

# World Journal of *Clinical Cases*

*World J Clin Cases* 2022 August 16; 10(23): 8057-8431



## Contents

Thrice Monthly Volume 10 Number 23 August 16, 2022

## OPINION REVIEW

- 8057** Invasive intervention timing for infected necrotizing pancreatitis: Late invasive intervention is not late for collection

*Xiao NJ, Cui TT, Liu F, Li W*

- 8063** Clinical utility of left atrial strain in predicting atrial fibrillation recurrence after catheter ablation: An up-to-date review

*Yu ZX, Yang W, Yin WS, Peng KX, Pan YL, Chen WW, Du BB, He YQ, Yang P*

## MINIREVIEWS

- 8076** Gut microbiota and COVID-19: An intriguing pediatric perspective

*Valentino MS, Esposito C, Colosimo S, Caprio AM, Puzone S, Guarino S, Marzuillo P, Miraglia del Giudice E, Di Sessa A*

- 8088** Beta receptor blocker therapy for the elderly in the COVID-19 era

*Santillo E, Migale M*

## ORIGINAL ARTICLE

## Retrospective Cohort Study

- 8097** Nonselective beta-blocker use is associated with increased hepatic encephalopathy-related readmissions in cirrhosis

*Fallahzadeh MA, Asrani SK, Tapper EB, Saracino G, Rahimi RS*

## Retrospective Study

- 8107** Different squatting positions after total knee arthroplasty: A retrospective study

*Li TJ, Sun JY, Du YQ, Shen JM, Zhang BH, Zhou YG*

- 8115** Outcomes of seromuscular bladder augmentation compared with standard bladder augmentation in the treatment of children with neurogenic bladder

*Sun XG, Li YX, Ji LF, Xu JL, Chen WX, Wang RY*

- 8124** Distinctive clinical features of spontaneous pneumoperitoneum in neonates: A retrospective analysis

*Kim SH, Cho YH, Kim HY*

- 8133** Cognitive training for elderly patients with early Alzheimer's disease in the Qinghai-Tibet Plateau: A pilot study

*Wang XH, Luo MQ*

- 8141** Diagnostic value of elevated serum carbohydrate antigen 125 level in sarcoidosis

*Zhang Q, Jing XY, Yang XY, Xu ZJ*

- 8152** Evaluation of progressive early rehabilitation training mode in intensive care unit patients with mechanical ventilation

*Qie XJ, Liu ZH, Guo LM*

- 8161** Comparison of demographic features and laboratory parameters between COVID-19 deceased patients and surviving severe and critically ill cases

*Wang L, Gao Y, Zhang ZJ, Pan CK, Wang Y, Zhu YC, Qi YP, Xie FJ, Du X, Li NN, Chen PF, Yue CS, Wu JH, Wang XT, Tang YJ, Lai QQ, Kang K*

### Clinical Trials Study

- 8170** Role of H<sub>2</sub>receptor blocker famotidine over the clinical recovery of COVID-19 patients: A randomized controlled trial

*Mohiuddin Chowdhury ATM, Kamal A, Abbas MKU, Karim MR, Ali MA, Talukder S, Hamidullah Mehedi H, Hassan H, Shahin AH, Li Y, He S*

### Observational Study

- 8186** Short-term prognostic factors for hepatitis B virus-related acute-on-chronic liver failure

*Ye QX, Huang JF, Xu ZJ, Yan YY, Yan Y, Liu LG*

- 8196** Three-dimensional psychological guidance combined with evidence-based health intervention in patients with liver abscess treated with ultrasound

*Shan YN, Yu Y, Zhao YH, Tang LL, Chen XM*

- 8205** Role of serum  $\beta$ 2-microglobulin, glycosylated hemoglobin, and vascular endothelial growth factor levels in diabetic nephropathy

*Yang B, Zhao XH, Ma GB*

### SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS

- 8212** Gallbladder neuroendocrine carcinoma diagnosis, treatment and prognosis based on the SEER database: A literature review

*Cai XC, Wu SD*

### CASE REPORT

- 8224** Sepsis complicated with secondary hemophagocytic syndrome induced by giant gouty tophi rupture: A case report

*Lai B, Pang ZH*

- 8232** Spontaneous remission of autoimmune pancreatitis: Four case reports

*Zhang BB, Huo JW, Yang ZH, Wang ZC, Jin EH*

- 8242** Epstein-Barr-virus-associated hepatitis with aplastic anemia: A case report

*Zhang WJ, Wu LQ, Wang J, Lin SY, Wang B*

- 8249** Aspiration as the first-choice procedure for airway management in an infant with large epiglottic cysts: A case report

