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### CanMEDS Roles Covered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medical Expert</strong></td>
<td>(as <em>Medical Experts</em>, physicians integrate all of the CanMEDS Roles, applying medical knowledge, clinical skills, and professional values in their provision of high-quality and safe patient-centered care. <em>Medical Expert</em> is the central physician Role in the CanMEDS Framework and defines the physician’s clinical scope of practice.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communicator</strong></td>
<td>(as <em>Communicators</em>, physicians form relationships with patients and their families that facilitate the gathering and sharing of essential information for effective health care.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaborator</strong></td>
<td>(as <em>Collaborators</em>, physicians work effectively with other health care professionals to provide safe, high-quality, patient-centred care.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leader</strong></td>
<td>(as <em>Leaders</em>, physicians engage with others to contribute to a vision of a high-quality health care system and take responsibility for the delivery of excellent patient care through their activities as clinicians, administrators, scholars, or teachers.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health Advocate</strong></td>
<td>(as <em>Health Advocates</em>, physicians contribute their expertise and influence as they work with communities or patient populations to improve health. They work with those they serve to determine and understand needs, speak on behalf of others when required, and support the mobilization of resources to effect change.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scholar</strong></td>
<td>(as <em>Scholars</em>, physicians demonstrate a lifelong commitment to excellence in practice through continuous learning and by teaching others, evaluating evidence, and contributing to scholarship.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional</strong></td>
<td>(as <em>Professionals</em>, physicians are committed to the health and well-being of individual patients and society through ethical practice, high personal standards of behaviour, accountability to the profession and society, physician-led regulation, and maintenance of personal health.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Objectives

• Describe the pathophysiology and anatomy of gastric varices

• Describe the evidence for primary prophylaxis of gastric varices

• Describe the optimal treatment for bleeding gastric varices
Case 1

- 60 year old male with compensated HCV (untreated) cirrhosis. Screening EGD showed an isolated fundal gastric varix (2cm) with no high risk stigmata. There were no esophageal varices. MELD score is 20. He is awaiting transplant. What is your next step?

A. Non-selective beta-blocker
B. Cyanoacrylate glue
C. TIPS
D. BRTO
E. EUS coiling
F. Repeat EGD in one year
Background

• Gastric varices (GV) are present in 20% of patients with cirrhosis

• Bleeding from gastric varices is less common than from esophageal varices (30% vs 70%)

• Associated with more severe blood loss, higher rates of re-bleeding and higher mortality (20%)

• Risk of bleeding from incidentally discovered gastric varices is: 16%, 36%, and 44% at 1, 3, and 5 years

### Classification, prevalence and risk of bleeding of gastric varices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Relative frequency</th>
<th>Overall bleeding risk without treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOV 1</td>
<td>OV extending below cardia into lesser curvature</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOV 2</td>
<td>OV extending below cardia into fundus</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGV 1</td>
<td>Isolated varices in the fundus</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGV 2</td>
<td>Isolated varices else in the stomach</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GOV, gastro-oesophageal varices; IGV, isolated gastric varices; OV, oesophageal varices.

**Figure 1.** Sarin’s classification of GV. Modified with permission from the American Gastroenterological Association (AGA) Institute Gastroslides – Cirrhosis and Portal Hypertension.
Anatomy
Why do Varices Bleed?

**Figure 2**
Mechanism of variceal bleeding. P: Pressure; R: Radius; WT: Wall thickness.

Wall tension \( (T) = \frac{[\text{Transmural pressure (Pvarices-Plumen)} \times \text{variceal radius (R)}]}{\text{Variceal wall thickness (WT)}} \).
Primary prophylaxis of gastric variceal bleeding comparing cyanoacrylate injection and beta-blockers: A randomized controlled trial

Smruti Ranjan Mishra¹, Barjesh Chander Sharma¹, Ashish Kumar², Shiv Kumar Sarin¹,²,*
Primary Prophylaxis – Cyanoacrylate Glue

