

**American College of Radiology
ACR Appropriateness Criteria®**

Clinical Condition: Radiologic Management of Benign and Malignant Biliary Obstruction

Variant 1: Initial therapeutic procedure for a patient with dilated bile ducts from benign biliary obstruction (eg, choledocholithiasis).

Treatment/Procedure	Rating	Comments
Endoscopic internal biliary catheter	8	
Percutaneous internal/external biliary catheter	6	Most appropriate whenever endoscopic treatment is unsuccessful.
Surgery (transplant or hepaticojejunostomy)	2	
Medical management only	2	
Permanent biliary metallic stent	1	
Removable biliary covered stent	4	If the case involves a benign, postinflammatory stricture.
Endosonography-guided biliary drainage (ESBD)	4	
Rating Scale: 1,2,3 Usually not appropriate; 4,5,6 May be appropriate; 7,8,9 Usually appropriate		

Variant 2: Initial therapeutic procedure for a patient with elevated bilirubin and suspected sclerosing cholangitis.

Treatment/Procedure	Rating	Comments
Endoscopic internal biliary catheter	8	
Percutaneous internal/external biliary catheter	6	Depends on location and extent of stricture formation.
Surgery (transplant or hepaticojejunostomy)	2	Surgery rarely indicated except in cases of endoscopic and percutaneous failure.
Medical management only	6	
Permanent biliary metallic stent	1	
Removable biliary covered stent	2	
Rating Scale: 1,2,3 Usually not appropriate; 4,5,6 May be appropriate; 7,8,9 Usually appropriate		

Variant 3: Initial therapeutic procedure for a patient with malignant common bile duct obstruction (eg, pancreatic carcinoma).

Treatment/Procedure	Rating	Comments
Endoscopic internal biliary catheter	8	
Percutaneous internal/external biliary catheter	7	
Surgery (transplant or hepaticojejunostomy)	5	May be appropriate in some cases; however, must be individualized based on patient's comorbidities and likelihood of cure.
Medical management only	3	May be palliative care in a terminal patient.
Permanent biliary metallic stent	5	
Removable biliary covered stent	5	
Endosonography-guided biliary drainage (ESBD)	4	
Rating Scale: 1,2,3 Usually not appropriate; 4,5,6 May be appropriate; 7,8,9 Usually appropriate		

Clinical Condition: Radiologic Management of Benign and Malignant Biliary Obstruction**Variant 4: Initial therapeutic procedure for a patient with hilar biliary obstruction from malignant etiology (eg, Klatskin tumor).**

Treatment/Procedure	Rating	Comments
Endoscopic internal biliary catheter	6	
Percutaneous internal/external biliary catheter	8	
Surgery (transplant or hepaticojejunostomy)	5	May be appropriate in some cases; however, must be individualized based on patient's comorbidities and likelihood of cure.
Medical management only	2	
Permanent biliary metallic stent	6	
Removable biliary covered stent	5	
Endosonography-guided biliary drainage (ESBD)	3	
Rating Scale: 1,2,3 Usually not appropriate; 4,5,6 May be appropriate; 7,8,9 Usually appropriate		

Variant 5: Initial therapeutic procedure for a patient with elevated bilirubin and dilated bile ducts from unknown etiology.

Treatment/Procedure	Rating	Comments
Endoscopic internal biliary catheter	8	
Percutaneous internal/external biliary catheter	7	Most appropriate whenever endoscopic treatment is unsuccessful.
Surgery (transplant or hepaticojejunostomy)	2	
Medical management only	2	
Permanent biliary metallic stent	1	
Removable biliary covered stent	3	
Endosonography-guided biliary drainage (ESBD)	3	
Rating Scale: 1,2,3 Usually not appropriate; 4,5,6 May be appropriate; 7,8,9 Usually appropriate		

Variant 6: Initial therapeutic procedure for a patient with dilated bile ducts and coagulopathy (INR >2.0 and/or platelet count <60 K).

Treatment/Procedure	Rating	Comments
Endoscopic internal biliary catheter	8	
Percutaneous internal/external biliary catheter	6	Most appropriate whenever endoscopic treatment is unsuccessful and after attempting to correct coagulopathy.
Surgery (transplant or hepaticojejunostomy)	2	
Medical management only	4	
Permanent biliary metallic stent	1	
Removable biliary covered stent	2	
Endosonography-guided biliary drainage (ESBD)	3	
Rating Scale: 1,2,3 Usually not appropriate; 4,5,6 May be appropriate; 7,8,9 Usually appropriate		

Clinical Condition: Radiologic Management of Benign and Malignant Biliary Obstruction**Variant 7: Initial therapeutic procedure for a patient with dilated bile ducts and moderate to massive ascites.**

Treatment/Procedure	Rating	Comments
Endoscopic internal biliary catheter	8	
Percutaneous internal/external biliary catheter	5	Most appropriate whenever endoscopic treatment is unsuccessful and after drainage of ascites.
Surgery (transplant or hepaticojejunostomy)	2	
Medical management only	4	Manage ascites prior to therapeutic intervention.
Permanent biliary metallic stent	2	
Removable biliary covered stent	4	
Endosonography-guided biliary drainage (ESBD)	3	
Rating Scale: 1,2,3 Usually not appropriate; 4,5,6 May be appropriate; 7,8,9 Usually appropriate		

Variant 8: Initial therapeutic procedure for a patient with dilated bile ducts and suspected biliary sepsis/acute cholangitis.