*Zheng JQ, Du L, Zhang WY*

- 8255** Sequential multidisciplinary minimally invasive therapeutic strategy for heart failure caused by four diseases: A case report  
*Zhao CZ, Yan Y, Cui Y, Zhu N, Ding XY*
- 8262** Primary ascending colon cancer accompanying skip metastases in left shoulder skin and left neck lymph node: A case report  
*Zhou JC, Wang JJ, Liu T, Tong Q, Fang YJ, Wu ZQ, Hong Q*
- 8271** Clinical and genetic study of ataxia with vitamin E deficiency: A case report  
*Zhang LW, Liu B, Peng DT*
- 8277** Complete resection of large-cell neuroendocrine and hepatocellular carcinoma of the liver: A case report  
*Noh BG, Seo HI, Park YM, Kim S, Hong SB, Lee SJ*
- 8284** Immunotherapy combined with antiangiogenic agents in patients with advanced malignant pleural mesothelioma: A case report  
*Xuan TT, Li GY, Meng SB, Wang ZM, Qu LL*
- 8291** Bladder malacoplakia: A case report  
*Wang HK, Hang G, Wang YY, Wen Q, Chen B*
- 8298** Delayed inflammatory response evoked in nasal alloplastic implants after COVID-19 vaccination: A case report  
*Seo MG, Choi EK, Chung KJ*
- 8304** Phosphoglyceride crystal deposition disease requiring differential diagnosis from malignant tumors and confirmed by Raman spectroscopy: A case report  
*Ohkura Y, Uruga H, Shiiba M, Ito S, Shimoyama H, Ishihara M, Ueno M, Udagawa H*
- 8312** Vulvovaginal myeloid sarcoma with massive pelvic floor infiltration: A case report and review of literature  
*Wang JX, Zhang H, Ning G, Bao L*
- 8323** Femoral neck stress fracture and medial tibial stress syndrome following high intensity interval training: A case report and review of literature  
*Tan DS, Cheung FM, Ng D, Cheung TLA*
- 8330** Periosteal chondroma of the rib: A case report  
*Gao Y, Wang JG, Liu H, Gao CP*
- 8336** Papillary thyroid carcinoma occurring with undifferentiated pleomorphic sarcoma: A case report  
*Lee YL, Cheng YQ, Zhu CF, Huo HZ*
- 8344** Laparoscopic treatment of bilateral duplex kidney and ectopic ureter: A case report  
*Wang SB, Wan L, Wang Y, Yi ZJ, Xiao C, Cao JZ, Liu XY, Tang RP, Luo Y*
- 8352** Incontinentia pigmenti with intracranial arachnoid cyst: A case report  
*Li WC, Li ML, Ding JW, Wang L, Wang SR, Wang YY, Xiao LF, Sun T*

- 8360** Relapsing polychondritis causing breathlessness: Two case reports  
*Zhai SY, Zhang YH, Guo RY, Hao JW, Wen SX*
- 8367** Endodontic management of a fused left maxillary second molar and two paramolars using cone beam computed tomography: A case report  
*Mei XH, Liu J, Wang W, Zhang QX, Hong T, Bai SZ, Cheng XG, Tian Y, Jiang WK*
- 8375** Infant biliary cirrhosis secondary to a biliary inflammatory myofibroblastic tumor: A case report and review of literature  
*Huang Y, Shu SN, Zhou H, Liu LL, Fang F*
- 8384** Metastatic low-grade endometrial stromal sarcoma with variable morphologies in the ovaries and mesentery: A case report  
*Yu HY, Jin YL*
- 8392** Bronchogenic cysts with infection in the chest wall skin of a 64-year-old asymptomatic patient: A case report  
*Ma B, Fu KW, Xie XD, Cheng Y, Wang SQ*
- 8400** Incidental accumulation of Technetium-99m pertechnetate in subacute cerebral infarction: A case report  
*Han YH, Jeong HJ, Kang HG, Lim ST*
- 8406** Metal stent combined with ileus drainage tube for the treatment of delayed rectal perforation: A case report  
*Cheng SL, Xie L, Wu HW, Zhang XF, Lou LL, Shen HZ*
- 8417** Using ketamine in a patient with a near-occlusion tracheal tumor undergoing tracheal resection and reconstruction: A case report  
*Xu XH, Gao H, Chen XM, Ma HB, Huang YG*

**LETTER TO THE EDITOR**

- 8422** Reflections on the prevalence of human leukocyte antigen-B27 and human leukocyte antigen-B51 co-occurrence in patients with spondylarthritis  
*Gonçalves Júnior J, Sampaio-Barros PD, Shinjo SK*
- 8425** Comment on "Disease exacerbation is common in inflammatory bowel disease patients treated with immune checkpoint inhibitors for malignancy"  
*Argyriou K, Kotsakis A*
- 8428** Intranasal sufentanil combined with intranasal dexmedetomidine: A promising method for non-anesthesiologist sedation during endoscopic ultrasonography  
*Wang Y, Ge ZJ, Han C*

**ABOUT COVER**

Editorial Board Member of *World Journal of Clinical Cases*, Peng Liang, MD, Associate Professor, Day Surgery Center, Department of Anesthesiology, West China Hospital of Sichuan University, Chengdu 610041, Sichuan Province, China. 39485572@qq.com

**AIMS AND SCOPE**

The primary aim of *World Journal of Clinical Cases* (WJCC, *World J Clin Cases*) is to provide scholars and readers from various fields of clinical medicine with a platform to publish high-quality clinical research articles and communicate their research findings online.

WJCC mainly publishes articles reporting research results and findings obtained in the field of clinical medicine and covering a wide range of topics, including case control studies, retrospective cohort studies, retrospective studies, clinical trials studies, observational studies, prospective studies, randomized controlled trials, randomized clinical trials, systematic reviews, meta-analysis, and case reports.

