
Anatomical Variations and Morphological Diversities of the Pancreatic Ductal System

– Clinical and ERCP evaluation –

**Jung Hoon Suh, M.D., Jin Heon Lee, M.D., Seung Woo Park, M.D.
Joon Kyu Lee, M.D., Jae Bock Chung, M.D., Si Young Song, M.D.
and Jin Kyung Kang, M.D.**

Department of Internal Medicine, Yonsei University
College of Medicine, Seoul, Korea

Background/Aims: The advent of endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP) has made it possible to identify the pancreatic ductal (PD) system. There is no established relationship between the PD system and various pancreaticobiliary diseases. The purpose of this study was to identify the morphological diversities and anatomical variations of PD and to define the relationship between PD types and pancreaticobiliary diseases. **Methods:** Five hundred and eighty-two consecutive patients, in whom both PD and common bile duct (CBD) were clearly visualized by ERCP, were included. PD types were categorized according to the relationship between CBD and PD. The anatomical variations were classified into migration, fusion, and duplication anomalies. **Results:** The PD types were classified into type A 84.4%, type B 9.6%, type C 3.4%, and type D 2.6%. The PD anomalies were noted in 51 patients, which were comprised of 19 (3.3%) fusion anomalies (12 complete pancreas divisum, 7 incomplete pancreas divisum) and 32 (5.5%) duplication anomalies (5 number variations, 27 form variations). No significant relationships between various PD morphologies and pancreaticobiliary diseases were found. Hyperamylasemia was more frequently complicated in type C (41.7%) and D (50%) than in type A and B after ERCP. **Conclusions:** Though a close relationship was not found between various PD types and pancreaticobiliary diseases, being familiar with the morphology and anatomical variation is worth it, for more accurate interpretation and for prediction of a complication such as pancreatitis. (Korean J Gastrointest Endosc 2000;20:14 – 20)

Key Words: ERCP, Pancreatic duct, Anatomical variation

1642 Wirsung
, 1775 Santorini가
가 .13
(endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography,
ERCP) 가

.45 , ERCP

가 .67

ERCP

ERCP

1.

1992 1 1996 11
ERCP
582
ERCP

2.

(ERCP)

ERCP
Hyoscine-n-butylbromide (Buscopan[®]) 40 mg
2% Xylocaine
Gascon 5 15 ml
Diazepam (Valium[®]) 10 mg
Midazolam (Dormicum[®]) 5 mg ,

x-ray

Olympus JF-20, Olympus JF-200,

Olympus TJF-200 ,

Hypaque 1 : 1

3.

(Fig. 1). A
Wirsung Santorini
torini
(,
가), B Wirsung
Santorini
, C Santorini
Wirsung

A, B, C

가 , C D 47가 A 6가 , B 5
(Fig. 1).8

4.

(,), (,
,), (,
r , , N ,) .9

5.

ERCP
Chi-square test

Figure 1. Relationships of common bile duct and pancreatic Wirsung and Santorini ducts.

Table 1. Frequencies of the Subtypes of Pancreatic Duct System

	Type A						Type B					Type C				Type D				
	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6	B1	B2	B3	B4	B5	C1	C2	C3	C4	D1	D2	D3	D4	
Total	254 (43.6)	70 (12.0)	15 (2.6)	2 (0.3)	26 (4.5)	124 (21.3)	37 (6.4)	6 (1.0)	10 (1.7)	2 (0.3)	1 (0.2)	12 (2.1)	7 (1.2)	0 (0.2)	1 (0.2)	12 (2.0)	1 (0.2)	1 (0.2)	1 (0.2)	582
Male	13 (40.6)	34 (10.5)	9 (2.8)	1 (0.3)	16 (4.9)	78 (24.0)	24 (7.4)	6 (1.8)	6 (1.8)	1 (0.3)	1 (0.3)	8 (2.5)	3 (0.9)	0 (0.3)	1 (1.5)	5 (1.5)	0	0	0	325
Female	122 (47.5)	36 (14.0)	6 (2.3)	1 (0.4)	10 (3.9)	46 (17.9)	13 (5.1)	0 (1.6)	4 (0.4)	1 (1.6)	0	4 (1.6)	4 (1.6)	0	0	7 (2.8)	1 (0.4)	1 (0.4)	1 (0.4)	257

(): %

Table 2. Frequencies of the Anatomical Variations of Pancreatic Duct System

	No. of cases (%)
Fusion anomalies	19 (3.3)
Pancreas divisum	12 (2.1)
Incomplete pancreas divisum	7 (1.2)
Duplication anomalies	32 (5.5)
Number variations	5 (0.9)
Form variations	27 (4.6)
Ring	18 (3.1)
Spiral	9 (1.5)
Total	51 (8.8)

1.

