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Abstract

The ACR Incidental Findings Committee (IFC) presents recommendations for managing pancreatic cysts that are incidentally detected on CT or MRI. These recommendations represent an update from the pancreatic component of the JACR 2010 white paper on managing incidental findings in the adrenal glands, kidneys, liver, and pancreas. The Pancreas Subcommittee—which included abdominal radiologists, a gastroenterologist, and a pancreatic surgeon—developed this algorithm. The recommendations draw from published evidence and expert opinion, and were finalized by informal iterative consensus. Algorithm branches successively categorize pancreatic cysts based on patient characteristics and imaging features. They terminate with an ascertainment of benignity and/or indolence (sufficient to discontinue follow-up), or a management recommendation. The algorithm addresses most, but not all, pathologies and clinical scenarios. Our goal is to improve quality of care by providing guidance on how to manage incidentally detected pancreatic cysts.
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Reasons for Changes in 2017

- No prior consensus on measurement
- No prior detailed reporting recommendations
- No prior definition of growth
- Increased utilization of EUS/aspiration
- Follow-up interval changes (substantial)
Estimate of Cyst Prevalence

- Almost 3.5 M cysts in 137 M patients
- Increased prevalence with age
- JACR: June, 2017 (3 yrs before/after white paper):
  - 2.4 fold difference in recommendations across rads
  - Decrease in FU recs from 23.7% to 13.5%
  - Adhered to guidance in 47.4% cases

Why is Diagnosing Type of Cyst Important?

- Not malignant:
  - Serous cystadenoma, epithelial, lymphoepithelial cysts, pseudocyst

- Malignant potential
  - MCT (10-17%)
  - Main duct, combined IPMN (38-68%)
  - BD-IPMN (12-47%)
    - ~10% progress, ~22% of those malignant
What to Report

- Cyst morphology, location, number, size
  - Measure largest cyst and use for FU
- Relation to MPD
- Suspicious features
- Growth
- Consensus proposal in this paper:
  - Single measurement in longest axis: coronal or axial
- 3-D volume useful to predict success of aspiration
- Changed categories for this paper:
  - 0.5-1.5 cm
  - 1.5-2.5 cm
  - >2.5 cm
- Often slow and not linear
- Benign lesions grow-particularly pseudocysts
- Growth rate:
  - >2 mm/yr: higher likelihood malignancy
  - Cyst in year 1 may receive more attention
- Definitions of growth:
  - Cyst ≤ 0.5 cm: 100% increase in long axis from baseline
  - Cyst between 0.5-1.5 cm: 50% increase long axis from baseline
  - Cyst >1.5 cm: 20% increase in long axis from baseline
Suspicious Features

- Suspicious features
  - Cyst ≥3 cm,
  - MPD ≥5 mm
  - Thickened, enhanced cyst walls
  - Non-enhanced mural nodules

- High Risk Stigmata
  - Jaundice
  - Enhanced Solid Component/mural nodule
  - MPD ≥10 mm
EUS

- Detailed information in paper

Follow up considerably lengthened from 2010

- Up to 15 years if asymptomatic cyst found in patient <65 yrs., but can stop at 80 yrs.

Extended follow-up because:

- New studies show delayed growth after 4 years of stability
- Development of PDAC
  - Estimated risk is 5.08 per 1000 pt. yrs. vs. 0.32 without cysts
Flowcharts
Principles of Using Algorithms

- Considered all incidental cysts mucinous unless definitively otherwise
- Cyst size directs follow-up or intervention
- Flowcharts defined by cyst size, growth may lead to different chart
- Development of suspicious features or high-risk stigmata lead to surgical consultation
- Compare to prior imaging
- Special consideration (*but not rule!* for patients >80 yrs.)
Figure 2B

1.5-2.5 cm Incidental pancreatic cyst. MPD communication absent OR cannot be determined.

- Reimage q6mo x 4, then q1y x 2 then q2y x 3.
  - STOP if stable over 10 years.
  - Interval growth.
    - Cyst is still ≤2.5 cm
      - Reimage q6mo x 2 then q1y x 5, then q2y x 3; or EUS/FNA.
      - STOP if cyst ≤2.5 cm over 10 years.
    - Cyst is >2.5 cm
      - EUS/FNA.

- EUS/FNA.
  - SCA, cPNET, Pseudocyst
  - Mucinous cyst or indeterminate aspiration
    - Management dependent on diagnosis
      - Reimage q6mo x 4, then q1y x 2, then q2y x 3.
      - STOP if stable over 10 years.
    - Interval growth.
      - Surgical consultation.
>2.5 cm Incidental pancreatic cyst

SCA

Low Risk by Imaging

Reimage q6mos x 4

Stable over initial 2 years

Reimage q1y x 2, then q2y x 3

STOP if stable over 10 years

High Risk by Imaging

Interval growth

EUS/FNA + Surgical consultation

EUS/FNA
Incidental pancreatic cyst in patient ≥80 years old at presentation

Cyst ≤2.5 cm
- Reimage q2y × 2 *
  - STOP if stable
Cyst is still ≤2.5 cm
  - Reimage q1y *
  - STOP if stabilizes or if no longer surgical candidate
Cyst is >2.5 cm
  - Interval growth *

Cyst >2.5 cm
- SCA 4
- Low Risk by Imaging 5
  - Reimage q2y × 2 *
  - STOP if stable
  - Interval growth *
- High Risk by Imaging 6
  - EUS/FNA + Surgical consultation 7
Conclusions

- Natural history of small cysts remains observational
- Assume incidental cyst is mucinous
- EUS/FNA should be used liberally
- Define measurement method and growth
- Extended follow-up because recognition of increased long-term risk
- Modified management for pts. >80 yrs.