**INDEXING/ABSTRACTING**

The WJCC is now abstracted and indexed in Science Citation Index Expanded (SCIE, also known as SciSearch®), Journal Citation Reports/Science Edition, Current Contents®/Clinical Medicine, PubMed, PubMed Central, Scopus, Reference Citation Analysis, China National Knowledge Infrastructure, China Science and Technology Journal Database, and Superstar Journals Database. The 2022 Edition of Journal Citation Reports® cites the 2021 impact factor (IF) for WJCC as 1.534; IF without journal self cites: 1.491; 5-year IF: 1.599; Journal Citation Indicator: 0.28; Ranking: 135 among 172 journals in medicine, general and internal; and Quartile category: Q4. The WJCC's CiteScore for 2021 is 1.2 and Scopus CiteScore rank 2021: General Medicine is 443/826.

**RESPONSIBLE EDITORS FOR THIS ISSUE**

Production Editor: Hua-Ge Yin; Production Department Director: Xiang Li; Editorial Office Director: Jin-Lei Wang.

**NAME OF JOURNAL**

*World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**ISSN**

ISSN 2307-8960 (online)

**LAUNCH DATE**

April 16, 2013

**FREQUENCY**

Thrice Monthly

**EDITORS-IN-CHIEF**

Bao-Gan Peng, Jerzy Tadeusz Chudek, George Kontogeorgos, Maurizio Serati, Ja Hyeon Ku

**EDITORIAL BOARD MEMBERS**

<https://www.wjnet.com/2307-8960/editorialboard.htm>

**PUBLICATION DATE**

August 16, 2022

**COPYRIGHT**

© 2022 Baishideng Publishing Group Inc

**INSTRUCTIONS TO AUTHORS**

<https://www.wjnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/204>

**GUIDELINES FOR ETHICS DOCUMENTS**

<https://www.wjnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/287>

**GUIDELINES FOR NON-NATIVE SPEAKERS OF ENGLISH**

<https://www.wjnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/240>

**PUBLICATION ETHICS**

<https://www.wjnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/288>

**PUBLICATION MISCONDUCT**

<https://www.wjnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/208>

**ARTICLE PROCESSING CHARGE**

<https://www.wjnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/242>

**STEPS FOR SUBMITTING MANUSCRIPTS**

<https://www.wjnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/239>

**ONLINE SUBMISSION**

<https://www.f6publishing.com>



## Invasive intervention timing for infected necrotizing pancreatitis: Late invasive intervention is not late for collection

Nian-Jun Xiao, Ting-Ting Cui, Fang Liu, Wen Li

**Specialty type:** Gastroenterology and hepatology

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited article; Externally peer reviewed.

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Peer-review report's scientific quality classification**

Grade A (Excellent): 0  
Grade B (Very good): 0  
Grade C (Good): C, C, C  
Grade D (Fair): D  
Grade E (Poor): 0

**P-Reviewer:** Kalayarsan R, India; Kitamura K, Japan; Kitamura K, Japan; Litvin A, Russia

**Received:** March 2, 2022

**Peer-review started:** March 2, 2022

**First decision:** April 19, 2022

**Revised:** May 3, 2022

**Accepted:** June 24, 2022

**Article in press:** June 24, 2022

**Published online:** August 16, 2022



**Nian-Jun Xiao**, Department of Gastroenterology, Air Force Medical Center, Air Force Medical University, Beijing 100142, China

**Ting-Ting Cui, Fang Liu**, Department of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Medical School of Chinese PLA, Beijing 100853, China

**Wen Li**, Department of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, The First Medical Center, Chinese PLA General Hospital, Beijing 100853, China

**Corresponding author:** Wen Li, AGAF, PhD, Chief Doctor, Department of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, The First Medical Center, Chinese PLA General Hospital, No. 28 Fuxing Road, Beijing 100853, China. [liwen@301hospital.com.cn](mailto:liwen@301hospital.com.cn)

### Abstract

With the advance of invasive interventions, the treatment model for infected necrotizing pancreatitis (INP) has shifted from open surgery to the step-up minimally invasive treatment. Late intervention, originating from the open surgery era, has been questioned in the minimally invasive period. With the emergence of new high-quality evidence about the timing for intervention, it seems to be increasingly apparent that, even in the age of minimal invasiveness, "late intervention" waiting for the necrotic collections to be encapsulated is still necessary. This opinion review mainly discusses the intervention timing for INP.

**Key Words:** Pancreatitis; Walled-off necrosis; Minimally invasive surgery; Endoscopic drainage; Endoscopic gastric fenestration

©The Author(s) 2022. Published by Baishideng Publishing Group Inc. All rights reserved.

**Core Tip:** Infected necrotizing pancreatitis is a potentially lethal disease that should be identified and managed early. For patients who can be stabilized with antibiotics and supportive care, the invasive treatment, either endoscopic or percutaneous approach, should be delayed for at least four weeks. While patients whose infection cannot be controlled by medication alone may need percutaneous drainage first in 48-72 h, followed by minimally invasive surgery (if necessary). Endoscopic gastric fenestration may be performed in selected patients. This innovative alternative intervention should also be postponed to more than four weeks, waiting for the necrosis to mature and the capsular lesions to fuse with the gastric wall.

