

1

2

3

4 **Outcomes of percutaneous transhepatic gallbladder**  
5 **drainage versus percutaneous transhepatic biliary**  
6 **drainage for obstructive jaundice**

7

8 **Short title: Usefulness of PTGBD and PTBD in patients with obstructive jaundice.**

9

10

11 Tetsushi Azami<sup>1\*</sup>, Yuichi Takano<sup>1</sup>, Naoki Tamai<sup>1</sup>, Jun Noda<sup>1</sup>, Masataka Yamawaki<sup>1</sup>,

12 Fumitaka Niiya<sup>1</sup>, Naotaka Maruoka<sup>1</sup>, Fumiya Nishimoto<sup>1</sup>, Akira Ishihara<sup>2</sup>, Masatsugu

13 Nagahama<sup>1</sup>

14

15

16

17 <sup>1</sup>Department of Medicine, Division of Gastroenterology, Showa University Fujigaoka

18 Hospital, Yokohama, Japan

19 <sup>2</sup>Department of Gastroenterological Surgery, Hitachi Medical Center, Hitachi, Japan

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

20

21 \* Corresponding author

22 E-mail: [tetsushiazami@yahoo.co.jp](mailto:tetsushiazami@yahoo.co.jp) (TA)

23

## 24 **Author contributions**

25 Conceptualization: Tetsushi Azami.

26 Data curation: Tetsushi Azami.

27 Formal analysis: Tetsushi Azami.

28 Investigation: Tetsushi Azami, Naoki Tamai, Jun Noda, Masataka Yamawaki.

29 Methodology: Tetsushi Azami, Yuichi Takano, Fumitaka Niiya.

30 Project administration: Tetsushi Azami.

31 Supervision: Akira Ishihara, Masatsugu Nagahama.

32 Writing – original draft: Tetsushi Azami, Yuichi Takano.

33 Writing – review & editing: Tetsushi Azami, Yuichi Takano, Fumitaka Niiya, Naotaka

34 Maruoka, Fumiya Nishimoto, Akira Ishihara, Masatsugu Nagahama.

35

36

## 37 **Abstract**

38 Percutaneous transhepatic gallbladder drainage (PTGBD) is an alternative to  
39 percutaneous transhepatic biliary drainage (PTBD) for cases of obstructive jaundice in which  
40 the bile duct obstruction is below the confluence of the cystic ducts. The present study aimed  
41 to evaluate the usefulness of PTGBD and PTBD in patients with obstructive jaundice. This  
42 study enrolled patients who had undergone percutaneous biliary drainage for acute  
43 cholangitis and obstructive jaundice at two institutions between January 2017 and March  
44 2024. Fifty-five patients were included in this analysis. However, patients with intrahepatic  
45 or hilar bile duct stenosis, post choledocholithiasis, complex cholecystitis, total bilirubin  
46 levels  $< 2.0$  mg/dL, and uncorrectable bleeding tendency and those who had undergone the  
47 procedure and later discontinued without puncture were excluded. The technical success  
48 rates, clinical success rates, and complication rates of the procedure were evaluated. The  
49 technical success rates were 96.3% (26/27) in the PTGBD group and 82.1% (13/28) in the  
50 PTBD group. The clinical success rates were 85.2% (23/27) in the PTGBD group and 67.9%  
51 (19/28) in the PTBD group. The complication rates were 11.1% (3/27) in the PTGBD group  
52 and 17.9% (5/28) in the PTBD group. Hence, the two groups did not significantly differ in  
53 any of the endpoints. The outcomes of PTGBD were comparable to those of PTBD in  
54 patients with obstructive jaundice. Hence, PTGBD is a reasonable treatment option for cases  
55 of obstructive jaundice in which PTBD is not feasible.