Assessed for eligibility, n = 1050

Excluded, n = 961
- Inclusion criteria not met, n = 957
- Refusal to participate, n = 3
- Other reasons, n = 1

Not bled from Gastric Varix [GOV2(Eradicated EV)/IGV1]
Randomization, n = 89

Allocated to cyanoacrylate injection, n = 30
- Received allocated intervention, n = 30
- Refused allocated intervention, n = 0

Lost to follow up, n = 0
- Discontinued intervention, n = 0

Analyzed, n = 30
- Excluded from analysis, n = 0

Allocated to beta-blocker, n = 29
- Received allocated intervention, n = 29
- Refused allocated intervention, n = 0

Lost to follow up, n = 0
- Discontinued intervention, n = 0

Analyzed, n = 29
- Excluded from analysis, n = 0

Allocated to no treatment, n = 30
- Received allocated intervention, n = 30
- Refused allocated intervention, n = 0

Lost to follow up, n = 0
- Discontinued intervention, n = 0

Analyzed, n = 30
- Excluded from analysis, n = 0
Primary Prophylaxis – Cyanoacrylate Glue

### Table 1. Baseline characteristics of patients.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Cyanoacrylate Group I (n = 30)</th>
<th>Beta-blocker Group II (n = 29)</th>
<th>No treatment Group III (n = 30)</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (Median, range) yrs</td>
<td>40 (10-71)</td>
<td>40 (10-85)</td>
<td>38 (11-60)</td>
<td>0.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (Male:Female)</td>
<td>20:10</td>
<td>21:8</td>
<td>23:7</td>
<td>0.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etiology of Cirrhosis (Alcohol/cryptogenic/others)</td>
<td>16/9/5</td>
<td>14/8/7</td>
<td>15/9/6</td>
<td>0.4378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascites</td>
<td>12/30</td>
<td>11/30</td>
<td>13/30</td>
<td>0.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE (Grade I/II)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serum Bilirubin (Median, range) mg/dl</td>
<td>1.8 (0.6-9.5)</td>
<td>2.0 (0.8-6.3)</td>
<td>1.8 (0.5-6.6)</td>
<td>0.952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serum Albumin (Median, range) g/dl</td>
<td>3.2 (1.8-3.8)</td>
<td>3.1 (2.2-3.6)</td>
<td>3.2 (2.2-3.7)</td>
<td>0.976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INR (Median, range)</td>
<td>1.3 (1.1-2.1)</td>
<td>1.3 (1.1-2.3)</td>
<td>1.3 (1.2-2.1)</td>
<td>0.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platelet (Median, range) 10^9/ml</td>
<td>1.2 (0.7-3.2)</td>
<td>1.0 (0.7-2.3)</td>
<td>1.1 (0.4-2.1)</td>
<td>0.372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serum Creatinine (Median, range) mg/dl</td>
<td>0.6 (0.3-1.5)</td>
<td>0.6 (0.4-1.4)</td>
<td>0.7 (0.3-1.5)</td>
<td>0.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Score (Median, range)</td>
<td>8 (5-12)</td>
<td>8 (5-12)</td>
<td>8 (6-12)</td>
<td>0.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child A/B/C</td>
<td>10/12/8</td>
<td>9/11/9</td>
<td>10/12/8</td>
<td>0.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MELD Score (Median, range)</td>
<td>13 (7-26)</td>
<td>13 (7-30)</td>
<td>13 (8-25)</td>
<td>0.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVPG (Median, range) mmHg</td>
<td>14 (8-26)</td>
<td>14 (11-26)</td>
<td>14 (8-24)</td>
<td>0.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow Up (Median, range)  mo</td>
<td>26 (3-34)</td>
<td>26 (3-34)</td>
<td>26 (3-34)</td>
<td>0.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esophageal varix type 2</td>
<td>26/30</td>
<td>26/29</td>
<td>26/30</td>
<td>0.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated gastric varix type 1</td>
<td>4/30</td>
<td>4/30</td>
<td>5/30</td>
<td>0.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of GV (Median, range) mm</td>
<td>20 (10-35)</td>
<td>20 (10-30)</td>
<td>20 (10-30)</td>
<td>0.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portal Hypertensive Gastropathy</td>
<td>7/30</td>
<td>9/30</td>
<td>9/30</td>
<td>0.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color of GV (Red/Blue)</td>
<td>15/15</td>
<td>16/13</td>
<td>15/15</td>
<td>0.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous shunt</td>
<td>13/30</td>
<td>10/29</td>
<td>11/30</td>
<td>0.885</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HE: hepatic encephalopathy; INR: international normalized ratio; MELD: model for end-stage liver disease; HVPG: hepatic venous pressure gradient.
## Primary Prophylaxis – Cyanoacrylate Glue

