

**American College of Radiology
ACR Appropriateness Criteria®
Radiologic Management of Gastric Varices**

Variant 1: Cirrhotic patient with active bleeding from large high-flow gastric varices, significant portal hypertension, and a MELD score of 14. CT demonstrates a large gastrosplenic shunt.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category
BRTO	Usually Appropriate
Endoscopic management	Usually Appropriate
Partial splenic embolization	May Be Appropriate
Surgical management	May Be Appropriate
TIPS	Usually Appropriate

Variant 2: Cirrhotic patient with bleeding from large high-flow gastric varices with a MELD score of 20. CT demonstrates a large gastrosplenic shunt.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category
BRTO	Usually Appropriate
Endoscopic management	Usually Appropriate
Partial splenic embolization	May Be Appropriate
Surgical management	May Be Appropriate
TIPS	May Be Appropriate

Variant 3: Cirrhotic patient bleeding from small, low-flow gastric varices and moderate ascites with a MELD score of 18. MRI does not demonstrate a gastrosplenic shunt.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category
BRTO	Usually Not Appropriate
Endoscopic management	Usually Appropriate
Partial splenic embolization	May Be Appropriate
Surgical management	May Be Appropriate
TIPS	Usually Appropriate

Variant 4: Cirrhotic patient bleeding from large, high-flow gastric varices with hepatic encephalopathy and a MELD score of 18. MRI demonstrates a large gastrosplenic shunt.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category
BRTO	Usually Appropriate
Endoscopic management	Usually Appropriate
Partial splenic embolization	May Be Appropriate
Surgical management	May Be Appropriate
TIPS	May Be Appropriate

Variant 5:

Cirrhotic patient bleeding from esophageal varices and gastric varices not amenable to endoscopic management with a MELD score of 13 and a hepatic wedge pressure of 22 mmHg. CT demonstrates a small gastrosplenic shunt.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category
BRTO	Usually Not Appropriate
Partial splenic embolization	May Be Appropriate
Surgical management	May Be Appropriate
TIPS	Usually Appropriate

Variant 6:

Cirrhotic patient bleeding from large high-flow gastric varices with a MELD score of 12 and a hepatic wedge pressure of 10 mmHg. MRI demonstrates a large gastrosplenic shunt.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category
BRTO	Usually Appropriate
Endoscopic management	Usually Appropriate
Partial splenic embolization	May Be Appropriate
Surgical management	May Be Appropriate
TIPS	Usually Appropriate

Variant 7:

Patient with gastric variceal bleeding, found to have chronic splenic vein occlusion on MRI.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category
BRTO	Usually Not Appropriate
Endoscopic management (sclerosis or cyanoacrylate injection)	May Be Appropriate
Partial splenic embolization	Usually Appropriate
Splenic vein recanalization	Usually Appropriate
Surgical management	Usually Appropriate
TIPS	Usually Not Appropriate

Variant 8:

Patient with chronic intrahepatic and extrahepatic portal vein occlusion with cavernous transformation on CT with gastric variceal bleeding.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category
BRTO	Usually Not Appropriate
Endoscopic management (sclerosis or cyanoacrylate injection)	May Be Appropriate
Partial splenic embolization	May Be Appropriate
Portal vein recanalization plus TIPS	Usually Appropriate
Surgical management	May Be Appropriate

RADIOLOGIC MANAGEMENT OF GASTRIC VARICES

Expert Panel on Interventional Radiology: Charles Y. Kim, MD^a; Jason W. Pinchot, MD^b; Osmanuddin Ahmed, MD^c; Aaron R. Braun, MD^d; Brooks D. Cash, MD^e; Barry W. Feig, MD^f; Sanjeeva P. Kalva, MD^g; Erica M. Knavel Koepsel, MD^h; Matthew J. Scheidt, MDⁱ; Kristofer Schramm, MD^j; David M. Sella, MD^k; Clifford R. Weiss, MD^l; Eric J. Hohenwarter, MD.^m

Summary of Literature Review

Introduction/Background

Gastric varices are a type of portosystemic shunt that may occur in isolation or in conjunction with esophageal varices. In the setting of cirrhosis and associated portal hypertension, gastric varices accompany esophageal varices in approximately 20% of patients and are due to the concurrently elevated splenic venous pressure. In these cases, gastric varices are most often gastroesophageal in nature as opposed to isolated gastric varices [1]. With portal vein occlusion, both esophageal and gastric varices may develop in the absence of cirrhosis; in this setting, the varices are most commonly isolated gastric varices rather than gastroesophageal [1]. However, gastric varices can occur in the absence of cirrhosis and portal hypertension, most frequently related to portal or splenic vein thrombosis related to conditions such as pancreatitis. Such interruption of splenic venous outflow will result in enlargement of portosystemic collateral veins, particularly gastric varices. Regardless of the underlying etiology, gastric varices typically originate from the mid to distal splenic vein, with flow toward the left renal vein, inferior vena cava, and other intra-abdominal systemic veins.

In cases of acute gastric variceal hemorrhage, patients are initially managed with blood transfusions, correction of underlying coagulopathy, vasoactive medications, and antibiotic prophylaxis. Endoscopy is classically the initial diagnostic modality for a patient with upper gastrointestinal (GI) hemorrhage given its high accuracy in diagnosing the etiology of hemorrhage and relative efficacy in treating many types of hemorrhage. In cases of acute massive hemorrhage, balloon tamponade may be attempted on a temporary basis with the Linton-Nachlas tube [2]. In some cases, the Sengstaken-Blakemore or Minnesota tubes with inflation of only the gastric balloon and anchoring against the gastroesophageal junction might be helpful, depending on the location of the gastric varices. Classification of the distribution of gastric varices is helpful for determining the ideal treatment. Based on the Sarin classification, there are four primary types of varices that involve the stomach: Gastroesophageal varices type 1 (GOV1) extend from the esophagus into the lesser curvature, gastroesophageal varices type 2 (GOV2) extend from the esophagus into the fundus, isolated gastric varices type 1 (IGV1) are located in the fundus, and isolated gastric varices type 2 (IGV2) are located elsewhere in the stomach [3]. Although varices extending into the lesser curvature (GOV1) are the most common type of gastric varices with cirrhosis, varices that involve the gastric fundus (GOV2 and IGV1) are much more frequent in the setting of portal or splenic vein thrombosis and are at higher risk of hemorrhage [3].

Special Imaging Considerations

Diagnosis of gastric varices is classically made on endoscopy; however, CT has been shown to detect gastric varices with high sensitivity and specificity [4,5]. Furthermore, performance of a contrast-enhanced CT or MRI is of particular importance when evaluating patients with gastric varices in order to identify the inflow and outflow because this can allow determination of the feasibility of balloon-occluded retrograde transvenous obliteration (BRTO). Similarly, identification of the presence of portal or splenic vein occlusion will determine which therapies can be considered and which will be more or less effective. Therefore, acquisition of a contrast-enhanced CT or MRI can provide crucial information for guiding therapy and thus should be obtained routinely for this patient population.

^aDuke University Medical Center, Durham, North Carolina. ^bPanel Chair, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin. ^cUniversity of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois. ^dSt. Elizabeth Regional Medical Center, Lincoln, Nebraska. ^eUniversity of Texas Health Science Center at Houston and McGovern Medical School, Houston, Texas; American Gastroenterological Association. ^fThe University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, Texas; American College of Surgeons. ^gMassachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts. ^hMayo Clinic, Rochester, Minnesota. ⁱFroedtert & The Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Wisconsin. ^jUniversity of Colorado Denver Anschutz Medical Campus, Aurora, Colorado. ^kMayo Clinic, Jacksonville, Florida. ^lJohns Hopkins Bayview Medical Center, Baltimore, Maryland. ^mSpecialty Chair, Froedtert & The Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

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: publications@acr.org

Discussion of Procedures by Variant

Variant 1: Cirrhotic patient with active bleeding from large high-flow gastric varices, significant portal hypertension, and a MELD score of 14. CT demonstrates a large gastrosplenic shunt.

Endoscopic Management

Endoscopy is an excellent modality for diagnosing and evaluating gastric varices as a source of upper GI bleeding. As with esophageal varices, endoscopic management is one of the initial considerations in the setting of gastric variceal hemorrhage [2]. Overall, there are three primary methods for endoscopic treatment of gastric varices: injection of sclerosant into the varices to induce thrombosis and occlusion (endoscopic variceal sclerotherapy), injection of cyanoacrylate into the varices to achieve obturation (endoscopic variceal obturation), and variceal ligation with standard rubber bands or other devices (endoscopic variceal ligation) [6].

Conventional endoscopic injection of sclerosant, although an effective therapy for esophageal varices, appears to be less successful in the treatment of gastric varices. Sarin et al [7] reported results for endoscopic sclerotherapy performed for actively bleeding gastric varices in 18 patients with a 67% rate for control of bleeding. There is a relative paucity of literature on endoscopic gastric variceal sclerotherapy, which has become less popular in favor of glue obturation and endoscopic ligation, which are the recommended endoscopic treatments by the most current American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases guidelines [2]. A recent meta-analysis of randomized studies comparing endoscopic variceal obturation to endoscopic variceal ligation included 194 patients [8]. Actively bleeding gastric varices were controlled more effectively with cyanoacrylate injection compared with band ligation (94% versus 80%, $P = .03$). Endoscopic variceal obturation had a significantly lower rebleeding rate for GOV1 (26% versus 48%, $P = .04$) and IGV1 (18% versus 86%, $P = .02$). However, control of GOV2 had similar rebleeding rates (36% versus 35%, $P = .90$). Complication rates were also similar. The addition of endoscopic variceal sclerotherapy to endoscopic variceal ligation may be helpful. In a randomized trial of 120 cirrhotic patients with bleeding gastroesophageal varices, the rebleeding rates were similar, but the mean number of sessions was significantly lower in patients undergoing combined endoscopic sclerotherapy and ligation compared with patients undergoing endoscopic variceal ligation alone (2.2 versus 3.4, $P < .01$). High-flow varices have been reported to result in significantly earlier recurrences when compared with slow-flow varices [9].

