

1 **A new preprocedural predictive risk model for post-endoscopic retrograde**

2 **cholangiopancreatography pancreatitis: The SuPER model**

3

4 Mitsuru Sugimoto^{1*}, Tadayuki Takagi¹, Tomohiro Suzuki², Hiroshi Shimizu², Goro

5 Shibukawa³, Yuki Nakajima³, Yutaro Takeda⁴, Yuki Noguchi MD⁴, Reiko Kobayashi

6 MD⁴, Hidemichi Imamura⁴, Hiroyuki Asama⁵, Naoki Konno⁵, Yuichi Waragai⁶,

7 Hidenobu Akatsuka⁷, Rei Suzuki¹, Takuto Hikichi⁸, and Hiromasa Ohira¹

8

9 ¹Department of Gastroenterology, Fukushima Medical University, School of Medicine,

10 Fukushima, Japan

11 ²Department of Gastroenterology, Fukushima Rosai Hospital, Iwaki, Japan

12 ³Department of Gastroenterology, Aizu Medical Center, Fukushima Medical University,

13 Aizu, Japan

14 ⁴Department of Gastroenterology, Ohta Nishinouchi Hospital, Koriyama, Japan

15 ⁵Department of Gastroenterology, Fukushima Redcross Hospital, Fukushima, Japan

16 ⁶Department of Gastroenterology, Soma General Hospital, Soma, Japan

17 ⁷Department of Gastroenterology, Saiseikai Fukushima General Hospital, Fukushima,

18 Japan

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

19 ⁸Department of Endoscopy, Fukushima Medical University Hospital, Fukushima, Japan

20

21 * **For correspondence**

22 kita335@fmu.ac.jp

23

24

25 **Abstract**

26 **Background:** Post–endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP)
27 pancreatitis (PEP) is a severe and deadly adverse event following ERCP. The ideal
28 method for predicting PEP risk before ERCP has yet to be identified. We aimed to
29 establish a simple PEP risk score model (SuPER model: Support for PEP Reduction)
30 that can be applied before ERCP.

31 **Methods:** This multicenter study enrolled 2074 patients who underwent ERCP. Among
32 them, 1037 patients each were randomly assigned to the development and validation
33 cohorts. In the development cohort, the risk score model for predicting PEP was
34 established by logistic regression analysis. In the validation cohort, the performance of
35 the model was assessed.

36 **Results:** In the development cohort, five PEP risk factors that could be identified before
37 ERCP were extracted and assigned weights according to their respective regression
38 coefficients: -2 points for pancreatic calcification, 1 point for female sex, and 2 points
39 for intraductal papillary mucinous neoplasm, a native papilla of Vater, or the use of
40 pancreatic duct procedures. The PEP occurrence rate was 0% among low-risk patients
41 (≤ 0 points), 5.5% among moderate-risk patients (1 to 3 points), and 20.2% among
42 high-risk patients (4 to 7 points). In the validation cohort, the C-statistic of the risk score
43 model was 0.71 (95% CI 0.64-0.78), which was considered acceptable. The PEP risk

44 classification (low, moderate, and high) was a significant predictive factor for PEP that
45 was independent from intraprocedural PEP risk factors (precut sphincterotomy and
46 inadvertent pancreatic duct cannulation) (OR 4.2, 95% CI 2.8-6.3, $P < 0.01$).

47 **Conclusions:** The PEP risk score allows an estimation of the risk of PEP prior to ERCP,
48 regardless of whether the patient has undergone pancreatic duct procedures. This simple
49 risk model, consisting of only five items, may aid in predicting and explaining the risk
50 of PEP before ERCP and in preventing PEP by allowing selection of the appropriate
51 expert endoscopist and useful PEP prophylaxes.

52

53 **Introduction**

54 Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP) is widely performed as an
55 important diagnostic and therapeutic procedure for pancreaticobiliary diseases.
56 ERCP-related procedures are relatively risky among endoscopic procedures. The
57 high-risk adverse events of ERCP include duodenal perforation and bleeding after
58 endoscopic sphincterotomy (EST) and post-ERCP pancreatitis (PEP). The rate of PEP
59 occurrence is 3.1-13.0% (*Andriulli et al. , 2007, Freeman et al. , 1996, Glomsaker et al. ,*
60 *2013, Katsinelos et al. , 2014, Kochar et al. , 2015, Loperfido et al. , 1998*). PEP can
61 even become life-threatening. The fatality rate of PEP is 0.1–0.7% (*Andriulli et al. ,*
62 *2007, Kochar et al. , 2015*). Therefore, the decision to perform ERCP should be made
63 carefully, considering each patient’s risk factors for PEP.

64 To predict an individual patient’s PEP risk, five scoring systems have been
65 devised (*Chiba et al. , 2021, DiMagno et al. , 2013, Friedland et al. , 2002, Fujita et al. ,*
66 *2021, Zheng et al. , 2020*). The first risk scoring system for PEP occurrence was
67 established in 2002. In that study, pain during the procedure, pancreatic duct
68 cannulation, a history of PEP, and the number of cannulation attempts were identified as
69 risk factors for PEP. After the first scoring system was reported, each new scoring
70 system used risk factors that were extracted by multivariate analyses. These included
71 various patient characteristics before ERCP and postprocedural risk factors. As

72 postprocedural risk factors, precut sphincterotomy and difficult cannulation were
73 proposed, but it is difficult to predict these risk factors and to determine the PEP risk
74 before ERCP. Thus, a new prediction scoring system for PEP before ERCP is desirable.
75 If the risk of PEP could be predicted before ERCP, then the expert endoscopist can
76 perform ERCP from the start, and high-PEP-risk procedures (for example, precut
77 sphincterotomy, multiple cannulation attempts, inadvertent pancreatic duct cannulation)
78 can be avoided (*Testoni et al. , 2010, Wang et al. , 2009*). If biliary cannulation without
79 the use of at least one high-PEP-risk procedure is difficult, other treatments (for
80 example, percutaneous transhepatic biliary drainage (PTBD) or endoscopic ultrasound
81 (EUS)-guided biliary drainage (EUS-BD)) could be considered.