56

## 57 **Introduction**

58 Bile duct drainage is indicated for all patients with acute cholangitis and obstructive  
59 jaundice, except for some mild cases that improve with antimicrobial therapy alone. The  
60 Tokyo Guidelines 2018 recommend endoscopic biliary drainage (EBD) as the first-line  
61 treatment for bile duct drainage [1]. However, in some cases, EBD cannot be performed due  
62 to factors such as the patient's general condition, postoperative reconstructed intestinal tract,  
63 and gastrointestinal stenosis. In recent years, endoscopic ultrasound-guided biliary drainage  
64 (EUS-BD) has been the salvage procedure of choice for such cases. If EBD and EUS-BD are  
65 challenging to perform, percutaneous transhepatic biliary drainage (PTBD) is considered.  
66 However, its technical success rate is 63% in patients with nondilated bile ducts and 86% in  
67 patients with dilated ducts, which is not sufficient [2].

68 Alternatively, percutaneous transhepatic gallbladder drainage (PTGBD) is a drainage  
69 technique for acute cholecystitis. It has a high success rate and can be useful for bile duct  
70 drainage if the bile duct obstruction is downstream of the cystic duct. EUS-guided  
71 gallbladder drainage has been reported to be useful for EUS-guided hepaticogastrostomy  
72 failure in obstructive jaundice [3]. PTGBD can serve as an alternative treatment strategy to  
73 PTBD. A case series and a small number of retrospective cohort studies have evaluated the  
74 use of PTGBD for cholangitis and obstructive jaundice [4-7]. However, to the best of our

75 knowledge, no studies have compared PTGBD and PTBD. The present study aimed to  
76 examine the usefulness of PTGBD and PTBD in patients with obstructive jaundice.

77

## 78 **Materials and Methods**

### 79 **Study design and participants**

80 This retrospective study was based on an analysis of data collected from the patients'  
81 electronic medical records. Patients who had undergone percutaneous biliary drainage for  
82 acute cholangitis and obstructive jaundice at Showa University Fujigaoka Hospital or Hitachi  
83 Medical Center between January 1, 2017 and March 31, 2024 were included in this analysis.  
84 Patients with intrahepatic or hilar bile duct stenosis, hepaticojejunostomy anastomotic  
85 stricture, coexisting cholecystitis, total bilirubin (T.bil) level < 2.0 mg/dL, and uncorrectable  
86 bleeding tendency and those who had undergone the procedure and later discontinued  
87 without puncture were excluded.

88 The original data were accessed for research purposes on August 16, 2024. The  
89 study was conducted according to the Declaration of Helsinki guidelines and was approved  
90 by the Showa University Research Ethics Review Board (Approval Number: 2024-106-B).  
91 Due to the retrospective nature of the study, the need for informed consent was waived by the  
92 IRB.

93

## 94 **Outcomes**

95           The primary endpoints were technical success rates, clinical success rates, and  
96 complication rates. Technical success was defined as catheter placement into the biliary tract.  
97 Clinical success was defined as a decrease in T.bil levels to <2.0 mg/dL or a 50% decrease in  
98 T.bil levels after 2 weeks. Complications were evaluated based on the Clavien–Dindo  
99 classification [8]. The severity of cholangitis was also assessed using the Tokyo Guidelines  
100 2018 [1].

101

## 102 **Procedure details**

103           For percutaneous drainage, PTBD was the first choice, but in cases with poor  
104 intrahepatic bile duct dilatation or when bile duct puncture was difficult due to respiratory  
105 fluctuations, PTGBD was selected at the surgeon's discretion. PTGBD was performed using a  
106 one-step technique (Fig 1). PTBD was performed with either one- or two-step techniques  
107 based on the surgeon's discretion (Fig 1). If necessary, analgesics (pentazocine 15 mg) were  
108 administered intravenously before puncture.

## 109 **One-step method**

110           After administering local anesthesia with lidocaine, an 18-G needle (Hanaco  
111 Medical, Saitama, Japan) was inserted into the gallbladder or bile duct under  
112 ultrasound guidance, and a small amount of bile was aspirated. Next, a 0.035-in guide wire

113 (Radifocus, Terumo, Tokyo, Japan) was placed in the gallbladder or bile duct under  
114 fluoroscopy. After a small skin incision was made and dilated with a dilator, a 6–8-Fr pigtail  
115 catheter (UreSil, L.C.C., Illinois, the USA) was inserted.