TIPS

Transjugular intrahepatic portal systemic shunts (TIPS) creation is a well-established treatment for esophageal variceal hemorrhage resulting from portal hypertension, the goal of which is to relieve the elevated portal pressures that caused the development of varices and subsequent pressurization. Although this treatment modality serves to address the underlying problem, it comes at the expense of a significant incidence of resulting hepatic encephalopathy of approximately 15% to 25% and risk of hepatic decompensation related to diversion of portal flow away from the hepatic parenchyma, with increasing risk with a higher Model for End Stage Liver Disease (MELD) score [10]. In a recent randomized trial of covered TIPS versus endoscopic therapy with beta blockers for patients with gastroesophageal varices (82% with esophageal varices only), TIPS was found to be superior for reduction of variceal bleeding (0% rebleeding episodes after TIPS versus 37% after endoscopic/medical management, $P = .001$), although survival was similar [11]. Although hepatic encephalopathy was more frequent after TIPS within 1 year (35% versus 14%, $P = .035$), there was no significant difference after 1 year [11]. Of note, although the vast majority of TIPS data are gathered with bare metal stents, current standard of practice is with covered stents, given that shunt dysfunction has been shown to be significantly improved with covered stents in randomized trials [12].

Although data on the use of TIPS for management of gastric variceal hemorrhage are more sparse, the data are similarly supportive. To date, there are eight studies specifically evaluating TIPS for treatment of patients with portal hypertension and gastric varices with >10 patients, comprising a total of 201 patients (range for individual studies: 12–35 patients) [13–20]. Four of these studies have intrainstitutional comparisons with BRTO outcomes [15,16,18,20] and one randomized to endoscopic management [17]. Within studies, there is substantial variation in reporting, with most results based on variable durations of clinical follow-up. In six studies, TIPS were performed with bare metal stents [13–15,17–19]. In two studies analyzing patients with active gastric variceal bleeding, TIPS with bare metal stents were successful in 90% to 96% [13,14]. However, the 12-month rebleeding rates were 31%, with a post-TIPS hepatic encephalopathy rate of 16% [13]. In the single randomized trial comparing TIPS to endoscopic management (with cyanoacrylate), the rate of gastric variceal rebleeding after TIPS was significantly lower than with endoscopic management (11% versus 38%, $P = .014$) with a median of 32

months of follow-up [17]. The rate of upper GI bleeding from any source was 43% versus 59%, $P = .12$. Although hepatic encephalopathy occurred more frequently after TIPS (26% versus 3%, $P < .01$), survival and other complications were similar [17].

The utilization of stent grafts for TIPS creation is expected to improve outcomes given their superior patency rates in randomized trials [12], particularly considering that over 70% of gastric variceal rebleeding occurrences after TIPS have been associated with TIPS dysfunction (TIPS stenosis or thrombosis) [17]. Two studies exclusively analyzed TIPS created with stent grafts. Kim et al [16] reported a 7% rate of rebleeding from gastric varices with a mean of 917 days of follow-up; in one patient with rebleeding 2 days after TIPS insertion, resolution was achieved with coil embolization of the varices, whereas the other patient experienced rebleeding 2 years after TIPS that was due to a TIPS stenosis, which was successfully treated with TIPS revision. Sabri et al [20] reported an 11% rate of rebleeding from gastric varices at a mean of 19.5 months of follow-up; in two of the cases, the patient had hepatic venous stenosis, which was treated successfully with revision. In the third case, the patient had normal TIPS, requiring BRTO for successful management. Of note, all three of these patients were treated with coil or plug embolization of the feeding portal vein branch during the initial TIPS procedure. The strategy of performing coil embolization of gastric varices concurrent with inserting a TIPS has been reported to result in persistent variceal patency and a substantial and surprisingly high rebleeding rate (28%) relative to those who did not undergo embolization (20%) at a median follow-up of 129 days [21]. The authors hypothesized that embolization of the dominant gastric varices is relatively ineffective because of the additional inflow veins that supply or will enlarge to supply the gastric varices. However, Jiang et al [22] reported a rebleeding rate of only 12% at a mean of 236 days with TIPS plus embolization of gastroesophageal varices. Patient selection and technique may account for the disparate differences between the two studies.

BRTO

BRTO describes transvenous sclerosis or occlusion of gastric varices via a spontaneous gastroduodenal shunt. Although the original technique for occlusion of the gastroduodenal shunt was described with an occlusion balloon, the use of vascular plugs (ie, PARTO) or coils (ie, CARTO) is increasing in popularity. Furthermore, various sclerosants and gelatin sponge mixtures have been utilized successfully. For the purpose of this manuscript, the term BRTO is inclusive of all of these variant techniques. BRTO has emerged as a popular method for treatment of gastric varices, which appears to convey a lesser risk of hepatic encephalopathy compared with TIPS because blood flow is not diverted from the portal system as occurs with TIPS. In fact, one of the emerging indications for BRTO is encephalopathy with the presence of a gastroduodenal or gastrosplenohepatic shunt [23-30]. In five studies evaluating a total of 35 patients with encephalopathy, there was resolution or significant reduction in encephalopathy in all patients [24,26-28,31]. The diversion of blood flow away from the liver with TIPS may also explain the observation of worsened MELD scores [25,32-34]. Because the BRTO procedure occludes a spontaneous hepatofugal shunt, the diversion of blood flow toward the liver [24,35-38] may help to preserve hepatic function [26,36,39]. However, it is controversial whether the Child-Pugh score remains unchanged or improves after BRTO [28,36,40]. Furthermore, the majority of authors conclude that if the Child-Pugh score improves initially in the first 6 to 9 months after BRTO, it then returns to pre-BRTO baseline levels [26,36].

Overall, the technical success rates of BRTO for patients with gastroduodenal/splenohepatic shunts and gastric varices range from 79% to 100% [18,26,27,35,41-52]. In most studies, gastric variceal rebleed rates of patients who had undergone a successful BRTO procedure range between 0% and 20% [18,24,26-28,35-37,41-59]. In a recent meta-analysis [60] that included 1,016 patients from 24 studies, the technical success rate was found to be 96.4%. The clinical success rate was 97.3% at a mean follow-up of 487 days, with clinical success defined as no recurrence or rebleeding from gastric varices or complete obliteration of varices on subsequent imaging. The flow velocity and flow volume in the varices have been correlated with outcomes after BRTO, with slow flow and low volume being associated with a higher success rate [61].

Procedural complications, when mentioned, include gross hematuria (15%–100% of BRTO cases) with hemoglobinuria-induced renal failure described in up to 4.8% of cases. Pulmonary embolism occurs in 1.5% to 4.1% of cases (symptomatic in 1.4%–2.5% of cases). Anaphylaxis to ethanolamine oleate (up to 5%), cardiac arrhythmias (up to 1.5%), and rapidly declining hepatic function (up to 5%–7%) have also been described. The 30-day mortality rates range from 0% to 4.1%, and the most common cause of death is progressive hepatic failure [24,26-28,30,35-38,47,51,53,55,56,59,62-64]. Notably, occlusion of gastroduodenal or splenohepatic shunts can aggravate sequelae of portal hypertension because these constitute portosystemic shunts that decompress the portal venous system. The aggravation of nongastric (esophageal or duodenal) varices appears to be a major

problem over the long term and is likely reflective of persistent or increasing portal hypertension following BRTO [24,26,27,30,35,37,38,47,51,53,55,62,63]. In four studies evaluating 160 patients who underwent BRTO with continuous post-BRTO endoscopic follow-up, the esophageal variceal aggravation rates (expressed as a Kaplan-Meier analysis) at 1, 2, and 3 years were: 27% to 35%, 45% to 66%, and 45% to 91%, respectively [24,32,51,55]. In another two studies evaluating 117 patients with BRTO, the percentage of patients with aggravated esophageal varices was 30% to 68%, and the percentage of patients who had bleeding esophageal varices was 17% to 24% (36%–57% of those with aggravated esophageal varices went on to have bleeding) [35,53]. In the meta-analysis by Park et al [60], the esophageal variceal recurrence rate was 33.3%. The risk of esophageal varix aggravation has been shown to correlate significantly with the total bilirubin level and a portosystemic gradient >13 [65]. Thus, pre-BRTO prophylactic esophageal banding, portosystemic gradient measurement, laboratory analysis, and post-BRTO surveillance may be helpful to avoid subsequent esophageal variceal hemorrhage. Other complications reflective of increased portal hypertension following BRTO include the development of portal hypertensive gastropathy (occurs in 5%–13%), ascites (occurs in 0%–44%), and hydrothorax/pleural effusion (occurs in 0%–8%) [24,28,36,55,59,64]. The presence of a TIPS in patients undergoing BRTO has been correlated with significantly lower ascites/hydrothorax rates and lower recurrent hemorrhage rates, although survival was similar [66]. Furthermore, concomitant performance of partial splenic embolization also can mitigate esophageal variceal aggravation as described below.

