

Special topic by C. Dervenis

Endoscopic Palliation for Unresectable Adenocarcinoma of the Pancreas

K.D. Paraskeva

INTRODUCTION

Pancreatic cancer is the fourth and the fifth most common cancer in men and women respectively and has the lowest 5-year survival rate of any cancer.^{1,2} The dismal prognosis of patients with pancreatic cancer is mainly due to the late diagnosis and, consequently, the low curative resection rates. While curative resection offers the only chance for long-term survival, 85-90% of the patients are staged as unresectable at the time of the diagnosis. Of the minority of patients undergoing surgical exploration with curative intent, up to 25% are found to be unresectable in the operating room.^{3,4}

The patient with unresectable pancreatic cancer has a limited life expectancy (<12 months), often complicated by obstructive jaundice, duodenal obstruction and pain. In these patients palliation of symptoms is the only relief which can be offered. Optimal palliation will relieve the symptoms of the disease, improve the quality and maybe, marginally prolong life expectancy.

PALLIATION OF JAUNDICE

Obstructive jaundice due to extrahepatic bile duct compression and/or infiltration is the commonest symptom of patients with pancreatic carcinoma and is the commonest presenting symptom in approximately 70% of cases at the time of diagnosis.

In patients with unresectable pancreatic tumour the choice of palliation is between endoscopic stent place-

ment or a surgical bypass procedure. Percutaneous transhepatic management is inferior to endoscopic approach for biliary drainage because of complications associated with liver puncture, particularly bleeding and bile leakage. It is applied as an alternative method if endoscopic approach fails or as complementary to endoscopy for a rendez-vous procedure.⁵

If the tumour is proven unresectable in what is preoperatively considered a radical operation, it is reasonable for the surgeon to palliate jaundice by performing a biliary bypass, with or without a prophylactic gastroenteroanastomosis.

In patients with high operative risk due to severe concurrent diseases, endoscopic palliation with stent insertion is definitely the treatment of choice.

For the rest of the patients, comprising the majority of cases with pancreatic cancer, the choice as to the optimal non-operative palliation is usually not clear-cut.

There are only a few prospective randomized controlled studies comparing endoscopic stenting with surgical bypass.⁶⁻¹¹ None of them used metallic expandable stents and the size of plastic stents used varied in the different studies. All of these studies have shown that while both techniques have an equally high technical and therapeutic success rate, endoscopic stenting has lower early morbidity and mortality rates which, on the other hand, are counterbalanced by the higher rate of late complications.

In one of the largest randomized prospective studies⁶ using only 10 Fr plastic stents, technical success approached 98% for surgical and 97% for endoscopic (stenting) palliation with effective functional biliary decompression in about 90% of the patients in both groups. However, in stented patients, there was a lower proce-

Gastroenterology Unit "Agia Olga" Hospital, Athens

Author for correspondence:

Konstantina Paraskeva, Gastroenterology Unit "Agia Olga" Hospital, 3-5 Agias Olgas Str., 142 33 Athens, Greece

dure-related mortality rate (3% versus 14%, $p=0,01$) and a major complication rate of 11% versus 29%, ($p=0,02$) with a median hospital stay of 20 days versus 26 days ($p=0,001$). Recurrence of jaundice was noticed in 39% of the patients after a median time interval of 4.4 months (due to stent blockage), while in the surgical group, only 2% of the patients experienced recurrent extrahepatic common bile duct obstruction with jaundice. Late gastric outlet obstruction occurred in 17% of the stented patients but only in 7% of those treated surgically. Despite the early benefits of stenting, there was no significant difference in overall survival between the two groups (median survival 26 weeks for the operated and 21 weeks for the stented patients).

In other words, endoscopic stent insertion offers effective biliary patency with lower complication rate than open surgery, but at a cost of an increased incidence of late obstruction, which is undesirable in a terminally ill patient.

A stent that would remain patent and functional for the rest of a patient's life would fulfill the criteria of optimum palliation for inoperable patients with pancreatic cancer, but to date such an "ideal" stent is not available.