## 116 **Two-step method**

117 After administering local anesthesia with lidocaine, a 20-G needle was inserted  
118 under ultrasound guidance. A small amount of bile was aspirated. Then, cholangiography was  
119 conducted (Urografine 60%, Byer AG, Nordrhein-Westfalen, Germany). Next, a 0.018-in  
120 guide wire was placed in the bile duct under fluoroscopic guidance. A small skin incision was  
121 made, an introducer set was inserted, and all but the sheath was removed. Then, a 0.035-in  
122 guide wire was inserted, the sheath was removed, and the bile duct was dilated with a dilator.  
123 Finally, a 7-Fr pigtail catheter (CLINY PTCD Kit, Create Medic Co., Yokohama, Japan) was  
124 implanted.

125

126 Fig 1. Percutaneous transhepatic gallbladder drainage (PTGBD) and percutaneous  
127 transhepatic biliary drainage (PTBD) procedure.

128 (A) 18-G needle was inserted into the gallbladder. Next, a 0.035-in guide wire was placed in  
129 the gallbladder. (B) 8-Fr pigtail catheter was inserted. (C) Cholangiography was performed.  
130 (D) 18-G needle was inserted into the gallbladder and cholangiography was performed. (E) A  
131 0.035-in guide wire was placed in the bile duct. (F) 8-Fr pigtail catheter was inserted.

132

## 133 **Statistical analysis**

134 The outcomes of the PTGBD and PTBD groups were compared using the Mann–  
135 Whitney U test for continuous variables and chi-square test or Fisher’s exact test for nominal  
136 variables. A p value of <0.05 was considered statistically significant. R version 4.0.3 (R  
137 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria) was used for data analysis.

138

## 139 **Results**

140

141 Table 1. Comparison of characteristics between percutaneous transhepatic gallbladder  
142 drainage and percutaneous transhepatic biliary drainage.

Characteristics	PTGBD (n=27)	PTBD (n=28)	P-value
age (years), median (range)	76 (53-93)	73 (59-95)	0.34
sex (male), n (%)	20 (74.1)	18 (64.3)	0.684
Charlson Comorbidity Index, median (range)	7 (3-12)	9 (4-11)	0.0599
use of antithrombotic medication, n (%)	5 (18.5)	4 (14.2)	1
baseline T.bil levels (mg/dl), median (range)	4.30 (2.3-22.7)	9.33 (2.0-26.2)	<0.01
severe cholangitis, n (%)	14 (51.9)	5 (17.9)	0.0111
etiology of obstruction			
benign, n (%)	18 (66.7)	5 (17.8)	<0.01
malignant, n (%)	9 (33.3)	23 (82.1)	
bile duct stone	17	5	
chronic pancreatitis	1	0	
pancreatic cancer	4	12	
bile duct cancer	1	6	



ampullary cancer	1	1	
gastric cancer	3	3	
malignant lymphoma	0	1	
reason for ERCP failed or not done, n (%)			<0.01
surgically altered anatomy	13 (48.1)	10 (35.7)	
duodenal invasion	3 (11.1)	5 (17.9)	
failed cannulation	4 (14.8)	13 (46.4)	
respiratory failure or septic shock	7 (25.9)	0	

143 PTGBD: percutaneous transhepatic gallbladder drainage. PTBD: percutaneous transhepatic  
 144 biliary drainage. ERCP: endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography.

145

## 146 **Clinical characteristics of the patients**

147 Percutaneous drainage was performed on 79 patients with cholangitis and  
 148 obstructive jaundice between January 1, 2017, and March 31, 2024. Among them, two  
 149 presented with hilar bile duct stenosis, seven with hepaticojejunostomy anastomotic stricture,  
 150 seven with coexisting cholecystitis, and eight with T.bil levels < 2.0 mg/dL were excluded.  
 151 Hence, 55 patients were finally included in this study.