The four retrospective studies that included intrainstitutional comparison between BRTO and TIPS had a total of 133 BRTO cases and 94 TIPS cases [15,16,18,20]. The study by Choi et al [15] had an inadequate sample size for statistical comparison (BRTO: 8, TIPS: 13). Ninoi et al [18], who compared patients undergoing bare TIPS versus BRTO, reported a 1-year rebleeding rate of 20% after TIPS versus 2% after BRTO ($P < .01$). Furthermore, the 1-, 3-, and 5-year survival rates after BRTO were better than those after TIPS in Child-Pugh patients: 96%, 83%, and 76% versus 81%, 64%, and 40%, respectively ($P = .01$) [18]. However, the more recent studies comparing covered TIPS with BRTO both revealed statistically similar rebleeding rates. Sabri et al [20] reported a 1-year rebleeding rate of 11% in the TIPS group and 0% in the BRTO group ($P = .25$) with a hepatic encephalopathy rate of 15% and 0% ($P = .12$). Kim et al [16] reported a 7% and 8% rebleeding rate throughout the study duration, respectively, but with a higher rate of hepatic encephalopathy after TIPS (22% versus 0%, $P = .01$).

Partial Splenic Embolization

In patients with cirrhosis, the development of hypersplenism with a concomitant increase in arterial and venous flow is a commonly observed phenomenon in response to portal hypertension. This increased splenic venous flow will theoretically contribute to pressurization of gastric varices arising from the splenic vein. Accordingly, partial splenic embolization in patients with hypersplenism has been shown to result in a significant decrease in the portosystemic gradient and splenic vein flow [67]. Buechter et al [68] reviewed outcomes after partial splenic embolization in 9 patients with portal hypertension and upper GI bleeding from gastroesophageal varices or portal gastropathy, reporting a 100% resolution of hemorrhage, without any episodes of rebleeding at a mean follow-up of 6 to 52 months. The benefits of partial splenic embolization in combination with other therapies for gastric varices have been investigated in several studies. In a retrospective study comparing patients undergoing transhepatic variceal embolization with ($n = 31$) or without partial splenic embolization ($n = 34$) for patients with acute massive hemorrhage of esophagogastric varices, the recurrent rebleeding rate was significantly lower in those who underwent partial splenic embolization (6.7% versus 36.7%, respectively, $P < .01$) [69]. Additionally, there was a significantly higher incidence of ascites and portal gastropathy in patients who did not undergo concomitant partial splenic embolization along with variceal embolization [69]. Similarly, in a retrospective study comparing results of transjugular BRTO with ($n = 14$) versus without ($n = 19$) concomitant partial splenic embolization, those undergoing partial splenic embolization had a 3-year occurrence rate of esophageal varices of 9% compared with 45% in those undergoing BRTO alone ($P < .05$) [55]. Waguri et al [70] also compared outcomes in patients with gastric varices after BRTO combined with partial splenic embolization ($n = 10$) versus BRTO alone ($n = 9$), reporting resolution of gastric varices in all patients but with significantly fewer cases of esophageal variceal exacerbation when partial splenic embolization was performed (60% versus 0% at 1 year, $P = .01$), with a similar incidence of ascites or hepatic hydrothorax between groups. In a randomized trial, 84 patients with cirrhosis, large varices, thrombocytopenia, and splenomegaly were randomized to undergo endoscopic variceal ligation with or without partial splenic embolization [71]. Patients who underwent partial splenic embolization plus endoscopic therapy had a significantly lower incidence of variceal recurrence ($P = .02$), variceal hemorrhage ($P = .01$), and death ($P = .04$).

Surgical Management

In patients with portal hypertension, the presence of an unpredictable and often extensive network of esophagogastric varices and other spontaneous pressurized portosystemic shunts around the portal and splenic veins render intra-abdominal surgeries to be challenging because of the risk of intraoperative hemorrhage [72]. Therefore, surgical management should be considered only at centers with substantial experience with operating in the setting of pressurized varices, such as liver transplant centers. Although rarely a first-line therapy, surgical portosystemic shunt creation has been reported to be effective in the management of gastric variceal hemorrhage. In a large randomized trial comparing endoscopic therapy with portacaval shunt creation, long-term control of hemorrhage was achieved in 97% to 100% of patients compared with only 27% to 29% with endoscopic therapy and 6% after TIPS [73]. Survival was also significantly longer after portacaval shunt creation. However, all TIPS in this study were created with bare metal stents, with a 94% rate of TIPS stenosis or occlusion, and failed TIPS revision in 93%, which is extremely disparate from results of contemporary TIPS studies with covered stents. In a clinical trial on 140 patients randomized to distal splenorenal shunt creation versus TIPS, of which over half had isolated gastric varices, there were no significant differences in rates of rebleeding, encephalopathy, or survival; however, reintervention was significantly higher in the TIPS group. Again, however, only bare metal stents were utilized in the TIPS group [74]. Therefore, in centers with appropriate experience, surgical shunt creation could be considered. For this document, it is assumed the procedure is performed and interpreted by an expert.

For similar reasons as partial splenic embolization, splenectomy can also serve to diminish blood flow into the portal venous system and by doing so potentially decrease portal venous pressures, particularly in the setting of splenomegaly with accompanying high blood flow throughput. Su et al [75] performed open splenectomy with esophagogastric devascularization in 283 patients with portal hypertension and recurrent variceal bleeding with a 3.2% incidence of rebleeding within 1 month and 4.6% incidence at full follow-up (mean 29 months). Results were compared with 196 patients who underwent TIPS, showing a significantly lower rate of rebleeding (4.6% versus 15.3%, $P = .001$) and encephalopathy (3.9% versus 17.3%) but with similar survival and hepatic function. Of note, a combination of bare and covered stents were utilized for TIPS creation. Cheng et al [76] reported results with laparoscopic splenectomy with esophagogastric devascularization on 204 patients with portal hypertension and variceal bleeding. The technical success rate was 92% with a mean intraoperative blood loss of 189 mL and 20% blood transfusion rate. Operative complications occurred in 49% of patients, with the majority consisting of portal vein thrombosis. The rate of rebleeding was 4% with a follow-up range of 2 to 65 months.

Finally, combined surgical procedures have also been reported as an effective strategy. Feng et al [77] reported results in 150 patients with portal hypertension and varices who underwent surgical shunt, portoazygous devascularization, and splenectomy in 100 patients, as well as 50 patients undergoing surgical shunt plus portoazygous devascularization. Although unclear whether patients presented with bleeding varices, the rate of rebleeding was reported at 2% with 1 to 7 years of follow-up.

Variant 2: Cirrhotic patient with bleeding from large high-flow gastric varices with a MELD score of 20. CT demonstrates a large gastrosplenic shunt.

The key feature in this patient is the high MELD score, with all other factors being equivalent to Variant 1.

TIPS

Higher MELD scores have been correlated with worsening survival after TIPS. The 3-month mortality for patients with a MELD score ≤ 10 has been reported as 0%, whereas the 3-month mortality is 35% for MELD scores 18–24 and 66% for MELD scores of 25 or greater [33]. It has been proposed that the reason for the higher mortality after TIPS in patients with high MELD scores is the TIPS-induced decrease in portal perfusion, which may theoretically be more detrimental in patients with worse liver dysfunction. On that basis, TIPS is often avoided in patients with high MELD scores, although the causality of TIPS and mortality in patients with high MELD scores has not been rigorously proven. The mortality for cirrhotic patients with high MELD scores is significantly higher than those with low MELD scores in the absence of a TIPS as well [78]. Furthermore, a recent retrospective comparison of patients with TIPS versus without TIPS reported that TIPS does not independently increase the risk of death in patients with a high MELD score [79].

Endoscopic Management

A high MELD score does not impact endoscopic management; by obstructing flow through varices, there may be some theoretical increase in portal perfusion, which may be beneficial to the liver [26,36,39].

BRTO

For similar reasons, there may be theoretical benefit to BRTO by virtue of increased portal perfusion, with reports of improved hepatic synthetic function after BRTO [80].

Partial Splenic Embolization

There is no literature regarding the use of partial splenic embolization as a standalone procedure in patients with high MELD scores in the management of gastric varices. In a case series of 9 patients with lower MELD scores (range 6–14) treated with partial splenic embolization for upper GI bleeding from gastroesophageal varices or portal gastropathy, a 100% clinical success rate was reported [68]. Partial splenic embolization may also be safe and effective for patients with high MELD scores as well. In a retrospective study comparing transhepatic variceal embolization with (n = 31) or without (n = 34) partial splenic embolization, the mean MELD score was 25.9 ± 8.4 in the group undergoing partial splenic embolization. The patients undergoing partial splenic embolization had a significantly lower bleeding recurrence rate, fewer cases of ascites, fewer cases of portal hypertensive gastropathy, and less progression of their Child-Pugh score compared with patients treated with variceal embolization alone [69].

Surgical Management

For the same reasons why TIPS may theoretically be more detrimental in patients with a high MELD score, a surgical shunt may be deemed less attractive as an option; however, splenectomy should not be impacted by a high MELD score [26,36,39].

Variant 3: Cirrhotic patient bleeding from small, low-flow gastric varices and moderate ascites with a MELD score of 18. MRI does not demonstrate a gastroduodenal shunt.

Endoscopic Management

The slow flow within the varices makes endoscopic management with sclerosants and embolic materials more favorable because high-flow varices are more technically challenging [6].