Treatment/Procedure	Rating	Comments
Endoscopic internal biliary catheter	8	
Percutaneous internal/external biliary catheter	8	
Surgery (transplant or hepaticojejunostomy)	2	
Medical management only	2	
Permanent biliary metallic stent	1	
Removable biliary covered stent	2	
Endosonography-guided biliary drainage (ESBD)	4	
Rating Scale: 1,2,3 Usually not appropriate; 4,5,6 May be appropriate; 7,8,9 Usually appropriate		

Variant 9: Initial therapeutic procedure for a liver transplant recipient with elevated bilirubin and suspected biliary anastomotic stenosis and/or bile leak, with no dilated ducts.

Treatment/Procedure	Rating	Comments
Endoscopic internal biliary catheter	8	Individualize based on local expertise and patient anatomy.
Percutaneous internal/external biliary catheter	8	
Surgery (transplant or hepaticojejunostomy)	3	Typically not appropriate as the initial treatment. However, may be needed as a definitive therapy.
Medical management only	2	
Permanent biliary metallic stent	1	
Removable biliary covered stent	5	Depends on accessibility endoscopically.
Endosonography-guided biliary drainage (ESBD)	3	
Rating Scale: 1,2,3 Usually not appropriate; 4,5,6 May be appropriate; 7,8,9 Usually appropriate		

Clinical Condition: **Radiologic Management of Benign and Malignant Biliary Obstruction**

Variant 10: **Initial therapeutic procedure for a patient with bile leak and dilated bile ducts following laparoscopic cholecystectomy.**

Treatment/Procedure	Rating	Comments
Endoscopic internal biliary catheter	8	
Percutaneous internal/external biliary catheter	8	Most appropriate whenever endoscopic treatment is unsuccessful and after drainage of ascites.
Surgery (transplant or hepaticojejunostomy)	4	
Medical management only	1	
Permanent biliary metallic stent	1	
Removable biliary covered stent	1	
Endosonography-guided biliary drainage (ESBD)	1	
<u>Rating Scale:</u> 1,2,3 Usually not appropriate; 4,5,6 May be appropriate; 7,8,9 Usually appropriate		

RADIOLOGIC MANAGEMENT OF BENIGN AND MALIGNANT BILIARY OBSTRUCTION

Expert Panel on Interventional Radiology: Charles E. Ray, Jr, MD, PhD¹; Jonathan M. Lorenz, MD²; Charles T. Burke, MD³; Michael D. Darcy, MD⁴; Nicholas Fidelman, MD⁵; Frederick L. Greene, MD⁶; Eric J. Hohenwarter, MD⁷; Thomas B. Kinney, MD⁸; Kenneth J. Kolbeck, MD⁹; Jon K. Kostelic, MD¹⁰; Brian E. Kouri, MD¹¹; Ajit V. Nair, MD¹²; Charles A. Owens, MD¹³; Paul J. Rochon, MD¹⁴; Don C. Rockey, MD¹⁵; George Vatakencherry, MD.¹⁶

Summary of Literature Review

Since the late 1970s percutaneous biliary drainage has been used in the management of jaundice caused by malignant and benign biliary obstruction. In the setting of acute cholangitis, percutaneous decompression of an obstructed biliary system can be lifesaving. For patients with cancer who are receiving chemotherapy, untreated obstructive jaundice leads to biochemical derangements that often preclude continuation of therapy unless biliary decompression is performed [1,2]. (See the ACR Appropriateness Criteria[®] topic on "[Jaundice](#).”)

Diagnostic Imaging

Diagnostic studies are used to identify the underlying etiology of clinical jaundice, confirm the presence and extent of a mechanical obstruction, and exclude extrahepatic metastatic disease. Accurate preoperative identification of the location and extent of the underlying cause of the obstructive jaundice is most beneficial in planning surgical or interventional treatment. Noninvasive diagnostic imaging includes ultrasound (US), helical computerized tomography (CT), and magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography (MRCP) [3-5].

Over the past two decades, CT and US have been the primary imaging tools in the evaluation of bile duct pathology. Preoperative imaging of the liver and surrounding structures has improved the identification of the extrahepatic spread of tumor and invasion of portal vein/hepatic artery, thereby greatly assisting with presurgical planning. With advances in CT technology, helical CT imaging has achieved marked improvement in anatomic detail, providing exceptional imaging of the liver, bile ducts, and periportal area [3]. MRCP provides excellent imaging of bile duct segments, allowing more detailed, three-dimensional imaging of the entire biliary system [6]. As with Klatskin type lesions, MRCP allows visualization of isolated bile duct segments that no longer communicate with the main biliary system and may not be visualized with either percutaneous transhepatic cholangiography (PTC) or endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP).

PTC and ERCP are invasive diagnostic procedures and are most often performed during placement of a percutaneous or endoscopic biliary drainage catheter or stent. Since these two procedures gain access to the biliary system, they also may allow further diagnostic tests to be performed (eg, bile cytology, bile duct biopsies, intraductal US, and PTC) [7,8].

