Second interventions for occluded metallic stents

Viroj Wiwanitkit

Published online: 24 August 2010
© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2010

To the Editor,

I read the report by Ridditid et al. concerning the outcome of second interventions for occluded metallic stents in patients with malignant biliary obstruction with a great interest [1]. Ridditid et al. concluded that “A second SEMS insertion in occluded SEMS provides a significantly longer patency time than PS and PTBD” [1]. Indeed, Lee et al. noted that “Metallic stents showed a favorable patency rate with regard to patient survival” [2]. I agree that the study by Ridditid et al. might provide evidence to support the clinical usefulness of SEMS. However, I have some additional concerns about the work. First, it is questionable whether SEMS can contribute to a better quality of life compared with PS and PTBD. Second, although SEMS can last for a longer time, its cost-effectiveness is still questionable. Third, as Ridditid et al. noted, there are many

kinds of malignant biliary obstruction; therefore, more subjects for each specific subgroup might be needed to strengthen the conclusion.

Disclosure V. Wiwanitkit has no conflicts of interest or financial ties to disclose.

References

1. Ridditid W, Rerknimitr R, Janchai A, Kongkam P, Treeprasertsuk S, Kullavanijaya P (2010) Outcome of second interventions for occluded metallic stents in patients with malignant biliary obstruction. *Surg Endosc* Feb 23 [Epub ahead of print]
2. Lee BH, Choe DH, Lee JH, Kim KH, Chin SY (1997) Metallic stents in malignant biliary obstruction: prospective long-term clinical results. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 168(3):741–745

V. Wiwanitkit (✉)
Wiwanitkit House, Bangkhuae, Bangkok 10160, Thailand
e-mail: wviroj@yahoo.com