TIPS

The MELD score is intermediate, making TIPS mildly less attractive based on historical concerns. However, an additional benefit to TIPS in this scenario is mitigation of ascites. Using contemporary 10-mm-diameter stent grafts for creation of TIPS, the long-term need for paracentesis was reported at 31%. Using 8-mm-diameter stent grafts, the degree of ascites control was reported to be inferior (58% with need for further paracentesis, $P = .003$) but without differences in the incidence of hepatic encephalopathy [81].

BRTO

The absence of a demonstrable gastroduodenal shunt renders this patient ineligible for BRTO. Even if a gastroduodenal shunt were present, there is a substantial incidence of post-BRTO ascites in 31% of patients, which may result in worsening of ascites in this scenario [80].

Partial Splenic Embolization

As above, partial splenic embolization may decrease gastric variceal bleeding [66]. In a study of 6 patients with refractory ascites after liver transplantation, splenic artery embolization resulted in complete resolution of ascites in 5 of the patients, presumably by decreasing pressurization of the portal system [82].

Surgical Management

For the same reasons why TIPS may be theoretically more detrimental in patients with an intermediate to high MELD score, a surgical shunt may be deemed less attractive as an option; however, splenectomy should not be impacted by the MELD score [26,36,39].

Variant 4: Cirrhotic patient bleeding from large, high-flow gastric varices with hepatic encephalopathy and a MELD score of 18. MRI demonstrates a large gastroduodenal shunt.

In this patient, the significant history of hepatic encephalopathy is a key discriminator.

Endoscopic Management

Endoscopic measures that result in occlusion of varices would increase portal perfusion, which could be beneficial in mitigating encephalopathy [26].

TIPS

Given the substantial incidence of worsened hepatic encephalopathy, by virtue of decreasing portal perfusion and decreased detoxification of intestinally produced bioactive compounds, TIPS would be a suboptimal choice in this patient [83].

BRTO

BRTO is likely to improve or resolve hepatic encephalopathy in addition to addressing the hemorrhage and improving hepatic synthetic function [26,80]. The presence of large varices and a large gastrosplenic shunt are favorable features, but the high flow within the shunt is correlated with lower success rates [60].

Partial Splenic Embolization

Although partial splenic embolization may help to mitigate variceal bleeding [66], there are no data to suggest that partial splenic embolization as a standalone treatment affects hepatic encephalopathy. However, partial splenic embolization when combined with BRTO has been shown to result in lower serum ammonia levels and lower grades of encephalopathy [84].

Surgical Management

For the same reasons as TIPS, creation of a surgical shunt would be considered a poor choice because of the risk of uncontrollable hepatic encephalopathy [83]. However, there is no literature or theoretical reason to suggest that splenectomy would affect encephalopathy.

Variant 5: Cirrhotic patient bleeding from esophageal varices and gastric varices not amenable to endoscopic management with a MELD score of 13 and a hepatic wedge pressure of 22 mmHg. CT demonstrates a small gastrosplenic shunt.

The presence of concurrently bleeding esophageal varices makes this case unique.

TIPS

TIPS has proven efficacy for both esophageal and gastric varices [11,13-20].

BRTO

Given the small gastrosplenic shunt, a BRTO would be expected to be technically challenging. Furthermore, BRTO is not particularly effective for managing esophageal varices, and there is substantial literature showing that BRTO results in increased risk of early or late esophageal variceal hemorrhage [24,26,27,30,35,37,38,47,51,53,55,62,63,85].

Partial Splenic Embolization

Decreased splenic outflow into the portal system may decrease the portal pressure, which may mitigate hemorrhage [67].

Surgical Management

Surgical shunt creation or splenectomy may be effective for mitigating gastric and esophageal variceal hemorrhage [73,75].

Variant 6: Cirrhotic patient bleeding from large high-flow gastric varices with a MELD score of 12 and a hepatic wedge pressure of 10 mmHg. MRI demonstrates a large gastrosplenic shunt.

This patient does not have significant portal hypertension based on the hepatic wedge pressure. Obtaining contrast-enhanced cross-sectional imaging (CT or MRI) is critical for ascertaining the presence of portal or splenic vein occlusion, which can cause severe gastric varices in the absence of cirrhosis or portal hypertension. This would be particularly crucial in determining the optimal treatment.

Endoscopic Management

Depending on technical expertise, high-flow varices can be challenging to treat with endoscopic methods [9]. For this document, it is assumed that the procedure is widely available and is performed and interpreted by an expert.

TIPS

Large gastric varices can serve as a highly effective portosystemic shunt that accordingly mitigates the portosystemic gradient [86]. In any case, diverting portal flow into a TIPS in the setting of large gastric varices would be beneficial for mitigating the risk of bleeding.

BRTO

A large splenorenal shunt is optimal for technical feasibility for performing BRTO [15], but the high flow may reduce the success rate [60].

Partial Splenic Embolization

Because partial splenic embolization has been shown to decrease portal flow and reduce the risk of variceal hemorrhage, it may be a favorable option if there is significant splenomegaly [67,68].

Surgical Management

Similar to the commentary on TIPS creation, the true portosystemic gradient is mitigated by the large gastric varices. Surgical shunt creation may help by diverting flow away from the gastric varices but may be even more effective when performed in conjunction with devascularization [87]. Similarly to partial splenic embolization, splenectomy may be helpful for decreasing flow through the varices with presumed decreased hemorrhage risk [67,68].

Variant 7: Patient with gastric variceal bleeding, found to have chronic splenic vein occlusion on MRI.

Splenic vein thrombosis may occur because of portal hypertension, pancreatitis, or a compressive mass. When occurring in the absence of portal vein occlusion, the resulting collateral development for decompression of the splenic outflow varies from portal vein occlusion in that either or both portosystemic venous collaterals or splenoportal venous collaterals can form to decompress the splenic vein. As similar with portal vein thrombosis, splenomegaly, increased splenic flow, and gastric varices can be a direct consequence of splenic vein occlusion, also referred to as sinistral portal hypertension [88].

Endoscopic Management

In patients with splenic vein occlusion, most or the entire splenic venous outflow may be via gastric varices. Although endoscopic interruption of gastric varices may be technically feasible, the abrupt distal splenic hypertension and drive for new splenic venous outflow after occlusion of the entire splenic venous outflow may encourage persistent patency or rapid development of new gastric varices. Although there is a paucity of data on endoscopic therapy in the setting of splenic vein occlusion, Liu et al [89] reported a rate of achievement of successful hemostasis of 40% after endoscopic sclerotherapy in 5 patients with splenic vein occlusion. One patient exsanguinated acutely during treatment. Sato et al [90] reported on endoscopic treatment of bleeding gastric varices using histoacryl in 3 patients with splenic vein occlusion, with successful control of bleeding in all three. However, follow-up information was not provided, and patients with severe varices were treated with alternative methods.

TIPS

Because isolated splenic vein occlusion can occur in the absence of cirrhosis, TIPS insertion would not be expected to be beneficial if the main portal vein pressure is not elevated.

BRTO

As with direct endoscopic therapy of gastric varices, the obliteration of the splenic venous drainage may be expected to be technically challenging and with suboptimal success rates [89]. Because the gastric varices comprise the sole outflow for the spleen, occlusion of the varices would also be expected to precipitate splenic congestion with worsening splenomegaly, infarction, and formation of new varices [91,92].

Splenic Vein Recanalization

When splenic vein occlusion is the etiology of sinistral hypertension, restoration of patency corrects the underlying causative problem. In a retrospective review of 11 patients with splenic vein stenosis or occlusion with gastric varices and associated bleeding, transjugular recanalization was successfully achieved in 8 patients [93]. Two were treated with angioplasty alone, with the remainder being treated with stents or stent grafts. In all patients, upper GI bleeding resolved without recurrence at a median follow-up of 17.5 months.

Partial Splenic Embolization

In the setting of splenic vein occlusion, the near entirety of splenic venous drainage will be into the gastric varices; therefore, a marked decrease in splenic volume should theoretically diminish the amount of flow and pressure within the gastric varices. Wang et al [94] performed partial splenic embolization on 14 noncirrhotic patients with gastric varices and splenic vein occlusion that was due to pancreatic pathology, resulting in diminishment or resolution of gastric varices in all patients. In the 8 patients with acute or chronic gastric bleeding, resolution of hemorrhage was achieved in all patients without recurrence. Liu et al [89] reported

outcomes in 21 noncirrhotic patients with splenic vein occlusion and gastric variceal bleeding undergoing endoscopic sclerotherapy (n = 5), splenic embolization (n = 6), or splenectomy (n = 15). Endoscopic therapy was successful in 40%, whereas splenic embolization and splenectomy were both successful in 100%, without any recurrent bleeding.

Surgical Management

Historically, splenectomy has been performed as a standard treatment for gastric variceal bleeding with sinistral portal hypertension. Because the dominant or entire source of blood flow and pressurization of gastric varices is the spleen when splenic vein occlusion is present, removal of the spleen should remove the impetus for varix development and pressurization. Thus, removal of the source of pressurization is expected to serve as definitive therapy and mitigation of hemorrhage risk. As described previously, a review of 15 noncirrhotic patients undergoing splenectomy for splenic vein occlusion and gastric variceal bleeding resulted in successful management of bleeding in all patients without recurrence [89]. In another series of 6 patients with chronic pancreatitis and splenic vein occlusion undergoing splenectomy because of bleeding gastric varices, bleeding was controlled in all patients without subsequent rebleeding at a mean of 4.8 years of follow-up [95]. However, in patients without hemorrhage, splenectomy was not found to improve outcomes in patients with gastric varices [96]. Of note, because the inferior mesenteric vein empties into the splenic vein, occlusion of the splenic vein that includes the segment between the main portal vein and inferior mesenteric vein may result in continued filling of the splenic vein and gastric varices from the inferior mesenteric vein distribution despite splenectomy.