**Citation:** Xiao NJ, Cui TT, Liu F, Li W. Invasive intervention timing for infected necrotizing pancreatitis: Late invasive intervention is not late for collection. *World J Clin Cases* 2022; 10(23): 8057-8062

**URL:** <https://www.wjgnet.com/2307-8960/full/v10/i23/8057.htm>

**DOI:** <https://dx.doi.org/10.12998/wjcc.v10.i23.8057>

## INTRODUCTION

Acute pancreatitis is one of the most common pancreatic diseases. According to the revised Atlanta classification[1], acute pancreatitis is categorized into interstitial edematous and necrotizing pancreatitis. The prognosis of acute edematous pancreatitis is usually favorable. However, acute necrotizing pancreatitis (ANP) is potentially lethal since it has a high ratio of complications. Acute necrotic collection (ANC) and walled-off necrosis (WON) are two main local complications of ANP, arising from pancreatic and/or peripancreatic necrosis in the early and late phases, respectively. During the evolution of the disease, the necrosis may remain sterile or become infected. Once infection occurs, as the liquefaction of the infected pancreatic necrosis progresses, there may be an increasing amount of suppuration, which was described as "pancreatic abscess" in the original Atlanta classification and some older literature. Since the collections usually contain solid necrotic tissue, the term "pancreatic abscess" was confusing and was gradually deprecated.

Currently, "infected necrotizing pancreatitis (INP)" has been preferred to describe ANP with infection. It is more common in severe acute pancreatitis and poses a considerable threat with a mortality of up to 30%-39%[2]. The treatment of INP is challenging and usually needs a multidisciplinary team to provide optimal management. Besides, invasive treatment is generally unavoidable. With the advancement of minimally invasive treatment of INP, the therapeutic algorithm has shifted from open surgery to minimally invasive techniques, including percutaneous catheter drainage, per-oral endoscopic drainage or necrosectomy, video-assisted retroperitoneal debridement (VARD), *etc.* Meanwhile, the invasive intervention timing has been arousing an extensive debate as treatment approaches transform in the minimal invasion era.

Recently, we published a mini-review about pancreatic and peripancreatic collections of acute pancreatitis, in which we mainly discussed treatment approaches[3]. We did not elaborate on the timing for invasive intervention due to space limitations. Another reason was that the results of the POINTER trial[4] had not been published at that time, we did not have direct evidence about this issue, even though we had presumed that the late intervention might be better based on our limited experience. According to the POINTER trial[5], earlier studies, and clinical experiences, we have more confidence in late intervention for INP.

## DIAGNOSIS OF INP

### Diagnosis of INP

In ANP, necrosis may involve the pancreatic parenchyma and/or peripancreatic tissues. The pancreatic parenchyma necrosis usually presents as a focal or diffuse area with no enhancement in the arterial and early venous phase. The peripancreatic necrosis is commonly located in the retroperitoneum and lesser sac, with heterogeneous and ill-defined regions. Both magnetic resonance imaging and contrast-enhanced computer tomography (CECT) have a good capability in evaluating the presence and extent of pancreatic and/or peripancreatic necrosis. However, due to the characteristics of short scan duration, accurate severity evaluation, robust reproducibility, and widespread usage, CECT is recommended as the first-line imaging modality for assessing necrosis in ANP[6]. The best timing of execution of CECT is at least 72 h after symptom onset, as necrosis may be underestimated or missed due to premature assessment.

After necrosis has been evaluated, INP should be suspected if patients with systemic inflammatory response syndrome (SIRS) improve but suddenly deteriorate, the SIRS does not improve after two weeks of treatment, or there is evidence of pancreatic and/or peripancreatic gas configurations.

Increased serum procalcitonin may consolidate the suspicion of infection, while a positive result on Gram stain or culture can diagnose the INP. Nevertheless, the obtaining of sampling, usually by applying fine-needle aspiration (FNA) guided by ultrasound or CT, is invasive. Additionally, the potential contamination and the probability of false-negative and false-positive results of this technique hamper it as a common approach to confirming INP[6]. Therefore, empirical broad-spectrum antibiotics (*e.g.*, carbapenems, quinolones, *etc.*) can be used as a diagnostic treatment for suspected cases of INP[7]. For patients with clinical deterioration after empirical antibiotic therapy, FNA samples are recommended to be tested to identify the infection and guide the adjustment of antibiotics.

### **Timing for percutaneous drainage and minimally invasive surgery**

As minimally invasive intervention and related clinical studies emerge, the standard treatment of INP has undergone a paradigm shift. The milestone PANTER trial, published in 2010, showed that the minimally invasive step-up approach reduced the rate of major complications or mortality among patients with INP compared to traditional standard open necrosectomy[8], which established the status of the minimally invasive step-up approach as a priority treatment. In this trial, 93% of patients in the step-up approach group received percutaneous catheter drainage as the first step. Furthermore, as shown in the POINTER trial, the postponed-drainage strategy indicated fewer invasive interventions than the immediate-drainage strategy without increasing the incidence of complications. Therefore, whenever possible, the percutaneous drainage should be postponed to about four weeks after the onset of the disease. Moreover, 39% of patients were spared invasive drainage or necrosectomy procedure with this strategy[5].

