

1 **Outcomes of endoscopic ultrasound-guided transmural drainage for postoperative**
2 **peripancreatic fluid collection with an external drainage-first approach**

3

4 Jun Noda,* Yuichi Takano, Naoki Tamai, Masataka Yamawaki, Tetsushi Azami, Fumitaka
5 Niiya, Fumiya Nishimoto, Masatsugu Nagahama

6

7 Division of Gastroenterology, Department of Internal Medicine, Showa University Fujigaoka
8 Hospital, Yokohama, Kanagawa, Japan

9

10 *** Correspondening author**

11 Email: nodaji0317@med.showa-u.ac.jp (JN)

12

13 **Author contributions**

14 JN, TY, TA, MY, and FN acquired patient data, and JN prepared the manuscript and figures. NT,
15 FN, and MN participated in data acquisition and analysis. All authors agree with the contents of
16 this manuscript.

17

18 **Short title:** Efficacy of EUS-TD in POPFC with an external drainage-first approach

19

20 **Abstract**

21 **Objectives:** Endoscopic ultrasound-guided transmural drainage (EUS-TD) is widely
22 performed to treat postoperative peripancreatic fluid collection (POPFC). Recent reports on
23 EUS-TD lack a consensus on stent selection. This study aimed to assess the efficacy of
24 EUS-TD for POPFC using an external drainage-first approach.

25 **Methods:** We retrospectively examined the medical records of patients with POPFC treated
26 with EUS-TD using external drainage between October 2016 and July 2024. Technical success
27 was defined as successful placement of the external drainage. Clinical success was defined as
28 the disappearance of fluid collection on follow-up computed tomography without additional
29 intervention.

30 **Results:** This study included 14 patients. The median duration from surgery to endoscopic
31 treatment was 13 (range: 11–26) days. The median procedural time was 26 (range: 13–35) min.
32 The technical success rate was 100%, and 6 Fr endoscopic nasocystic drainage was performed
33 in all patients. The clinical success rate was 64.3%, and no adverse events were observed. In
34 35.7% (5/14) of the patients, additional endoscopic internal drainage was required; the POPFC
35 was successfully controlled in all patients. The reasons for conversion to internal drainage were
36 prolonged inflammation in one patient, remaining fluid collection in one patient, and requests
37 from surgeons in three patients.

38 **Conclusions:** EUS-TD for POPFC with external drainage proved to be safe and effective, with

39 a short procedure time. However, in certain patients, additional internal drainage is required.

40

41 **Keywords:** drainage, endoscopic ultrasonography, peripancreatic, postoperative, stent

42

43 **Introduction**

44 Postoperative peripancreatic fluid collection (POPFC) primarily occurs because of pancreatic
45 fluid leakage, leading to adverse events, such as infection, hemorrhage, and fistula formation.

46 Pancreatic fluid leakage reportedly occurs in 5–20% of patients after
47 pancreaticoduodenectomy (PD) [1] and 10–40% of patients after distal pancreatectomy (DP)
48 [2]. While POPFC can be asymptomatic, it may manifest as intra-abdominal bleeding, severe
49 pain, gastric outlet obstruction, fistula formation, intra-abdominal abscess, and sepsis [3,4].

50 Traditionally, POPFC has been managed via percutaneous or surgical drainage. In 2009,
51 Varadarajulu first reported the application of endoscopic ultrasound-guided transmural
52 drainage (EUS-TD) in 10 patients after DP, demonstrating high technical and clinical success
53 rates with minimal adverse events [5]. Several studies recommend EUS-TD as the primary
54 treatment method for POPFC management [6–9]. Regarding the optimal timing of EUS-TD
55 intervention for POPFC, one meta-analysis identified six retrospective studies encompassing
56 128 and 107 patients who underwent early and delayed EUS-TD, respectively, from 1,415
57 initially screened articles [10]. They reported a drainage window ranging from 14 to 30 days,
58 within which POPFC could be effectively managed using early EUS-TD without a high
59 number of adverse events.

