



CODEN [USA]: IAJPB

ISSN: 2349-7750

**INDO AMERICAN JOURNAL OF  
PHARMACEUTICAL SCIENCES**<http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3255439>Available online at: <http://www.iajps.com>

Research Article

**ACUTE PANCREATITIS SURGICAL APPROACHES**

<sup>1</sup> Hussam Salem Alshammari, <sup>2</sup> Naif Abdulmohsen Alabdali, <sup>3</sup> Wael Saleh Alanazi,  
<sup>4</sup> Sultan Nahar Alshmmari, <sup>5</sup> Abdulmajeed Mohammed Alshammari,  
<sup>6</sup> Abdulaziz Saad S Alshammari, <sup>7</sup> Abdulaziz Mohammed Alenezi, <sup>8</sup> Mohammad  
abdulkarim alduheim, <sup>9</sup> Motab Ali Alsulaiman, <sup>10</sup> Ethar Abed Alsulami

Article Received: April 2019

Accepted: May 2019

Published: June 2019

**Abstract:**

*Gallstones are still one of the most common cause with epidemiological patterns indicating an increasing incidence. The surgical approaches of acute gallstone pancreatitis were discussed in this review. PubMed, Embase, and Google scholar databases were searched up to April, 2019 for published studies with English language and human subjects discussing the management of Acute pancreatitis and surgical approaches. Surgical procedure has a really limited role in the medical diagnosis of acute pancreatitis. One of the most typical signs for treatment in acute pancreatitis is for the therapy of issues and most significantly the therapy of infected walled off necrosis. Other indicators for surgical procedure in acute pancreatitis are for the therapy of acute area disorder, non-occlusive intestinal ischaemia and necrosis, enterocutaneous fistulae, vascular complications and pseudocyst. Surgical procedure also has a role in the avoidance of recurrent acute pancreatitis by cholecystectomy. Despite the more restricted role, doctors have an important contribution to make in the multidisciplinary care of patients with complicated acute pancreatitis.*

**Corresponding author:****Hussam Salem Alshammari**

QR code



Please cite this article in press Hussam Salem Alshammari *et al.*, *Acute Pancreatitis Surgical Approaches.*, *Indo Am. J. P. Sci.*, 2019; 06(06).

**INTRODUCTION:**

Acute pancreatitis (AP) is an acute inflammation of the pancreas resulting from an auto-digestion of the gland. The management of acute pancreatitis has been controversial over the past years, ranging a conservative clinical method on the one hand and a hostile surgical method on the various other. There has been significant improvement in understanding of the natural program and pathophysiology of acute pancreatitis over the past years [1]. The medical course of acute pancreatitis differs from a light temporal kind to a serious necrotising disease. A lot of episodes of acute pancreatitis (80%) are mild and self-limiting, decreasing spontaneously within 3- 5 days. Patients with mild pancreatitis react well to clinical treatment, requiring little bit more than intravenous liquid resuscitation and analgesia [2]. On the other hand, serious pancreatitis is specified as pancreatitis associated with body organ failing and/or local difficulties such as necrosis, abscess formation, or pseudocysts. Extreme pancreatitis can be observed in 15- 20% of all situations [3].

In general, severe pancreatitis develops in two stages. The first 2 weeks after onset of signs are qualified by the systemic inflammatory response syndrome (SIRS). Release of proinflammatory mediators is believed to contribute to the pathogenesis of SIRS associated pulmonary, cardiovascular, and kidney insufficiency [4]. In parallel, pancreatic necrosis establishes within the first 4 days after the start of signs and symptoms to its complete extent [5]. Although SIRS in the very early stage of extreme pancreatitis might be discovered in the absence of considerable pancreatic necrosis, most of patients with serious early organ dysfunction will have pancreatic necrosis on computed tomography (CT) scan [6]. Late deterioration of organ dysfunction happens most typically in the second to third week after admission and is usually the outcome of second infection of pancreatic or peripancreatic necrosis [5]. Today, infection of pancreatic necrosis is still the significant threat factor of sepsis associated numerous body organ failure and the main life endangering complication of severe acute pancreatitis [7]. Infection of pancreatic death can be observed in 40-70% of patients with necrotising illness [5]. The danger of infection enhances with the extent of intra- and extrapancreatic death [7]. Management of acute pancreatitis in the two phases of the illness is various. Recently, treatment of extreme acute pancreatitis has moved away from very early medical debridement/necrosectomy to hostile extensive treatment [8]. While the therapy is conventional in the

earlier stage of the disease, surgery must be taken into consideration in the second stage.