### Table 1

Risk of bleeding, mortality and complication rate according to treatment group[11].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Cyanoacrylate Group I ($n = 30$)</th>
<th>Propranolol Group II ($n = 29$)</th>
<th>No treatment Group III ($n = 30$)</th>
<th>$P$ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GV bleed</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleed-related mortality</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall mortality</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>0.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complications</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Primary Prophylaxis – Cyanoacrylate Glue

• Predictors of high risk of first bleeding from gastric varices:
  1. Size of gastric varix >20 mm
  2. MELD score ≥17
  3. Presence of PHG

• Primary prophylaxis with gluing was recommended in patients with large and high risk gastric varices in this study
Primary Prophylaxis – Cyanoacrylate Glue

• Cons:
  • Glue injection requires expertise, which is not always available
  • Highly skilled endoscopists who conducted the study
  • Data suggesting that carvedilol is more effective in reducing the hepatic venous pressure gradient (HVPG) may reduce the gap in efficacy between NSBB and cyanoacrylate injection
  • The number of patients with IGV1 was small (15%)

• Pro
  • Bleeding from GV does not depend only on the HVPG, but also on the wall tension and size of the varix
Glubran 2 – The new glue

- No studies in GV bleeding
- Authorized for surgical use and endovascular radiology
- Glubran 2 is not the same as other cyanoacrylate glues
  - Co-monomer (N butyl 2 cyanoacrylate and MS (a monomer owned by GEM Srl) vs monomer)
  - Addition of MS allows for faster polymerization
  - Also has anti-inflammatory effect

CHECK WITH YOUR ENDOSCOPY CHARGE NURSE WHAT YOU HAVE
Primary Prophylaxis - TIPS

- Compared to EV (high portal pressures), GV have a low mean portal pressure because fundal varices drain through a natural shunt, i.e., gastrorenal shunt

- Gastric varices travel thru the wall of the stomach, the overlying muscularis mucosa and lamina propria becomes thinner – the likely point of rupture

- TIPS may not decrease the diameter and thickness of the markedly engorged fundal varices

- TIPS may not reverse this already thin wall
EUS-guided coil versus cyanoacrylate therapy for the treatment of gastric varices: a multicenter study (with videos)


Rafael Romero-Castro, MD, PhD*,1,2*, Mark Ellrichmann, MD*,2, Carlos Ortiz-Moyano, MD, PhD3, Jose Charles Subtil-Inigo, MD, PhD4, Felix Junquera-Florez, MD5, Joan B. Gornals, MD6, Alejandro Repiso-Ortega, MD7, Juan Vila-Costas, MD, PhD8, Francisco Marcos-Sanchez, MD9, Miguel Muñoz-Nava, MD, PhD4, Manuel Romero-Gomez, MD, Prof, PhD3, Enric Brullet-Benedi, MD5, Javier Romero-Vazquez, MD1, Angel Caunedo-Alvarez, MD1, Francisco Pellicer-Bautista, MD, PhD1, Juan M. Herrerias-Gutierrez, MD, Prof, PhD1, Annette Fritscher-Ravens, MD, Prof, PhD2
Primary Prophylaxis – EUS coiling