60 However, optimal drainage techniques, including appropriate stent selection and the duration
61 of stent placement, remain unclear. Notably, literature focusing specifically on optimal

62 drainage strategies for EUS-TD in the context of POPFC is sparse. In this study, we present our
63 EUS-TD strategy for POPFC using an external drainage-first approach.

64

65 **Materials and Methods**

66 **Patient selection**

67 We retrospectively examined the medical records of patients with POPFC treated with
68 EUS-TD using external drainage between October 2016 and July 2024 at Showa University
69 Fujigaoka Hospital. The exclusion criteria were EUS-TD treatment using internal drainage
70 only, both internal and external drainage, or percutaneous drainage, and reoperation.

71

72 **Definitions**

73 POPFC was defined according to the guidelines established by the International Study Group
74 for Pancreatic Surgery (ISGPS) on pancreatic drainage [11]. POPFC was defined as an
75 abnormal communication between the pancreatic ductal epithelium and another epithelial
76 surface containing pancreas-derived, enzyme-rich fluid. POPFC was also defined as fluid
77 leakage of any measurable volume through an operatively-placed drain with an amylase
78 activity greater than three times the upper limit of normal serum. In addition, a clinical system
79 of three discrete grades of POPFC (grades A, B, and C) was proposed based on the severity of
80 the complication. Technical success was defined as the successful placement of an external

81 drain. Clinical success was defined as the disappearance of fluid collection on follow-up
82 computed tomography (CT) without additional interventions. Adverse events were defined
83 according to the criteria outlined by the American Society for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy.
84 Procedural time was defined as the time from scope insertion to scope removal.

85

86 **EUS-TD strategy outline**

87 Whether EUS-TD should be performed was determined through a comprehensive evaluation
88 by surgeons and endoscopists based on follow-up CT, percutaneous drain output, amylase
89 levels in the drainage fluid, patient symptoms (abdominal pain and fever), and serum
90 C-reactive protein (CRP) levels, leading to a consensus.

91 For patients in whom POPFC was confirmed, the steps of the EUS-TD procedure were as
92 follows (Fig 1): When the patient had been placed under sedation with 35 mg of pethidine
93 hydrochloride and 2–5 mg of midazolam, an Olympus convex array endoscope (GF-UCT260;
94 Olympus Medical Systems, Tokyo, Japan) was inserted (Fig 1B). Peripancreatic fluid
95 collection was confirmed from the gastric lumen, and Doppler-guided puncture was performed
96 at a site devoid of intervening vessels. The puncture was performed using a 19 G needle (EZ
97 shot3, Olympus), and a 0.025-inch guidewire (Visiglide2, Olympus) was inserted into the fluid
98 cavity. After dilation using a 7 Fr mechanical dilator (ES dilator, Zeon Medical, Tokyo, Japan)
99 or balloon catheter (REN, Kaneka, Yokohama, Japan), a 6 Fr pigtail-type endoscopic

100 nasocystic drain (ENCD) (Cook Medical) was inserted in all patients (Fig 1C).

101

102 **Fig 1.** Study flow diagram. POPFC, postoperative peripancreatic fluid collection; EUS-TC,
103 endoscopic ultrasound-guided transmural drainage

104

105 The timing of external drain removal was based on the disappearance of clinical symptoms,
106 such as fever and abdominal pain, improvement in serum CRP levels, and disappearance of
107 fluid collection on follow-up CT 1 week later. When the cavity had disappeared (Fig 1D), the
108 external drain was removed (Fig– 1E). In cases of poor improvement or upon request from the
109 surgeons (Fig 1F), internal drain replacement was planned. First, an attempt was made to insert
110 a guidewire into the cyst through the side of the external drain. It was often necessary to
111 re-puncture as the fluid volume shrank, and a contrast agent was injected through the external
112 drain to expand the area. Finally, internal drainage was performed to complete the procedure
113 (Fig 1G). A 7 Fr double-pigtail-type stent (Zimmon, Cook, or Through & Pass; Gadelius
114 Medical, Tokyo, Japan) was used; the stent was left in place permanently for the duration of
115 outpatient care.