Variant 8: Patient with chronic intrahepatic and extrahepatic portal vein occlusion with cavernous transformation on CT with gastric variceal bleeding.

One of the complications of cirrhosis and portal hypertension is the development of portal vein thrombosis that is due to the stagnation of blood flow caused by the increased resistance at the hepatic sinusoids. The development of main portal vein thrombosis will increase the existing portal hypertension within the splanchnic and splenic veins and thus can further exacerbate any existing esophageal and gastric varices. Even in noncirrhotic patients, pancreatitis, abdominal surgery, and thrombophilic states can result in portal vein thrombosis that obstructs the entire splenomesenteric venous outflow, resulting in venous hypertension of the splenic and mesenteric veins. Irrespective of the cause, the acute mesenteric venous congestion can result in venous mesenteric ischemia. Traditional thrombectomy methods can be employed, such as mechanical or pharmacologic thrombectomy, and transjugular or transhepatic access may be needed [97]. If pharmacomechanical resolution of thrombus is not performed or if spontaneous thrombolysis and recanalization does not eventually occur, the occlusion will become chronic, and esophageal, gastric, and/or ectopic varices will invariably develop to allow adequate venous drainage of the splenomesenteric system. If the intrahepatic portal veins remain patent, portal-to-portal collateral veins/cavernous transformation may develop to restore some inflow into the intrahepatic portal veins.

Endoscopic Management

Although there is a paucity of studies on endoscopic management of gastric varices specifically in the setting of portal vein occlusion, such treatment likely occurs without awareness of the underlying portal patency because imaging has historically not been routinely performed. Sharma et al [1] reported results of endoscopic variceal obturation on 162 patients who had gastric variceal hemorrhage and portal vein occlusion in comparison to 292 patients with cirrhosis. The rate of acute control of bleeding in patients with portal vein obstruction was 94%, which was found to be similar with the cirrhotic patient group ($P = .05$). The delayed rebleeding rate after >48 hours was also 94%, which was also similar to that of the cirrhotic patient group ($P = .07$) at a mean of 18.6 months of follow-up. The amount of glue used was significantly higher in patients with portal venous obstruction ($P = .001$).

Portal Vein Recanalization Plus TIPS

Classically, the presence of portal vein occlusion is a relative contraindication to TIPS placement because the lack of continuous flow between the TIPS and the splenomesenteric veins prevents variceal decompression, and the lack of brisk flow through the actual TIPS will result in inevitable TIPS thrombosis. Therefore, TIPS creation alone should not be performed in this setting. However, if direct continuity between the TIPS and the splenomesenteric venous systems can be re-established with portal vein recanalization, then TIPS insertion can decompress the portal venous system and associated varices.

In the largest series to date on 61 patients with chronic portal vein occlusion, Thornburg et al [98] reported a 98% technical success rate for inserting a TIPS with concomitant portal vein recanalization, with 92% achieving

patency to transplant or until the end of the study with a mean follow-up of 16.7 months. In all cases, the main portal vein was treated with angioplasty alone without stenting in order to preserve liver transplant candidacy. Although 66% of patients had esophagogastric varices, the occurrence of variceal bleeding before or after treatment were not reported. There were no cases of major hemorrhage. Luo et al [99] reported that TIPS with portal vein recanalization was successful in 92% of 22 cirrhotic patients with chronic portal vein occlusion and variceal bleeding, with 3 patients developing shunt dysfunction and recurrent variceal bleeding. The recanalized main portal vein was treated with self-expanding bare metal stents. Two patients had associated self-limited hemorrhage requiring blood transfusion. In a randomized controlled trial on 73 patients with cirrhosis and portal vein thrombosis, patients were randomized to TIPS with portal vein recanalization or endoscopic band ligation with propranolol [100]. The rate of freedom from esophageal variceal bleeding was 77.8% in the TIPS group and 42.9% in the endoscopic therapy group ($P = .002$) but with similar encephalopathy rates and survival. However, it is notable that the portal occlusion was not necessarily chronic and that patients with gastric varices were excluded. In a population of cirrhotic and noncirrhotic patients, Han et al [101] attempted TIPS with portal vein recanalization in 65 patients; the success rate was 72% (28 of 39) in patients with portal vein thrombosis with cavernous transformation and 100% (26 of 26) in patients without cavernous transformation. The authors concluded that it is essential to recanalize the thrombosed portal vein followed by TIPS placement. However, in several case reports, short-term TIPS patency has been reported without portal vein recanalization in patients with cavernous transformation when the TIPS can be deployed into an adequately large periportal collateral vein that effectively bypasses the occluded segment [102,103].

Although patients with cirrhosis are expected to require a TIPS with portal vein recanalization in order to bypass the high-resistance hepatic sinusoids, noncirrhotic patients may have nonpathologic hepatic sinusoids; thus, a TIPS may not be necessary in all circumstances. Marot et al [104] reported successful portal vein recanalization and stenting in 12 of 13 noncirrhotic patients with chronic portal venous occlusion to the level of the main or segmental portal vein branches. Of the 6 patients presenting with variceal bleeding, hemorrhage resolved and did not recur. Stent patency at 2 years was achieved in all 6 patients with portal occlusion extending to the left or right main portal vein compared with 4 of 6 patients with occlusion extending to the segmental branches. In 2 patients with portal vein occlusion extending even further to the distal subsegmental branches, recanalization and stenting was unsuccessful in both. These findings suggest that stent deployment is most effective when the portal vein occlusion is limited to the main and right or left portal vein to ensure adequate flow through the stent; otherwise, TIPS creation may be needed to ensure adequate portal flow and patency after recanalization. Qi et al [105] reported outcomes after TIPS with portal vein recanalization in 20 noncirrhotic patients with chronic portal vein occlusion and variceal bleeding in which the success rate was 35% with a variceal rebleeding rate of 14% in patients with successful TIPS. Klinger et al [106] reported a 77% portal vein recanalization success rate in 17 noncirrhotic patients with chronic portal vein thrombosis, with treatment including angioplasty, stent deployment, and/or TIPS creation, depending on the degree of portal flow, with a resulting 2-year patency rate of 70%.

BRTO

There is a paucity of literature on BRTO with portal vein occlusion. Generally, BRTO in this setting can have grave consequences because the gastric varices may be the sole or dominant outflow for the entire splenomesenteric circulation; thus, occlusion of this outflow could result not only in splenic engorgement and infarction, it could also result in mesenteric venous thrombosis and acute venous mesenteric ischemia [92]. One small case series of 2 patients described successful BRTO in a noncirrhotic patient with subacute portal vein thrombosis with complete resolution of gastric varices on endoscopy 105 days postprocedure and on CT 5 months postprocedure. The second patient had chronic portal vein occlusion with cavernous transformation and splenic vein thrombosis that was due to necrotizing pancreatitis with multiple failed endoscopic treatments of her gastric varices [107]. BRTO was again successfully performed, with resolution of variceal bleeding and continued complete obliteration of varices at 6 months.

Partial Splenic Embolization

Because partial splenic embolization should decrease flow into gastric varices, some degree of mitigation of active bleeding and rebleeding risk is expected, as shown for patients with portal hypertension and splenic vein occlusion above. However, robust literature is lacking. In a case report, the authors described a patient with severe portal hypertensive gastropathy with oozing on endoscopy with portal thrombosis and cavernous transformation who was treated with partial splenic embolization. Two months later, there was improvement in the appearance on endoscopy, and at 1 year post-treatment, there were no additional episodes of bleeding [108].

Surgical Management

For similar reasons in portal hypertension and sinistral portal hypertension, splenectomy is expected to decrease venous inflow into the portal system and thereby decrease portal hypertension and hemorrhage from gastric varices. Surgical portosystemic shunts would also be expected to have similar results in patients with portal hypertension or sinistral portal hypertension. The Rex-bypass shunt, which allows bypass of the occluded segment from the superior mesenteric vein to the left portal vein, has been shown to be effective in relieving both esophageal and gastric varices, with a patency rate of 86% over a follow-up period ranging from 6 to 64 months [109]. Creation of a splenorenal or mesocaval shunt has also been reported as a method for decompressing the portal venous system in the setting of portal vein occlusion [110].

Summary of Recommendations

- **Variante 1:** BRTO, endoscopic management, or TIPS is usually appropriate for a cirrhotic patient with active bleeding from large, high-flow gastric varices, significant portal hypertension, a MELD score of 14, and a large gastrosplenic shunt. These procedures are equivalent alternatives (ie, only one procedure will be performed to effectively manage the patient's care).
- **Variante 2:** BRTO or endoscopic management is usually appropriate for a cirrhotic patient with bleeding from large, high-flow gastric varices with a MELD score of 20, and a large gastrosplenic shunt. These procedures are equivalent alternatives (ie, only one procedure will be performed to effectively manage the patient's care).
- **Variante 3:** Endoscopic management or TIPS is usually appropriate for a cirrhotic patient bleeding from small low-flow gastric varices and moderate ascites with a MELD score of 18 and no gastrosplenic shunt. These procedures are equivalent alternatives (ie, only one procedure will be performed to effectively manage the patient's care).
- **Variante 4:** BRTO or endoscopic management is usually appropriate for a cirrhotic patient bleeding from large, high-flow gastric varices with hepatic encephalopathy, a MELD score of 18, and a large gastrosplenic shunt. These procedures are equivalent alternatives (ie, only one procedure will be performed to effectively manage the patient's care).
- **Variante 5:** TIPS is usually appropriate for a cirrhotic patient bleeding from both esophageal and gastric varices that are not amenable to endoscopic management, with a MELD score of 13, a small gastrosplenic shunt, and a hepatic wedge pressure of 22 mmHg.
- **Variante 6:** BRTO, endoscopic management, or TIPS is usually appropriate for a cirrhotic patient bleeding from large, high-flow gastric varices with a MELD score of 12, a hepatic wedge pressure of 10 mmHg, and a large gastrosplenic shunt. These procedures are equivalent alternatives (ie, only one procedure will be performed to effectively manage the patient's care).
- **Variante 7:** Partial splenic embolization, splenic vein recanalization, or surgical management is usually appropriate for a patient with gastric variceal bleeding and chronic splenic vein occlusion. These procedures are equivalent alternatives (ie, only one procedure will be performed to effectively manage the patient's care).
- **Variante 8:** Portal vein recanalization plus TIPS is usually appropriate for a patient with chronic intrahepatic and extrahepatic portal vein occlusion with cavernous transformation and gastric variceal bleeding.