82 Therefore, we aimed to establish a PEP prediction model using only risk
83 factors that can be gathered before ERCP. Our model was developed and validated with
84 multicenter data from Japan.

85

86 **Methods**

87 We performed a multicenter retrospective study at six institutions in Japan. This study
88 was approved by the institutional review board of Fukushima Medical University and
89 that of each partner medical institution. All patients agreed to undergo ERCP after

90 providing written consent.

91

92 ***Patients***

93 Among 2,176 patients who underwent ERCP between November 2020 and October

94 2022, 2,074 were enrolled in this study. The other 102 patients were excluded for the

95 following reasons: past history of choledochojejunostomy, acute pancreatitis,

96 choledochoduodenal fistula, difficulty finding the Vater papilla, past history of

97 pancreatojejunostomy, or past history of pancreatogastrostomy (**Figure 1**).

98

99 ***Study design***

100 We randomly sampled 50% of the patients as the development cohort and 50% as the

101 validation cohort (**Figure 1**). In the development cohort, we established a risk scoring

102 system for predicting PEP before ERCP, which was named the support for PEP

103 reduction model (SuPER model). The validation cohort was used to confirm the

104 effectiveness of the scoring system. PEP diagnosis and severity were assessed according

105 to Cotton's criteria (*Cotton et al. , 1991*). Patients who experienced abdominal pain and

106 had hyperamylasemia (more than three times the normal upper limit) at least 24 hours

107 after ERCP were diagnosed with PEP. Mild PEP was defined as pancreatitis that

108 required prolongation of the planned hospitalization by 2-3 days. Moderate PEP was
109 defined as pancreatitis that required 4-10 days of hospitalization. Severe PEP was
110 defined as pancreatitis that required more than 10 days of hospitalization or intervention
111 or hemorrhagic pancreatitis, phlegmon, or pseudocysts.

112 To establish the risk score, the risk factors for PEP were investigated using the
113 data from the development cohort. To determine the PEP risk score, factors that might
114 be associated with PEP occurrence were investigated. To predict the PEP risk score
115 before ERCP, factors related to patient characteristics and previously scheduled
116 procedures, as reported in past studies, were selected. The patients' risk factors included
117 age < 50 years, female sex, a past history of pancreatitis, a past history of PEP, a past
118 history of gastrectomy, pancreatic cancer, intraductal papillary mucinous neoplasm
119 (IPMN), a native papilla of Vater, absence of chronic pancreatitis (CP), normal serum
120 bilirubin (≤ 1.2 mg/dl), and periapillary diverticulum (*Ding et al. , 2015, Freeman et*
121 *al. , 2001, Freeman et al. , 1996, Fujita et al. , 2022, Fujita et al. , 2021, Masci et al. ,*
122 *2003, Wang et al. , 2009, Williams et al. , 2007, Zheng et al. , 2020*). Pancreatic divisum
123 was excluded from the patient risk factor list because pancreatic divisum was observed
124 in only two patients. Pancreatic calcification and a diameter of the main pancreatic duct
125 > 3 mm were considered to indicate CP (*Beyer et al. , 2023, Sarner and Cotton, 1984*).

126 These imaging findings were confirmed by CT, MRI, or EUS before ERCP. The CT and
127 MRI findings were reviewed by radiologists. IPMN was diagnosed according to the
128 results of CT, MRI, and EUS. As pre-ERCP prophylaxes for PEP, gabexate or
129 nafamostat, intravenous hydration, and NSAID suppositories were used (*Fujita et al.* ,
130 2022). As planned procedure-related risk factors, EST, endoscopic papillary balloon
131 dilation (EPBD), endoscopic papillary large balloon dilation (EPLBD) using a ≥ 12 mm
132 balloon catheter (*Itoi et al.* , 2018), biliary stone removal, ampullectomy, biliary stent
133 material (plastic stent, self-expandable metallic stent (SEMS), or covered SEMS
134 (CSEMS)), inside stent placement, and procedures on the pancreatic duct were
135 evaluated (*Freeman et al.* , 2001, *Freeman et al.* , 1996, *Harewood et al.* , 2005, *Kato et*
136 *al.* , 2022, *Masci et al.* , 2003, *Masci et al.* , 2001, *Testoni et al.* , 2010, *Williams et al.* ,
137 2007). A biliary stent above the Vater papilla was also assessed as a prophylactic
138 measure against PEP (*Ishiwatari et al.* , 2013).

139 To demonstrate the independence of the established risk classification, the
140 relationship between it and intraprocedural PEP risk factors (including precut
141 sphincterotomy and inadvertent pancreatic duct cannulation) (*Testoni et al.* , 2010, *Wang*
142 *et al.* , 2009) were investigated. Because of the retrospective nature of the data, the
143 exact cannulation times and the number of cannulation attempts were not available.

144 Therefore, multiple cannulation attempts and a prolonged cannulation time could not be
145 investigated as intraprocedural PEP risk factors.

146

147 *Sample size*

148 The primary aim of this study was to establish a PEP prediction model that could be
149 used to calculate a risk score before ERCP. To construct a prediction model by logistic
150 regression analysis, 10 events per explanatory variable were needed (*Wynants et al. ,*
151 *2015*). Seven variables were evaluated in the development cohort, so 70 PEP patients
152 were required. Five variables were evaluated in the validation cohort, so 50 PEP patients
153 were necessary for it. According to a previous systematic review, the rate of PEP
154 occurrence was 9.7% (*Kochar et al. , 2015*). Therefore, at least 722 and 521 patients
155 were included in the development and validation cohorts, respectively.