116

117 **Ethical statement**

118 This retrospective study was reviewed and approved by the Ethics Committee of Showa

119 University (approval no. 21-061-A). This study was conducted in accordance with Good
120 Clinical Practice principles in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. Data were
121 accessed for research purposes from December 1, 2019 to May 31, 2024. The requirement for
122 informed consent was waived due to the retrospective nature of the study and utilization of
123 anonymous data.

124

125 **Results**

126 **Patient characteristics**

127 A retrospective cohort of 17 patients who underwent EUS-TD for POPFC at Showa University
128 Fujigaoka Hospital between October 2016 and July 2024 was included. Of these, three patients,
129 in whom internal and external drainage were selected, were excluded (Fig 2). Finally, 14
130 patients who underwent the external drainage-first approach were included; their
131 characteristics are presented in Table 1. The median age was 74.5 (range: 51–84) years, and the
132 group included 10 men and 4 women. The most prevalent primary disease was pancreatic
133 cancer, which was observed in nine patients. The surgical procedures included DP in 11
134 patients, PD in 2 patients, and combined PD with DP in 1 patient. All patients were categorized
135 as grade B, according to the ISGPS classification system.

136

137 **Fig 2.** (A) POPFC was confirmed, and (B) EUS-TD was performed. (C) We inserted the

138 external drain only. (D) Once the cavity had disappeared, (E) the external drain was removed.
139 (F) If the cavity persisted, (G) external drainage was changed to internal drainage. POPFC,
140 postoperative peripancreatic fluid collection; EUS-TD, endoscopic ultrasound-guided
141 transmural drainage.

142 **Table 1.**

143

144 **Outcome of EUS-TD for POPFC**

145 The EUS-TD outcomes are shown in Table 2. The median duration from surgery to endoscopic
146 treatment was 13 (range: 11–26) days, with a median procedural time of 26 (range: 13–35) min.
147 The median duration of the removal of the external drainage was 11.5 (range: 7–23) days, and
148 the median postprocedural hospital stay was 16 (range: 10–32) days.

149

150 **Table 2.**

151

152 The technical success rate was 100%, and the clinical success rate was 64.3%, with no
153 occurrences of adverse events, such as bleeding or perforation. Self-removal occurred in one
154 patient, and a second EUS-TD was performed.

155 Regarding progress after stent placement, nine (64.3%) patients had no recurrence after
156 removal of the external drain, while five (35.7%) patients required additional EUS-TD for

157 internal drainage. In two patients, the internal drainage tube was successfully inserted beside
158 the external drainage tube using forward-viewing gastroduodenoscopy (GIF-Q260J, Olympus).
159 In three patients, a second EUS-TD was required. The reasons for conversion to internal
160 drainage were prolonged inflammation in one patient, remaining fluid collection in one patient,
161 and requests from surgeons in three patients.

162 Table 3 shows the changes in CRP and amylase levels in the drainage fluid, and the culture
163 results of the treated patients. In all tested patients, amylase levels were very high and the
164 cultures were positive. In some patients, CRP levels temporarily increased after treatment but
165 improved after 7 days.

166

167 **Table 3.**

168

169 **Case presentations**

170 Case 1: A woman in her 70s with a history of PD for cancer of the pancreatic head underwent
171 EUS-TD on the 11th postoperative day. CT revealed peripancreatic fluid collection around the
172 pancreaticojejunostomy site (Fig 3A), and EUS revealed amorphous fluid collection around
173 the pancreas (Fig 3B). Using a 19 G needle, puncture was performed from the gastric body, and
174 a guidewire was placed at the site of fluid collection. After dilation using an ES dilator, a 6 Fr
175 pigtail-type ENCD was inserted. Drainage contrast imaging confirmed adequate placement of

176 the ENCD at the peripancreatic fluid collection site (Fig 4A), and the procedure was concluded.

177 On postoperative day 3, CRP levels improved from 24.95 to 4.95 mg/dL on the day after

178 EUS-TD. Follow-up CT 1 week after drainage showed complete disappearance of the fluid

179 collection (Fig 4B). Consequently, the ENCD was removed 13 days after EUS-TD, and the

180 patient was discharged without recurrence.

