

COMPARISON OF ENDOSCOPIC ULTRASOUND-GUIDED VERSUS PERCUTANEOUS BILIARY DRAINAGE FOR PREOPERATIVE MANAGEMENT OF MALIGNANT DISTAL BILIARY OBSTRUCTION AFTER FAILED ERCP: A MULTICENTER RETROSPECTIVE STUDY

Kenji Ikezawa

UEG Week Berlin 2025

Presentation

Endoscopy

Hepatobiliary

October 7, 2025

In patients with malignant distal biliary obstruction after failed ERCP, EUS-guided biliary drainage achieved comparable surgical and oncological outcomes to percutaneous transhepatic biliary drainage, with superior internalization success, fewer interventions, and shorter preoperative hospital stay.

KEY POINTS

- This multicenter retrospective study from 15 Japanese centers compared PTBD and EUS-BD in 13 propensity-matched pairs of patients undergoing pancreaticoduodenectomy for periampullary cancer after failed ERCP.
- EUS-BD achieved significantly higher internalization success rate compared to PTBD (100% vs. 46%, $P=0.005$) and required fewer drainage sessions (median 1 vs. 2, $P=0.015$).
- EUS-BD was associated with significantly shorter hospital stay for drainage (11 vs. 17 days, $P=0.042$), with drainage-related adverse events tending to be lower though not statistically significant.
- Surgery-related outcomes including operative time, intraoperative blood loss, R0 resection rate, postoperative hospital stay, and surgery-related adverse events did not differ significantly between groups.
- No cases of needle tract seeding were observed, and median disease-free survival (14.2 vs. 16.8 months, $P=0.22$) and overall survival (17.9 vs. 27.9 months, $P=0.167$) were comparable between groups.

- The presenter concluded that EUS-BD may be preferable to PTBD after failed ERCP, particularly in patients scheduled for neoadjuvant therapy, given the advantages of internal drainage and shorter preoperative stay.

VIEW THIS CONTENT ON GUTFLIX

<https://gutflix.eu/search/d/de5a66c6-a813-11f0-bd06-0242ac140006>



AI-generated summary

This summary was generated by an AI large language model based on the content transcript. It is for informational purposes only and should not be considered a substitute for clinical judgment. Always rely on your professional expertise and the full clinical context when making clinical decisions.