156

157 *Statistical analysis*

158 In the development cohort, univariate and multivariate logistic regression analyses were
159 performed to identify the risk factors for PEP. The factors that had a p value < 0.10 in
160 the univariate analysis were included in the multivariate analysis. To construct the
161 scoring system for PEP risk, the factors with $p < 0.10$ in the multivariate analysis were

162 ultimately included in the risk score model. The factors selected in the multivariate
163 analysis were assigned points according to the regression coefficient (each variable's
164 risk points = the ratio of the variable's regression coefficient/minimum regression
165 coefficient). The sum of the assigned points was calculated for each patient, and the
166 patients were classified into three groups (low risk, moderate risk, and high risk)
167 according to the expected rate of PEP occurrence (*Friedland et al. , 2002*). The risk
168 classification system (SuPER model) was also applied to the validation cohort.

169 With respect to both the development and validation cohorts, the effectiveness
170 of the risk score model was evaluated as follows. The correlations between the risk
171 score, risk classification and PEP occurrence were evaluated by the Cochran–Armitage
172 trend test. The predictive accuracy of the risk score was assessed using the C statistic.
173 The goodness of fit of the model was evaluated using the Hosmer–Lemeshow test. The
174 independence of the established risk classification from the unexpected intraprocedural
175 PEP risk factors was assessed by multivariate logistic regression analyses.

176 Patients with missing data for variables selected in the risk score model were
177 removed from the final cohort.

178 Statistical analyses were performed using EZR version 1.62 (Saitama Medical
179 Centre, Jichi Medical University, Saitama, Japan) and SPSS version 26.0 (IBM Corp.,

180 Armonk, NY, USA). A p value < 0.05 indicated statistical significance.

181

182 **Results**

183

184 *Patient characteristics and ERCP outcomes in each cohort*

185 The patient characteristics and ERCP outcomes in each cohort are shown in **Table 1**. A
186 total of 1037 patients were assigned to each of the development and validation cohorts,
187 including 70 (6.8%) and 64 (6.2%) patients diagnosed with PEP, respectively. The
188 pre-ERCP prophylactic measures used at each hospital differed, and not all patients
189 received prophylaxis.

190

191 *Construction of the PEP risk scoring system*

192 According to the univariate analyses, age < 50 years, female sex, IPMN, a native papilla
193 of Vater, pancreatic calcification, EST, and procedures on the pancreatic duct had p
194 values < 0.10 (**Table 2**). According to the multivariate analysis, female sex, IPMN, a
195 native papilla of Vater, pancreatic calcification, and procedures on the pancreatic duct
196 had p values < 0.10 . These factors were assigned risk points according to their
197 respective regression coefficients.

198 The risk score of each patient was calculated as the total of that patient's risk
199 points and ranged from -2 to 7 points (**Table 3**). The risk score was found to be
200 correlated with PEP occurrence ($p < 0.01$, Cochran–Armitage trend test). The patients
201 were classified as low (≤ 0 points), moderate (1-3 points), or high risk (4-7 points) for
202 PEP according to the risk score. The PEP rates were 0% (0/327) among the low-risk
203 patients, 5.5% (27/492) among the moderate-risk patients, and 20.2% (39/193) among
204 the high-risk patients. The risk classification was correlated with PEP occurrence ($p <$
205 0.01, Cochran–Armitage trend test).

206 The C statistic of the risk score model was sufficiently high at 0.77 (95%
207 confidence interval (CI) 0.72-0.82) (**Table 4**). The goodness of fit of the risk score
208 model was also confirmed by the Hosmer–Lemeshow test ($p = 0.59$).

209

210 *Validation of the PEP risk scoring system*

211 The risk score was associated with PEP occurrence in the validation cohort ($p < 0.01$,
212 Cochran–Armitage trend test) (**Table 3**). We found that 2.4% (8/331) of the patients at
213 low risk, 5.3% (27/513) of those at moderate risk, and 18.0% (29/161) of those at high
214 risk experienced PEP. The risk classification was also correlated with PEP occurrence in
215 the validation cohort ($p < 0.01$, Cochran–Armitage trend test).

216 The C statistic of the risk score was 0.71, which was also high in the validation
217 cohort (**Table 4**). The PEP risk score model showed good fitness according to the
218 Hosmer–Lemeshow test ($p = 0.40$). According to the above results, the preprocedural
219 PEP risk could be calculated, as shown in **Figure 2**.

220

221 *Risk classification and unexpected PEP risk factors*

222 The relation between the established risk classification and intraprocedural PEP risk
223 factors is shown in **Appendix 1–table 1**. In all patients, the development cohort, and the
224 validation cohort, the risk classification was significantly associated with the occurrence
225 of PEP. On the other hand, precut sphincterotomy and inadvertent pancreatic duct
226 cannulation were not significantly associated with the occurrence of PEP.

227

228 **Discussion**

229 In this multicenter study, we created a risk scoring system (the SuPER model) using five
230 items that could be measured before performing ERCP. With this score, PEP occurrence
231 could be accurately predicted to some degree. Besides, the established PEP risk
232 classification was associated with PEP occurrence independently from unpredictable
233 intraprocedural PEP risk procedures.

234 This risk scoring and classification of PEP has several advantages. First, the
235 score is calculated using only five items, all of which can be easily assessed by medical
236 interviews and imaging (for example, CT). One scoring system included sphincter of
237 Oddi dysfunction (SOD) as a test item (*DiMagno et al. , 2013*). The diagnosis of SOD
238 requires sphincter of Oddi manometry and fulfilment of the criteria for biliary pain, but
239 sphincter of Oddi manometry is not widely used (*Cotton et al. , 2016*). The diagnostic
240 criterion for biliary pain included 8 items, and that for SOD included 15 items. Among
241 the items of the SuPER risk scoring system, pancreatic calcification was assigned -2
242 points. Its low weighting could be explained by the following. The international
243 conceptual model of CP can be divided into four stages: acute pancreatitis–recurrent
244 acute pancreatitis, early CP, established CP, and end-stage CP (*Whitcomb et al. , 2016*).
245 Established CP patients have already passed the acute pancreatitis–recurrent acute
246 pancreatitis course, and pancreatic calcification has been reported in established CP
247 patients. Acinar dysfunction has also been observed in these patients (*Whitcomb et al. ,*
248 *2016*). Therefore, patients with pancreatic calcification may have a lower incidence of
249 PEP.