0.8 . ERCP 52.8 1 :
 63 (10.8%), 209 (35.9%),
 (7.6%), 39 (6.7%), 47 (8.1%), 44
 . ERCP 253
 (40.4%), 77 (13.2%), 48 (8.2%)
 39 (6.7%) 21 (3.6%)
 65 (1.2%) .

2.

A 491 (84.4%) 가 C3
 B 56 (9.6%), C 20 (3.4%), D 15
 (2.6%) .
 325 A 83.1%, B 11.7%, C 3.7%, D 1.5%
 257
 A 86.0%, B 7.0%, D 3.9%, C 3.1%
 . B 11.7% 1.5%
 D 3.9% 1.5%
 . A 6
 A1 254 (43.6%)
 가 A2 70 (12%), A3 15 (2.6%), A4 2
 (0.3%), A5 26 (4.5%), A6 124 (21.3%) B
 5 B1 37 (6.4%), B2 6
 (1.0%), B3 10 (1.7%), B4 2 (0.3%) B5 1 (0.2%)
 . C 4
 C1 12 (2.1%), C2 7 (1.2%), C4 1 (0.2%)

. D 4
 D1 12 (2.0%) D2, D3, D4가
 1 (0.2%) (Table 1).

3.

51 (8.8%)
 , 가 19 (3.3%), 가 32 (5.5%)
 . 가 12 (2.1%),
 가 7 (1.2%) , 가 5 (0.9%)
 가 27 (4.6%) 18 (3.1%),
 9 (1.5%) (Table 2).

4.

가
 (Table 3).

Table 3. Relationships between Pancreatic Duct Type and Pancreatobiliary Diseases

Type	n	Acute pancreatitis	Chronic pancreatitis	Pancreatic cancer	Biliary stone	Biliary cancer
A	491	19 (3.9)	63 (12.8)	34 (6.9)	203 (41.3)	35 (7.1)
B	56	1 (1.8)	8 (14.3)	2 (3.6)	20 (35.7)	8 (14.3)
C	20	1 (5.0)	4 (20.0)	2 (10.0)	6 (30.3)	3 (15.0)
D	15	0	2 (13.3)	1 (6.7)	6 (40.0)	2 (13.3)
Total	582	21 (3.6)	77 (13.2)	39 (6.7)	235 (40.4)	48 (8.2)

(): %

Table 4. Incidence of Post-ERCP Hyperamylasemia According to Pancreatic Duct Type

Type	n	Hyperamylasemia (%)
A	237	47 (19.8)*
B	32	3 (9.4)*
C	12	5 (41.7)
D	8	4 (50)
Total	289	59 (20.4)

*p=0.018

5. ERCP

ERCP

289 가 가 59

20.4%

A 237 47 (19.8%)
 B 32 3 (9.4%)

C 12 5 (41.7%)
 D 8 4 (50%)

(p= 0.018)(Table 4).
 C D 5

1.7%
 A 4 , C 1 가

6

2

Wirsung

Santorini

Wirsung

.10

.1,3,8,9,11,12

Millbourn 1

109 , 1

2

, 3 Dawson 2

120

, 2

3

Kleitsch 3 1

3 4 (foregut)

, 2

(bud) 7 8

3

(p > 0.05)(Table

Stolte 8 3).

, Wirsung , Santorini
A D

ERCP

Wirsung Santorini

ERCP

가 가

Siegel 9

A 491 (84.4%) 가 B 56
(9.6%) C 20 (3.4%), D
15 (2.6%) , Stolte 8 A 20,000
63.7%, B 22.7%, C 10.1% D 20
3.5%

3 가
ERCP 가 가

Wirsung Santorini

가

96%

0.5 11%

10

66 90%

.310

6%
2.1% 가

21

50 100% Santorini

76.7%

0.13 0.9%

10 Santorini

10 29%

1722

1.2%

310

13%

가

Uomo 16 4.6%

5.5%

가

A 83.1%, B 11.7%, C 3.7%, D
1.5% , A 86.0%, B 7.0%, D
3.9%, C 3.1% B , D

25 38% 1416

9.5%

A1 43.6% 가

A6 21.3%, A2 12%, B1 6.4%, A5 4.5%, A3 2.6%,
C1 2.1%, D1 2%, B3 1.7%, C2 1.2%

2.0%

가

1%

(p > 0.05).