However, it is not always appropriate to postpone the intervention in clinical practice since some patients suffer serious infections that cannot be controlled by medication alone; they usually demonstrate new-onset organ failure on the basis of SIRS or present with persistent organ failure and even aggravation of pre-existing organ failure. For these patients, early invasive drainage should be planned. Usually, after an attempt at antibiotic treatment for the first 48-72 h, we would prefer percutaneous drainage next because this approach is comparatively handy and can provide rapid source control in most infectious lesions. For adequate drainage, if necessary, the combination of percutaneous drainage and endoscopic drainage can also be considered. Meanwhile, FNA could be done before the indwelling of a drainage catheter to gather a sample, which may provide the details on the infection and the antibiotic susceptibility results. If there is no clinical improvement 48-72 h after the first drainage, another catheter drainage or expanded drainage channel should be constructed. If patients do not show clinical improvement after an additional 48-72 h, minimally invasive surgery, for instance, VARD, should be considered, irrespective of whether the intervention time has exceeded four weeks. If there is clinical improvement, minimally invasive surgery could be postponed until the necrosis has substantially or entirely encapsulated.

### **Timing for endoscopic drainage and necrosectomy**

In 2012, the PENGUIN trial demonstrated that endoscopic drainage and subsequent necrosectomy (if necessary) reduced the postprocedural proinflammatory response and the composite clinical endpoint compared with percutaneous drainage and subsequent VARD or laparotomy (if necessary) in patients with INP[9]. Despite a small sample size, this was the first randomized controlled trial (RCT) comparing two minimally invasive procedures. Then, another RCT, the TENSION trial with a larger sample size, was published in 2018. Although this trial did not verify that the endoscopic step-up approach was superior to the surgical step-up approach in reducing major complications or deaths, it demonstrated that the endoscopic step-up approach had a better effect in reducing the incidence of pancreatic fistula and shortening hospital stay[10]. The contemporaneous MISER trial also proved the superiority of the endoscopic approach in reducing fistulas[11]. Meta-analyses based on the RCTs or the other clinical cohort studies confirmed these conclusions[12-14]. Therefore, guidelines recommended the endoscopic step-up approach as a preferred treatment for endoscopically reachable lesions[7].

If patients maintain improvement after antibiotics and other supportive care, then the timing for endoscopic drainage is also recommended to postpone until four or more weeks after initial presentation. As we have mentioned above, the POINTER trial, in which 56% of immediate drainage cases and 67% of postponed drainage cases were intervened with an endoscopic approach, did not show the benefit of early intervention. Besides, compared to the standard timing of endoscopic intervention ( $\geq 4$  wk) in patients with necrotizing pancreatitis, a retrospective study showed that early endoscopic intervention ( $< 4$  wk) had a worse outcome in terms of median hospital days, ICU days, need for rescue open necrosectomy, and the mortality[15]. Another matched case-control study also showed that the total duration of therapy was longer for early intervention compared with the control group[16]. Moreover, late intervention is related to fewer invasive interventions. For instance, 39% of patients in the postponed group in the POINTER trial were treated conservatively with antibiotics and did not require any invasive drainage. Additionally, for patients in the TENSION trial who indicated invasive intervention, under the premise of late invasive intervention (more than 4 wk after the onset of symptoms), 47% of them only need drainage and were exempt from necrosectomy. We list in Table 1 the major RCTs guiding the invasive intervention strategies for INP toward a better-supported recommendation for late endoscopic intervention. These results were consistent with our limited

**Table 1 Major randomized controlled trials guiding the invasive intervention strategies for infected necrotizing pancreatitis**

Years	First authors	RCTs	Study group (n)	Control group (n)	Main results	Conclusions
2010	Hjalmar C van Santvoort	PANTER	Step-up approach (n = 43, including 41 percutaneous drainage and 2 endoscopic drainages, 24 of them underwent VARD)	Open necrosectomy (n = 45, including 44 laparotomies and 1 VARD)	(1) Major complications or death (40% vs 69%); (2) New-onset multiple organ failure y (12% vs 40%); and (3) Incisional hernias (7% vs 24%)	A minimally invasive step-up approach, as compared with open necrosectomy, reduced the rate of the composite endpoint of major complications or death among patients with INP
2012	Olaf J Bakker	PENGUIN	Endoscopic transgastric necrosectomy (n = 10)	Surgical necrosectomy (n = 10, including 6 VARDs and 4 laparotomies)	(1) IL-6 levels increased after surgical necrosectomy, but decreased after endoscopy; (2) Composite clinical endpoint (20% vs 80%); (3) New-onset multiple organ (0 vs 50%); and (4) Pancreatic fistulas (10% vs 70%)	Endoscopic necrosectomy reduced the pro-inflammatory response as well as the composite clinical endpoint compared with surgical necrosectomy
2018	Sandra van Brunschot	TENSION	Endoscopic step-up approach (n = 51, including 22 endoscopic drainage only and 27 endoscopic necrosectomies and 2 VARD)	Surgical step-up approach (n = 47, including 24 percutaneous drainages only and 23 VARDs)	(1) Major complications or death during 6-month follow-up (43% vs 45%); (2) Mortality (18% vs 13%); (3) Pancreatic fistulas (5% vs 32%); and (4) Hospital stay (35 d vs 65 d)	The endoscopic step-up approach was not superior to the surgical step-up approach in reducing major complications or death. The rate of pancreatic fistulas and length of hospital stay were lower in the endoscopy group
2019	Ji Young Bang	MISER	Endoscopic step-up approach (n = 34)	Minimally invasive surgery (n = 32, including 26 laparoscopic cystogastrostomy and 6 VARDs)	(1) Major complications or death (11.8% vs 40.6%); (2) The rate of SIRS at 72 hours after intervention (20.6% vs 65.6%); (3) Disease-related adverse events (5.9% vs 43.8%); and (4) The average total cost (\$75830 vs \$117492)	An endoscopic transluminal approach for INP, compared with minimally invasive surgery, significantly reduced major complications, lowered costs, and increased quality of life
2021	L Boxhoorn	POINTER	Immediate drainage within 24 hours once INP was diagnosed (n = 55)	Postponed drainage until the stage of WON (n = 49)	(1) The mean score on the Comprehensive Complication Index (57 vs 58); (2) Mortality (13% vs 10%); and (3) The mean number of interventions (4.4 vs 2.6)	Immediate drainage did not show superiority over postponed drainage concerning complications. Patients with the postponed-drainage strategy received fewer invasive interventions

