

REVIEW ARTICLE

Edward W. Campion, M.D., *Editor*

Acute Pancreatitis

Chris E. Forsmark, M.D., Santhi Swaroop Vege, M.D., and C. Mel Wilcox, M.D.

From the Division of Gastroenterology, Hepatology, and Nutrition, University of Florida, Gainesville (C.E.F.); the Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN (S.S.V.); and the Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, University of Alabama, Birmingham (C.M.W.). Address reprint requests to Dr. Forsmark at the Division of Gastroenterology, Hepatology, and Nutrition, University of Florida, 1329 S.W. 16th St., Suite 5251, P.O. Box 100214, Gainesville, FL 32610-0214, or at chris.forsmark@medicine.ufl.edu.

N Engl J Med 2016;375:1972-81.

DOI: 10.1056/NEJMra1505202

Copyright © 2016 Massachusetts Medical Society.

THE INCIDENCE OF ACUTE PANCREATITIS IS INCREASING IN THE UNITED States, and the disorder is now one of the most common reasons for hospitalization with a gastrointestinal condition. In this review, we consider recent changes in the management of acute pancreatitis, as well as common misunderstandings and areas of ongoing controversy.

CAUSES OF ACUTE PANCREATITIS

Table 1 lists the causes of acute pancreatitis. Gallstones are the most common cause.^{1,2} Migrating gallstones cause transient obstruction of the pancreatic duct, a mechanism shared by other recognized causes (e.g., endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography [ERCP]), as well as purported causes (i.e., pancreas divisum and sphincter of Oddi dysfunction). A recent trial failed to show that sphincter of Oddi dysfunction contributed to post-cholecystectomy biliary pain,³ and there are no convincing data from controlled trials that either pancreatic sphincter of Oddi dysfunction or pancreas divisum plays a role in acute pancreatitis.⁴⁻⁶

Alcohol is the second most common cause of acute pancreatitis. Prolonged alcohol use (four to five drinks daily over a period of more than 5 years) is required for alcohol-associated pancreatitis⁷; the overall lifetime risk of pancreatitis among heavy drinkers is 2 to 5%. In most cases, chronic pancreatitis has already developed and the acute clinical presentation represents a flare superimposed on chronic pancreatitis. The risk is higher for men than for women, perhaps reflecting differences in alcohol intake or genetic background.⁸ The mechanisms by which alcohol causes acute (or chronic) pancreatitis are complex and include both direct toxicity and immunologic mechanisms.⁹ The type of alcohol ingested does not affect risk, and binge drinking in the absence of long-term, heavy alcohol use does not appear to precipitate acute pancreatitis.¹⁰

Drugs appear to cause less than 5% of all cases of acute pancreatitis, although hundreds of drugs have been implicated.¹¹ The drugs most strongly associated with the disorder are azathioprine, 6-mercaptopurine, didanosine, valproic acid, angiotensin-converting-enzyme inhibitors, and mesalamine. Pancreatitis caused by drugs is usually mild. Recent data do not support a role for glucagon-like peptide 1 mimetics in causing pancreatitis.¹² It is common for patients to be taking one of the many drugs associated with pancreatitis when they are admitted to the hospital with acute pancreatitis,¹³ but it is exceedingly difficult to determine whether the drug is responsible.

Mutations and polymorphisms in a number of genes are associated with acute (and chronic) pancreatitis, including mutations in the genes encoding cationic trypsinogen (PRSS1), serine protease inhibitor Kazal type 1 (SPINK1), cystic fibrosis transmembrane conductance regulator (CFTR), chymotrypsin C, calcium-sensing receptor, and claudin-2.¹⁴ These mutations may serve as cofactors, interacting with