Advancements in radiological imaging, new growths in interventional radiology, and various other marginal accessibility interventions have revolutionised the management of numerous surgical conditions over the past decades. Today, it is suggested that severe acute pancreatitis be treated in specialist devices with multidisciplinary proficiency available on site, consisting of extensive care professionals, interventional endoscopists, diagnostic and interventional radiologists, and specialists [8]. Thinking about recent renovations in interventional therapy regimens, this article examines the present role of surgical procedure and interventional intensive care in the management of severe acute pancreatitis.

While the majority of situations of acute pancreatitis are mild, the challenge continues to be in managing the serious instances and the complications related to acute pancreatitis. Gallstones are still one of the most common cause with epidemiological patterns indicating an increasing incidence. The surgical approaches of acute gallstone pancreatitis were discussed in this review.

**METHODOLOGY:**

PubMed, Embase, and Google scholar databases were searched up to April, 2019 for published studies with English language and human subjects discussing the management of Acute pancreatitis and surgical approaches. Moreover, we included reviews and randomized control studies, we excluded all case reports, in our search strategy we scanned the references list of our included studies for more relevant articles.

**DISCUSSION:**

There have been remarkable changes in the role of surgical treatment for acute pancreatitis over the last 20 years, and some have anticipated its demise. While it holds true that open surgery now has a more limited role in patients with extreme and crucial AP, there are still a range of signs for which surgery stays a vital and occasionally life-saving treatment (Table 1) [9]. Other signs for intervention consist of problems of acute pancreatitis, and these may need surgery alone or combined with other treatment methods, consisting of interventional radiologic and endoscopic methods. The function of this chapter is to provide a current summary of the role of surgery in AP, in the context of these larger changes in intervention.

**Table 1.** Indications for surgery in acute pancreatitis [9].

1. Surgery for diagnosis
2. Surgery to treat complications of pancreatitis
  - a. Abdominal compartment syndrome
  - b. Infected necrosis
  - c. Non-occlusive intestinal ischaemia and necrosis
  - d. Enterocutaneous fistulae
  - e. Vascular complications
  - f. Pseudocyst
3. Surgery to prevent recurrent acute pancreatitis

- **Surgical Diagnosis of Acute Pancreatitis**

Acute pancreatitis is now rarely diagnosed by surgical treatment in advanced healthcare systems. The scenario where this might still hold true is when patients with AP present late, and there is a non-diagnostic elevation of serum pancreatic enzyme concentration. The various other indicator is when a patient presents with signs of severe peritonitis, calling for an urgent laparotomy. If these patients can be secured, cross-sectional imaging will usually allow the radiological medical diagnosis of acute pancreatitis, preventing the requirement for medical diagnosis.

- **Management of local complications**

#### **Surgical Treatment of Abdominal Compartment Syndrome**

The incidence of intra-abdominal hypertension (IAH) and abdominal compartment syndrome (ACS) in AP appears to be connected to an extra hostile resuscitation strategy [10]. The consensus meaning of IAH is a persistent boost of intra-abdominal pressure (IAP) > 12 mm Hg, and ACS is specified as the combination of IAP > 20 mm Hg and new-onset body organ dysfunction [10]. Pressures are generally determined by a catheter in the bladder, but this is far from routine technique. In patients with AP, ACS is associated with extensive pancreatic necrosis, multi-organ failure, a longer remain in ICU and medical facility and higher mortality [11]. In a consolidated series of 6 research studies consisting of 93 patients with ACS the mortality varied from 25 to 75 % [11]. Patients with IAP exceeding 25 mm of Hg within the initial 14 days in the ICU have actually been shown to have a mortality rate of greater than 50 % [11]. Early acknowledgment and prompt therapy of ACS help to reduce morbidity and improve patient survival.

Although IAH is associated with a significantly greater APACHE II and multiple organ dysfunction (MODS) scores in patients with severe acute pancreatitis (SAP), a causal relationship in between ACS and MODS has actually not been developed [12]. It has actually been found that the duration of IAH is of greater importance than the absolute increase in intra-abdominal pressure.

The mechanism by which IAH impacts end-organs such as the heart, lungs and kidneys has not been developed. The gut-lymph hypothesis is a probable explanation, with disability of gut microcirculation bring about a malfunction of the digestive tract barrier and the generation of harmful digestive tract lymph which bypasses the liver getting in the circulation promptly upstream of the organs influenced [13].