Supporting Documents

The evidence table, literature search, and appendix for this topic are available at <https://acsearch.acr.org/list>. The appendix includes the strength of evidence assessment and the final rating round tabulations for each recommendation.

For additional information on the Appropriateness Criteria methodology and other supporting documents go to www.acr.org/ac.

Appropriateness Category Names and Definitions

Appropriateness Category Name	Appropriateness Rating	Appropriateness Category Definition
Usually Appropriate	7, 8, or 9	The imaging procedure or treatment is indicated in the specified clinical scenarios at a favorable risk-benefit ratio for patients.
May Be Appropriate	4, 5, or 6	The imaging procedure or treatment may be indicated in the specified clinical scenarios as an alternative to imaging procedures or treatments with a more favorable risk-benefit ratio, or the risk-benefit ratio for patients is equivocal.
May Be Appropriate (Disagreement)	5	The individual ratings are too dispersed from the panel median. The different label provides transparency regarding the panel's recommendation. "May be appropriate" is the rating category and a rating of 5 is assigned.
Usually Not Appropriate	1, 2, or 3	The imaging procedure or treatment is unlikely to be indicated in the specified clinical scenarios, or the risk-benefit ratio for patients is likely to be unfavorable.

References

- Sharma BC, Varakanahalli S, Singh JP, Srivastava S. Gastric Varices in Cirrhosis vs. Extrahepatic Portal Venous Obstruction and Response to Endoscopic N-butyl-2-cyanoacrylate Injection. *J Clin Exp Hepatol* 2017;7:97-101.
- Garcia-Tsao G, Abraldes JG, Berzigotti A, Bosch J. Portal hypertensive bleeding in cirrhosis: Risk stratification, diagnosis, and management: 2016 practice guidance by the American Association for the study of liver diseases. *Hepatology* 2017;65:310-35.
- Sarin SK, Lahoti D, Saxena SP, Murthy NS, Makwana UK. Prevalence, classification and natural history of gastric varices: a long-term follow-up study in 568 portal hypertension patients. *Hepatology* 1992;16:1343-9.
- Deng H, Qi X, Guo X. Computed tomography for the diagnosis of varices in liver cirrhosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies. *Postgrad Med* 2017;129:318-28.
- Zhu K, Meng X, Pang P, et al. Gastric varices in patients with portal hypertension: evaluation with multidetector row CT. *J Clin Gastroenterol* 2010;44:e108-15.
- Ryan BM, Stockbrugger RW, Ryan JM. A pathophysiologic, gastroenterologic, and radiologic approach to the management of gastric varices. *Gastroenterology* 2004;126:1175-89.
- Sarin SK. Long-term follow-up of gastric variceal sclerotherapy: an eleven-year experience. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1997;46:8-14.
- Qiao W, Ren Y, Bai Y, Liu S, Zhang Q, Zhi F. Cyanoacrylate Injection Versus Band Ligation in the Endoscopic Management of Acute Gastric Variceal Bleeding: Meta-Analysis of Randomized, Controlled Studies Based on the PRISMA Statement. *Medicine (Baltimore)* 2015;94:e1725.
- Kuramochi A, Imazu H, Kakutani H, Uchiyama Y, Hino S, Urashima M. Color Doppler endoscopic ultrasonography in identifying groups at a high-risk of recurrence of esophageal varices after endoscopic treatment. *J Gastroenterol* 2007;42:219-24.
- Dariushnia SR, Haskal ZJ, Midia M, et al. Quality Improvement Guidelines for Transjugular Intrahepatic Portosystemic Shunts. *J Vasc Interv Radiol* 2016;27:1-7.
- Holster IL, Tjwa ET, Moelker A, et al. Covered transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt versus endoscopic therapy + beta-blocker for prevention of variceal rebleeding. *Hepatology* 2016;63:581-9.
- Perarnau JM, Le Gouge A, Nicolas C, et al. Covered vs. uncovered stents for transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt: a randomized controlled trial. *J Hepatol* 2014;60:962-8.

13. Barange K, Peron JM, Imani K, et al. Transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt in the treatment of refractory bleeding from ruptured gastric varices. *Hepatology* 1999;30:1139-43.
14. Chau TN, Patch D, Chan YW, Nagral A, Dick R, Burroughs AK. "Salvage" transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunts: gastric fundal compared with esophageal variceal bleeding. *Gastroenterology* 1998;114:981-7.
15. Choi YH, Yoon CJ, Park JH, Chung JW, Kwon JW, Choi GM. Balloon-occluded retrograde transvenous obliteration for gastric variceal bleeding: its feasibility compared with transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt. *Korean J Radiol* 2003;4:109-16.
16. Kim SK, Lee KA, Sauk S, Korenblat K. Comparison of Transjugular Intrahepatic Portosystemic Shunt with Covered Stent and Balloon-Occluded Retrograde Transvenous Obliteration in Managing Isolated Gastric Varices. *Korean J Radiol* 2017;18:345-54.
17. Lo GH, Liang HL, Chen WC, et al. A prospective, randomized controlled trial of transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt versus cyanoacrylate injection in the prevention of gastric variceal rebleeding. *Endoscopy* 2007;39:679-85.
18. Ninoi T, Nakamura K, Kaminou T, et al. TIPS versus transcatheter sclerotherapy for gastric varices. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2004;183:369-76.
19. Rees CJ, Nylander DL, Thompson NP, Rose JD, Record CO, Hudson M. Do gastric and oesophageal varices bleed at different portal pressures and is TIPS an effective treatment? *Liver* 2000;20:253-6.
20. Sabri SS, Abi-Jaoudeh N, Swee W, et al. Short-term rebleeding rates for isolated gastric varices managed by transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt versus balloon-occluded retrograde transvenous obliteration. *J Vasc Interv Radiol* 2014;25:355-61.
21. Lakhoo J, Bui JT, Lokken RP, Ray CE, Jr., Gaba RC. Transjugular Intrahepatic Portosystemic Shunt Creation and Variceal Coil or Plug Embolization Ineffectively Attain Gastric Variceal Decompression or Occlusion: Results of a 26-Patient Retrospective Study. *J Vasc Interv Radiol* 2016;27:1001-11.
22. Jiang Q, Wang MQ, Zhang GB, Wu Q, Xu JM, Kong DR. Transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt combined with esophagogastric variceal embolization in the treatment of a large gastroduodenal shunt. *World J Hepatol* 2016;8:850-7.
23. Chikamori F, Kuniyoshi N, Shibuya S, Takase Y. Transjugular retrograde obliteration for chronic portosystemic encephalopathy. *Abdom Imaging* 2000;25:567-71.
24. Chikamori F, Kuniyoshi N, Shibuya S, Takase Y. Eight years of experience with transjugular retrograde obliteration for gastric varices with gastroduodenal shunts. *Surgery* 2001;129:414-20.
25. Chikamori F, Kuniyoshi N, Shibuya S, Takase Y. Combination treatment of transjugular retrograde obliteration and endoscopic embolization for portosystemic encephalopathy with esophageal varices. *Hepatogastroenterology* 2004;51:1379-81.
26. Fukuda T, Hirota S, Sugimura K. Long-term results of balloon-occluded retrograde transvenous obliteration for the treatment of gastric varices and hepatic encephalopathy. *J Vasc Interv Radiol* 2001;12:327-36.
27. Hirota S, Matsumoto S, Tomita M, Sako M, Kono M. Retrograde transvenous obliteration of gastric varices. *Radiology* 1999;211:349-56.
28. Park KS, Kim YH, Choi JS, et al. [Therapeutic efficacy of balloon-occluded retrograde transvenous obliteration in patients with gastric variceal bleeding]. *Korean J Gastroenterol* 2006;47:370-8.
29. Takuma Y, Nouse K, Makino Y, Saito S, Shiratori Y. Prophylactic balloon-occluded retrograde transvenous obliteration for gastric varices in compensated cirrhosis. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2005;3:1245-52.
30. Yamagami T, Kato T, Hirota T, Yoshimatsu R, Matsumoto T, Nishimura T. Infusion of 50% glucose solution before injection of ethanolamine oleate during balloon-occluded retrograde transvenous obliteration. *Australas Radiol* 2007;51:334-8.
31. Chikamori F, Shibuya S, Takase Y, Ozaki A, Fukao K. Transjugular retrograde obliteration for gastric varices. *Abdom Imaging* 1996;21:299-303.
32. Arai H, Abe T, Shimoda R, Takagi H, Yamada T, Mori M. Emergency balloon-occluded retrograde transvenous obliteration for gastric varices. *J Gastroenterol* 2005;40:964-71.
33. Ferral H, Patel NH. Selection criteria for patients undergoing transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt procedures: current status. *J Vasc Interv Radiol* 2005;16:449-55.
34. Saad WE, Sabri SS. Balloon-occluded Retrograde Transvenous Obliteration (BRTO): Technical Results and Outcomes. *Semin Intervent Radiol* 2011;28:333-8.