181

182 **Fig 3.** (A) CT performed 11 days after surgery shows POPFC (arrow). (B) EUS imaging shows

183 POPFC, into which a 19 G needle was inserted trans-gastrically. CT, computed tomography;

184 EUS, endoscopic ultrasound; POPFC, postoperative peripancreatic fluid collection

185 **Fig 4.** (A) Endoscopic ultrasound-guided drainage was performed, and a 6 Fr endoscopic

186 nasocystic drainage tube was placed. (B) CT performed 7 days after EUS-TD showed that the

187 fluid collection had completely disappeared. CT, computed tomography; EUS-TD, endoscopic

188 ultrasound-guided transmural drainage. EUS, endoscopic ultrasound

189

190 Case 2: An man in his 70s had a history of DP for pancreatic cancer. CT findings 14 days after

191 the surgery revealed peripancreatic fluid collection. A puncture was performed using a 19 G

192 needle from the gastric body (Fig 5A), and a guidewire was placed at the site of fluid collection.

193 Following this, the site was dilated using an ES dilator, after which a 6 Fr pigtail-type ENCD

194 was inserted (Fig 5B). Follow-up CT conducted 27 days after surgery indicated a reduction in

195 the size of the POPFC, although it remained present (Fig 6A); therefore, additional drainage

196 was deemed necessary. The insertion of an internal drainage tube was planned; however,
197 insertion from the side of the ENCD was difficult. On EUS, the POPFC was unclear. We
198 attempted to expand the cavity by injecting a contrast medium through the ENCD. We were
199 then able to perform a puncture with a 19 G needle, and a 0.025-inch guidewire was placed (Fig
200 6B). After dilatation with a 7 Fr mechanical dilator, a 7 Fr 7 cm double-pigtail-type stent was
201 successfully placed (Fig 6C). No adverse events were observed after removal of the ENCD.

202

203 **Fig 5.** (A) EUS imaging shows POPFC, into which a 19 G needle was inserted trans-gastrically.

204 (B) A 6 Fr endoscopic nasocystic drainage was successfully placed. EUS, endoscopic

205 ultrasound; POPFC, postoperative peripancreatic fluid collection

206 **Fig 6.** (A) Contrast-enhanced CT on the 27th day after surgery showed a reduction in the size of

207 the peripancreatic fluid collection; however, it remained present (arrow). (B) We were then

208 able to perform a puncture with a 19 G needle, and a 0.025-inch guidewire was placed. (C) A 7

209 Fr 7 cm double-pigtail stent was successfully placed.

210

211 **Discussion**

212 We retrospectively analyzed the data of 14 patients who underwent EUS-TD at our institution

213 using the external drainage-first approach for POPFC between 2016 and 2024. We examined

214 the technical and clinical outcomes and adverse events. The technical success rate was 100%,

215 and EUS-TD for POPFC was considered a safe procedure. Previous studies have reported
216 varied findings regarding the efficacy of EUS-TD for POPFC [6–9]. These studies have
217 reported favorable outcomes, with technical and clinical success rates ranging from 92% to
218 100%. Moreover, the incidence of adverse events reportedly ranges between 0% and 8%,
219 indicating favorable overall outcomes. Regarding the timing of EUS-TD, a meta-analysis
220 reported that early intervention within 1 month was effective [10]. Our study also showed
221 favorable results when EUS-TD was performed as early as 13 days after surgery. At our
222 institution, EUS-TD for POPFC has been performed since 2016. When we first started
223 performing EUS-TD, consultations with the surgeon were often conducted approximately 1
224 month postoperatively. However, requests for EUS-TD have recently been received as early as
225 10 days postoperatively. Early EUS-TD may be considered in patients with inflammation or
226 infection.