Endoscopic versus Percutaneous Drainage

With the availability of percutaneous, endoscopic, and surgical approaches, the selection of the most appropriate modality with which to provide biliary drainage will largely depend on the interventional options available to the patient at the time of presentation. For those who are not surgical candidates due to nonresectability of disease or to comorbidities, the choice of percutaneous versus endoscopic route may largely depend on the location and extent of the obstructing lesion in addition to the expertise of the operator.

In recent years, endoscopic retrograde biliary drainage (ERBD) has overtaken percutaneous transhepatic biliary drainage (PTBD) as the initial procedure of choice in patients with distal bile duct obstruction. Much of this trend

¹Panel Chair, University of Colorado, Anschutz Medical Campus, Aurora, Colorado. ²Panel Vice-chair, University of Chicago Hospital, Chicago, Illinois. ³University of North Carolina Hospital, Chapel Hill, North Carolina. ⁴Mallinckrodt Institute of Radiology, Saint Louis, Missouri. ⁵University of California-San Francisco, San Francisco, California. ⁶Carolinas Medical Center, Charlotte, North Carolina, American College of Surgeons. ⁷Froedtert & The Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Wisconsin. ⁸University of California-San Diego Medical Center, San Diego, California. ⁹Oregon Health and Science University, Portland, Oregon. ¹⁰Central Kentucky Radiology, Lexington, Kentucky. ¹¹Wake Forest University Baptist Medical Center, Winston-Salem, North Carolina. ¹²Kaiser Permanente Modesto Medical Center, Modesto, California. ¹³University of Illinois College of Medicine, Chicago, Illinois. ¹⁴University of Colorado Denver, Denver, Colorado. ¹⁵University of Texas Southwestern Medical School, Dallas, Texas, American Gastroenterological Association. ¹⁶Kaiser Permanente, Los Angeles Medical Center, Los Angeles, California.

The American College of Radiology seeks and encourages collaboration with other organizations on the development of the ACR Appropriateness Criteria through society representation on expert panels. Participation by representatives from collaborating societies on the expert panel does not necessarily imply individual or society endorsement of the final document.

Reprint requests to: Department of Quality & Safety, American College of Radiology, 1891 Preston White Drive, Reston, VA 20191-4397.

can be attributed to the availability of trained gastroenterologists at most institutions and to reported lower complication rates with ERBD [9,10]. In contrast, some authors have recommended that patients with hilar neoplasm (Klatskin tumor) may be better managed by a percutaneous approach. These publications note that ERBD too often provides ineffective drainage of isolated bile duct segments that become opacified during ERCP and as a result develop biliary sepsis [11-14].

Contraindications to PTBD are relatively few but might include severe coagulopathy or ascites [15]. Absolute contraindications to ERBD would include pharyngeal or esophageal obstruction or active coagulopathy. Relative contraindications to ERBD might include acute pancreatitis, severe cardiopulmonary disease, and previous Roux-en-Y surgery [16].

The use of endoscopic US to guide ERBD in patients with difficult anatomy and/or after failed attempts at endoscopic cannulation of the ampulla of Vater has been described in recent literature [17-20]. Studies have described the successful placement of biliary drainage catheters using the transgastric [17] or transduodenal approach [18]. Although this approach may offer access to the biliary ducts in patients whose anatomy precludes routine endoscopic placement of drainage catheters/stents via the ampulla of Vater, this approach requires a higher level of endoscopic skills and experience not routinely seen outside of major medical centers and teaching facilities. Although this technique may provide an important alternative to percutaneous drainage catheters, further well-conducted studies are needed.

Preoperative Biliary Drainage

Percutaneous and endoscopic biliary decompression prior to surgery has been performed for many years. When surgery is delayed, percutaneous or endoscopic drainage of an obstructed biliary system not only relieves the associated symptoms of jaundice (eg, nausea, pruritis) but also helps to correct the biochemical derangements caused by prolonged biliary obstruction. Preoperative drainage allows time for surgical planning, detailed imaging, and proper laboratory testing. Correction of nutritional and biochemical derangements prior to surgery may result in improved surgical outcomes [21-24].

The surgical and clinical benefits of preoperative biliary drainage, however, remain questionable, and its benefits have been widely debated. External biliary drainage alone does not allow the bile salts to return to the gastrointestinal system, thereby potentially causing severe metabolic alterations. Early randomized trials assessing the benefits of preoperative external biliary drainage failed to demonstrate any reduction in surgical morbidity [25-27]. In contrast, internal biliary drainage, by alleviating cholestasis without loss of bile salts, has been shown to improve postoperative results [28]. In 1987, Lygidakis et al [29] published a prospective randomized study demonstrating the benefits of preoperative internal biliary drainage by reducing surgical mortality rate from 10% to 0% and associated morbidity from 70% to 16%. Other investigators have published trials in support of Lygidakis' findings [30,31]. In contrast, several studies have reported an increase in postoperative complications, especially infection rates, following preoperative biliary drainage [32-36]. The increase in postoperative infections was attributed to the contamination of the sterile bile from direct communication with skin and gut flora following percutaneous and endoscopic drainage. A meta-analysis by Saleh et al [37] in 2002 failed to show either any positive or adverse effect of preoperative endoscopic stenting prior to pancreaticoduodenectomy. More recent literature has suggested that selective biliary drainage of the remnant liver as opposed to total biliary drainage in conjunction with portal vein embolization prior to an extended hemihepatectomy can significantly promote hypertrophy of the future remnant liver segment [38].