### TABLE 1. Patient characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CYA</th>
<th>Coll</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of patients</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age ± SD, y</td>
<td>60.8 ± 8.2</td>
<td>59.0 ± 10.0</td>
<td>60.6 ± 8.7</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex, M/F, no.</td>
<td>14/5</td>
<td>8/3</td>
<td>22/8</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child-Pugh class, no.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etiology of cirrhosis/portal hypertension, no.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viral hepatitis</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown origin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepatocellular carcinoma</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonalcoholic steatohepatitis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 3. Sarin classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CYA</th>
<th>Coll</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isolated gastric varices I, no.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastroesophageal varices type II, no.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastroesophageal varices type I, no.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active bleeding of previous EUS-guided therapy, no. (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10 (33.3)</td>
<td>.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20 (66.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CYA, Cyanocrylate. *Significant difference.
Figure 7. Rate of overall adverse events between the cyanoacrylate (CYA) and the coil group. Data are presented as mean ± standard error of the mean.
EUS-guided treatment of gastric fundal varices with combined injection of coils and cyanoacrylate glue: a large U.S. experience over 6 years (with video)

Yasser M. Bhat, MD, Frank Weilert, MD, R. Todd Fredrick, MD, Steven D. Kane, BS, Janak N. Shah, MD, Chris M. Hamerski, MD, Kenneth F. Binmoeller, MD

Paul May and Frank Stein Interventional Endoscopy Center, California Pacific Medical Center, San Francisco, California, USA
Primary Prophylaxis – EUS coiling

40 Patients treated for primary prophylaxis

3 (7.5\%) No follow-up

28 (70\%) Patients with EUS FU

2 (7\%) Late bleeding from GFV

26 (93\%) No bleeding from GFV

2 Treated with additional EUS therapy

9 (22.5\%) EGD/Clinical FU only

2 Lost to FU

1 Awaiting FU

0 Bleeding from GFV
• Balloon-occluded Retrograde Transvenous Obliteration was first described in 1984.

• It has been the primary endovascular treatment for bleeding gastric varices in Japan and South Korea. Also can be used to treat refractory HE.

• BRTO procedure fell into disuse in the Western world due to the possibility of worsening portal HTN.

• The shunt closure by BRTO has a positive counter effect increasing hepatic blood flow and improving hepatic function.
Primary Prophylaxis – BRTO
• **There are some relative contraindications to BRTO:**

• Gastric varices formed by chronic portal or splenic vein thrombosis

• Severe uncorrected coagulopathy

• Uncontrolled esophageal variceal bleeding

• Large volume intractable ascites

• The presence of hepatocellular carcinoma greater than 5 cm
Primary Prophylaxis – BRTO

• **2 modifications of BRTO:**
  
  • Plug-assisted retrograde transvenous obliteration (PARTO)
  
  • Coil-assisted retrograde transvenous obliteration (CARTO)
Primary Prophylaxis – BRTO

Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology
Volume 3, Issue 12, December 2005, Pages 1245-1252

Original article
Prophylactic Balloon-Occluded Retrograde Transvenous Obliteration for Gastric Varices in Compensated Cirrhosis

Yoshitaka Takuma *, Kazuhiro Nouso ‡, Yasuhiro Makino *, Syunsuke Saito *, Yasushi Shiratori §
Primary Prophylaxis – BRTO
Primary Prophylaxis – BRTO

![Cumulative survival rate graph]

- **Patients at risk**
  - B-RTO: 17 16 11 8 6 3 2 1
  - Control: 17 12 7 5 3 2 1 1

(Years)
Guidance statements

- For prevention of first VH from GOV2 or IGV1, NSBBs can be used, although the data are not as strong as for EV.
- Prevention of first bleeding from GOV1 varices may follow the recommendations for EV.
- Neither TIPS nor BRTO are recommended to prevent first hemorrhage in patients with fundal varices that have not bled.

Recommendations

- NSBBs are suggested for primary prevention of VH from gastro-oesophageal varices type 2 or isolated gastric varices type 1 (III;2).
- Primary prevention for gastro-oesophageal varices type 1 follow the recommendations of oesophageal varices (III;2).