227 No consensus has been reached on the appropriate stent selection for POPFC. At our
228 institution, external drainage placement is generally selected during EUS-TD for POPFC. We
229 were concerned about the risk of stent migration due to insufficient capsule formation in the
230 early postoperative period. External drainage placement is useful for avoiding stent migration,
231 measuring drainage output, and technical ease [8,10,12]. However, in one patient in our study,
232 self-removal of the external drain led to the need for reintervention; internal drainage should be
233 prioritized in patients with dementia or delirium. No consensus has been reached regarding the

234 timing of external drain removal. Wang et al. reported waiting for encapsulation for 1 month
235 while monitoring drainage and symptoms; if the cyst diameter was <2 cm, external drain
236 removal was considered [12]. Leaving an external drain in place for too long can be
237 uncomfortable for the patient. Our criteria for removal were symptom improvement and the
238 disappearance of fluid collection on CT.

239 In this study, approximately 30% of the patients required additional drainage, and in some,
240 re-puncture using an echoendoscope was required. If a cavity persists on follow-up CT or
241 inflammation remains high, residual pus may be present, which cannot be drained using
242 external drainage [7].

243 Some surgeons believe that internal and external drainage should be selected at the outset;
244 however, we selected external drainage to avoid stent migration and for technical ease.
245 Although the ENCD being cut for internal drainage has been reported [8], the remaining tube
246 on the gastric side may straighten, raising concerns about migration. In addition, the gastric
247 side of the tube has no side holes, which may result in poor drainage. We believe that
248 pigtail-type internal drainage is preferable for the prevention of stent migration and the
249 provision of sufficient drainage, considering that the stent will be placed permanently. It is
250 often difficult to insert an internal drain because the cavity has already shrunk. As in Case 2,
251 expansion through the external drain may be useful.

252 Large-diameter lumen-apposing metal stents (LAMS), such as the Hot AXIOS™ System

253 (Boston Scientific Japan, Tokyo, Japan), have recently been used to treat post-pancreatitis
254 pseudocyst and walled-off necrosis, aiming for effective drainage [13]. Overseas reports on
255 drainage using LAMS to treat POPFC have shown favorable results [14]. The greatest
256 advantage of LAMS is its superior drainage to that of plastic stents, owing to its larger diameter.
257 For POPFC persisting for >1 month, fluid collection may already be encapsulated, and the risk
258 of stent migration may be lower. However, after drainage, metal stents may come into contact
259 with other organs in the abdominal cavity, leading to inflammation or bleeding (e.g.,
260 pseudoaneurysm) [15]. Additionally, LAMS is an expensive device, and its use should be
261 carefully considered in terms of cost-effectiveness.

262 This study had several limitations. First, it was a retrospective study conducted at a single
263 institution with a small number of patients. This retrospective design may have introduced
264 biases that affected data collection and interpretation. Nevertheless, this study is the first to
265 investigate optimal stent selection for EUS-TD for POPFC; it contributes valuable insights
266 despite the aforementioned limitations.

267

268 **Conclusions**

269 EUS-TD for POPFC with an external drainage-first approach proved to be safe and effective
270 with a short procedure time. However, additional internal drainage is required in certain cases.