35. Cho SK, Shin SW, Lee IH, et al. Balloon-occluded retrograde transvenous obliteration of gastric varices: outcomes and complications in 49 patients. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2007;189:W365-72.
36. Kumamoto M, Toyonaga A, Inoue H, et al. Long-term results of balloon-occluded retrograde transvenous obliteration for gastric fundal varices: hepatic deterioration links to portosystemic shunt syndrome. *J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2010;25:1129-35.
37. Matsumoto A, Hamamoto N, Nomura T, et al. Balloon-occluded retrograde transvenous obliteration of high risk gastric fundal varices. *Am J Gastroenterol* 1999;94:643-9.
38. Miyamoto Y, Oho K, Kumamoto M, Toyonaga A, Sata M. Balloon-occluded retrograde transvenous obliteration improves liver function in patients with cirrhosis and portal hypertension. *J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2003;18:934-42.
39. Yamamoto A, Nishida N, Morikawa H, et al. Prediction for Improvement of Liver Function after Balloon-Occluded Retrograde Transvenous Obliteration for Gastric Varices to Manage Portosystemic Shunt Syndrome. *J Vasc Interv Radiol* 2016;27:1160-7.
40. Kiyosue H, Mori H, Matsumoto S, Yamada Y, Hori Y, Okino Y. Transcatheter obliteration of gastric varices: Part 2. Strategy and techniques based on hemodynamic features. *Radiographics* 2003;23:921-37; discussion 37.
41. Chang IS, Park SW, Kwon SY, et al. Efficacy and Safety of Balloon-Occluded Retrograde Transvenous Obliteration with Sodium Tetradecyl Sulfate Liquid Sclerotherapy. *Korean J Radiol* 2016;17:224-9.
42. Choi SY, Won JY, Kim KA, Lee DY, Lee KH. Foam sclerotherapy using polidocanol for balloon-occluded retrograde transvenous obliteration (BRTO). *Eur Radiol* 2011;21:122-9.
43. Gwon DI, Kim YH, Ko GY, et al. Vascular Plug-Assisted Retrograde Transvenous Obliteration for the Treatment of Gastric Varices and Hepatic Encephalopathy: A Prospective Multicenter Study. *J Vasc Interv Radiol* 2015;26:1589-95.
44. Gwon DI, Ko GY, Yoon HK, et al. Gastric varices and hepatic encephalopathy: treatment with vascular plug and gelatin sponge-assisted retrograde transvenous obliteration--a primary report. *Radiology* 2013;268:281-7.
45. Ito C, Koizumi J, Hashimoto T, et al. Balloon-Occluded Retrograde Transvenous Obliteration for the Treatment of Gastric Varices: Polidocanol Foam Versus Liquid Ethanolamine Oleate. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2015;205:659-66.
46. Jang SY, Kim GH, Park SY, et al. Clinical outcomes of balloon-occluded retrograde transvenous obliteration for the treatment of gastric variceal hemorrhage in Korean patients with liver cirrhosis: a retrospective multicenter study. *Clin Mol Hepatol* 2012;18:368-74.
47. Kitamoto M, Imamura M, Kamada K, et al. Balloon-occluded retrograde transvenous obliteration of gastric fundal varices with hemorrhage. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2002;178:1167-74.
48. Kobayakawa M, Kokubu S, Hirota S, et al. Short-Term Safety and Efficacy of Balloon-Occluded Retrograde Transvenous Obliteration Using Ethanolamine Oleate: Results of a Prospective, Multicenter, Single-Arm Trial. *J Vasc Interv Radiol* 2017;28:1108-15 e2.
49. Koizumi J, Hashimoto T, Myojin K, et al. Balloon-occluded retrograde transvenous obliteration of gastric varices: use of CT-guided foam sclerotherapy to optimize technique. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2012;199:200-7.
50. Mukund A, Deogaonkar G, Rajesh S, Shasthry SM, Sarin SK. Safety and Efficacy of Sodium Tetradecyl Sulfate and Lipiodol Foam in Balloon-Occluded Retrograde Transvenous Obliteration (BRTO) for Large Porto-Systemic Shunts. *Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol* 2017;40:1010-16.
51. Ninoi T, Nishida N, Kaminou T, et al. Balloon-occluded retrograde transvenous obliteration of gastric varices with gastrosplenic shunt: long-term follow-up in 78 patients. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2005;184:1340-6.
52. Sabri SS, Swee W, Turba UC, et al. Bleeding gastric varices obliteration with balloon-occluded retrograde transvenous obliteration using sodium tetradecyl sulfate foam. *J Vasc Interv Radiol* 2011;22:309-16; quiz 16.
53. Akahoshi T, Hashizume M, Tomikawa M, et al. Long-term results of balloon-occluded retrograde transvenous obliteration for gastric variceal bleeding and risky gastric varices: a 10-year experience. *J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2008;23:1702-9.
54. Arai H, Abe T, Takagi H, Mori M. Efficacy of balloon-occluded retrograde transvenous obliteration, percutaneous transhepatic obliteration and combined techniques for the management of gastric fundal varices. *World J Gastroenterol* 2006;12:3866-73.

55. Chikamori F, Kuniyoshi N, Kawashima T, Takase Y. Gastric varices with gastroduodenal shunt: combined therapy using transjugular retrograde obliteration and partial splenic embolization. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2008;191:555-9.
56. Hong CH, Kim HJ, Park JH, et al. Treatment of patients with gastric variceal hemorrhage: endoscopic N-butyl-2-cyanoacrylate injection versus balloon-occluded retrograde transvenous obliteration. *J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2009;24:372-8.
57. Kiyosue H, Matsumoto S, Onishi R, et al. [Balloon-occluded retrograde transvenous obliteration (B-RTO) for gastric varices: therapeutic results and problems]. *Nihon Igaku Hoshasen Gakkai Zasshi* 1999;59:12-9.
58. Koito K, Namieno T, Nagakawa T, Morita K. Balloon-occluded retrograde transvenous obliteration for gastric varices with gastroduodenal or gastroduodenal collaterals. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 1996;167:1317-20.
59. Sonomura T, Sato M, Kishi K, et al. Balloon-occluded retrograde transvenous obliteration for gastric varices: a feasibility study. *Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol* 1998;21:27-30.
60. Park JK, Saab S, Kee ST, et al. Balloon-Occluded Retrograde Transvenous Obliteration (BRTO) for Treatment of Gastric Varices: Review and Meta-Analysis. *Dig Dis Sci* 2015;60:1543-53.
61. Okugawa H, Maruyama H, Kobayashi S, Yoshizumi H, Matsutani S, Yokosuka O. Therapeutic effect of balloon-occluded retrograde transvenous obliteration for gastric varices in relation to haemodynamics in the short gastric vein. *Br J Radiol* 2009;82:930-5.
62. Kim ES, Park SY, Kwon KT, et al. [The clinical usefulness of balloon occluded retrograde transvenous obliteration in gastric variceal bleeding]. *Taehan Kan Hakhoe Chi* 2003;9:315-23.
63. Park SJ, Chung JW, Kim HC, Jae HJ, Park JH. The prevalence, risk factors, and clinical outcome of balloon rupture in balloon-occluded retrograde transvenous obliteration of gastric varices. *J Vasc Interv Radiol* 2010;21:503-7.
64. Shimoda R, Horiuchi K, Hagiwara S, et al. Short-term complications of retrograde transvenous obliteration of gastric varices in patients with portal hypertension: effects of obliteration of major portosystemic shunts. *Abdom Imaging* 2005;30:306-13.
65. Jogo A, Nishida N, Yamamoto A, et al. Factors associated with aggravation of esophageal varices after B-RTO for gastric varices. *Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol* 2014;37:1243-50.
66. Saad WE, Wagner CC, Lippert A, et al. Protective value of TIPS against the development of hydrothorax/ascites and upper gastrointestinal bleeding after balloon-occluded retrograde transvenous obliteration (BRTO). *Am J Gastroenterol* 2013;108:1612-9.
67. Chikamori F, Kuniyoshi N, Kawashima T, Takase Y. Short-term portal hemodynamic effects of partial splenic embolization for hypersplenism. *Hepatogastroenterology* 2007;54:1847-9.
68. Buechter M, Kahraman A, Manka P, et al. Partial spleen embolization reduces the risk of portal hypertension-induced upper gastrointestinal bleeding in patients not eligible for TIPS implantation. *PLoS One* 2017;12:e0177401.
69. Duan X, Zhang K, Han X, et al. Comparison of percutaneous transhepatic variceal embolization (PTVE) followed by partial splenic embolization versus PTVE alone for the treatment of acute esophagogastric variceal massive hemorrhage. *J Vasc Interv Radiol* 2014;25:1858-65.
70. Waguri N, Hayashi M, Yokoo T, et al. Simultaneous combined balloon-occluded retrograde transvenous obliteration and partial splenic embolization for portosystemic shunts. *J Vasc Interv Radiol* 2012;23:650-7.
71. Ohmoto K, Yoshioka N, Tomiyama Y, et al. Improved prognosis of cirrhosis patients with esophageal varices and thrombocytopenia treated by endoscopic variceal ligation plus partial splenic embolization. *Dig Dis Sci* 2006;51:352-8.
72. Bernades P, Baetz A, Levy P, Belghiti J, Menu Y, Fekete F. Splenic and portal venous obstruction in chronic pancreatitis. A prospective longitudinal study of a medical-surgical series of 266 patients. *Dig Dis Sci* 1992;37:340-6.
73. Orloff MJ, Hye RJ, Wheeler HO, et al. Randomized trials of endoscopic therapy and transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt versus portacaval shunt for emergency and elective treatment of bleeding gastric varices in cirrhosis. *Surgery* 2015;157:1028-45.
74. Henderson JM, Boyer TD, Kutner MH, et al. Distal splenorenal shunt versus transjugular intrahepatic portal systematic shunt for variceal bleeding: a randomized trial. *Gastroenterology* 2006;130:1643-51.