4. Is there a role for primary prophylaxis of gastric variceal bleeding?

- NSBB (level 2a, grade B) can be considered in selected high-risk patients with large GOV-2 after taking into account the patient's preferences and clinical judgement.
- Cyanoacrylate injection is not recommended outside clinical trials (level 2a, grade A).
Case 1 Conclusion

- No large scale studies to make definite treatment plan (rare event, large numbers needed, etc.)

- Beta blockers safest but...

- If expertise available and high risk patient (Child B or C/High MELD/>2cm varix) then can challenge status quo: BRTO>EUS>Glue>TIPS with embolization
Case 2

• What do you do?

A) Endoscopic band ligation  
B) Cyanoacrylate glue  
C) Hemospray  
D) Code blue + Linton/Blakemore/Minnesota tube  
E) BRTO
Endoscopic Band Ligation

- Two studies with 49 patients treated with EBL showed a hemostasis rate of 89-100%, however re-bleeding rates were 20%
- Works very well for esophageal varices
- Can be only used in very small gastric varix in which both mucosal and contralateral wall can be suctioned in the ligator. Otherwise very high risk of band falling off and massive bleeding due post-band ulceration
- EBL could still be a useful treatment option but...

A randomized trial of endoscopic treatment of acute gastric variceal hemorrhage: N-Butyl-2-Cyanoacrylate injection versus band ligation††
Cyanoacrylate glue
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

Weiguang Qiao, MD, Yutang Ren, MD, Yang Bai, MD, Side Liu, MD, Qiang Zhang, MD, and Fachao Zhi, MD
Early application of haemostatic powder added to standard management for oesophagogastric variceal bleeding: a randomised trial

Mostafa Ibrahim,1,2 Ahmed El-Mikkawy,2 Mohamed Abdel Hamid,2 Haitham Abdalla,2 Arnaud Lemmers,1 Ibrahim Mostafa,2 and Jacques Devière1

› Author information › Article notes › Copyright and License information Disclaimer
"Salvage" transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunts: gastric fundal compared with esophageal variceal bleeding.

Chau TN, Patch D, Chan YW, Nagral A, Dick R, Burroughs AK.

Author information

Abstract

BACKGROUND & AIMS: The optimal emergency treatment for gastric fundal variceal bleeding is still unclear. In this study, the efficacy of transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic stent/shunt (TIPS) in patients with uncontrolled gastric fundal vs. esophageal variceal bleeding was compared.

METHODS: One hundred twelve consecutive patients with uncontrolled variceal bleeding required emergency TIPS, 84 with esophageal varices (EV group) unresponsive to endoscopic and vasoconstrictor therapy and 28 with gastric fundal varices (GV group) unresponsive to vasoconstrictor therapy. Clinical and biochemical data were retrieved, and the two groups were compared.

RESULTS: Variceal bleeding was controlled in all patients after TIPS except for 1 in each group. There were no significant differences between the two groups in terms of markers of disease severity, severity of bleeding, or portal hemodynamics. During a median follow-up period of 7 months, 20 in the EV group (24%) and 8 in the GV group (29%) developed clinical rebleeding. Most early rebleeding (within 7 days after TIPS) was related to esophageal ulceration secondary to previous sclerotherapy. Rates of mortality were similar in both groups.

CONCLUSIONS: These results suggest that emergency TIPS is equally effective in the immediate short-term control of gastric fundal variceal bleeding compared with esophageal variceal bleeding.
Endoscopic cyanoacrylate versus transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt for gastric variceal bleeding: a single-center U.S. analysis

Nicholas J. Procaccini, MD, JD, MS, Abdullah M.S. Al-Osaimi, MD, Patrick Northup, MD, MD, MS, Stephen H. Caldwell, MD

Current affiliations: Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Digestive Health Center of Excellence, Virginia Health System, Charlottesville, Virginia, USA

Comparative study of endoscopy vs. transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt in the management of gastric variceal bleeding

Gursimran Singh Kourthar, 1 Udayakumar Krueserathikan, 1 Jason Hartman, 1 Jose Mari Panumara, 1 Raúl López, 1

Ranjit Gupta, 1 Balikendra Kanoria, 3 Parasheel Mehta, 3 and Madhu Sanapakai 1
Both studies noted that patients treated with glue had significantly less long-term morbidity than the TIPS patients along with re-bleeding and recurrent hospitalizations but there was no difference in mortality.

