age (year)                | 59.5 ± 17.1         | 70.8 ± 12.7         | <0.001  | Table 1 Baseline cha  |
| Male sex (N,%)                 | 67 (43.2%)          | 61 (47.7%)          | 0.456   | Tuble 1. Buseline end |
| Cholangitis (N,%)              | 141 (91%)           | 121 (94.5%)         | 0.255   |                       |
| CBD stone (N,%)                | 74 (86%)            | <b>69 (98.6%</b> )  | 0.005   |                       |
| <b>CBD</b> stone size          | $4 \pm 0.0$         | 9.1 $\pm$ 2.4       | 0.146   |                       |
| Previous Cholecystectomy (N,%) | 15 (25.9%)          | 14 (28.6%)          | 0.288   | Factors               |
| GB stone (N,%)                 | 44 (78.6%)          | 27 (60.0%)          | 0.042   |                       |
| <b>CBD</b> diameter            | $4.6 \pm 5.1$       | $13.9 \pm 2.9$      | 0.04    | All type PAD (N,%)    |
| Total bilirubin                | $2.8 \pm 3.5$       | $2.6 \pm 1.7$       | 0.665   | True 1 DAD            |
| AST                            | $172 \pm 206$       | $152 \pm 161$       | 0.594   | Type T PAD            |
| ALT                            | $223 \pm 258$       | 151 ± 154           | 0.096   | Type 2 PAD            |
| ALP                            | $235 \pm 167$       | $296 \pm 240$       | 0.151   | True 2 DA D           |
| GGT                            | $339 \pm 281$       | 611 ± 1648          | 0.268   | Type 3 PAD            |
| <b>Post ERCP pancreatitis</b>  | <b>69 (44.5%)</b>   | 73 (357%)           | 0.036   |                       |
| EST                            | 94 (82.5%)          | 93 (83%)            | 0.908   | Table 2. Post ERCP    |
| <b>ERCP</b> cannulation time   | $20.5 \pm 13.3$     | $19.9 \pm 13.1$     | 0.722   |                       |
| ERCP total procedure time      | $40.5 \pm 17.1$     | $40.1 \pm 17.2$     | 0.816   |                       |

### Effect of the size and type

# Methods

This is a retrospective case-control study, which included a total of 200 ERCPs, performed by four endosco pists in a single center. 62 patients with PEP, and 138 patients without PEP were enrolled. The correlation be tween PEP and risk factors, including periampullary diverticulum, angle of common bile duct (CBD), endosc opic sphincterotomy (EST), canulation time, procedure time, and periampullary diverticulum types were inve stigated by univariate and multivariate analyses. The types of periampullary diverticulum were classified by the location of ampulla of Vater (type 1: inside the diverticulum; type 2: on the margin of the diverticulum, type 3: outside the diverticulum). Diverticulum were classified into three types by the location of ampulla of Vater: 1, inside the diverticulum; 2, on the margin of diverticulum; 3, outside the diverticulum.

# Conclusions

PAD Present (n=74)

73 (57%)

3 (50%)

53(67.1%)

18(40.9%)

**P-value** 

0.036

0.018

PAD, especially Type 2 PAD, cannulation time and procedure time were risk factor for PEP in univariate analysis. However, only cannulation time was significant related to PEP in multivariate analysis. Although, this study had limitations of retrospective case-control study, prospective randomized control study in multi-center was required.

#### **Baseline characteristics**

| <b>Risk Factors</b>     | <b>P-value</b> | <b>Odds Ratio</b> | 95% CI      |
|-------------------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------|
| All type PAD            | 0.036          | 1.654             | 1.032-2.652 |
| Type 1 PAD              | 0.732          | 0.709             | 0.142-3.772 |
| Type 2 PAD              | 0.005          | 2.815             | 1.354-5.852 |
| Type 3 PAD              | 0.007          | 0.359             | 0.169-0.759 |
| <b>Cannulation time</b> | 0.004          | 2.876             | 1.423-7.603 |
| Total procedure time    | 0.009          | 2.635             | 1.358-9.378 |
| Angle of CBD            | 0.373          | 0.893             | 2.652-7.053 |
| History of EST          | 0.405          | 1.341             | 0.671-2.679 |

#### 2. Post ERCP pancreatitis according to PAD type

PEP Abscent (n=55)

55 (43%)

3 (50%)

26 (32.9%)

26 (59.1%)





#### Table 3. Risk factors in univariate analysis