INP: Infected necrotizing pancreatitis; VARD: Videoscope assisted retroperitoneal debridement; RCT: Randomized controlled trial.

experience, and we usually do not hastily perform the endoscopic drainage in clinical practice until the lesions are encapsulated and the necrotic tissues are partially liquefied. As with the evidence discussed above, the late intervention which usually occurred more than four weeks after the onset of symptoms may have a better drainage outcome. However, in some cases of INP, despite the most outstanding support, the infection may still cause clinical deterioration, and require invasive intervention earlier. In this situation, we usually prefer percutaneous drainage, as discussed above, reserving endoscopic drainage for those who lack an ideal drainage path or have poor percutaneous drainage effects.

For endoscopic drainage, the most used stents include plastic stents and metal stents. Traditionally, to minimize migration risk, plastic stents with double pigtailed have been the most used in drainage. As introduced in the TENSION trial, two 7 French double pigtail stents and an 8.5 French nasocystic catheter were used as a combination for drainage. Due to their small diameter, plastic stents are prone to occlusion during the drainage process, making them more suitable for INP with more liquid and less solid necrotic tissue. When the fluid was wholly drained or the stents were blocked, the plastic stents should be opportunistically removed. Owing to the larger luminal diameter, metal stent drainage is more effective in patients with INP. Nevertheless, one of its limitations is stent migration. As a result, various metal stents with anti-migration functions have been introduced in recent years. Among them, the most striking one is lumen-apposing metal stent (LAMS). Compared with the plastic stent, LAMS is related to a shorter procedure duration but a higher stent-related adverse event risk[17], including LAMS buried under gastric mucosal, pseudoaneurysms bleeding, and obstructive jaundice. Most of them occurred in patients whose LAMS had been placed for more than three weeks[17]. A retrospective study also observed that patients with LAMS had a higher risk of pseudoaneurysm bleeding[18]. Therefore, it is crucial to retrieve LAMS timely after the drainage purpose is achieved. Currently, a CT scan in 3 wk is recommended to evaluate the drainage effect followed by LAMS removal to minimize the adverse events[17].

To avoid stent-related complications, we explored endoscopic gastric fenestration (EGF) as an innovative alternative intervention for infected WON[19]. First, endoscopic submucosal dissection achieved initial fenestration between the stomach and the WON lesion. Then, under the guidance of endoscopic ultrasound (EUS) and the spatial direction of WON, the fenestration was suitably enlarged to 1.5-3 cm to allow efficient drainage and direct endoscopic necrosectomy. One of the greatest advantages of the EGF is the avoidance of stents and their potential complications. This approach is not suitable for all WON, since its prerequisite is the fusion of WON with its closely connected stomach wall, which can present as mucosal inflammation such as edema and erosion in the direct endoscopic view and unnormal combined thickness without distinct layers in the EUS view. Therefore, late intervention waiting for the maturity of INP and the fusion of the encapsulated lesion with the gastric wall is also necessary for the EGF.

## CONCLUSION

The endoscopic step-up approach has been recommended as the first-line treatment for patients with INP. With the results of published studies (especially the POINTER trial) and our limited experiences, the late invasive intervention is not late for INPs. In contrast, this delayed invasive intervention strategy may avert the need for invasive intervention in around one-third of patients with INP. In addition, patients with late invasive intervention strategies may have the chance for an innovative EGF treatment, thereby avoiding stents and the related complications.

## FOOTNOTES

**Author contributions:** Xiao NJ and Li W contributed to the review design; Xiao NJ wrote the manuscript; Xiao NJ and Cui TT edited the manuscript; Cui TT contributed to the audio core tip; Liu F and Li W contributed to the manuscript revising.

**Conflict-of-interest statement:** All authors report no relevant conflict of interest for this article.

**Open-Access:** This article is an open-access article that was selected by an in-house editor and fully peer-reviewed by external reviewers. It is distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution NonCommercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited and the use is non-commercial. See: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

**Country/Territory of origin:** China

**ORCID number:** Nian-Jun Xiao 0000-0002-4055-7968; Ting-Ting Cui 0000-0001-6289-5696; Fang Liu 0000-0002-2013-9881; Wen Li 0000-0003-3963-6850.