152 Of 55 patients, 27 and 28 underwent PTGBD and PTBD, respectively. One patient  
 153 in the PTGBD group and five in the PTBD group experienced technical failure. Technical  
 154 success was 26 in the PTGBD group and 23 in the PTBD group (21 one-step and 2 two-step  
 155 procedures) (Fig 2).

156 In terms of technical failures, in one patient, PTGBD was unsuccessful because the  
 157 dilator could not be inserted due to the lack of gallbladder distension. Surgical treatment was

158 then performed. In five patients in whom PTBD failed, three and two underwent PTGBD and  
159 EUS-BD, respectively (Fig 2). Table 1 shows the characteristics of the patients. The PTGBD  
160 and PTBD groups did not significantly differ in terms of age, sex, and use of antithrombotic  
161 medication. The median Charlson Comorbidity Index (CCI) values were 7 (3–12) in the  
162 PTGBD group and 9 (4–11) in the PTBD group. The PTBD group (9.33 [2.0–26.2] mg/dL)  
163 had significantly higher baseline T.bil levels than the PTGBD group (4.30 [2.3–22.7] mg/dL).  
164 Severe cholangitis was significantly more common in the PTGBD group than in the PTBD  
165 group (14 [51.9%] vs 5 [17.9%]). In terms of obstruction etiology, 18 (66.7%) and 9 (33.3%)  
166 patients in the PTGBD group presented with benign and malignant diseases, respectively.  
167 Moreover, 5 (17.8%) and 23 (82.1%) patients in the PTBD group presented with benign and  
168 malignant diseases, respectively. Hence, benign disease was more common in the PTGBD  
169 group than in the PTBD group. The most common reasons for failure or absence of  
170 endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP) were postoperative surgically  
171 altered anatomy in the PTGBD group (n = 13 [48.1%]) and failed cannulation in the PTBD  
172 group (n = 13 [46.4%]) (Table 1).

173

174 Fig 2. Participant flow chart.

175 PTGBD: percutaneous transhepatic gallbladder drainage. PTBD: percutaneous transhepatic  
176 biliary drainage.

177

## 178 Outcomes

179

180 Table 1. Comparison of outcomes between Percutaneous transhepatic gallbladder drainage  
181 and percutaneous transhepatic biliary drainage.

	PTGBD (n=27)	
technical success rates, % (n)	96.3 (26)	
clinical success rates, % (n)	85.2 (23)	
complication rates, % (detail)	11.1 (catheter migration: n=2, shock grade II : n=1)	17.9 (catheter migration: n=2, shock grade II : n=1)

182

183 PTGBD: percutaneous transhepatic gallbladder drainage. PTBD: percutaneous transhepatic  
184 biliary drainage.

185

186 The technical success rates were 96.3% (26/27) in the PTGBD group and 82.1%  
187 (23/28) in the PTBD group. The clinical success rates were 85.2% (23/27) in the PTGBD  
188 group and 67.9% (19/28) in the PTBD group. Hence, the two groups did not significantly  
189 differ in terms of technical success and clinical success rates. Although not included in the  
190 PTBD group, one patient who did not achieve a clinical success to PTGBD achieved a  
191 clinical success to PTBD. The complication rates were 11.1% (3/27) in the PTGBD group  
192 and 17.9% (5/28) in the PTBD group. Thus, there were no significant differences in terms of  
193 the complication rates between the two groups (Table 2).

194

## 195 **Discussion**

196 Cholecystocentesis, which was first reported by Burckhardt and Muller in 1921, has  
197 a long history [9]. Subsequently, Huard and Du-Xuan-Hop et al. successfully performed  
198 intrahepatic bile duct puncture in 1937 [10]. The introduction of echo-guided puncture and  
199 improvements in treatment tools led to therapeutic application of percutaneous biliary  
200 puncture. PTBD was first reported by Glenn et al. in 1962 [11]. PTGBD was first reported by  
201 Elyaderani and Gabriele in 1979 [12] and performed by Radder in 1982 in patients with acute  
202 cholecystitis [13]. To date, in the Tokyo Guidelines, PTGBD is recommended as the standard  
203 drainage method for patients with cholecystitis who are at high risk for surgery, and PTBD is  
204 an alternative treatment to EBD in patients with cholangitis [1].