75. Su AP, Zhang ZD, Tian BL, Zhu JQ. Transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt versus open splenectomy and esophagogastric devascularization for portal hypertension with recurrent variceal bleeding. *Hepatobiliary Pancreat Dis Int* 2017;16:169-75.
76. Cheng Z, Li JW, Chen J, Fan YD, Guo P, Zheng SG. Therapeutic effects of laparoscopic splenectomy and esophagogastric devascularization on liver cirrhosis and portal hypertension in 204 cases. *J Laparoendosc Adv Surg Tech A* 2014;24:612-6.
77. Feng LS, Chen XP. Combined splenocaval or mesocaval C shunt and portoazygous devascularization in the treatment of portal hypertension: analysis of 150 cases. *Hepatobiliary Pancreat Dis Int* 2006;5:70-3.
78. Reverter E, Tandon P, Augustin S, et al. A MELD-based model to determine risk of mortality among patients with acute variceal bleeding. *Gastroenterology* 2014;146:412-19 e3.
79. Spengler EK, Hunsicker LG, Zarei S, Zimmerman MB, Voigt MD. Transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt does not independently increase risk of death in high model for end stage liver disease patients. *Hepatol Commun* 2017;1:460-68.
80. Saad WE, Wagner CC, Al-Osaimi A, et al. The effect of balloon-occluded transvenous obliteration of gastric varices and gastroduodenal shunts on the hepatic synthetic function: a comparison between Child-Pugh and model for end-stage liver disease scores. *Vasc Endovascular Surg* 2013;47:281-7.
81. Miraglia R, Maruzzelli L, Tuzzolino F, Petridis I, D'Amico M, Luca A. Transjugular Intrahepatic Portosystemic Shunts in Patients with Cirrhosis with Refractory Ascites: Comparison of Clinical Outcomes by Using 8- and 10-mm PTFE-covered Stents. *Radiology* 2017;284:281-88.
82. Quintini C, D'Amico G, Brown C, et al. Splenic artery embolization for the treatment of refractory ascites after liver transplantation. *Liver Transpl* 2011;17:668-73.
83. Madoff DC, Wallace MJ, Ahrar K, Saxon RR. TIPS-related hepatic encephalopathy: management options with novel endovascular techniques. *Radiographics* 2004;24:21-36; discussion 36-7.
84. Yoshida H, Mamada Y, Taniai N, et al. Long-term results of partial splenic artery embolization as supplemental treatment for portal-systemic encephalopathy. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2005;100:43-7.
85. Choi YS, Lee JH, Sinn DH, et al. Effect of balloon-occluded retrograde transvenous obliteration on the natural history of coexisting esophageal varices. *J Clin Gastroenterol* 2008;42:974-9.
86. Watanabe K, Kimura K, Matsutani S, Ohto M, Okuda K. Portal hemodynamics in patients with gastric varices. A study in 230 patients with esophageal and/or gastric varices using portal vein catheterization. *Gastroenterology* 1988;95:434-40.
87. Xu CE, Zhang SG, Yu ZH, et al. Combined devascularization and proximal splenorenal shunt: is this a better option than either procedure alone? *J Hepatobiliary Pancreat Surg* 2004;11:129-34.
88. Ono Y, Matsueda K, Koga R, et al. Sinistral portal hypertension after pancreaticoduodenectomy with splenic vein ligation. *Br J Surg* 2015;102:219-28.
89. Liu Q, Song Y, Xu X, Jin Z, Duan W, Zhou N. Management of bleeding gastric varices in patients with sinistral portal hypertension. *Dig Dis Sci* 2014;59:1625-9.
90. Sato T, Yamazaki K, Akaike J, Toyota J, Karino Y, Ohmura T. Clinical and endoscopic features of gastric varices secondary to splenic vein occlusion. *Hepatol Res* 2008;38:1076-82.
91. Janne d'Othee B, Walker TG, Marota JJ, Waltman AC, Greenfield AJ, Koizumi J. Splenic venous congestion after balloon-occluded retrograde transvenous obliteration of gastric varices. *Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol* 2012;35:434-8.
92. Saad WE, Kitanosono T, Koizumi J, Hirota S. The conventional balloon-occluded retrograde transvenous obliteration procedure: indications, contraindications, and technical applications. *Tech Vasc Interv Radiol* 2013;16:101-51.
93. Luo X, Nie L, Wang Z, Tsao J, Tang C, Li X. Transjugular endovascular recanalization of splenic vein in patients with regional portal hypertension complicated by gastrointestinal bleeding. *Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol* 2014;37:108-13.
94. Wang Q, Xiong B, Zheng C, Liang M, Han P. Splenic Arterial Embolization in the Treatment of Severe Portal Hypertension Due to Pancreatic Diseases: The Primary Experience in 14 Patients. *Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol* 2016;39:353-8.
95. Sakorafas GH, Sarr MG, Farley DR, Farnell MB. The significance of sinistral portal hypertension complicating chronic pancreatitis. *Am J Surg* 2000;179:129-33.
96. Loftus JP, Nagorney DM, Ilstrup D, Kunselman AR. Sinistral portal hypertension. Splenectomy or expectant management. *Ann Surg* 1993;217:35-40.

97. Uflacker R. Applications of percutaneous mechanical thrombectomy in transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt and portal vein thrombosis. *Tech Vasc Interv Radiol* 2003;6:59-69.
98. Thornburg B, Desai K, Hickey R, et al. Portal Vein Recanalization and Transjugular Intrahepatic Portosystemic Shunt Creation for Chronic Portal Vein Thrombosis: Technical Considerations. *Tech Vasc Interv Radiol* 2016;19:52-60.
99. Luo J, Li M, Zhang Y, et al. Percutaneous transhepatic intrahepatic portosystemic shunt for variceal bleeding with chronic portal vein occlusion after splenectomy. *Eur Radiol* 2018;28:3661-68.
100. Luo X, Wang Z, Tsauo J, Zhou B, Zhang H, Li X. Advanced Cirrhosis Combined with Portal Vein Thrombosis: A Randomized Trial of TIPS versus Endoscopic Band Ligation Plus Propranolol for the Prevention of Recurrent Esophageal Variceal Bleeding. *Radiology* 2015;276:286-93.
101. Han GH, Meng XJ, Yin ZX, et al. [Transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt and combination with percutaneous transhepatic or transsplenic approach for the treatment of portal vein thrombosis with or without cavernomatous transformation]. *Zhonghua Yi Xue Za Zhi* 2009;89:1549-52.
102. Walser EM, Soloway R, Raza SA, Gill A. Transjugular portosystemic shunt in chronic portal vein occlusion: importance of segmental portal hypertension in cavernous transformation of the portal vein. *J Vasc Interv Radiol* 2006;17:373-8.
103. Wils A, van der Linden E, van Hoek B, Pattynama PM. Transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt in patients with chronic portal vein occlusion and cavernous transformation. *J Clin Gastroenterol* 2009;43:982-4.
104. Marot A, Barbosa JV, Duran R, Deltenre P, Denys A. Percutaneous portal vein recanalization using self-expandable nitinol stents in patients with non-cirrhotic non-tumoral portal vein occlusion. *Diagn Interv Imaging* 2019;100:147-56.
105. Qi X, Han G, Yin Z, et al. Transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt for portal cavernoma with symptomatic portal hypertension in non-cirrhotic patients. *Dig Dis Sci* 2012;57:1072-82.
106. Klinger C, Riecken B, Schmidt A, et al. Transjugular portal vein recanalization with creation of intrahepatic portosystemic shunt (PVR-TIPS) in patients with chronic non-cirrhotic, non-malignant portal vein thrombosis. *Z Gastroenterol* 2018;56:221-37.
107. Borghei P, Kim SK, Zuckerman DA. Balloon occlusion retrograde transvenous obliteration of gastric varices in two non-cirrhotic patients with portal vein thrombosis. *Korean J Radiol* 2014;15:108-13.
108. Miyaaki H, Ichikawa T, Nakao K, et al. Portal hypertensive gastropathy with portal thrombosis successfully treated with partial splenic embolization. *Clin J Gastroenterol* 2009;2:218-21.
109. Wang RY, Wang JF, Liu Q, Ma N, Chen WX, Li JL. Combined Rex-bypass shunt with pericardial devascularization alleviated prehepatic portal hypertension caused by cavernomatous transformation of portal vein. *Postgrad Med* 2017;129:768-76.
110. Zhang H, Zhang N, Li M, Jin W, Pan S. Surgical treatment of portal vein cavernous transformation. *World J Surg* 2004;28:708-11.

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 ability 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.