

## Challenges in ERCP post-Billroth II gastrectomy: Is it the scope, tools or technique?

See article on page 355

The performance of ERCP in patients with altered anatomy is challenging, time-consuming and less likely to result in successful cannulation of the duct of interest compared to conventional anatomy. The limitations inherent to altered anatomy include the inability to reach the papilla due to the surgically altered gastroduodenal anatomy, the failure to cannulate the desired duct or to provide therapy because of the change in orientation of the papilla, use of forward viewing scopes, lack of elevator, smaller therapeutic channel, difficult endoscope position and/or limited availability of devices.<sup>[1-3]</sup>

In Billroth II gastrectomy, the distal stomach is resected and the proximal stomach is anastomosed to the proximal jejunum in an end-to-side fashion. In certain cases, a side-to-side jejuno-jejunostomy between the afferent and efferent limbs is created (Braun procedure) in order to divert the bile away from the remainder of the stomach. When performing ERCP in patients with Billroth II anatomy, endoscopists face several challenges. These include recognizing the afferent loop, reaching the papilla, selective cannulation of the desired duct and performing the desired intervention.<sup>[4]</sup>

Therefore, good knowledge of postoperative anatomy and available tools and devices including endoscopes (side-viewing or forward-viewing) and accessories are required before performing ERCP procedures for post-gastrectomy patients. Presently, ERCP for post-gastrectomy patients is carried out with various devices including a single-balloon enteroscopes, double-balloon enteroscopes, spiral enteroscopes, and cap-fitted upper endoscope. Preliminary data and some prospective studies suggest that the different device-assisted enteroscopy methods perform equally.<sup>[5]</sup> A systematic review and meta-analysis by Park *et al.*<sup>[6]</sup> indicates that the use of forward-viewing endoscope is as safe and effective as conventional side-viewing endoscope for ERCP in patients with Billroth II gastrectomy. The meta-analysis included 25 studies (1 randomized, 18 retrospective, 1 prospective, and 5 case series studies) with 2446 patients

(499 forward-viewing and 1947 side-viewing endoscopes). More recent data supported the use of cap-assisted ERCP with a forward-viewing gastroscope as a rescue endoscopic intervention in patients with Billroth II anatomy.<sup>[7,8]</sup>

In this issue of *Saudi Journal of Gastroenterology*, Li *et al.*<sup>[9]</sup> studied the outcomes of ERCP in patients with Billroth II gastrectomy and identified factors for its technical success. The study expands the growing body of literature on this issue and summarizes the results of a single-center retrospective study that included 308 patients (391 procedures). Ampullary access, selective duct cannulation, and the accomplishment of expected procedures was 81.3% (318/391), 86.5% (275/318) and 97.3% (256/263), respectively. The technical success rate was 70.3% (275/391). The overall ERCP-related complication rate was 15.3% (60/391). Previous ERCP history, absence of Braun anastomosis and the use of a cap-assisted gastroscope were the predictive factors for its technical success. We commend the investigators on their pursuit to answering this critical question, which continues to frequently impact our practices. The limitations of this study were well outlined by the authors. The study was retrospective with possibly underreported adverse events. Referral bias is a possibility as the study was conducted in a large single tertiary center that often treats patients with multiple comorbidities and complex surgical anatomies. Furthermore, the heterogeneous competency among performing endoscopists might have affected the success rate.

At our facility, and based on mounting evidence supporting the use of cap-assisted ERCP with a forward viewing scope in Billroth II gastrectomy patients, we have gradually embraced this approach. This technique has the advantages of improved technical and therapeutic success, better patient outcomes and shorter overall procedure times. The main question remains whether there is enough literature at this time supporting the use of one device-assisted technique over another? Head-to-head comparison of the various device-assisted methods may be difficult due to the time-consuming and difficult nature of ERCP particularly in a smaller cohort of patients like the one under discussion. We strongly believe that further adaptations of the different

device-assisted methods are mandatory to facilitate ERCP procedures after Billroth II reconstruction to expand the biliopancreatic therapeutic indications and to reduce complications. Thus, future dedicated accessory material needs to be developed and validated in prospective cohorts.

Ihab I. El Hajj<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Mohammad Al-Haddad<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Medicine, Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Indiana University School of Medicine, Indianapolis, IN, USA, <sup>2</sup>Division of Gastroenterology, St George Hospital University Medical Center, University of Balamand, Beirut, <sup>3</sup>Division of Gastroenterology, Clemenceau Medical Center Affiliated with Johns Hopkins International, Beirut, Lebanon

**Address for correspondence:** Dr. Mohammad Al-Haddad, Department of Medicine, Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Indiana University School of Medicine, 550 N. University Blvd, Suite 4100, Indianapolis, IN 46202, USA.  
E-mail: moalhadd@iu.edu

REFERENCES

- Choi EK, Chiorean MV, Coté GA, El Hajj II, Ballard D, Fogel EL, *et al.* ERCP via gastrotomy vs. double balloon enteroscopy in patients with prior bariatric Roux-en-Y gastric bypass surgery. *Surg Endosc* 2013;27:2894-9.
- Abbas AM, Strong AT, Diehl DL, Brauer BC, Lee IH, Burbridge R, *et al.* Multicenter evaluation of the clinical utility of laparoscopy-assisted ERCP in patients with Roux-en-Y gastric bypass. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2018;87:1031-9.
- Park CH. Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography in post gastrectomy patients. *Clin Endosc* 2016;49:506-9.
- Pribadi RR, Rani AA, Abdullah M. Challenges of endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography in patients with Billroth II gastrointestinal anatomy: A review article. *J Dig Dis* 2019. doi: 10.1111/1751-2980.12821.
- Moreels TG. Altered anatomy: Enteroscopy and ERCP procedure. *Best Pract Res Clin Gastroenterol* 2012;26:347-57.
- Park TY, Bang CS, Choi SH, Yang YJ, Shin SP, Suk KT, *et al.* Forward-viewing endoscope for ERCP in patients with Billroth II gastrectomy: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Surg Endosc* 2018;32:4598-613.
- Anastassiades CP, Salah W, Pauli EM, Marks JM, Chak A. Cap-assisted ERCP with a forward-viewing gastroscope as a rescue endoscopic intervention in patients with Billroth II anatomy. *Surg Endosc* 2013;27:2237.
- Park TY, Kang JS, Song TJ, Lee SS, Lee H, Choi JS, *et al.* Outcomes of ERCP in Billroth II gastrectomy patients. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2016;83:1193-201.
- Li JS, Zou DW, Jin ZD, Chen J, Shi XG, Li ZS, *et al.* Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography in Billroth II gastrectomy patients: Outcomes and potential factors affecting technical failure. *Saudi J Gastroenterol* 2019;25:355-61.

This is an open access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work non-commercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.

| Access this article online   |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Quick Response Code:</b><br> | <b>Website:</b><br><a href="http://www.saudijgastro.com">www.saudijgastro.com</a> |
|  | <b>DOI:</b><br>10.4103/sjg.SJG_583_19   |

**How to cite this article:** El Hajj II, Al-Haddad M. Challenges in ERCP post-Billroth II gastrectomy: Is it the scope, tools or technique? *Saudi J Gastroenterol* 2019;25:333-4.