250 Second, the SuPER risk score can be determined before the ERCP procedure,
251 as the established risk classification was found to be the sole significant factor

252 predicting the occurrence of PEP independent from intraprocedural PEP risk factors. As
253 described in the Background section, precut sphincterotomy, multiple cannulation
254 attempts, and a cannulation time greater than 10 minutes were identified as high risk
255 factors that cannot be accounted for prior to ERCP (*Testoni et al. , 2010, Wang et al. ,*
256 *2009*). Although the established PEP risk classification was independent from the
257 included intraprocedural risk factors (precut sphincterotomy and inadvertent pancreatic
258 duct cannulation), detailed data on the number of cannulation attempts and the
259 cannulation time were not available. Therefore, to avoid intraoperative procedures
260 associated with a high risk of PEP occurrence, an expert endoscopist can initially
261 perform ERCP for high-PEP-risk patients. In addition, PEP prophylaxis can be
262 administered beforehand for high-PEP-risk patients. As effective prophylaxes for PEP,
263 rectal NSAIDS and pancreatic stent placement have been reported (*Elmunzer et al. ,*
264 *2008, Murray et al. , 2003, Sugimoto et al. , 2019*). In this report, rectal NSAID use was
265 not identified as a significant factor preventing PEP. One reason for this is that in past
266 reports describing the use of rectal NSAIDs to prevent PEP, patients at high risk for PEP
267 were often treated (*Elmunzer et al. , 2008*). In contrast, this study included all patients
268 who underwent ERCP. Another reason might be the difference in dose. One hundred
269 milligrams of rectal diclofenac was used in past reports, whereas 12.5-50 mg of

270 diclofenac was used in this study. In Japan, the approved diclofenac dose covered by
271 insurance is 50 mg or less, with the dose being typically lower for elderly patients.
272 Therefore, diclofenac doses of 12.5-50 mg were prescribed by the doctors depending on
273 the age and size of the patients. Pancreatic stent placement itself is one of the
274 procedures performed on the pancreatic duct and was a higher-risk procedure for PEP
275 than endoscopic biliary procedures without an approach to the pancreatic duct
276 (**Appendix 2–table 2**). Moreover, pancreatic stent placement has become a prophylactic
277 treatment for PEP in patients who have undergone pancreatography or wire placement
278 to the pancreatic duct (*Mazaki et al. , 2014, Sugimoto et al. , 2019*). As described above,
279 pancreatic stent placement was performed along with high-risk-PEP procedures (i.e.,
280 guidewire placement to the pancreatic duct or pancreatography); therefore, pancreatic
281 stent placement was grouped together with the other endoscopic retrograde
282 pancreatography procedures as “procedures on the pancreatic duct”.

283 This study has several limitations. First, the study was retrospective, and there
284 were missing data. However, the results reported are trustworthy. The percentage of
285 patients who did not meet the inclusion criteria was not more than 5%, and the
286 percentage of missing data was not over 1%. As described in the Materials and Methods
287 section, patients with missing data for the variables selected in the risk score model

288 were removed from the final cohort. The reliability of the SuPER risk score model was
289 also statistically confirmed. Second, some factors cannot be assessed before ERCP.
290 Additional procedures could be conducted during ERCP, and unplanned
291 pancreatography is often performed in patients who are scheduled for endoscopic
292 cholangiography or biliary treatment. However, the established PEP risk classification
293 was independent from the included intraprocedural risk factors. A planned procedure for
294 accessing the pancreatic duct is listed in the SuPER risk model. Therefore, we can
295 predict the SuPER risk score and classification of patients regardless of whether they
296 have undergone pancreatic duct procedures. Third, this study was performed in a single
297 country. Validation studies over wider geographic regions are necessary.

298 In conclusion, a simple and useful PEP scoring system (SuPER model) with
299 only five clinical items was developed in this multicenter study. This scoring system
300 may aid in predicting and explaining PEP risk and in selecting appropriate prophylaxes
301 for PEP and endoscopic pancreaticobiliary procedures for each patient.

302

303 **Acknowledgements**

304 We thank all the staff at the Department of Gastroenterology of Fukushima Medical
305 University, the Department of Endoscopy of Fukushima Medical University Hospital,

306 the Department of Gastroenterology of Fukushima Rosai Hospital, the Department of
307 Gastroenterology of Aizu Medical Center, Fukushima Medical University, the
308 Department of Gastroenterology of Ohtanishinouchi Hospital, Koriyama, the
309 Department of Gastroenterology of Fukushima Redcross Hospital, the Department of
310 Gastroenterology of Soma General Hospital, the Department of Gastroenterology of
311 Saiseikai Fukushima General Hospital, and the Gastroenterology Ward of Fukushima
312 Medical University Hospital. We also thank American Journal Experts for providing
313 English language editing services.

314

315 **Additional information**

316 ***Competing interests***

317 The authors declare that they have no competing interests to report.

318

319 ***Funding***

320 None.

321

322 ***Author contributions***

323 M.S. wrote the paper, designed and performed the research. T.T. wrote the paper,
324 designed and oversaw the research. T.S., H.S., G.S., Y.S., Y.N., Y.T., Y.N., R.K., H.I.,
325 H.A., N.K., Y.W., and H.A. performed the research. R.S. provided clinical advice. T.H.
326 supervised the report. H.O. supervised the report and the writing of the paper. All
327 authors read and approved the final manuscript.

328

329 ***Ethics***

330 The study protocol was reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board of
331 Fukushima Medical University (Number 2453). The analysis used anonymous clinical
332 data obtained after all the participants agreed to treatment by written consent, so patients
333 were not required to give informed consent for the study. The details of the study can be
334 found on the homepage of Fukushima Medical University.