Multiple studies from many endoscopy centres have identified the principles which rule the function of newer, high quality stents and describe the strategies to prolong stent patency. The sequence of plastic stent occlusion begins with the intraluminal coating of the stent by deposition of host proteins, which promote bacterial attachment, followed by bacterial production of glucoproteins, which lead to biofilm formation consisting of bacteria and bacterial by-products and subsequently to sludge formation that inevitably leads to stent occlusion.^{12,13} Stents of larger diameter have longer patency rate because it takes longer for this process to obstruct the lumen. On the other hand, duodenoscope design limits the maximal stent diameter to about 12 Fr, but even these larger stents occlude at a median time interval of 3 to 6 months.^{6,14,15} Ten Fr stents clearly have a patency advantage over smaller stents,^{16,17} but further increase in stent diameter does not appear to offer a significant advantage.^{18,19}

Although in vitro experiments have shown that stents without side holes or those made from materials with a low coefficient of friction (such as Teflon or with a hydrophilic coating) clog more slowly, this was not proven in clinical trials.²⁰⁻²³ Oral use of ursodeoxycholic acid plus broad spectrum antibiotics were found to be beneficial in prolonging stent patency but this was reported in

only one study and needs further confirmation.²⁴

In search of a more effective approach to overcome the continuing problem of plastic stent occlusion, self-expandable metal stents have been developed. These stents are made of steel or nitinol and come in a compressed and sheathed form so that they can pass through the working channel of the endoscope and, after insertion in the bile duct, they expand to a diameter of up to 10mm (32Fr). Comparative studies between metallic and plastic stents clearly show the superiority of metal stents, in terms of both more effective bile duct drainage and lower stent occlusion rate with subsequent longer patency, thus limiting the need for repeated endoscopic procedures. A relative disadvantage of these stents is their high initial cost (about tenfold that of plastic ones).²⁵⁻²⁹ They remain patent about twice as long as conventional plastic stents and they occlude at an average of 8 to 12 months. They become obstructed mainly either by tumour ingrowth through the meshes of the stent or tumour overgrowth at either end, while sludge-related occlusion is relatively rare. In these cases, since metallic stents cannot be extracted, recanalization can be achieved with the insertion of either a plastic or a second metallic stent through the lumen of the occluded stent. In order to overcome the above mentioned mechanisms of metallic stent occlusion, membrane-covered stents have been developed, but they can still become occluded due to either tumour ingrowth at the level of the partially coated ends or to sludge encrustation as in the plastic stents.^{30,31} The problem with the coated stents is that they tend to migrate, which in a way cancels out their advantage over occlusion. Whereas uncovered metallic endoprostheses cannot be extracted, it is possible to remove an occluded coated stent.

Despite the significant patency advantages of metal stents no clear increase in patient survival has been proven in relevant studies.^{28,32}

At present, self-expandable metallic stents are an excellent palliation choice in patients with a definite diagnosis of pancreatic cancer, staged as unresectable but with a life expectancy of more than 6 months.^{26,33}

In the rest of the patients the use of a plastic stent with prophylactic stent exchange every three months seems to be preferable to stent exchange after symptomatic occlusion.²⁸ If the patient has a good performance status and a low tumour burden about 3 months following initial plastic stent insertion, exchange with a metallic stent is a reasonable approach.

PANCREATIC PAIN

Pain in end-stage pancreatic carcinoma patients may be the most intractable and incapacitating symptom. The main causes are considered to be neoplastic infiltration of the local nervous bed and obstruction of the main pancreatic duct with secondary upstream ductal hypertension.³⁴ Endoscopic pancreatic stenting has proven beneficial for relief of pain in patients who suffer from postprandial pain because of neoplastic obstruction of the main pancreatic duct.^{35,36} Pancreatic stenting is a very demanding endoscopic procedure because of the angulation and the narrowing of the duct proximally to the stricture. The largest inserted stents are plastic stents sized 5 to 7 Fr. Bile and pancreatic drainage can be carried out during the same ERCP session, following biliary sphincterotomy with the pancreatic stent being placed first. This technique has been reported to be helpful in selected patients with "obstructive" pain, but it needs further evaluation with larger randomized trials.

DUODENAL OBSTRUCTION

Duodenal obstruction due to infiltration from pancreatic carcinoma is usually a terminal event occurring in about 5-9% of the patients.³⁷ Obstructive symptoms, including nausea, vomiting and abdominal distension may be devastating, leading to considerable deterioration of patient's quality of life. Surgical gastroenterostomy is the preferred palliation for these patients. However, in terminally ill patients and those with a very limited life expectancy, the operative procedure is probably not the treatment of choice. There is increasing evidence suggesting that in these patients palliation of duodenal obstruction can be achieved by endoscopic placement of an uncoated self-expandable metallic stent, in order to establish lumen patency.^{38,39} These stents have a large diameter of 18,20 or 22 mm and a length of 60 to 90 mm when fully expanded, but their effectiveness is somehow limited by occlusion, mainly because of external compression or infiltration from the tumour. Covered enteric stents are not yet available in the market. A relative disadvantage of enteric stents is that, after placed, they preempt access to the biliary tract. In a patient with duodenal infiltration who needs biliary stent exchange, balloon dilatation of the duodenal lumen may offer an alternative palliative approach, allowing access for stent replacement or exchange. However, the dilatation effect is usually quite temporary compared with that of enteric stenting.