Plastic versus Metal Stents for Malignant Disease

The choice of plastic or metallic stents for the optimal percutaneous or endoscopic palliation of patients with nonresectable malignant biliary obstruction is not clear. Metallic stents have been shown to be more cost-effective, with fewer reinterventions needed when placed in patients with life expectancies of 6-12 months [39,40]. Metallic stents also provide a better quality of life for the terminally ill patient by eliminating the need to care for an external prosthesis [41]. The long-term patency of metallic stents, on the other hand, is not good, with an occlusion rate of 30%-40% by 6 months, and nearly all patients requiring reintervention within a year [42-44].

Although there are no clear data in the literature, the temporary use of plastic stents may be preferable in cases of obstructive lesions that may respond to chemotherapy/radiotherapy (eg, lymphoma), in patients who have hilar lesions with multiple isolated biliary segments, or in patients whose histological diagnosis has yet to be made.

The use of polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE)-covered self-expandable stents in the treatment of malignant biliary obstruction has been demonstrated to provide better patency rates than metallic noncovered stents and offer the option of removal if occluded. Further studies are needed, as this approach is undergoing preliminary evaluation to identify which patient populations will most benefit [45-48]. The use of drug-eluting or dissolving stents is also under investigation [49-52].

Metal Stenting in Benign Disease

The use of metallic biliary stents for malignant biliary obstruction has been well accepted, especially for inoperable patients whose life expectancies are 6-12 months. The use of permanent metallic stents to treat benign strictures of the biliary tree (eg, bile duct strictures from chronic pancreatitis, postoperative bilioenteric anastomotic strictures) has been described in the literature but remains highly controversial [53-55]. Some studies have shown very poor clinical results, with short-term patency and a need for extensive surgery to correct the eventual biliary obstruction [56]. To date there is not enough evidence in the literature to support the use of permanent metallic stents to treat benign biliary strictures, especially in cases where surgical revision remains an option, and percutaneous treatment by balloon dilatation and long-term internal/external drainage has proven to be effective and safe [57,58]. The use of covered metal stents in benign biliary disease provides additional options for patients who are not optimal surgical candidates [59-61]. The temporary placement of fully covered metallic stents in benign biliary strictures has been shown to have good results, with 83% resolution of the benign stricture by 3.3 months and an associated complication rate of only 14% [62].

Liver Transplant/Postoperative Dilatation

Biliary complications following orthotopic liver transplantation (OLT) are an important cause of graft loss and are associated with significant morbidity and mortality. The incidence of biliary complications is between 17% and 25%, of which over half are caused by biliary stricture [63,64]. Bile ducts in the transplanted liver are extremely sensitive to injury, typically as a result of injury to the hepatic artery; ischemic injury to the bile ducts can manifest as biliary stricture and/or bile leak. It is notable that even in the case of significant obstruction or stricture of the biliary anastomosis, the bile ducts within a transplanted liver often fail to dilate.

The failure rate of PTC is reportedly higher in nondilated systems (35%) as compared to dilated systems (5%) [57]. In a study by Funaki et al [65] of 117 patients, the technical success rate using a 21-gauge needle and an 0.018-inch wire to gain initial access into a nondilated biliary system was 90%, with a major complication rate of only 4%. Following OLT, biliary strictures can be found in two forms: anastomotic and nonanastomotic or diffuse biliary strictures. Anastomotic strictures have a better prognosis and can be treated with percutaneous or endoscopic biliary drainage followed with repeated biliary dilatations. Occasionally, anastomotic strictures will require reoperation. Nonanastomotic or diffuse biliary strictures are multiple and often require retransplantation [66,67]. Independent of the underlying etiology, early diagnosis and intervention following OLT increase patient survival [68]. The use of endoscopic and/or percutaneous transhepatic therapy has proven to be effective in the management of anastomotic and nonanastomotic strictures and biliary leaks following liver transplantation [69-73].

Complications of Percutaneous Biliary Drainage

Percutaneous biliary drainage is one of the most challenging procedures performed by interventional radiologists. The reported technical success rate of PTC/PTBD is between 90%-95% [57,74-76]. Related periprocedural mortality rates of 0.7% to 8.6% have been reported [57,75]. Drainage-related complications such as hemorrhage (3%-7%), acute sepsis (3%-5%), and pleural transgression (1%-5%) can occur during the placement of the catheter, and delayed complications such as pericatheter bile leak (15%-20%), catheter dislodgement (10%-20%), catheter obstruction with or without cholangitis (47%), and tumor spread along the catheter tract have been described weeks to months following catheter placement [57,76-80].

One of the most frequent complications associated with biliary drainage is cholangitis. It has been reported to occur in up to 47% of patients treated [77]. The pathophysiology behind the development of cholangitis following biliary drainage is complex and has been described in the literature [77,81]. The use of larger catheter size has been shown to reduce the incidence of catheter obstruction and catheter-related cholangitis [82]. The use of cholergics, oral antibiotics, antibiotic-impregnated stents, and frequent biliary catheter exchanges have all been recommended to decrease biliary catheter occlusions and recurrent cholangitis.