335

336 ***Data availability***

337 The datasets generated and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the
338 corresponding author upon reasonable request.

339

340 **References**

- 341 Andriulli A, Loperfido S, Napolitano G, Niro G, Valvano MR, Spirito F, Pilotto A,
342 Forlano R. 2007. Incidence rates of post-ERCP complications: a systematic
343 survey of prospective studies. *American Journal of Gastroenterology*
344 **102**:1781-1788. DOI: 10.1111/j.1572-0241.2007.01279.x
- 345 Beyer G, Kasproicz F, Hannemann A, Aghdassi A, Thamm P, Volzke H, Lerch MM,
346 Kühn JP, Mayerle J. 2023. Definition of age-dependent reference values for the
347 diameter of the common bile duct and pancreatic duct on MRCP: a
348 population-based, cross-sectional cohort study. *Gut* **72**:1738-1744. DOI:
349 10.1136/gutjnl-2021-326106, PMID: PMC10423481
- 350 Chiba M, Kato M, Kinoshita Y, Shimamoto N, Tomita Y, Abe T, Kanazawa K,
351 Tsukinaga S, Nakano M, Torisu Y, Toyozumi H, Sumiyama K. 2021. The
352 milestone for preventing post-ERCP pancreatitis using novel simplified
353 predictive scoring system: a propensity score analysis. *Surgical Endoscopy*
354 **35**:6696-6707. DOI: 10.1007/s00464-020-08173-4
- 355 Cotton PB, Elta GH, Carter CR, Pasricha PJ, Corazziari ES. 2016. Rome IV.
356 Gallbladder and Sphincter of Oddi Disorders. *Gastroenterology*. DOI:
357 10.1053/j.gastro.2016.02.033

- 358 Cotton PB, Lehman G, Vennes J, Geenen JE, Russell RC, Meyers WC, Liguory C,
359 Nickl N. 1991. Endoscopic sphincterotomy complications and their
360 management: an attempt at consensus. *Gastrointestinal Endoscopy* **37**:383-393
- 361 DiMagno MJ, Spaete JP, Ballard DD, Wamsteker EJ, Saini SD. 2013. Risk models for
362 post-endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography pancreatitis (PEP):
363 smoking and chronic liver disease are predictors of protection against PEP.
364 *Pancreas* **42**:996-1003. DOI: 10.1097/MPA.0b013e31827e95e9, PMID:
365 PMC3701741
- 366 Ding X, Zhang F, Wang Y. 2015. Risk factors for post-ERCP pancreatitis: A systematic
367 review and meta-analysis. *Surgeon* **13**:218-229. DOI:
368 10.1016/j.surge.2014.11.005
- 369 Elmunzer BJ, Waljee AK, Elta GH, Taylor JR, Fehmi SM, Higgins PD. 2008. A
370 meta-analysis of rectal NSAIDs in the prevention of post-ERCP pancreatitis. *Gut*
371 **57**:1262-1267. DOI: 10.1136/gut.2007.140756
- 372 Freeman ML, DiSario JA, Nelson DB, Fennerty MB, Lee JG, Bjorkman DJ, Overby CS,
373 Aas J, Ryan ME, Bochna GS, Shaw MJ, Snady HW, Erickson RV, Moore JP,
374 Roel JP. 2001. Risk factors for post-ERCP pancreatitis: a prospective,
375 multicenter study. *Gastrointestinal Endoscopy* **54**:425-434

- 376 Freeman ML, Nelson DB, Sherman S, Haber GB, Herman ME, Dorsher PJ, Moore JP,
377 Fennerty MB, Ryan ME, Shaw MJ, Lande JD, Pheley AM. 1996. Complications
378 of endoscopic biliary sphincterotomy. *New England Journal of Medicine*
379 **335**:909-918. DOI: 10.1056/nejm199609263351301
- 380 Friedland S, Soetikno RM, Vandervoort J, Montes H, Tham T, Carr-Locke DL. 2002.
381 Bedside scoring system to predict the risk of developing pancreatitis following
382 ERCP. *Endoscopy* **34**:483-488. DOI: 10.1055/s-2002-32004
- 383 Fujita K, Yazumi S, Matsumoto H, Asada M, Nebiki H, Matsumoto K, Maruo T,
384 Takenaka M, Tomoda T, Onoyama T, Kurita A, Ueki T, Katayama T, Kawamura
385 T, Kawamoto H. 2022. Multicenter prospective cohort study of adverse events
386 associated with biliary endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography:
387 Incidence of adverse events and preventive measures for post-endoscopic
388 retrograde cholangiopancreatography pancreatitis. *Digestive Endoscopy*
389 **34**:1198-1204. DOI: 10.1111/den.14225, PMID: PMC9540598
- 390 Fujita K, Yazumi S, Uza N, Kurita A, Asada M, Kodama Y, Goto M, Katayama T,
391 Anami T, Watanabe A, Sugahara A, Mukai H, Kawamura T. 2021. New practical
392 scoring system to predict post-endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography
393 pancreatitis: Development and validation. *JGH Open* **5**:1078-1084. DOI:

- 394 10.1002/jgh3.12634, PMID: PMC8454475
- 395 Glomsaker T, Hoff G, Kvaloy JT, Soreide K, Aabakken L, Soreide JA. 2013. Patterns
396 and predictive factors of complications after endoscopic retrograde
397 cholangiopancreatography. *Br J Surg* **100**:373-380. DOI: 10.1002/bjs.8992
- 398 Harewood GC, Pochron NL, Gostout CJ. 2005. Prospective, randomized, controlled
399 trial of prophylactic pancreatic stent placement for endoscopic snare excision of
400 the duodenal ampulla. *Gastrointestinal Endoscopy* **62**:367-370. DOI:
401 10.1016/j.gie.2005.04.020
- 402 Ishiwatari H, Hayashi T, Ono M, Sato T, Kato J. 2013. Newly designed plastic stent for
403 endoscopic placement above the sphincter of Oddi in patients with malignant
404 hilar biliary obstruction. *Digestive Endoscopy* **25 Suppl 2**:94-99. DOI:
405 10.1111/den.12080
- 406 Itoi T, Ryozaawa S, Katanuma A, Okabe Y, Kato H, Horaguchi J, Tsuchiya T, Gotoda T,
407 Fujita N, Yasuda K, Igarashi Y, Fujimoto K. 2018. Japan Gastroenterological
408 Endoscopy Society guidelines for endoscopic papillary large balloon dilation.
409 *Digestive Endoscopy* **30**:293-309. DOI: 10.1111/den.13029
- 410 Kato S, Kuwatani M, Onodera M, Kudo T, Sano I, Katanuma A, Uebayashi M, Eto K,
411 Fukasawa M, Hashigo S, Iwashita T, Yoshida M, Taya Y, Kawakami H, Kato H,

- 412 Nakai Y, Kobashigawa K, Kawahata S, Shinoura S, Ito K, Kubo K, Yamato H,
413 Hara K, Maetani I, Mukai T, Shibukawa G, Itoi T. 2022. Risk of Pancreatitis
414 Following Biliary Stenting With/Without Endoscopic Sphincterotomy: A
415 Randomized Controlled Trial. *Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology*
416 **20**:1394-1403 e1391. DOI: 10.1016/j.cgh.2021.08.016
- 417 Katsinelos P, Lazaraki G, Chatzimavroudis G, Gkagkalis S, Vasiliadis I, Papaeuthimiou
418 A, Terzoudis S, Pilpilidis I, Zavos C, Kountouras J. 2014. Risk factors for
419 therapeutic ERCP-related complications: an analysis of 2,715 cases performed
420 by a single endoscopist. *Ann Gastroenterol* **27**:65-72, PMID: PMC3959534
- 421 Kochar B, Akshintala VS, Afghani E, Elmunzer BJ, Kim KJ, Lennon AM, Khashab MA,
422 Kalloo AN, Singh VK. 2015. Incidence, severity, and mortality of post-ERCP
423 pancreatitis: a systematic review by using randomized, controlled trials.
424 *Gastrointestinal Endoscopy* **81**:143-149 e149. DOI: 10.1016/j.gie.2014.06.045
- 425 Loperfido S, Angelini G, Benedetti G, Chilovi F, Costan F, De Berardinis F, De
426 Bernardin M, Ederle A, Fina P, Fratton A. 1998. Major early complications from
427 diagnostic and therapeutic ERCP: a prospective multicenter study. *Gastrointest*
428 *Endosc* **48**:1-10
- 429 Masci E, Mariani A, Curioni S, Testoni PA. 2003. Risk factors for pancreatitis following

- 430 endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography: a meta-analysis. *Endoscopy*
431 **35**:830-834. DOI: 10.1055/s-2003-42614
- 432 Masci E, Toti G, Mariani A, Curioni S, Lomazzi A, Dinelli M, Minoli G, Crosta C,
433 Comin U, Fertitta A, Prada A, Passoni GR, Testoni PA. 2001. Complications of
434 diagnostic and therapeutic ERCP: a prospective multicenter study. *American*
435 *Journal of Gastroenterology* **96**:417-423. DOI:
436 10.1111/j.1572-0241.2001.03594.x
- 437 Mazaki T, Mado K, Masuda H, Shiono M. 2014. Prophylactic pancreatic stent
438 placement and post-ERCP pancreatitis: an updated meta-analysis. *Journal of*
439 *Gastroenterology* **49**:343-355. DOI: 10.1007/s00535-013-0806-1
- 440 Murray B, Carter R, Imrie C, Evans S, O'Suilleabhain C. 2003. Diclofenac reduces the
441 incidence of acute pancreatitis after endoscopic retrograde
442 cholangiopancreatography. *Gastroenterology* **124**:1786-1791. DOI:
443 10.1016/s0016-5085(03)00384-6
- 444 Sarner M, Cotton PB. 1984. Classification of pancreatitis. *Gut* **25**:756-759. DOI:
445 10.1136/gut.25.7.756, PMID: PMC1432589
- 446 Sugimoto M, Takagi T, Suzuki R, Konno N, Asama H, Sato Y, Irie H, Watanabe K,
447 Nakamura J, Kikuchi H, Takasumi M, Hashimoto M, Hikichi T, Ohira H. 2019.

- 448 Pancreatic stents to prevent post-endoscopic retrograde
449 cholangiopancreatography pancreatitis: A meta-analysis. *World J Metaanal*
450 **7**:249-258
- 451 Testoni PA, Mariani A, Giussani A, Vailati C, Masci E, Macarri G, Ghezzi L, Familiari
452 L, Giardullo N, Mutignani M, Lombardi G, Talamini G, Spadaccini A, Briglia R,
453 Piazzzi L. 2010. Risk factors for post-ERCP pancreatitis in high- and low-volume
454 centers and among expert and non-expert operators: a prospective multicenter
455 study. *American Journal of Gastroenterology* **105**:1753-1761. DOI:
456 10.1038/ajg.2010.136
- 457 Wang P, Li ZS, Liu F, Ren X, Lu NH, Fan ZN, Huang Q, Zhang X, He LP, Sun WS,
458 Zhao Q, Shi RH, Tian ZB, Li YQ, Li W, Zhi FC. 2009. Risk factors for
459 ERCP-related complications: a prospective multicenter study. *American Journal*
460 *of Gastroenterology* **104**:31-40. DOI: 10.1038/ajg.2008.5
- 461 Whitcomb DC, Frulloni L, Garg P, Greer JB, Schneider A, Yadav D, Shimosegawa T.
462 2016. Chronic pancreatitis: An international draft consensus proposal for a new
463 mechanistic definition. *Pancreatology* **16**:218-224. DOI:
464 10.1016/j.pan.2016.02.001, PMID: PMC6042966
- 465 Williams EJ, Taylor S, Fairclough P, Hamlyn A, Logan RF, Martin D, Riley SA, Veitch