In conclusion, endoscopy can offer a variety of palli-

ative options in patients with unresectable pancreatic cancer, but further technical improvements are required to solve the problem of long-term stent occlusion. Expandable metallic stents have already been proven to have a significant patency advantage over plastic stents and their use is expanding in relieving obstruction of both the biliary tree and duodenal lumen. The management of such patients is a complicated one and is better judged by a multidisciplinary team approach including expert endoscopists, surgeons, oncologists and radiologists.

REFERENCES

1. Parker SL, Tong T, Bolden S, Wingo PA. Cancer statistics, 1996. *Cancer J Clin* 1996; 46:5-27.
2. Niederhuber JE, Brennan MF, Menck HR. The National Cancer Data Base report on pancreatic cancer. *Cancer* 1995; 76:1671-1677.
3. Warshaw AL, Fernandez-del C. Pancreatic carcinoma. *N Engl J Med* 1992; 326:455-465.
4. Di Magno EP, Reber HA, Tempero MA. American Gastroenterological Association technical review on the epidemiology, diagnosis, and treatment of ductal pancreatic adenocarcinoma. *Gastroenterology* 1999; 117:1464-1484.
5. Speer A, Russell CG, Hatfield ARW, et al. Randomized trial of endoscopic versus percutaneous stent insertion in malignant obstructive jaundice. *Lancet* 1987; 2:57-62.
6. Smith AC, Dowsett JF, Russell RCG, Hatfield ARW, Cotton PB. Randomized trial of endoscopic stenting versus surgical bypass in malignant low bile duct obstruction. *Lancet* 1994; 17:1655-1660.
7. Shepherd HA, Royle G, Ross APR, Dida A, Arthur M, Colin-Jones D. Endoscopic biliary endoprosthesis in the palliation of malignant obstruction of the distal common bile duct: a randomized trial. *Br J Surg* 1988; 75:1166-1168.
8. Bosch RP, Schelling GP, Kinkenbijn JHG, Mulder PG, Blankenstein M, Jeekel J. Guidelines for the application of surgery and endoprostheses in the palliation of obstructive jaundice in advanced cancer of the pancreas. *Ann Surg* 1994; 219(1):18-24.
9. Andersen JR, Sorensen SM, Kruse A, Rokkjer M, Matzen P. Randomized trial of endoscopic endoprosthesis versus operative bypass in malignant obstructive jaundice. *Gut* 1989; 30:1132-1135.
10. Naggar E, Krag E, Matzen P. Endoscopically inserted biliary endoprosthesis in malignant obstructive jaundice: a survey of the literature. *Liver* 1990; 10:321-324.
11. Raikar GV, Melin MM, Ress A, Lettieri SZ, Poterucha JJ, Nagorney DM. Cost-effective analysis of surgical palliation versus endoscopic stenting in the management of unresectable pancreatic cancer. *Ann Surg Oncol* 1996; 3:470-475.
12. Libby ED, Leung JW. Prevention of biliary stent clogging: A clinical review. *Am J Gastroenterol* 1996; 7:1301-1308.
13. Faigel DO. Preventing biliary stent occlusion. *Gastroin-*