271

272 **Acknowledgments**

273 JN would like to thank members of the Department of General and Gastroenterological Surgery,

274 Showa University Fujigaoka Hospital, for their insightful discussions.

275

276 **References**

- 277 1. Alexakis N, Sutton R, Neoptolemos JP. Surgical treatment of pancreatic fistula. *Dig Surg.*
278 2004;21: 262–274. doi: [10.1159/000080199](https://doi.org/10.1159/000080199).
- 279 2. Fujino Y. Perioperative management of distal pancreatectomy. *World J Gastroenterol.*
280 2015;21: 3166–3169. doi: [10.3748/wjg.v21.i11.3166](https://doi.org/10.3748/wjg.v21.i11.3166).
- 281 3. Ahmad SA, Edwards MJ, Sutton JM, Grewal SS, Hanseman DJ, Maithel SK, et al. Factors
282 influencing readmission after pancreaticoduodenectomy: A multi-institutional study of
283 1302 patients. *Ann Surg.* 2012;256: 529–537. doi: [10.1097/SLA.0b013e318265ef0b](https://doi.org/10.1097/SLA.0b013e318265ef0b).
- 284 4. McMillan MT, Soi S, Asbun HJ, Ball CG, Bassi C, Beane JD, et al. Risk-adjusted
285 outcomes of clinically relevant pancreatic fistula following pancreatoduodenectomy: A
286 model for performance evaluation. *Ann Surg.* 2016;264: 344–352. doi:
287 [10.1097/SLA.0000000000001537](https://doi.org/10.1097/SLA.0000000000001537).
- 288 5. Varadarajulu S, Trevino JM, Christein JD. EUS for the management of peripancreatic
289 fluid collections after distal pancreatectomy. *Gastrointest Endosc.* 2009;70: 1260–1265.
290 doi: [10.1016/j.gie.2009.06.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gie.2009.06.007).
- 291 6. Onodera M, Kawakami H, Kuwatani M, Kudo T, Haba S, Abe Y, et al. Endoscopic
292 ultrasound-guided transmural drainage for pancreatic fistula or pancreatic duct dilation
293 after pancreatic surgery. *Surg Endosc.* 2012;26: 1710–1717. doi:
294 [10.1007/s00464-011-2097-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00464-011-2097-z).
- 295 7. Futagawa Y, Imazu H, Mori N, Kanazawa K, Chiba M, Furukawa K, et al. The
296 effectiveness and feasibility of endoscopic ultrasound-guided transgastric drainage of

- 297 postoperative fluid collections early after pancreatic surgery. *Surg Laparosc Endosc*
298 *Percutan Tech.* 2017;27: 267–272. doi: [10.1097/SLE.0000000000000413](https://doi.org/10.1097/SLE.0000000000000413).
- 299 8. Tamura T, Kitano M, Kawai M, Tanioka K, Itonaga M, Kawaji Y, et al. Effectiveness of
300 endoscopic ultrasound-guided drainage for noncapsulated postoperative pancreatic
301 collection. *Therap Adv Gastroenterol.* 2019;12: 1756284819884418. doi:
302 [10.1177/1756284819884418](https://doi.org/10.1177/1756284819884418).
- 303 9. Fujimori N, Osoegawa T, Aso A, Itaba S, Minoda Y, Murakami M, et al. Efficacy of early
304 endoscopic ultrasound-guided transluminal drainage for postoperative pancreatic fistula.
305 *Can J Gastroenterol Hepatol.* 2021;2021: 6691705. doi: [10.1155/2021/6691705](https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/6691705).
- 306 10. Mukai T, Nakai Y, Hamada T, Matsubara S, Sasaki T, Ishiwatari H, et al. Early versus
307 delayed EUS-guided drainage for postoperative pancreatic fluid collections: A systematic
308 review and meta-analysis. *Surg Endosc.* 2024;38: 47–55. doi:
309 [10.1007/s00464-023-10568-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00464-023-10568-y).
- 310 11. Bassi C, Marchegiani G, Dervenis C, Sarr M, Abu Hilal M, Adham M, et al. The 2016
311 update of the International Study Group (ISGPS) definition and grading of postoperative
312 pancreatic fistula: 11 years after. *Surgery.* 2017;161: 584–591. doi:
313 [10.1016/j.surg.2016.11.014](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.surg.2016.11.014).
- 314 12. Wang L, Zhang Y, Chen B, Ding Y. Endoscopic ultrasound-guided drainage in the
315 management of postoperative pancreatic fistula after partial pancreatectomy. *Turk J*
316 *Gastroenterol.* 2021;32: 979–987. doi: [10.5152/tjg.2020.20841](https://doi.org/10.5152/tjg.2020.20841).
- 317 13. Yasuda I, Takahashi K. Endoscopic management of walled-off pancreatic necrosis. *Dig*
318 *Endosc.* 2021;33: 335–341. doi: [10.1111/den.13699](https://doi.org/10.1111/den.13699).