205 In recent years, EUS-BD has been gaining popularity as a biliary drainage technique  
206 since the study of Giovannini [14]. Moreover, EUS-GBD has been reported to be useful in  
207 treating obstructive jaundice in cases of EUS-guided hepaticogastrostomy failure if the bile  
208 duct obstruction was downstream of the confluence of the cystic duct. Furthermore, PTGBD  
209 may be useful in obstructive jaundice. A case series and a few retrospective cohort studies  
210 have long documented the efficacy of PTGBD for obstructive jaundice [4-7].

211 Li et al. and Park et al. reported that PTGBD resulted in jaundice control in 91% (29  
212 / 32) and 100% (20 / 20) of patients with obstructive jaundice. Only 3% (one patient with

213 biliary peritonitis) and 5% (one patient with catheter migration) of patients presented with  
214 complications, respectively. And technical success was 100% in both studies. Both studies  
215 have revealed that PTGBD is useful in treating obstructive jaundice [4, 5].

216 No reports have compared PTGBD and PTBD. This is the first report comparing the  
217 efficacy of PTGBD and PTBD in obstructive jaundice. The technical success, clinical  
218 success, and complication rates of PTGBD and PTBD were comparable in this study.  
219 PTGBD for obstructive jaundice should be considered as an alternative treatment to PTBD.  
220 However, in one case, PTBD improved jaundice in a patient who showed no clinical response  
221 to PTGBD. Treatment via the percutaneous drainage route (rendezvous procedure,  
222 percutaneous bile duct stenting, and stone removal) is also less difficult with PTBD than with  
223 PTGBD. In patients considering treatment via the percutaneous drainage route, PTBD can  
224 be a better option because of the ease of subsequent procedures.

225 Although there were no significant differences in terms of outcomes between the  
226 two groups, the clinical characteristics of the two groups differed. In terms of disease  
227 etiology, benign diseases such as common bile duct stones were more common in the  
228 PTGBD group than in the PTBD group. Meanwhile, malignant diseases were more common  
229 in the PTBD group than in the PTGBD group. Severe cholangitis was significantly more  
230 common in the PTGBD group than in the PTBD group. Severe cholangitis caused by bile  
231 duct stones requires a short treatment time due to unstable vital signs. In several cases, it is

232 difficult to obtain patient cooperation and respiratory arrest at the time of puncture.  
233 Therefore, PTGBD, which is less difficult to perform, was selected. By contrast, obstructive  
234 jaundice caused by malignant diseases is generally more severe than that caused by benign  
235 disease. However, it is less likely to be complicated by severe cholangitis. The high degree of  
236 bile duct dilatation and the ease of patient cooperation might have been the reasons for  
237 selecting PTBD. The PTBD group can have a higher CCI than the PTGBD group because of  
238 the higher number of patients with malignant diseases. There were no statistically significant  
239 differences. However, it should not be underestimated that the PTGBD group was more  
240 likely to have a higher technical success rate and a lower incidence rate of accidents.

241           The greatest advantage of PTGBD is its ease of use and high technical success rate.  
242 PTGBD and PTBD should be used interchangeably in different cases. However, in cases  
243 where PTBD is challenging to perform, PTGBD should be considered as an alternative  
244 treatment.

245           The present study had several limitations. First, it was a retrospective study  
246 conducted at two centers, and the number of cases was small. The two groups differed in  
247 terms of clinical characteristics, with the PTGBD group having milder jaundice. The type of  
248 procedure might have been influenced by the operator's subjective bias. Future studies  
249 comparing PTBD and PTGBD under identical conditions should be performed.