- test *Endosc* 2000; 51:104-107.
14. Frakes JT, Johanson JF, Stake JJ. Optimal timing for stent replacement in malignant biliary tract obstruction. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1993; 39:164-167.
 15. Huibregtse K, Katon RM, Coene PP, Tytgat GNJ. Endoscopic palliative treatment in pancreatic cancer. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1986; 32:334-338.
 16. Speer AG, Cotton P, MacRea KD. Endoscopic management of malignant biliary obstruction: Stents of 10 French gauge are preferable to stents of 8 French gauge. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1988; 34:412-417.
 17. Pedersen FM. Endoscopic management of malignant biliary obstruction: is stent size of 10 French gauge better than 7 French gauge? *Scand J Gastroenterol* 1993; 28:185-189.
 18. Finnie IA, O'Toole PA, Rhodes JM, et al. A prospective randomized trial of 10 and 11,5 FG endoprotheses in malignant bile duct obstruction. *Gut* 1994; 35(suppl):S50.
 19. Siegel JH, Pullano GW, Kodsi B, et al. Optimal palliation of malignant bile duct obstruction: experience with endoscopic 12 French prostheses. *Endoscopy* 1988; 20:137.
 20. Costamagna G, Mutignani M, Rotondano G, et al. Hydrophilic hydromer-coated polyurethane stents versus uncoated stents in malignant biliary obstruction: a randomized trial. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2000; 51:8-11.
 21. Terruzzi V, Comin U, De Grazia F, et al. Prospective randomized trial comparing Tannenbaum Teflon and standard polyethylene stents in distal malignant biliary stenosis. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2000; 51:23-27.
 22. Sung JY, Chung SC, Chi-Ping Tsui, et al. Omitting sideholes in biliary stents does not improve drainage of the obstructed biliary system: a prospective randomized trial *Gastrointest Endosc* 1994; 40:321-325.
 23. Berkel AM, Boland C, Redekop WK, Bergman JJGHM, et al. A prospective randomized trial of Teflon versus Polyethylene stents for distal malignant biliary obstruction. *Endoscopy* 1998; 30(8):681-686.
 24. Ghosh S, Palmer KR. Prevention of biliary stent occlusion using cyclical antibiotics and ursodeoxycholic acid. *Gut* 1994; 35:1757-1759.
 25. Carr-Locke DL, Ball TJ, Connors PJ, et al. Multicenter randomized trial of Wallstent biliary endoprosthesis versus plastic stents. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1993; 39:310.
 26. Davids PHP, Groen AK, Rauws EAJ, et al. Randomized trial of self-expanding metal stents versus polyethylene stents for distal malignant biliary obstruction. *Lancet* 1992; 340:488-492.
 27. O'Brien S, Hatfield ARW, Craig PI, et al. A three year follow up of self-expanding metal stents in the endoscopic palliation of longterm survivors with malignant biliary obstruction. *Gut* 1995; 36:618-621.
 28. Prat F, Chapat O, Ducot B, et al. A randomized trial of endoscopic drainage methods for inoperable malignant strictures of the common bile duct. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1998; 47:1-7.
 29. Lee JG, Leung JWC. Biliary stents: plastic or metal? *Gastrointest Endosc* 1998; 47:90-91.
 30. Born P, Neuhaous H, Rosch T, et al. Initial experience with a new, partially covered Wallstent for malignant biliary obstruction. *Endoscopy* 1996; 28:699-702.
 31. Shim C, Lee Y, Cho Y, et al. Preliminary results of a new covered biliary metal stent for malignant biliary obstruction. *Endoscopy* 1998; 30:345-350.
 32. Knyrim K, Wagner HJ, Pausch J, Vakil N. A prospective, randomized, controlled trial of metal stents for malignant obstruction of the common bile duct. *Endoscopy* 1993; 25:207-212.
 33. Schmassmann A, Von Gunten E, Knuchel J, et al. Wallstents versus plastic stents in malignant biliary obstruction: effects of stent patency of the first and second stent on patient compliance and survival. *Am J Gastroenterol* 1996; 91:654-659.
 34. Lebowitz AH, Lefkowitz M. Pain management of pancreatic carcinoma: a review. *Pain* 1988; 36:1-11.
 35. Harrison MA, Hamilton JW. Palliation of pancreatic cancer pain by endoscopic stent placement. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1989; 35:443-445.
 36. Costamagna G, Gabbrielli A, Mutignani M, et al. Treatment of obstructive pain by endoscopic drainage in patients with pancreatic head carcinoma. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1993; 39:774-777.
 37. Huibregtse K. Biliary stenting: cosmetic or clinical value? *Scand J Gastroenterol* 1992; 27 (suppl1):77-79.
 38. Yates MR, Morgan DE, Baron TH. Palliation of malignant gastric and small intestinal strictures with self expandable metal stents. *Endoscopy* 1998; 30:266-272.
 39. Feretis C, Benakis P, Dimopoulos C, et al. Palliation of malignant gastric outlet obstruction with self-expanding metal stents. *Endoscopy* 1996; 28:225-228.