466 P, Wilkinson ML, Williamson PR, Lombard M. 2007. Risk factors for
467 complication following ERCP; results of a large-scale, prospective multicenter
468 study. *Endoscopy* **39**:793-801. DOI: 10.1055/s-2007-966723

469 Wynants L, Bouwmeester W, Moons KG, Moerbeek M, Timmerman D, Van Huffel S,
470 Van Calster B, Vergouwe Y. 2015. A simulation study of sample size
471 demonstrated the importance of the number of events per variable to develop
472 prediction models in clustered data. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*
473 **68**:1406-1414. DOI: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2015.02.002

474 Zheng R, Chen M, Wang X, Li B, He T, Wang L, Xu G, Yao Y, Cao J, Shen Y, Wang Y,
475 Zhu H, Zhang B, Wu H, Zou X, He G. 2020. Development and validation of a
476 risk prediction model and scoring system for post-endoscopic retrograde
477 cholangiopancreatography pancreatitis. *Ann Transl Med* **8**:1299. DOI:
478 10.21037/atm-20-5769, PMID: PMC7661903

479
480
481

482 **Figure legends**

483 **Figure 1.** Flowchart of the inclusion criteria. ERCP, endoscopic retrograde

484 cholangiopancreatography.

485 **Figure 2.** Example of the preprocedural PEP risk checklist. ERCP, endoscopic

486 retrograde cholangiopancreatography. IPMN, intraductal papillary mucinous neoplasm;

487 PEP, post-ERCP pancreatitis.

488

489 **Tables**

490 **Table 1.** Comparison of patient characteristics and ERCP outcomes between the
491 development and validation cohorts.

	Development cohort (n=1037)	Validation cohort (n=1037)	<i>P</i> value
Patient factors			
Age, y, mean ± SD	73.8 ± 12.7	75.1 ± 12.5	0.02
Sex, n, male/female	642/395	629/408	0.59
History of pancreatitis, n (%)	73 (7.0)	45 (4.4)	0.01
History of PEP, n (%)	26 (2.5)	24 (2.3)	0.89
History of gastrectomy, n (%)	82 (7.9)	88 (8.5)	0.69
Billroth-I reconstruction, n	24	25	
Billroth-II reconstruction, n	23	25	
Roux-en-Y reconstruction, n	33	36	
Double tract, n	1	1	
Gastric tube reconstruction, n	1	1	
Pancreatic cancer, n (%)	145 (14.0)	174 (16.8)	0.09
IPMN, n (%)	17 (1.6)	8 (0.8)	0.11
Native papilla of Vater, n (%)	535 (51.6)	494 (47.7)	0.08
Total bilirubin, mg/dl, mean ± SD	3.5 ± 5.3	3.6 ± 5.0	0.45
Diameter of the MPD, mm, mean ± SD	2.84 ± 2.63	3.1 ± 2.9	0.10
^a			
Pancreatic calcification, n (%) ^b	107 (10.6)	87 (8.7)	0.15
Periampullary diverticulum, n (%)	207 (20.0)	224 (21.6)	0.39
Pre-ERCP prophylaxis			
Gabexate or Nafamostat, n (%)	709 (68.4)	703 (67.8)	0.81
Intravenous hydration, n (%)	22 (2.1)	14 (1.4)	0.24
NSAID suppository, n (%)	53 (5.1)	45 (4.3)	0.47
Factors related to the planned procedure			
EST, n (%)	449 (43.3)	434 (41.9)	0.53
EPBD, n (%)	31 (3.0)	40 (3.9)	0.33
EPLBD, n (%)	56 (5.4)	55 (5.3)	1.0
Biliary stone removal, n (%)	327 (31.5)	342 (33.0)	0.51

Ampullectomy, n (%)	5 (0.5)	5 (0.5)	1.0
Biliary stent, n (%)	594 (57.3)	611(58/9)	0.48
Plastic stent, n (%)	445 (42.9)	436 (42.0)	0.72
SEMS, n (%)	119 (11.5)	122 (11.8)	0.89
CSEMS, n (%)	36 (3.5)	44 (4.2)	0.43
Biliary stent above the papilla, n (%)	45 (4.3)	47 (4.5)	0.92
Procedures on the pancreatic duct, n (%)	285 (27.5)	237 (22.9)	0.017
PEP occurrence, n (%)	70 (6.8)	64 (6.2)	0.66
Mild, n	60	53	
Moderate, n	8	7	
Severe, n	2	4	

492 ERCP, endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography; SD, standard deviation; PEP,
493 post-ERCP pancreatitis; IPMN, intraductal papillary mucinous neoplasm; MPD, main
494 pancreatic duct; EST, endoscopic sphincterotomy; EPBD, endoscopic papillary balloon
495 dilation; SEMS, self-expandable metallic stent; CSEMS, covered SEMS.

496 ^aData were available for 1671 patients.

497 ^bData were available for 2017 patients.

498

499

500 **Table 2.** Logistic regression analysis of predictive factors for PEP in the development cohort.