Summary

- Endoscopic biliary drainage is generally considered the best initial therapeutic procedure when biliary drainage is necessary.
- PTC for biliary drainage has evolved over the past three decades and has established itself as an important diagnostic tool and treatment modality in the management of patients with malignant and nonmalignant obstructive jaundice.
- The choice between percutaneous (PTC/PTBD), endoscopic, or surgical therapy will greatly depend on the clinical status (comorbidities) of the patient, the etiology and extent of the biliary pathology, and the expertise of the clinical specialist. The choice between percutaneous biliary drainage techniques and endoscopic or surgical techniques will vary from institution to institution depending on operator expertise.
- In nonoperable biliary obstruction, endoscopic drainage is recommended. If it is unavailable or has failed, percutaneous drainage is recommended.
- Although the use of permanent metallic stents in malignant biliary disease is well accepted. Its use in benign disease is not. The temporary use of removable covered stents for benign biliary strictures may play an important role.
- The best therapeutic management of patients with biliary obstruction involves a team approach leveraging the experience and expertise of the primary physician, interventional radiologists, gastroenterologists, and surgeons.

Supporting Documents

- [ACR Appropriateness Criteria® Overview](#)
- [Evidence Table](#)

References

1. Hortobagyi GN. Treatment of breast cancer. *N Engl J Med*. 1998;339(14):974-984.
2. Rougier P, Van Cutsem E, Bajetta E, et al. Randomised trial of irinotecan versus fluorouracil by continuous infusion after fluorouracil failure in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer. *Lancet*. 1998;352(9138):1407-1412.
3. Feydy A, Vilgrain V, Denys A, et al. Helical CT assessment in hilar cholangiocarcinoma: correlation with surgical and pathologic findings. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 1999;172(1):73-77.
4. Fulcher AS, Turner MA. HASTE MR cholangiography in the evaluation of hilar cholangiocarcinoma. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 1997;169(6):1501-1505.
5. Hann LE, Greatrex KV, Bach AM, Fong Y, Blumgart LH. Cholangiocarcinoma at the hepatic hilus: sonographic findings. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 1997;168(4):985-989.
6. Freeman ML, Overby C. Selective MRCP and CT-targeted drainage of malignant hilar biliary obstruction with self-expanding metallic stents. *Gastrointest Endosc*. 2003;58(1):41-49.
7. Kim HM, Park JY, Kim KS, et al. Intraductal ultrasonography combined with percutaneous transhepatic cholangioscopy for the preoperative evaluation of longitudinal tumor extent in hilar cholangiocarcinoma. *J Gastroenterol Hepatol*. 2010;25(2):286-292.
8. Nakai Y, Isayama H, Tsujino T, et al. Intraductal US in the assessment of tumor involvement to the orifice of the cystic duct by malignant biliary obstruction. *Gastrointest Endosc*. 2008;68(1):78-83.
9. Speer AG, Cotton PB, Russell RC, et al. Randomised trial of endoscopic versus percutaneous stent insertion in malignant obstructive jaundice. *Lancet*. 1987;2(8550):57-62.
10. Van Leeuwen DJ, Huibregtse K, Tytgat GN. Carcinoma of the hepatic confluence 25 years after Klatskin's description: diagnosis and endoscopic management. *Semin Liver Dis*. 1990;10(2):102-113.
11. Kosuge T, Yamamoto J, Shimada K, Yamasaki S, Makuuchi M. Improved surgical results for hilar cholangiocarcinoma with procedures including major hepatic resection. *Ann Surg*. 1999;230(5):663-671.
12. Nimura Y, Kamiya J, Kondo S, et al. Aggressive preoperative management and extended surgery for hilar cholangiocarcinoma: Nagoya experience. *J Hepatobiliary Pancreat Surg*. 2000;7(2):155-162.
13. Sugiura Y, Nakamura S, Iida S, et al. Extensive resection of the bile ducts combined with liver resection for cancer of the main hepatic duct junction: a cooperative study of the Keio Bile Duct Cancer Study Group. *Surgery*. 1994;115(4):445-451.