Table 1. Causes of Acute Pancreatitis.*

Cause	Approximate Frequency	Diagnostic Clues	Comments
Gallstones	40%	Gallbladder stones or sludge, abnormal liver-enzyme levels	Endoscopic ultrasonography can reveal very small gallbladder or duct stones.
Alcohol	30%	Acute flares superimposed on underlying chronic pancreatitis	Diagnosis rests on history, obtained with CAGE questions.†
Hypertriglyceridemia	2–5%	Fasting triglycerides >1000 mg/dl (11.3 mmol per liter)	
Genetic causes	Not known	Recurrent acute pancreatitis and chronic pancreatitis	
Drugs	<5%	Other evidence of drug allergy (e.g., rash) only in rare cases	The condition is idiosyncratic and usually mild.
Autoimmune cause	<1%	Type 1: obstructive jaundice, elevated serum IgG4 levels, response to glucocorticoids; type 2: possible presentation as acute pancreatitis; occurrence in younger patients; no IgG4 elevation; response to glucocorticoids	Type 1 is a systemic disease affecting the pancreas, salivary glands, and kidneys; in type 2, only the pancreas is affected.
ERCP	5–10% (among patients undergoing ERCP)		The symptoms can be reduced with rectal NSAIDs (diclofenac or indomethacin) or temporary placement of a stent in the pancreatic duct.
Trauma	<1%	Blunt or penetrating trauma, particularly in midbody of pancreas as it crosses spine	
Infection	<1%	Viruses: CMV, mumps, and EBV most common; parasites: ascaris and clonorchis	
Surgical complication	5–10% (among patients undergoing cardiopulmonary bypass)		The condition is probably due to pancreatic ischemia; pancreatitis may be severe.
Obstruction	Rare	Celiac disease and Crohn's disease, pancreas divisum (controversial), and sphincter of Oddi dysfunction (very controversial)	On rare occasions, malignant pancreatic duct or ampullary obstruction is seen.
Associated conditions	Common	Diabetes, obesity, and smoking	

* CMV denotes cytomegalovirus, EBV Epstein–Barr virus, ERCP endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography, and NSAIDs nonsteroidal antiinflammatory drugs.

† CAGE is an acronym for the following questions: Have you ever felt you should cut down on your drinking? Have people annoyed you by criticizing your drinking? Have you ever felt bad or guilty about your drinking? Have you ever had a drink first thing in the morning to steady your nerves or to get rid of a hangover (eye opener)?

other causes; for example, claudin-2 mutations work synergistically with alcohol.^{8,14}

The cause of acute pancreatitis often cannot be established, and the proportion of persons who are considered to have idiopathic acute pancreatitis increases with age. A number of potential factors might contribute to unexplained pancreatitis, including unidentified genetic polymorphisms, exposure to smoking and other environmental toxins,¹⁵ and effects of coexisting diseases that are commonly associated with acute pancreatitis (e.g., obesity and diabetes). Morbid obesity is a risk factor for acute pancreatitis^{2,16} and for severe acute pancreatitis.¹⁷ Type 2 diabetes increases the risk of acute pancreatitis by a factor of 2 or 3.² Both obesity and diabetes are also risk factors for chronic pancreatitis and pancreatic cancer.¹⁸

EPIDEMIOLOGY

Acute pancreatitis in the United States accounts for health care costs of \$2.5 billion¹⁹ and for 275,000 admissions each year. Admissions have increased by at least 20% over the past 10 years. Studies worldwide²⁰⁻²² have shown a rising but variable incidence of acute pancreatitis, including large increases in incidence in pediatric populations.²³ This increased risk of pancreatitis tracks with the worldwide obesity epidemic and increasing rates of gallstones. Approximately 80% of patients admitted with acute pancreatitis have mild, self-limited disease and are discharged within several days. Mortality associated with acute pancreatitis has decreased over time,² and the overall mortality is now approximately 2%. Death is more likely in certain subgroups of patients, including the elderly, those with more numerous and more severe coexisting conditions (particularly obesity),^{16,17} those in whom hospital-acquired infections develop,²⁴ and those with severe episodes of acute pancreatitis (characterized by persistent failure of one or more organ systems or infected pancreatic necrosis).

DIAGNOSIS AND CLASSIFICATION

Accurate diagnosis of acute pancreatitis requires at least two of the following three diagnostic features²⁵: abdominal pain consistent with acute pancreatitis, serum lipase or amylase levels that are at least 3 times the upper limit of the normal

range, and findings of acute pancreatitis on cross-sectional imaging (computed tomography [CT] or magnetic resonance imaging). Patients with vague abdominal symptoms and a minimally increased serum amylase or lipase level should not receive a diagnosis of acute (or chronic) pancreatitis. Cross-sectional imaging is invaluable in confirming an initial diagnostic impression, in assessing patients for other conditions that might mimic acute pancreatitis, and in evaluating patients with atypical symptoms or small elevations in serum pancreatic enzyme levels.