Non-operative approaches to avoid and reverse IAH in the setting of AP must be initially thought about, with medical intervention typically scheduled for the setup of consistent body organ dysfunction [14]. Medical interventions to lower IAP target three important factors: (1) distension and quantity of hollow organs (such as with paralytic ileus), (2) space inhabiting lesions (such as ascites, blood and liquid collections) and (3) problems that limit abdominal wall expansion (such as agitation or incomplete relaxation in ventilated patients). The degrees of sedation and analgesia ought to be optimized to prevent agitation and increased abdominal wall surface tone. A short test with neuromuscular blocking agents helps to reduce abdominal muscular tone and increases abdominal wall compliance hence decreasing IAP. Enteral decompression with nasogastric or rectal tubes can be practical in handling ileus and gastric dilation. Prokinetic agents such as erythromycin and metoclopramide may help minimize paralytic ileus. One more drug, neostigmine, a parasympathomimetic agent, has been utilized for treatment of ACS related to acute colonic pseudo-obstruction (ACPO) after conservative steps have stopped working. It exerts its effect by two mechanisms: increasing the quantity of available acetylcholine and indirectly boosting nicotinic and muscarinic receptors in the smooth muscles of intestinal tract. Valle et al. concluded from a meta-analysis that the performance to solve ACPO with a solitary dosage of neostigmine was 89.2 % [15]. The use of neostigmine in AP is not included in any kind of existing guidelines [16]. Percutaneous drainage of ascites and/or fluid collection(s) need to be taken into consideration as an useful intervention to reduce intra-abdominal pressure.

Presently, there is no consensus regarding the ideal timing for medical decompression of ACS or the most effective strategy in patients with AP. One of the most frequently used approach for surgical decompression is a midline laparostomy extending from the xiphisternum to the pubis. This technique allows an evaluation of bowel viability and the diagnosis of ischaemia. Although very early complications, such as intestinal fistulas, have been greatly decreased with careful management and improved understanding of the open abdomen, there is still the medium-term demand of skin grafting and longer-term demand for elective repair of the taking place incisional ventral hernia. One more technique is to use transverse bilateral prolonged incision listed below the costal margins to form a full thickness laparostomy. This incision is more probable to achieve primary closure than the midline incision. A third alternative is subcutaneous vertical linea alba fasciotomy which is achieved via 3 short horizontal skin incisions. This enables the linea alba to be split, often using a laparoscope for visual control although the least reliable for decompression relates to much less problems, such as fistulae [17].

The judicious use intravenous resuscitation fluids enhanced non-operative management, and the wider use percutaneous drainage for collections has led to a decline in the incidence of ACS in patients with AP. Although surgical decompression leads to timely recuperation from ACS, it is associated with a significant morbidity consisting of intra-abdominal bleeding, persistent infection, development of post-operative fistulas, and hernias [18].

Preventative prescription antibiotics are not suggested [19]. Surgical resection of pancreatic necrosis can be achieved by open, laparoscopic, or organized necrosectomy (open-staged or closed-continuous lavage). These methods do not compete with, but instead enhance, other strategies. No standards exist, however there is agreement that surgical treatment ought to be done- if at all- at a late stage, at the very least 2 weeks after the onset of pancreatitis [20].

More conservative interventions than surgical treatment now predominate as a result of 2 pioneering advances. Antibiotic treatment alone can heal contaminated necrosis [21]. This is now the very first step when such lesions are revealed. Antibiotic therapy is feasible in almost two-thirds of patients with necrotising pancreatitis, with a mortality of 7% [22]. Seifert and colleagues successfully introduced debridement of infected necrosis after fenestration of the gastric wall surface [23]. This kind of intervention

has actually become widely utilized and other routes of access have been established, but it must be restricted to expert centres. Lasting success can after that be attained in two-thirds of patients. Endoscopic transgastric necrosectomy contrasts positively with surgery [24]. Clinical tests are needed to confirm the numerous alternatives for intervention.

Van Santvoort and coworkers compared step-up management of infected necrosis (placement of percutaneous catheters in addition to therapy with prescription antibiotics, if necessary, followed by minimally invasive necrosectomy) with open necrosectomy [25]. This step-up method decreased new-onset multiorgan failing by 29%. Nonetheless, the research was underpowered to detect a distinction in mortality. In patients with walled-off death, medical professionals ought to intervene just in case of symptoms attributable to the collection (persistent abdominal pain, anorexia, nausea, or throwing up from mechanical blockage or secondary infection) [25]. In this instance, straight endoscopic necrosectomy is feasible in competent hands.