	Univariate analysis			Multivariate analysis			Regression coefficient	Points
	OR	95% CI	<i>P</i> value	OR	95% CI	<i>P</i> value		
Age < 50 years	2.42	0.99-6.0	0.053	1.76	0.67-4.63	0.25	0.56	-
Female	1.91	1.17-3.10	<0.01	1.72	1.03-2.89	0.039	0.55	1
History of pancreatitis	1.26	0.53-3.0	0.61					
History of PEP	1.84	0.54-6.28	0.33					
History of gastrectomy	0.89	0.35-2.27	0.81					
Pancreatic cancer	1.03	0.51-2.06	0.94					
IPMN	8.15	2.92-22.7	<0.01	3.04	0.97-9.52	0.056	1.11	2
Native papilla of Vater	4.49	2.42-8.30	<0.01	2.72	1.30-5.71	<0.01	1.0	2
Total bilirubin ≤ 1.2 mg/dl	1.13	0.69-1.84	0.62					
Diameter of the MPD > 3 mm ^a	1.31	0.76-2.25	0.33					
Pancreatic calcification ^b	0.36	0.11-1.17	0.089	0.32	0.10-1.1	0.072	-1.13	-2
Periampullary diverticulum	0.65	0.33-1.30	0.22					
Gabexate or Nafamostat	0.72	0.44-1.19	0.20					
Intravenous hydration	1.39	0.32-6.08	0.66					
NSAID suppository before ERCP	1.47	0.57-3.83	0.43					
EST	1.71	1.05-2.79	0.03	0.83	0.45-1.52	0.54	-0.19	-
EPBD	< 0.01	0-Infinity	0.98					
EPLBD	0.24	0.03-1.76	0.16					
Biliary stone removal	0.68	0.39-1.19	0.18					

Ampullectomy	3.49	0.39-31.6	0.27					
Biliary stent	0.93	0.57-1.52	0.78					
Plastic stent	0.72	0.44-1.20	0.21					
SEMS	1.66	0.87-3.20	0.13					
CSEMS	0.81	0.19-3.43	0.77					
Biliary stent above the papilla	0.30	0.04-2.24	0.24					
Procedures on the pancreatic duct	4.77	2.89-7.89	<0.01	3.49	1.99-6.12	<0.01	1.25	2

501 PEP, post–endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography pancreatitis; OR, odds ratio; CI, confidence interval; IPMN, intraductal
502 papillary mucinous neoplasm; MPD, main pancreatic duct; EST, endoscopic sphincterotomy; EPBD, endoscopic papillary balloon
503 dilation; EPLBD, endoscopic papillary large balloon dilation; SEMS, self-expandable metallic stent; CSEMS, covered SEMS.

504 ^a Data were available for 985 patients in the development cohort.

505 ^b Data were available for 1012 patients in the development cohort.

506

507

508 **Table 3.** Patient distribution in terms of risk score and classification.

Risk score		Development cohort (n = 1012) ^a			Validation cohort (n = 1005) ^b		
		PEP occurrence, N	PEP rate (95% CI) (%)	<i>P</i> value ^c	PEP occurrence, N	PEP rate (95% CI) (%)	<i>P</i> value ^c
-2		0/29	0 (0-11.9)	< 0.01	0/33	0 (0-10.6)	< 0.01
-1		0/9	0 (0-33.6)		0/5	0 (0-52.2)	
0		0/289	0 (0-1.3)		8/293	2.7 (1.2-5.3)	
1		6/140	4.3 (1.6-9.1)		5/160	3.1 (1.0-7.1)	
2		8/202	4.0 (1.7-7.7)		14/195	7.2 (4.0-11.8)	
3		13/150	8.7 (4.7-14.4)		8/158	5.1 (2.2-9.7)	
4		18/97	18.6 (11.4-27.7)		14/84	16.7 (9.4-26.4)	
5		17/83	20.5 (12.4-30.8)		14/71	19.7 (11.2-30.9)	
6		3/9	33.3 (7.5-70.1)		0/3	0 (0-70.8)	
7		1/4	25.0 (0.6-80.6)		1/3	33.3 (0.8-90.6)	
Risk classification	Risk score	PEP occurrence, N	PEP rate (95% CI) (%)	<i>P</i> value ^c	PEP occurrence, N	PEP rate (95% CI) (%)	<i>P</i> value ^c
Low	≤ 0	0/327	0 (0-1.1)	< 0.01	8/331	2.4 (1.0-4.7)	< 0.01
Moderate	1-3	27/492	5.5 (3.6-7.9)		27/513	5.3 (3.5-7.6)	
High	4-7	39/193	20.2 (14.8-26.6)		29/161	18.0 (12.4-24.8)	

509 PEP, post–endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography pancreatitis; CI, confidence interval.

510 ^a There were missing data for 25 patients.

511 ^b There were missing data for 32 patients.

512 ^c The correlations between the risk score or classification and PEP occurrence were evaluated by the Cochran–Armitage test.

513

514

515 **Table 4.** Goodness of fit of the risk score model.

	Development cohort	Validation cohort
C-statistic (95% CI)	0.77 (0.72–0.82)	0.71 (0.64–0.78)
Hosmer–Lemeshow test, <i>p</i> value	0.59	0.40

516 CI, confidence interval.

517

Patients in whom ERCP was tried between
November 2020 – October 2022
N = 2176

- Patients who did not meet the inclusion criteria
- Past history of choledochojejunostomy, N = 78
 - Acute pancreatitis, N = 9
 - Choledochoduodenal fistula, N = 8
 - Difficulty in identifying the Vater papilla, N = 4
 - Past history of pancreatojejunostomy, N = 2
 - Past history of pancreatogastrostomy, N = 1

Patients who were involved in the analyses
N = 2074

Development cohort
N = 1037

Validation cohort
N = 1037

Preprocedural risk score for Post-ERCP pancreatitis

1. Please check the corresponding items and calculate the total score.

Risk factors	Points	
<input type="checkbox"/> Female sex	1	
<input type="checkbox"/> Native papilla of Vater	2	
<input type="checkbox"/> Pancreatic calcification on imaging	-2	
<input type="checkbox"/> IPMN	2	
<input type="checkbox"/> Planned pancreatic duct procedures	2	Total <input type="text"/> points

2. Please find the predictive post-ERCP pancreatitis rate according to the total score.

Total points	Risk group	Predictive post-ERCP pancreatitis rate
≤ 0	Low	0-2%
1-3	Moderate	5%
4-7	High	18-20%

※The post-ERCP pancreatitis rate might change due to the actual ERCP procedure performed.