Wirsung Santorini

ERCP

7.7%

A1, B1, C1

23

20.4%

B

9.4% 가

Santorini

C 5%, 20% 10%

Santorini

A
ERCP

(p > 0.05) (Table 3). C

A

1.3

13-16

11.3%

2426

17-19

가

1.7%

. ERCP

torini 가 ERCP 가 : ERCP ERCP : ERCP 582 가 19 (3.4%) 가 7 가 27 (18 , 9) . ERCP (19.8%) B(9.4%) 가 ERCP ERCP ERCP

2. Dawson W, Langman J. An anatomical-radiological study on the pancreatic duct pattern in man. *Anat Rec* 1961;139:59-68.
3. Kleitsch WP. Anatomy of the pancreas. *Arch Surg* 1955;71: 795-802.
4. Oi I, Kobayashi S, Kondo T. Endoscopic pancreatocholangiography. *Endoscopy* 1970;2:103-106.
5. Heiss FW, Shea JA. Association of pancreatitis and variant ductal anatomy: dominant drainage of the duct of Santorini. *Am J Gastroenterol* 1978;70:158-162.
6. Phillip J, Koch H, Classen M. Variations and anomalies of the papilla of Vater, the pancreas and the biliary duct system. *Endoscopy* 1974;6:70-77.
7. Belber JP, Bill K. Fusion anomalies of the pancreatic ductal system: differentiation from pathologic states. *Radiology* 1977; 123:637-642.
8. Cubilla AL, Fitzgerald PJ. Gross anatomy. In: Cubilla AL, Fitzgerald PJ, eds. *Tumors of the exocrine pancreas*. 2nd series, Fascicle 19. Washington, D.C.: Armed forces institute of pathology, 1984:31-52.
9. Sigel HJ. Radiologic interpretation: Normal biliary system and variations; normal pancreatic duct and variations. In: Siegel HJ ed. *Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography: technique, diagnosis and therapy*. New York: Raven Press Ltd., 1992:41-59.
10. Kozu T, Suda K, Toki F. Pancreatic development and anatomical variation. *Gastrointest Endosc Clin N Am* 1995;5:1-30.
11. Sigfusson BF, Wehlin L, Lindstrom CG. Variants of pancreatic duct system of importance in endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography. Observations on autopsy specimens. *Acta Radiol Diagn (Stockh)* 1983;24:113-128.
12. Yatto RP, Siegel JH. Variant pancreatography. *Am J Gastroenterol* 1983;78:115-118.
13. Gregg JA. Pancreas divisum: its association with pancreatitis. *Am J Surg* 1977;134:539-543.
14. Cotton PB. Congenital anomaly of pancreas divisum as cause of obstructive pain and pancreatitis. *Gut* 1980;21:105-114.
15. Bernard JP, Sahel J, Giovannini M, Sarles H. Pancreas divisum is a probable cause of acute pancreatitis: a report of 137 cases. *Pancreas* 1990;5:248-254.
16. Uomo G, Manes G, D'Anna L, Laccetti M, Di Gaeta S, Rabitti PG. Fusion and duplication variants of pancreatic duct system. Clinical and pancreatographic evaluation. *Int J Pancreatol* 1995;17:23-28.
17. Sugawa C, Walt AJ, Nunez DC, Masuyama H. Pancreas divisum: is it a normal anatomic variant? *Am J Surg* 1987;153: 62-67.
18. Burtin P, Person B, Charneau J, Boyer J. Pancreas divisum and pancreatitis: a coincidental association? *Endoscopy* 1991; 23:55-58.
19. Delhay M, Cremer M. Clinical significance of pancreas divisum. *Acta Gastroenterol Belg* 1992;55:306-313.
20. Ravitch MM, Woods AC Jr. Annular pancreas. *Ann Surg*

1. Millbourn E. On the excretory ducts of the pancreas in man, with special reference to their relations to each other, to the common bile duct and to the duodenum. A radiological and anatomical study. *Acta Anat* 1950;9:1-34.

- 1950;132:1116-1127.
21. Carr-Locke DL. Pancreas divisum. the controversy goes on? *Endoscopy* 1991;23:88-90.
 22. Tulassay Z, Papp J, Farkas IE. Diagnostic aspects of incomplete pancreas divisum. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1986;32:428.
 23. Dickinson RJ, Davies S. Post-ERCP pancreatitis and hyperamylasaemia: the role of operative and patient factors. *Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 1998;10:423-428.
 24. Loperfido S, Angelini G, Benedetti G, et al. Major early complications from diagnostic and therapeutic ERCP: a prospective multicenter study. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1998;48:1-10.
 25. LaFerla G, Gordon S, Archibald M, Murray WR. Hyperamylasaemia and acute pancreatitis following endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography. *Pancreas* 1986;1:160-163.
 26. Johnson GK, Geenen JE, Johanson JF, Sherman S, Hogan WJ, Cass O. Evaluation of post-ERCP pancreatitis: potential causes noted during controlled study of differing contrast media. Midwest Pancreaticobiliary Study Group. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1997;46:217-222.
-