14. Lee SH, Park JK, Yoon WJ, et al. Optimal biliary drainage for inoperable Klatskin's tumor based on Bismuth type. *World J Gastroenterol*. 2007;13(29):3948-3955.
15. Ring EJ, Kerlan RK, Jr. Interventional biliary radiology. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 1984;142(1):31-34.
16. Silveira ML, Seamon MJ, Porshinsky B, et al. Complications related to endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography: a comprehensive clinical review. *J Gastrointest Liver Dis*. 2009;18(1):73-82.
17. Bories E, Pesenti C, Caillol F, Lopes C, Giovannini M. Transgastric endoscopic ultrasonography-guided biliary drainage: results of a pilot study. *Endoscopy*. 2007;39(4):287-291.
18. Hanada K, Iiboshi T, Ishii Y. Endoscopic ultrasound-guided choledochoduodenostomy for palliative biliary drainage in cases with inoperable pancreas head carcinoma. *Dig Endosc*. 2009;21 Suppl 1:S75-78.
19. Horaguchi J, Fujita N, Noda Y, et al. Endosonography-guided biliary drainage in cases with difficult transpapillary endoscopic biliary drainage. *Dig Endosc*. 2009;21(4):239-244.
20. Park do H, Koo JE, Oh J, et al. EUS-guided biliary drainage with one-step placement of a fully covered metal stent for malignant biliary obstruction: a prospective feasibility study. *Am J Gastroenterol*. 2009;104(9):2168-2174.
21. Kimmings AN, van Deventer SJ, Obertop H, Rauws EA, Huibregtse K, Gouma DJ. Endotoxin, cytokines, and endotoxin binding proteins in obstructive jaundice and after preoperative biliary drainage. *Gut*. 2000;46(5):725-731.
22. Padillo FJ, Andicoberry B, Muntane J, et al. Factors predicting nutritional derangements in patients with obstructive jaundice: multivariate analysis. *World J Surg*. 2001;25(4):413-418.
23. Abdullah SA, Gupta T, Jaafar KA, Chung YF, Ooi LL, Mesenas SJ. Ampullary carcinoma: effect of preoperative biliary drainage on surgical outcome. *World J Gastroenterol*. 2009;15(23):2908-2912.
24. Kloek JJ, van der Gaag NA, Aziz Y, et al. Endoscopic and percutaneous preoperative biliary drainage in patients with suspected hilar cholangiocarcinoma. *J Gastrointest Surg*. 2010;14(1):119-125.
25. Hatfield AR, Tobias R, Terblanche J, et al. Preoperative external biliary drainage in obstructive jaundice. A prospective controlled clinical trial. *Lancet*. 1982;2(8304):896-899.
26. McPherson GA, Benjamin IS, Hodgson HJ, Bowley NB, Allison DJ, Blumgart LH. Pre-operative percutaneous transhepatic biliary drainage: the results of a controlled trial. *Br J Surg*. 1984;71(5):371-375.
27. Pitt HA, Gomes AS, Lois JF, Mann LL, Deutsch LS, Longmire WP, Jr. Does preoperative percutaneous biliary drainage reduce operative risk or increase hospital cost? *Ann Surg*. 1985;201(5):545-553.
28. Sewnath ME, Birjmohun RS, Rauws EA, Huibregtse K, Obertop H, Gouma DJ. The effect of preoperative biliary drainage on postoperative complications after pancreaticoduodenectomy. *J Am Coll Surg*. 2001;192(6):726-734.
29. Lygidakis NJ, van der Heyde MN, Lubbers MJ. Evaluation of preoperative biliary drainage in the surgical management of pancreatic head carcinoma. *Acta Chir Scand*. 1987;153(11-12):665-668.
30. Marcus SG, Dobryansky M, Shamamian P, et al. Endoscopic biliary drainage before pancreaticoduodenectomy for periampullary malignancies. *J Clin Gastroenterol*. 1998;26(2):125-129.
31. Trede M, Schwall G. The complications of pancreatotomy. *Ann Surg*. 1988;207(1):39-47.
32. Garcia-Plata E, Seco JL, de la Plaza M, et al. [Influence of preoperative biliary drainage on postoperative morbidity and mortality after pancreatoduodenectomy]. *Cir Esp*. 2005;77(4):203-207.
33. Hochwald SN, Burke EC, Jarnagin WR, Fong Y, Blumgart LH. Association of preoperative biliary stenting with increased postoperative infectious complications in proximal cholangiocarcinoma. *Arch Surg*. 1999;134(3):261-266.
34. Jagannath P, Dhir V, Shrikhande S, Shah RC, Mullerpatan P, Mohandas KM. Effect of preoperative biliary stenting on immediate outcome after pancreaticoduodenectomy. *Br J Surg*. 2005;92(3):356-361.
35. Povoski SP, Karpeh MS, Jr., Conlon KC, Blumgart LH, Brennan MF. Association of preoperative biliary drainage with postoperative outcome following pancreaticoduodenectomy. *Ann Surg*. 1999;230(2):131-142.
36. Ferrero A, Lo Tesoriere R, Vigano L, Caggiano L, Sgotto E, Capussotti L. Preoperative biliary drainage increases infectious complications after hepatectomy for proximal bile duct tumor obstruction. *World J Surg*. 2009;33(2):318-325.
37. Saleh MM, Norregaard P, Jorgensen HL, Andersen PK, Matzen P. Preoperative endoscopic stent placement before pancreaticoduodenectomy: a meta-analysis of the effect on morbidity and mortality. *Gastrointest Endosc*. 2002;56(4):529-534.
38. Ishizawa T, Hasegawa K, Sano K, Imamura H, Kokudo N, Makuuchi M. Selective versus total biliary drainage for obstructive jaundice caused by a hepatobiliary malignancy. *Am J Surg*. 2007;193(2):149-154.