According to a recent international consensus (see the Supplementary Appendix, available with the full text of this article at NEJM.org), the classifications of moderately severe pancreatitis and severe pancreatitis are defined by the presence of complications that are systemic, local, or both. Systemic complications include failure of an organ system (respiratory, cardiovascular, or renal) and exacerbation of a preexisting disorder (e.g., chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, heart failure, or chronic liver disease). Local complications comprise peripancreatic fluid collections or pseudocysts and pancreatic or peripancreatic necrosis, whether sterile or infected.²⁵ In this classification system, persistent failure of an organ system (i.e., lasting more than 48 hours) is the prime determinant of a poor outcome. The overall mortality is approximately 2%, but it approaches 30% among patients with persistent failure of an organ system. According to another classification system, the presence of both persistent organ failure and infected pancreatic necrosis ("critical" pancreatitis) is associated with the highest mortality (see the Supplementary Appendix).²⁶

By providing standardized definitions and descriptions of severity, as well as radiographic features, these classification systems for acute pancreatitis have value in clinical research. However, they do not provide methods for predicting severity.

PREDICTION OF SEVERITY

Knowing which patient will have severe pancreatitis could allow earlier triage to an intermediate care or intensive care unit and earlier initiation of effective therapy. Prediction of severity has been accomplished through careful observation by an experienced clinician, with symptoms,

signs, and the results of routine laboratory and radiographic testing taken into account. This process largely allows the identification of severe pancreatitis as it develops. A host of predictors, including clinical and laboratory markers and various scoring systems, have been developed to improve clinical judgment.

Clinical factors that increase the risk of complications or death among patients with acute pancreatitis include advanced age (≥ 60 years), numerous and severe coexisting conditions (a score of ≥ 2 on the Charlson comorbidity index [a weighted sum of diseases according to the codes of the International Classification of Diseases, 10th revision, with higher scores indicating a greater disease burden]), obesity (a body-mass index of >30 [calculated as the weight in kilograms divided by the square of the height in meters]), and long-term, heavy alcohol use.² A variety of laboratory measures have also been studied, primarily measures of intravascular volume depletion due to third-space losses (i.e., the leakage of fluid from the intravascular spaces and into the interstitial spaces), such as hemoconcentration and azotemia, or markers of inflammation (e.g., elevated levels of C-reactive protein and interleukins 6, 8, and 10). Several of these measures have reasonable predictive value for severe acute pancreatitis. The most useful predictors are elevated blood urea nitrogen and creatinine levels and an elevated hematocrit, particularly if they do not return to the normal range with fluid resuscitation.^{27,28} The degree of elevation of the serum amylase or lipase level has no prognostic value.

A number of predictive systems use CT findings, but CT evidence of severe acute pancreatitis lags behind clinical findings, and an early CT study can underestimate the severity of the disorder. Several scoring systems have been developed to incorporate clinical, radiographic, and laboratory findings in various combinations: Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation II (APACHE II), APACHE combined with scoring for obesity (APACHE-O), the Glasgow scoring system, the Harmless Acute Pancreatitis Score (HAPS), PANC 3, the Japanese Severity Score (JSS), Pancreatitis Outcome Prediction (POP), and the Bedside Index for Severity in Acute Pancreatitis (BISAP).²⁹ These scoring systems all have a high false positive rate (i.e., in many patients with high scores, severe pancreatitis does not

develop), which is an unavoidable consequence of the fact that in most patients, severe disease does not develop. The scoring systems are complex and cumbersome and not routinely used.