250

## 251 **Conclusions**

252           The outcomes of PTGBD are comparable with those of PTBD in patients with  
253 obstructive jaundice. Thus, PTGBD is a reasonable treatment option in cases of obstructive  
254 jaundice in which the intrahepatic bile duct dilatation is poor or PTBD is challenging to  
255 perform due to the patient's general condition.

256

## 257 **Acknowledgments**

258 None.

259

## 260 **References**

- 261 [1] Yokoe M, Hata J, Takada T, Strasberg SM, Asbun HJ, Wakabayashi G, et al. Tokyo  
262 Guidelines 2018: diagnostic criteria and severity grading of acute cholecystitis (with videos).  
263 J Hepatobiliary Pancreat Sci. 2018;25(1): 41-54.
- 264 [2] Saad WE, Wallace MJ, Wojak JC, Kundu S, Cardella JF. Quality improvement guidelines  
265 for percutaneous transhepatic cholangiography, biliary drainage, and percutaneous  
266 cholecystostomy. J Vasc Interv Radiol. 2010;21(6): 789-95.
- 267 [3] Imai H, Kitano M, Omoto S, Kadosaka K, Kamata K, Miyata T, et al. EUS-guided  
268 gallbladder drainage for rescue treatment of malignant distal biliary obstruction after  
269 unsuccessful ERCP. Gastrointest Endosc. 2016;84: 147-151.

- 270 [4] Park JM, Kang CD, Lee M, Park SC, Lee SJ, Jeon YH, et al. Percutaneous  
271 cholecystostomy for biliary decompression in patients with cholangitis and pancreatitis. *J Int*  
272 *Med Res.* 2018;46(10): 4120-4128.
- 273 [5] Li YL, Wong KH, Chiu KW, Cheng AK, Cheung RK, Yam MK, et al. Percutaneous  
274 cholecystostomy for high-risk patients with acute cholangitis. *Medicine (Baltimore).*  
275 2018;97(19):e0735.
- 276 [6] Ren Z, Xu Y, Zhu S. Percutaneous transhepatic cholecystostomy for choledocholithiasis  
277 with acute cholangitis in high-risk patients. *Hepatogastroenterology.* 2012;59: 329-331.
- 278 [7] Shitrit AB-G, Braverman D. Interval percutaneous cholecystostomy is effective for  
279 decompression of the common bile duct in high-risk elderly patients prior to endoscopic  
280 retrograde cholangiopancreatography. *Gerontology.* 2008;54: 144-147.
- 281 [8] Dindo D, Demartines N, Clavien PA. Classification of surgical complications: a new  
282 proposal with evaluation in a cohort of 6336 patients and results of a survey. *Ann Surg.*  
283 2004;240(2): 205-13.
- 284 [9] Burckhardt H, Muller W. Study on the puncture of the gallbladder and their X-ray  
285 imaging. *Dtsch Z Chir.* 1921;162: 168-197.
- 286 [10] Huard P, Du-Xuan-Hop. Transhepatic bile duct puncture. *Bull Soc Med Chir*  
287 *Indochine.* 1937;15: 1090-1110.



- 288 [11] Glenn F, Evans JA, Mujahed Z, Thorbjarnarson B. Percutaneous transhepatic  
289 cholangiography. *Ann Surg.* 1962;156: 451-460.
- 290 [12] Elyaderani M, Gabriele OF. Percutaneous cholecystostomy and cholangiography in  
291 patients with obstructive jaundice. *Radiology.* 1979;130: 601-602.
- 292 [13] Radder RW. Percutaneous cholecystostomy. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 1982;139: 1240-  
293 1241.
- 294 [14] Giovannini M, Moutardier V, Pesenti C, Bories E, Lelong B, Delpero JR. Endoscopic  
295 ultrasound-guided bilioduodenal anastomosis: a new technique for biliary drainage.  
296 *Endoscopy.* 2001;33: 898-900.
- 297
- 298




Figure 1




Figure2