Same limitations apply to previous.
META ANALYSIS AND SYSTEMATIC REVIEW

Balloon-occluded retrograde transvenous obliteration versus transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt for treatment of gastric varices due to portal hypertension: A meta-analysis

Yun-Bing Wang, *, † Jian-Ying Zhang, ‡ Jian-Ping Gong, † Fan Zhang § and Yong Zhao §

*Graduate School, Chongqing Medical University, † Department of Hepatobiliary Surgery, The Second Affiliated Hospital of Chongqing Medical University, ‡ Department of Radiology, The Second Affiliated Hospital of Chongqing Medical University, and § School of Public Health and Management, Chongqing Medical University, Chongqing, China
Rescue Therapies - BRTO

• Meta-analysis of 5 comparison studies \((n = 210\text{ in BRTO versus } n = 143\text{ in TIPS})\) showed no differences between BRTO and TIPS in terms of technical success, immediate hemostasis, and postprocedure complications.

• BRTO has advantages over TIPS regarding incidence of rebleeding \((\text{OR, 0.27; 95\% CI: 0.09–0.81; } p = 0.02)\) and encephalopathy \((\text{OR, 0.05; 95\% CI: 0.02–0.13, } P < 0.001)\).

• Complications of reflective of increased portal hypertension following BRTO include: Ascites, Hydrothorax, Splenomegaly, PHG, and development of EV \((33\%)\).
Guidance statements

- Patients with acute bleeding from GV should be initially managed in a similar fashion to those bleeding from EV (using a restrictive transfusion policy, vasoactive drug infusion, and antibiotic prophylaxis).
- In patients bleeding from GOV1 varices, either EVL (if technically feasible) or cyanoacrylate glue injection, if available, are the recommended endoscopic treatments.
- TIPS is the treatment of choice in the control of bleeding from cardiofundal varices (GOV2 or IGV1).
- Cyanoacrylate glue injection is an option for cases in which TIPS is not technically feasible, but it is not approved for treatment of GV in the United States and should be performed only in centers where the expertise is available.

- Acute gastric VH should be treated medically, like oesophageal VH (I;1). Cyanoacrylate is the recommended endoscopic haemostatic treatment for cardiofundal varices (gastro-oesophageal varices type 2 or isolated gastric varices type 1) (I;2).
- TIPS with potential embolisation efficiently controls bleeding and prevents rebleeding in fundal VH (gastro-oesophageal varices type 2 or isolated gastric varices type 1) and should be considered in appropriate candidates (II-2;1).
- Selective embolisation (BROTO/BATO) may also be used to treat bleeding from fundal varices associated with large gastro/splenorenal collaterals, although more data is required (III;2).
Case 2 Conclusion

- Cyanoacrylate glue is the treatment of choice for bleeding gastric varices

- However, if not able to use cyanoacrylate glue, rescue with EBL, Hemospray or Linton/Blakemore/Minnesota tube acceptable with plan for BRTO>TIPS with embolization
Conclusion

• There is little literature regarding management of GV compared with the abundant quantity published on EV

• Probably, cyanoacrylate injection has a role in primary prophylaxis, but NSBB in primary prophylaxis is less invasive and easily accessible. Can consider BRTO if expertise available

• In bleeding fundal varices (i.e., GOV2 and IGV1) management with cyanoacrylate injections is the preferred option leaving BRTO (>TIPS) as rescue therapy once patient stabilized

• There is still a wide area for research in GV therapy