#### **Pseudocyst**

Prognostic factors for the development of pseudocysts are alcohol misuse and initially severe disease. Spontaneous resolution happens in a 3rd of patients with a pseudocyst. Prognostic elements for this resolution are no or moderate symptoms, and a pseudocyst diameter of no greater than 4 centimeters [26]. Symptomatic pseudocysts can be effectively decompressed by endoscopic cyst gastrostomy with endoscopic ultrasound guidance.

#### **Ductal disruption**

Ductal disruption can cause unilateral pleural effusion, pancreatic ascites, or enlarging fluid collection. If the disruption is focal, placement of a bridging stent using endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography usually promotes duct healing [27]. When ductal disruption takes place in an area of widespread necrosis, optimum management requires a multidisciplinary team of therapeutic endoscopists, interventional radiologists, and surgeons.

#### **Peripancreatic vascular complications**

Splenic vein thrombosis has been reported in as much as 20% of patients with acute pancreatitis undertaking imaging [28]. The risk of bleeding from gastric varices is less than 5%, and splenectomy is not advised. Pseudoaneurysms are unusual, however create major issues in 4-- 10% of cases [28]. Mesenteric angiography with transcatheter arterial embolisation is the first-line therapy.

### Management of extrapancreatic complications

Extrapancreatic infections, such as bloodstream infections, pneumonia, and urinary system tract infections, occur early in approximately 24% of patients with acute pancreatitis, and can double mortality [29]. If sepsis is suspected, it is reasonable to begin prescription antibiotics while waiting on blood culture outcomes. If culture results are negative, antibiotics need to be discontinued to lower the risk of fungaemia or *Clostridium difficile* infection [29].

### Surgical Treatment of Gallstones

Patients with gallstone acute pancreatitis can offer with connected cholestasis and cholangitis, suggestive of choledocholithiasis. While there is no longer any kind of role for surgical exploration of the typical bile duct in the acute setup, there is a distinct role for urgent bile duct decompression by ERCP, biliary sphincterotomy and/or stenting. Too often, ERCP has been undertaken for predicted serious acute pancreatitis and for cholestasis. The inaccuracy of anticipating severe AP (70- 80 %) leads to unneeded intervention in some patients and is no longer an indicator for early ERCP. A recent meta-analysis locates that the primary indicator for endoscopic therapy is concomitant cholangitis [30]. If the presentation of a patient with AP and cholangitis has been postponed beyond 72 h, it may be more secure to decompress the biliary tree by percutaneous transhepatic biliary drainage considering that duodenal oedema and patient instability can dramatically boost the dangers of an endoscopic approach. Keep in mind that cholestasis per se does not need urgent endoscopic intervention; indeed, screening liver function tests over 48 h will certainly usually disclose enhancement which suggests that the annoying CBD stone has passed into the duodenum currently.

Patients with gallstone acute pancreatitis warrant cholecystectomy. There is currently substantial body evidence indicating that this need to take place during the exact same admission for those with mild and moderate AP [31]. There is a significant danger of recurrent AP if this is not done during the index admission. Much more challenging is the timing of cholecystectomy in those with serious and important AP, specifically when there has been considerable inflammation and collections in the subhepatic space. Generally, the cholecystectomy is postponed up until the patient has recovered and undertakes an interval elective cholecystectomy [32]. In patients that endure a serious episode of gallstone AP and are not fit enough for surgery, there is a trend to do an endoscopic sphincterotomy as a conclusive procedure on the basis that it reduces the danger of recurrent acute pancreatitis

[33]. If these patients develop signs and symptoms of biliary colic, an interval cholecystectomy will certainly be called for [33].

### CONCLUSION:

A patient suffering unexpected beginning of epigastric pain emitting to the back, accompanied by nausea and throwing up, requires fast exclusion of a wide range of life threatening conditions including the cardiovascular (myocardial infarction, burst, and/or dissecting aortic aneurysm) and gastrointestinal (peptic ulcer disease with perforation or bleeding, acute pancreatitis) systems. The medical professional's history and exam findings are boosted by appropriate investigations in tightening the differential medical diagnoses to at some point assist the management and therapy of a specific problem and its associated issues. Acute pancreatitis is an inflammation of the pancreas. The initial management of acute pancreatitis is mostly encouraging, with fluid substitute and optimization of electrolyte balance, supplying enough caloric assistance, and preventing or determining and treating local and systemic complications. Nutritional assistance intends to give ample caloric intake and modulate the oxidative stress feedback during the first stage of acute pancreatitis, consequently counteracting the catabolic impacts.