39. Wagner HJ, Knyrim K, Vakil N, Klose KJ. Plastic endoprosthesis versus metal stents in the palliative treatment of malignant hilar biliary obstruction. A prospective and randomized trial. *Endoscopy*. 1993;25(3):213-218.
40. Yeoh KG, Zimmerman MJ, Cunningham JT, Cotton PB. Comparative costs of metal versus plastic biliary stent strategies for malignant obstructive jaundice by decision analysis. *Gastrointest Endosc*. 1999;49(4 Pt 1):466-471.
41. Abraham NS, Barkun JS, Barkun AN. Palliation of malignant biliary obstruction: a prospective trial examining impact on quality of life. *Gastrointest Endosc*. 2002;56(6):835-841.
42. Lee MJ, Dawson SL, Mueller PR, et al. Failed metallic biliary stents: causes and management of delayed complications. *Clin Radiol*. 1994;49(12):857-862.
43. Rossi P, Bezzi M, Rossi M, et al. Metallic stents in malignant biliary obstruction: results of a multicenter European study of 240 patients. *J Vasc Interv Radiol*. 1994;5(2):279-285.
44. Salomonowitz EK, Adam A, Antonucci F, Stuckmann G, Zollikofer CL. Malignant biliary obstruction: treatment with self-expandable stainless steel endoprosthesis. *Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol*. 1992;15(6):351-355.
45. Hausegger KA, Thurnher S, Bodendorfer G, et al. Treatment of malignant biliary obstruction with polyurethane-covered Wallstents. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 1998;170(2):403-408.
46. Rossi P, Bezzi M, Salvatori FM, Panzetti C, Rossi M, Pavia G. Clinical experience with covered wallstents for biliary malignancies: 23-month follow-Up. *Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol*. 1997;20(6):441-447.
47. Fanelli F, Orgera G, Bezzi M, Rossi P, Allegritti M, Passariello R. Management of malignant biliary obstruction: technical and clinical results using an expanded polytetrafluoroethylene fluorinated ethylene propylene (ePTFE/FEP)-covered metallic stent after 6-year experience. *Eur Radiol*. 2008;18(5):911-919.
48. Han YM, Kwak HS, Jin GY, Lee SO, Chung GH. Treatment of malignant biliary obstruction with a PTFE-covered self-expandable nitinol stent. *Korean J Radiol*. 2007;8(5):410-417.
49. Ginsberg G, Cope C, Shah J, et al. In vivo evaluation of a new bioabsorbable self-expanding biliary stent. *Gastrointest Endosc*. 2003;58(5):777-784.
50. Hatzidakis A, Krokidis M, Kalbakis K, Romanos J, Petrakis I, Gourtsoyiannis N. ePTFE/FEP-covered metallic stents for palliation of malignant biliary disease: can tumor ingrowth be prevented? *Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol*. 2007;30(5):950-958.
51. Schoder M, Rossi P, Uflacker R, et al. Malignant biliary obstruction: treatment with ePTFE-FEP- covered endoprosthesis initial technical and clinical experiences in a multicenter trial. *Radiology*. 2002;225(1):35-42.
52. Suk KT, Kim JW, Kim HS, et al. Human application of a metallic stent covered with a paclitaxel-incorporated membrane for malignant biliary obstruction: multicenter pilot study. *Gastrointest Endosc*. 2007;66(4):798-803.
53. Jeng KS. Treatment of intrahepatic biliary stricture associated with hepatolithiasis. *Hepatogastroenterology*. 1997;44(14):342-351.
54. Maccioni F, Rossi M, Salvatori FM, Ricci P, Bezzi M, Rossi P. Metallic stents in benign biliary strictures: three-year follow-up. *Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol*. 1992;15(6):360-366.
55. Yoon HK, Sung KB, Song HY, et al. Benign biliary strictures associated with recurrent pyogenic cholangitis: treatment with expandable metallic stents. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 1997;169(6):1523-1527.
56. Lopez RR, Jr., Cosenza CA, Lois J, et al. Long-term results of metallic stents for benign biliary strictures. *Arch Surg*. 2001;136(6):664-669.
57. Burke DR, Lewis CA, Cardella JF, et al. Quality improvement guidelines for percutaneous transhepatic cholangiography and biliary drainage. *J Vasc Interv Radiol*. 2003;14(9 Pt 2):S243-246.
58. Kocher M, Cerna M, Havlik R, Kral V, Gryga A, Duda M. Percutaneous treatment of benign bile duct strictures. *Eur J Radiol*. 2007;62(2):170-174.
59. Kim JH, Gwon DI, Ko GY, et al. Temporary placement of retrievable fully covered metallic stents versus percutaneous balloon dilation in the treatment of benign biliary strictures. *J Vasc Interv Radiol*. 2011;22(6):893-899.
60. Krokidis M, Fanelli F, Orgera G, et al. Percutaneous palliation of pancreatic head cancer: randomized comparison of ePTFE/FEP-covered versus uncovered nitinol biliary stents. *Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol*. 2011;34(2):352-361.
61. Kullman E, Frozanpor F, Soderlund C, et al. Covered versus uncovered self-expandable nitinol stents in the palliative treatment of malignant distal biliary obstruction: results from a randomized, multicenter study. *Gastrointest Endosc*. 2010;72(5):915-923.

