**Introduction**

Although conventional endoscopic techniques for the removal of stones from the biliary tree are highly effective, they fail in up to 10% of patients with choledocholithiasis. With the introduction of single operator peroral cholangioscope (POC), the SpyGlass® System, stone fragmentation under direct visual control has proven to be highly effective and is now emerging as an important endoscopic therapy. We describe the characteristics and outcomes of patients undergoing POC directed electrohydraulic lithotripsy (POC-EHL) in two tertiary Hepatobiliary units in England.

**Methods**

Details of all patients undergoing POC-EHL at Aintree University Hospital and University College London Hospitals were prospectively recorded. Data collected included demographics, number of ERCPs, site of the stone, number of POC-EHL sessions, success of stone clearance and complications.

**Results**

A total of 93 patients were referred for POC-EHL. There were 25 males (27%) and 68 females (73%). The median age was 65 (20–92) years. 71 (76%) patients were tertiary referrals. 62 (67%) patients had at least two or more endoscopic attempts at stone removal prior to referral for POC-EHL. In six patients POC-EHL was not required because at ERCP prior to POC, the ducts could be cleared with conventional techniques. In five patients EHL was not attempted due to the size, configuration and quantity of stones. With the knowledge that these patients were fit for cholecystectomy, they were referred for cholecystectomy and bile duct exploration as a one-stage procedure. All POC-EHL sessions were performed under general anaesthesia. Of the 82 patients undergoing POC-EHL 61 (75%) patients needed one POC-EHL session and 10 (12%) required two sessions and 6 (7%) required three sessions for complete stone extraction. In 5/82 (6%) complete stone extraction was not possible despite POC-EHL and these patients were referred for surgery. The sites of stones were common bile duct in 48%, cystic duct and CBD in 20%, cystic duct in 4%, common hepatic duct in 10% and intrahepatic ducts in 18%. Three patients developed cholangitis post POC-EHL, responding to antimicrobial therapy. Two patients experienced post-procedure bleeding, only one patient required endoscopic intervention.

**Conclusion**

Our study shows that EUS has a significant yield in individuals with unexplained duct dilatation and normal LFTs (13% had a causative diagnosis). The yield was highest in isolated PD dilatation. A new finding was significantly more likely in men than women. EUS should ideally follow review of original cross sectional imaging by a HPB radiologist.
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**Introduction**

The finding of dilated CBD or PD or both (double duct sign) on abdominal cross-sectional imaging (CT or MRI) in patients with normal LFTs frequently leads to further investigation by EUS if a clear cause is not demonstrated on imaging. There is limited literature on the yield of EUS in this setting.

**Methods**

A retrospective review of our prospectively maintained EUS database was carried out to identify patients who underwent EUS for dilated duct(s), normal LFTs and non-diagnostic cross-sectional imaging between January 2007 and August 2011. Our aim was to evaluate the yield of EUS in this setting. Minimum follow up was for 12 months.

**Results**

85 patients (3% of pancreatobiliary EUS procedures during this period) were identified. Mean age was 66.7 years (30 – 87). There was a female preponderance (73%). 40 (48%) had CBD only, 5 (6%) had solitary PD dilatation and 38 (46%) had both CBD and PD dilatation on prior imaging. EUS was concordant with prior imaging in 60 (72%) patients and discordant in 23 (28%) (partial agreement in 18, non-dilated ducts in 3 and different duct dilated in 2). 16 (19%) patients had a new finding on EUS [5 CBD stones, 3 CBD polyps, 4 microlithiasis, 1 ampullary adenoma, 3 chronic pancreatitis, 1 pancreatic duct adenocarcinoma (PDAC) and 1 portal vein compressing mid CBD]. Of these 11 (13%) were felt to be the cause of duct dilatation. On subsequent MDT review, the PDAC was identified on the initial scan from the referring hospital. 45% (10/22) of males compared to 9.8% of (6/61) females had a new finding on EUS (p = 0.006). Overall, more females had symptoms compared to males (p = 0.065). There was no significant association between symptoms and new finding on EUS (p = 0.24). 7 (17.5%) of the isolated CBD dilatation, 3 (60%) of the isolated PD dilatation and 2 (2.5%) of the dilated CBD and PD had a causative diagnosis respectively. Follow up of patients with no cause of duct dilatation on EUS revealed that 18 patients (54.5%) in the dilated CBD cohort had prior cholecystectomy [one patient had peri-ampullary diverticulum and prior cholecystectomy] while 2 and 10 patients in the dilated CBD and PD cohort (n = 37) had ampullary stenosis and prior cholecystectomy respectively.

**Conclusion**

Our study shows that EUS has a significant yield in individuals with unexplained duct dilatation and normal LFTs (13% had a causative diagnosis). The yield was highest in isolated PD dilatation. A new finding was significantly more likely in men than women. EUS should ideally follow review of original cross sectional imaging by a HPB radiologist.
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