Surgical procedure has a really limited role in the medical diagnosis of acute pancreatitis. One of the most typical signs for treatment in acute pancreatitis is for the therapy of issues and most significantly the therapy of infected walled off necrosis. Other indicators for surgical procedure in acute pancreatitis are for the therapy of acute area disorder, non-occlusive intestinal ischaemia and necrosis, enterocutaneous fistulae, vascular complications and pseudocyst. Surgical procedure also has a role in the avoidance of recurrent acute pancreatitis by cholecystectomy. Despite the more restricted role, doctors have an important contribution to make in the multidisciplinary care of patients with complicated acute pancreatitis.

### REFERENCE:

1. Gloor B, Muller CA, Worni M, *et al*. Pancreatic infection in severe pancreatitis: The role of fungus and multiresistent organisms. Arch Surg 2001;36:592-6.
2. Dervenis C, Johnson CD, Bassi C, *et al*. Diagnosis, objective assessment of severity, and management of acute pancreatitis. Int J Pancreatol 1999;25:195-200.

3. Uhl W, Warshaw A, Imrie C, *et al*. IAP Guidelines for the surgical management of acute pancreatitis. *Pancreatology* 2002;2:565–73.
4. Werner J, Z'Graggen K, Fernandez-del Castillo C, *et al*. Specific therapy for local and systemic complications of acute pancreatitis with monoclonal antibodies against ICAM-1. *Ann Surg* 1999;229:834–40.
5. Beger HG, Bittner R, Block S, *et al*. Bacterial contamination of pancreatic necrosis—a prospective clinical study. *Gastroenterology* 1986;91:433–41.
6. Tenner S, Sica G, Hughes M, *et al*. Relationship of necrosis to organ failure in severe acute pancreatitis. *Gastroenterology* 1997;113:899–903.
7. Isenmann R, Rau B, Beger H. Bacterial infection and extent of necrosis are determinants of organ failure in patients with acute necrotizing pancreatitis. *Br J Surg* 1999;86:1020–4.
8. United Kingdom guidelines for the management of acute pancreatitis. *Gut* 1998;42:1–13.
9. Windsor JA, Petrov MS. Acute pancreatitis reclassified. *Gut*. 2013;62:4–5. doi: 10.1136/gutjnl-2012-303725.
10. Radenkovic DV, Bajec D, Ivancevic N, Bumbasirevic V, Milic N, Jeremic V, *et al*. Decompressive laparotomy with temporary abdominal closure versus percutaneous puncture with placement of abdominal catheter in patients with abdominal compartment syndrome during acute pancreatitis: background and design of multicenter, randomised, controlled study. *BMC Surg*. 2010;10:22. doi: 10.1186/1471-2482-10-22.
11. Keskinen P, Leppaniemi A, Pettila V, Piilonen A, Kempainen E, Hynninen M. Intra-abdominal pressure in severe acute pancreatitis. *World J Emerg Surg*. 2007;2:2. doi: 10.1186/1749-7922-2-2.
12. Aitken EL, Gough V, Jones A, Macdonald A. Observational study of intraabdominal pressure monitoring in acute pancreatitis. *Surgery*. 2014;155(5):910–918. doi: 10.1016/j.surg.2013.12.028.
13. Deitch EA. Gut lymph and lymphatics: a source of factors leading to organ injury and dysfunction. *Ann N Y Acad Sci*. 2010;1207(S1):E103–E111. doi: 10.1111/j.1749-6632.2010.05713.x.
14. Cheatham ML, Malbrain ML, Kirkpatrick A, Sugrue M, Parr M, *et al*. Results from the international conference of experts on intra-abdominal hypertension and abdominal compartment syndrome II. Recommendations. *Intensive Care Med*. 2007;33:951–962. doi: 10.1007/s00134-007-0592-4.
15. Valle RGL, Godoy FL. Neostigmine for acute colonic pseudo-obstruction: a meta-analysis. *Annals Med Surg*. 2014;3:60–64. doi: 10.1016/j.amsu.2014.04.002.
16. Loveday BPT, Srinivasa S, Vather R, Mittal A, Petrov MS, Phillips ARJ, Windsor JA. High quantity and variable quality of guidelines for acute pancreatitis: a systematic review. *Am J Gastroenterol*. 2010;105:1466–1476. doi: 10.1038/ajg.2010.137.
17. Trikudanathan G, Vege SS. Current concepts of the role of abdominal compartment syndrome in acute pancreatitis :An opportunity or merely an epiphenomenon. *Pancreatology*. 2014;14(4):238–243. doi: 10.1016/j.pan.2014.06.002.
18. Mentula P, Hienonen P, Kempainen E, Puolakkainen P, Leppaniemi A, *et al*. Surgical decompression for abdominal compartment syndrome in severe acute pancreatitis. *Arch Surg*. 2010;145(8):764–769. doi: 10.1001/archsurg.2010.132.
19. Villatoro E, Bassi C, Larvin M. Antibiotic therapy for prophylaxis against infection of pancreatic necrosis in acute pancreatitis. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2006; 4: CD002941.
20. Mofi di R, Lee AC, Madhavan KK, Garden OJ, Parks RW. Prognostic factors in patients undergoing surgery for severe necrotizing pancreatitis. *World J Surg* 2007; 31: 2002–07.
21. Freeman ML, Werner J, van Santvoort HC, *et al*, and the International Multidisciplinary Panel of Speakers and Moderators. Interventions for necrotizing pancreatitis: summary of a multidisciplinary consensus conference. *Pancreas* 2012; 41: 1176–94.
22. van Santvoort HC, Bakker OJ, Bollen TL, *et al*, and the Dutch Pancreatitis Study Group. A conservative and minimally invasive approach to necrotizing pancreatitis improves outcome. *Gastroenterology* 2011; 141: 1254–63.
23. Seifert H, Wehrmann T, Schmitt T, Zeuzem S, Caspary WF. Retroperitoneal endoscopic debridement for infected peripancreatic necrosis. *Lancet* 2000; 356: 653–55.
24. Seifert H, Biermer M, Schmitt W, *et al*. Transluminal endoscopic necrosectomy after acute pancreatitis: a multicentre study with long-term follow-up (the GEPARD Study). *Gut* 2009; 58: 1260–66.
25. van Santvoort HC, Besselink MG, Bakker OJ, *et al*, and the Dutch Pancreatitis Study Group. A step-up approach or open necrosectomy for