62. Mahajan A, Ho H, Sauer B, et al. Temporary placement of fully covered self-expandable metal stents in benign biliary strictures: midterm evaluation (with video). *Gastrointest Endosc.* 2009;70(2):303-309.
63. Baccarani U, Risaliti A, Zoratti L, et al. Role of endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography in the diagnosis and treatment of biliary tract complications after orthotopic liver transplantation. *Dig Liver Dis.* 2002;34(8):582-586.
64. Fleck A, Zanotelli ML, Meine M, et al. Biliary tract complications after orthotopic liver transplantation in adult patients. *Transplant Proc.* 2002;34(2):519-520.
65. Funaki B, Zaleski GX, Straus CA, et al. Percutaneous biliary drainage in patients with nondilated intrahepatic bile ducts. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 1999;173(6):1541-1544.
66. Rieber A, Brambs HJ, Lauchart W. The radiological management of biliary complications following liver transplantation. *Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol.* 1996;19(4):242-247.
67. Righi D, Cesarani F, Muraro E, Gazzera C, Salizzoni M, Gandini G. Role of interventional radiology in the treatment of biliary strictures following orthotopic liver transplantation. *Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol.* 2002;25(1):30-35.
68. Stratta RJ, Wood RP, Langnas AN, et al. Diagnosis and treatment of biliary tract complications after orthotopic liver transplantation. *Surgery.* 1989;106(4):675-683; discussion 683-674.
69. Aytekin C, Boyvat F, Harman A, Ozyer U, Sevmis S, Haberal M. Percutaneous management of anastomotic bile leaks following liver transplantation. *Diagn Interv Radiol.* 2007;13(2):101-104.
70. Kim ES, Lee BJ, Won JY, Choi JY, Lee DK. Percutaneous transhepatic biliary drainage may serve as a successful rescue procedure in failed cases of endoscopic therapy for a post-living donor liver transplantation biliary stricture. *Gastrointest Endosc.* 2009;69(1):38-46.
71. Kim JH, Ko GY, Sung KB, et al. Bile leak following living donor liver transplantation: clinical efficacy of percutaneous transhepatic treatment. *Liver Transpl.* 2008;14(8):1142-1149.
72. Lopez-Benitez R, Barragan-Campos HM, Richter GM, et al. Interventional radiologic procedures in the treatment of complications after liver transplantation. *Clin Transplant.* 2009;23 Suppl 21:92-101.
73. Weber A, Prinz C, Gerngross C, et al. Long-term outcome of endoscopic and/or percutaneous transhepatic therapy in patients with biliary stricture after orthotopic liver transplantation. *J Gastroenterol.* 2009;44(12):1195-1202.
74. Gunther RW, Schild H, Thelen M. Percutaneous transhepatic biliary drainage: experience with 311 procedures. *Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol.* 1988;11(2):65-71.
75. Lameris JS, Obertop H, Jeekel J. Biliary drainage by ultrasound-guided puncture of the left hepatic duct. *Clin Radiol.* 1985;36(3):269-274.
76. Weber A, Gaa J, Rosca B, et al. Complications of percutaneous transhepatic biliary drainage in patients with dilated and nondilated intrahepatic bile ducts. *Eur J Radiol.* 2009;72(3):412-417.
77. Carrasco CH, Zornoza J, Bechtel WJ. Malignant biliary obstruction: complications of percutaneous biliary drainage. *Radiology.* 1984;152(2):343-346.
78. Chapman WC, Sharp KW, Weaver F, Sawyers JL. Tumor seeding from percutaneous biliary catheters. *Ann Surg.* 1989;209(6):708-713; discussion 713-705.
79. Mueller PR, van Sonnenberg E, Ferrucci JT, Jr. Percutaneous biliary drainage: technical and catheter-related problems in 200 procedures. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 1982;138(1):17-23.
80. Fidelman N, Bloom AI, Kerlan RK, Jr., et al. Hepatic arterial injuries after percutaneous biliary interventions in the era of laparoscopic surgery and liver transplantation: experience with 930 patients. *Radiology.* 2008;247(3):880-886.
81. Audisio RA, Morosi C, Bozzetti F, et al. The outcome of cholangitis after percutaneous biliary drainage in neoplastic jaundice. *HPB Surg.* 1993;6(4):287-293.
82. Libby ED, Leung JW. Prevention of biliary stent clogging: a clinical review. *Am J Gastroenterol.* 1996;91(7):1301-1308.

The ACR Committee on Appropriateness Criteria and its expert panels have developed criteria for determining appropriate imaging examinations for diagnosis and treatment of specified medical condition(s). These criteria are intended to guide radiologists, radiation oncologists and referring physicians in making decisions regarding radiologic imaging and treatment. Generally, the complexity and severity of a patient's clinical condition should dictate the selection of appropriate imaging procedures or treatments. Only those examinations generally used for evaluation of the patient's condition are ranked. Other imaging studies necessary to evaluate other co-existent diseases or other medical consequences of this condition are not considered in this document. The availability of equipment or personnel may influence the selection of appropriate imaging procedures or treatments. Imaging techniques classified as investigational by the FDA have not been considered in developing these criteria; however, study of new equipment and applications should be encouraged. The ultimate decision regarding the appropriateness of any specific radiologic examination or treatment must be made by the referring physician and radiologist in light of all the circumstances presented in an individual examination.