- 319 14. Oh D, Lee JH, Song TJ, Song KB, Hwang DW, Kim JH, et al. Clinical outcomes of
320 EUS-guided transluminal drainage with a novel lumen-apposing metal stent for
321 postoperative pancreatic fluid collection after pancreatic surgery. *Gastrointest Endosc.*
322 2022;95: 735–746. doi: [10.1016/j.gie.2021.12.015](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gie.2021.12.015).
- 323 15. Fogwe DT, AbiMansour JP, Truty MJ, Levy MJ, Storm AC, Law RJ, et al. Endoscopic
324 ultrasound-guided versus percutaneous drainage for the management of post-operative
325 fluid collections after distal pancreatectomy. *Surg Endosc.* 2023;37: 6922–6929. doi:
326 [10.1007/s00464-023-10188-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00464-023-10188-6).
- 327
- 328
- 329

Table 1: Characteristics of patients who underwent EUS-TD for POPFC.

Case	Age	Sex	Disease	Surgical Method
1	61-65	M	PDC	PD + DP
2	51-55	M	PDC	DP
3	71-75	F	PDC	PD
4	81-85	M	BTC	PD
5	81-85	M	AIP	DP
6	71-75	M	IPMN	DP
7	81-85	M	PDC	DP
8	81-85	M	PDC	DP
9	51-55	M	PDC	DP
10	76-80	M	PDC	DP
11	65-70	F	IPMN	DP
12	51-55	M	PNET	DP
13	76-80	F	PDC	DP
14	81-85	F	PDC	DP

EUS-TD, endoscopic ultrasound-guided transmural drainage; POPFC, postoperative pancreatic collection; PDC, pancreatic duct cancer; IPMN, intraductal papillary mucinous neoplasm; PNET, pancreatic neuroendocrine tumor; BTC, Biliary tract cancer; AIP, Autoimmune pancreatitis; PD, pancreatoduodenectomy; DP, distal pancreatectomy;

330

331

Table 2: Details of endoscopic treatment.

Case	Procedure time(min)	Duration from surgery to endoscopic treatment(day)	Duration to the removal of the external drainage(day)	Duration of postprocedural hospital stay(day)	Replacement internal drainage
1	35	26	23	32	n/a
2	27	10	22	30	n/a
3	22	11	12	27	n/a
4	28	19	7	25	n/a
5	23	14	11	15	n/a
6	28	13	15	17	Repuncture
7	21	26	9	14	n/a
8	13	13	12	13	Repuncture
9	25	12	7	10	n/a
10	22	12	9	16	n/a
11	29	12	8	12	n/a
12	35	9	23	31	Insertion the side of ENCD
13	20	15	9	12	Repuncture
14	29	13	13	27	Insertion the side of ENCD

n/a, Not Applicable; ENCD, Endoscopic naso-cystic drainage




332

333

Table 3: Details of endoscopic treatment.					
Case	Before treatment CRP levels (mg/dl)	Day3 after treatment CRP levels (mg/dl)	Day7 after treatment CRP levels (mg/dl)	Amy levels of drainage(U/L)	Culture of drainage
1	3.44	6.09	4.6	n/a	Intestinal bacteria
2	3.22	1.88	1.41	3058	n/a
3	24.95	12.86	4.38	10018	Fungus
4	23.77	15.81	7.27	15825	<i>Enterococcus.</i>
5	4.33	3.97	1	5666	Intestinal bacteria
6	11.66	4.84	4.4	2774	Intestinal bacteria
7	2.06	6.35	0.62	36404	<i>Enterococcus.</i>
8	2.48	4.12	3.23	24900	Intestinal bacteria
9	7	2.46	0.64	50611	<i>Enterococcus.</i>
10	19.8	2.42	0.49	37810	<i>Enterococcus.</i>
11	1.44	3.83	0.28	1714	<i>Streptococcus.</i>
12	5.91	2.76	1.47	35748	n/a
13	2.34	1.21	0.34	103555	<i>Staphylococcus.</i>
14	15.43	0.91	0.37	21167	<i>Enterococcus.</i>

CRP, C-reactive protein; Amy, Amylase; n/a, Not Applicable.

334





POPFC underwent EUS-TD (N=17)

Excluded of 3 cases

- Internal drainage: 2 cases
- External and Internal dranaige 1 case


EUS-TD performed with external drainage first approach(N=14)


a**b**



a



b



a**b**

a**b****c**