- necrotizing pancreatitis. *N Engl J Med* 2010; 362: 1491–502.
26. Varadarajulu S, Christein JD, Tamhane A, Drelichman ER, Wilcox CM. Prospective randomized trial comparing EUS and EGD for transmural drainage of pancreatic pseudocysts (with videos). *Gastrointest Endosc* 2008; 68: 1102–11.
  27. Varadarajulu S, Noone TC, Tutuiian R, Hawes RH, Cotton PB. Predictors of outcome in pancreatic duct disruption managed by endoscopic transpapillary stent placement. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2005; 61: 568–75.
  28. Bergert H, Hinterseher I, Kersting S, Leonhardt J, Bloomenthal A, Saeger HD. Management and outcome of hemorrhage due to arterial pseudoaneurysms in pancreatitis. *Surgery* 2005; 137: 323–28.
  29. Wu BU, Johannes RS, Kurtz S, Banks PA. The impact of hospital-acquired infection on outcome in acute pancreatitis. *Gastroenterology* 2008; 135: 816–20.
  30. Tse F, Yuan Y. Early routine endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography strategy versus early conservative management strategy in acute gallstone pancreatitis. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2012;5.
  31. Tenner S, Baillie J, DeWitt J, Vege SS, American College of Gastroenterology American College of Gastroenterology guideline: management of acute pancreatitis. *Am J Gastroenterol*. 2013;108(9):1400–1415. doi: 10.1038/ajg.2013.218.
  32. Van Baal MC, Besselink MG, Bakker OJ, Van Santvoort HC, Schaapherder AF, Nieuwenhuijs VB, et al. Timing of cholecystectomy after mild biliary pancreatitis: a systematic review. *Ann Surg*. 2012;255:860–866. doi: 10.1097/SLA.0b013e3182507646.
  33. Sanjay P, Yeeting S, Whigham C, Judson H, Polignano FM, Tait IS. Endoscopic sphincterotomy and interval cholecystectomy are reasonable alternatives to index cholecystectomy in severe acute gallstone pancreatitis (GSP) *Surg Endosc*. 2007;22(8):1832–1837. doi: 10.1007/s00464-007-9710-1.