**S-Editor:** Wu YXJ

**L-Editor:** A

**P-Editor:** Wu YXJ

## REFERENCES

- 1 **Banks PA**, Bollen TL, Dervenis C, Gooszen HG, Johnson CD, Sarr MG, Tsotos GG, Vege SS; Acute Pancreatitis Classification Working Group. Classification of acute pancreatitis--2012: revision of the Atlanta classification and definitions by international consensus. *Gut* 2013; **62**: 102-111 [PMID: 23100216 DOI: 10.1136/gutjnl-2012-302779]
- 2 **Bugiantella W**, Rondelli F, Boni M, Stella P, Polistena A, Sanguinetti A, Avenia N. Necrotizing pancreatitis: A review of the interventions. *Int J Surg* 2016; **28** Suppl 1: S163-S171 [PMID: 26708848 DOI: 10.1016/j.ijsu.2015.12.038]
- 3 **Xiao NJ**, Cui TT, Liu F, Li W. Current status of treatments of pancreatic and peripancreatic collections of acute pancreatitis. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2021; **13**: 633-644 [PMID: 34354797 DOI: 10.4240/wjgs.v13.i7.633]
- 4 **van Grinsven J**, van Dijk SM, Dijkgraaf MG, Boermeester MA, Bollen TL, Bruno MJ, van Brunschot S, Dejong CH, van Eijck CH, van Lienden KP, Boerma D, van Duijvendijk P, Hadithi M, Haveman JW, van der Hulst RW, Jansen JM, Lips DJ, Manusama ER, Molenaar IQ, van der Peet DL, Poen AC, Quispel R, Schaapherder AF, Schoon EJ, Schwartz MP, Seerden TC, Spanier BWM, Straathof JW, Venneman NG, van de Vrie W, Wittteman BJ, van Goor H, Fockens P, van Santvoort HC, Besselink MG; Dutch Pancreatitis Study Group. Postponed or immediate drainage of infected necrotizing pancreatitis (POINTER trial): study protocol for a randomized controlled trial. *Trials* 2019; **20**: 239 [PMID: 31023380 DOI: 10.1186/s13063-019-3315-6]
- 5 **Boxhoorn L**, van Dijk SM, van Grinsven J, Verdonk RC, Boermeester MA, Bollen TL, Bouwense SAW, Bruno MJ, Cappendijk VC, Dejong CHC, van Duijvendijk P, van Eijck CHJ, Fockens P, Francken MFG, van Goor H, Hadithi M,

- Hallensleben NDL, Haveman JW, Jacobs MAJM, Jansen JM, Kop MPM, van Lienden KP, Manusama ER, Micog JSD, Molenaar IQ, Nieuwenhuijs VB, Poen AC, Poley JW, van de Poll M, Quispel R, Römkens TEH, Schwartz MP, Seerden TC, Stommel MWJ, Straathof JWA, Timmerhuis HC, Venneman NG, Voermans RP, van de Vrie W, Witterman BJ, Dijkgraaf MGW, van Santvoort HC, Besselink MG; Dutch Pancreatitis Study Group. Immediate vs Postponed Intervention for Infected Necrotizing Pancreatitis. *N Engl J Med* 2021; **385**: 1372-1381 [PMID: [34614330](#) DOI: [10.1056/NEJMoa2100826](#)]
- 6 **Arvanitakis M**, Dumonceau JM, Albert J, Badaoui A, Bali MA, Barthet M, Besselink M, Deviere J, Oliveira Ferreira A, Gyökeres T, Hritz I, Hucl T, Milashka M, Papanikolaou IS, Poley JW, Seewald S, Vanbiervliet G, van Lienden K, van Santvoort H, Voermans R, Delhaye M, van Hooft J. Endoscopic management of acute necrotizing pancreatitis: European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ESGE) evidence-based multidisciplinary guidelines. *Endoscopy* 2018; **50**: 524-546 [PMID: [29631305](#) DOI: [10.1055/a-0588-5365](#)]
  - 7 **Baron TH**, DiMaio CJ, Wang AY, Morgan KA. American Gastroenterological Association Clinical Practice Update: Management of Pancreatic Necrosis. *Gastroenterology* 2020; **158**: 67-75.e1 [PMID: [31479658](#) DOI: [10.1053/j.gastro.2019.07.064](#)]
  - 8 **van Santvoort HC**, Besselink MG, Bakker OJ, Hofker HS, Boermeester MA, Dejong CH, van Goor H, Schaapherder AF, van Eijck CH, Bollen TL, van Ramshorst B, Nieuwenhuijs VB, Timmer R, Laméris JS, Kruij PM, Manusama ER, van der Harst E, van der Schelling GP, Karsten T, Hesselink EJ, van Laarhoven CJ, Rosman C, Bosscha K, de Wit RJ, Houdijk AP, van Leeuwen MS, Buskens E, Gooszen HG; Dutch Pancreatitis Study Group. A step-up approach or open necrosectomy for necrotizing pancreatitis. *N Engl J Med* 2010; **362**: 1491-1502 [PMID: [20410514](#) DOI: [10.1056/NEJMoa0908821](#)]
  - 9 **Bakker OJ**, van Santvoort HC, van Brunschot S, Gekus RB, Besselink MG, Bollen TL, van Eijck CH, Fockens P, Hazebroek EJ, Nijmeijer RM, Poley JW, van Ramshorst B, Vleggaar FP, Boermeester MA, Gooszen HG, Weusten BL, Timmer R; Dutch Pancreatitis Study Group. Endoscopic transgastric vs surgical necrosectomy for infected necrotizing pancreatitis: a randomized trial. *JAMA* 2012; **307**: 1053-1061 [PMID: [22416101](#) DOI: [10.1001/jama.2012.276](#)]
  - 10 **van Brunschot S**, van Grinsven J, van Santvoort HC, Bakker OJ, Besselink MG, Boermeester MA, Bollen TL, Bosscha K, Bouwense SA, Bruno MJ, Cappendijk VC, Consten EC, Dejong CH, van Eijck CH, Erkelens WG, van Goor H, van Grevenstein WMU, Haveman J-W, Hofker SH, Jansen JM, Laméris JS, van Lienden KP, Meijssen MA, Mulder CJ, Nieuwenhuijs VB, Poley J-W, Quispel R, de Ridder RJ, Römkens TE, Scheepers JJ, Schepers NJ, Schwartz MP, Seerden T, Spanier BWM, Straathof JWA, Strijker M, Timmer R, Venneman NG, Vleggaar FP, Voermans RP, Witterman BJ, Gooszen HG, Dijkgraaf MG, Fockens P, Manusama ER, Hadithi M, Rosman C, Schaapherder AF, Schoon EJ. Endoscopic or surgical step-up approach for infected necrotising pancreatitis: a multicentre randomised trial. *The Lancet* 2018; **391**: 51-58 [DOI: [10.1016/s0140-6736\(17\)32404-2](#)]
  - 11 **Bang JY**, Arnoletti JP, Holt BA, Sutton B, Hasan MK, Navaneethan U, Feranec N, Wilcox CM, Tharian B, Hawes RH, Varadarajulu S. An Endoscopic Transluminal Approach, Compared With Minimally Invasive Surgery, Reduces Complications and Costs for Patients With Necrotizing Pancreatitis. *Gastroenterology* 2019; **156**: 1027-1040.e3 [PMID: [30452918](#) DOI: [10.1053/j.gastro.2018.11.031](#)]
  - 12 **Haney CM**, Kowalewski KF, Schmidt MW, Koschny R, Felinska EA, Kalkum E, Probst P, Diener MK, Müller-Stich BP, Hackert T, Nickel F. Endoscopic vs surgical treatment for infected necrotizing pancreatitis: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Surg Endosc* 2020; **34**: 2429-2444 [PMID: [32112252](#) DOI: [10.1007/s00464-020-07469-9](#)]
  - 13 **Bang JY**, Wilcox CM, Arnoletti JP, Varadarajulu S. Superiority of endoscopic interventions over minimally invasive surgery for infected necrotizing pancreatitis: meta-analysis of randomized trials. *Dig Endosc* 2020; **32**: 298-308 [PMID: [31220368](#) DOI: [10.1111/den.13470](#)]
  - 14 **Hu Y**, Li C, Zhao X, Cui Y. An endoscopic or minimally invasive surgical approach for infected necrotizing pancreatitis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Rev Esp Enferm Dig* 2019; **111**: 471-480 [PMID: [31021167](#) DOI: [10.17235/reed.2019.5792/2018](#)]
  - 15 **Trikudanathan G**, Tawfik P, Amateau SK, Munigala S, Arain M, Attam R, Beilman G, Flanagan S, Freeman ML, Mallory S. Early (<4 Weeks) Versus Standard (≥ 4 Weeks) Endoscopically Centered Step-Up Interventions for Necrotizing Pancreatitis. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2018; **113**: 1550-1558 [PMID: [30279466](#) DOI: [10.1038/s41395-018-0232-3](#)]
  - 16 **Oblizajek N**, Takahashi N, Agayeva S, Bazerbach F, Chandrasekhara V, Levy M, Storm A, Baron T, Chari S, Gleeson FC, Pearson R, Petersen BT, Vege SS, Lennon R, Topazian M, Abu Dayyeh BK. Outcomes of early endoscopic intervention for pancreatic necrotic collections: a matched case-control study. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2020; **91**: 1303-1309 [PMID: [31958461](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.gie.2020.01.017](#)]
  - 17 **Bang JY**, Navaneethan U, Hasan MK, Sutton B, Hawes R, Varadarajulu S. Non-superiority of lumen-apposing metal stents over plastic stents for drainage of walled-off necrosis in a randomised trial. *Gut* 2019; **68**: 1200-1209 [PMID: [29858393](#) DOI: [10.1136/gutjnl-2017-315335](#)]
  - 18 **Brimhall B**, Han S, Tatman PD, Clark TJ, Wani S, Brauer B, Edmundowicz S, Wagh MS, Attwell A, Hammad H, Shah RJ. Increased Incidence of Pseudoaneurysm Bleeding With Lumen-Apposing Metal Stents Compared to Double-Pigtail Plastic Stents in Patients With Peripancreatic Fluid Collections. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2018; **16**: 1521-1528 [PMID: [29474970](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.cgh.2018.02.021](#)]
  - 19 **Liu F**, Wu L, Wang XD, Xiao JG, Li W. Endoscopic gastric fenestration of debridging pancreatic walled-off necrosis: A pilot study. *World J Gastroenterol* 2020; **26**: 6431-6441 [PMID: [33244203](#) DOI: [10.3748/wjg.v26.i41.6431](#)]



Published by **Baishideng Publishing Group Inc**  
7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

**Telephone:** +1-925-3991568

**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

**Help Desk:** <https://www.f6publishing.com/helpdesk>

<https://www.wjgnet.com>