These scoring systems cannot replace ongoing evaluation by an experienced clinician. A few points are worth emphasizing for incorporation into clinical decisions. The presence of the systemic inflammatory response syndrome (SIRS) is usually obvious, although it may not be recognized. SIRS can be diagnosed on the basis of four routine clinical measurements, with findings of two or more of the following values: temperature, below 36°C or above 38°C; pulse, greater than 90 beats per minute; respiratory rate, greater than 20 breaths per minute (or partial pressure of arterial carbon dioxide, <32 mm Hg); and white-cell count, lower than 4000 or higher than 12,000 per cubic millimeter. SIRS that persists for 48 hours or more after the onset of symptoms is indicative of a poor prognosis. Recent guidelines^{27,28} recommend using demographic and clinical factors at admission (advanced age, high body-mass index, and coexisting conditions), simple laboratory values at admission and during the next 24 to 48 hours (hematocrit, $>44\%$; blood urea nitrogen level, >20 mg per deciliter [7 mmol per liter]; or creatinine level, >1.8 mg per deciliter [$159 \mu\text{mol}$ per liter]), and the presence of SIRS to identify patients who are at greatest risk for severe disease and most likely to benefit from a high-intensity nursing unit. During the first 48 to 72 hours, a rising hematocrit or blood urea nitrogen or creatinine level, persistent SIRS after adequate fluid resuscitation, or the presence of pancreatic or peripancreatic necrosis on cross-sectional imaging constitutes evidence of evolving severe pancreatitis.³⁰

MANAGEMENT OF ACUTE PANCREATITIS

The essential requirements for the management of acute pancreatitis are accurate diagnosis, appropriate triage, high-quality supportive care, monitoring for and treatment of complications, and prevention of relapse (Fig. 1).

FLUID RESUSCITATION

Substantial third-space loss and intravascular volume depletion are the basis for many of the negative predictive features of acute pancreatitis



(hemoconcentration and azotemia).^{27–30} On the basis of retrospective studies suggesting that aggressive fluid administration during the first 24 hours reduces morbidity and mortality,^{31,32} current guidelines provide directions for early and vigorous fluid administration.^{27,28}

Vigorous fluid therapy is most important during the first 12 to 24 hours after the onset of symptoms and is of little value after 24 hours. Administration of a balanced crystalloid solution has been recommended at a rate of 200 to 500 ml per hour, or 5 to 10 ml per kilogram of

body weight per hour, which usually amounts to 2500 to 4000 ml within the first 24 hours.^{27,28} One trial suggested the superiority of Ringer's lactate as compared with normal saline in reducing inflammatory markers.³³ Clinical cardiopulmonary monitoring for fluid status, hourly measurement of urine output, and monitoring of the blood urea nitrogen level and hematocrit are practical ways to gauge the adequacy of fluid therapy.

The main, and not inconsequential, risk of fluid therapy is volume overload. Excessive fluid administration results in increased risks of the abdominal compartment syndrome, sepsis, need for intubation, and death.^{34,35} Fluid therapy needs to be tailored to the degree of intravascular volume depletion and the cardiopulmonary reserve that is available to handle the fluid. All recommendations regarding fluid resuscitation in patients with acute pancreatitis are based largely on expert opinion. Randomized trials are needed to address the type of fluid, the rate of administration, and the goals of therapy.³⁶ In the interim, it seems prudent to provide the aggressive regimen of fluid therapy outlined above, as tolerated, in the first 24 hours of illness.

FEEDING

Total parenteral nutrition is now known to be more expensive, riskier, and no more effective than enteral nutrition in patients with acute pancreatitis.^{27,28,37,38} In patients with mild acute pancreatitis who do not have organ failure or necrosis, there is no need for complete resolution of pain or normalization of pancreatic enzyme levels before oral feeding is started.³⁹ A low-fat soft or solid diet is safe and associated with shorter hospital stays than is a clear-liquid diet with slow advancement to solid foods.^{40,41} Most patients with mild acute pancreatitis can be started on a low-fat diet soon after admission, in the absence of severe pain, nausea, vomiting, and ileus (all of which are unusual in mild cases of acute pancreatitis).

A need for artificial enteral feeding may be predicted by day 5, on the basis of symptoms that continue to be severe or an inability to tolerate attempts at oral feeding. Although nasojejunal tube feeding is best for minimizing pancreatic secretion, randomized trials and a meta-analysis⁴² have shown that nasogastric or nasoduodenal feeding is clinically equivalent. Simple tube feeding has replaced total parenteral nutrition and feeding through complex, deeply placed intesti-

nal tubes. Whether an elemental or semielemental formula is superior to a polymeric formula is not known.

Total parenteral nutrition should be reserved for the rare cases in which enteral nutrition is not tolerated or nutritional goals are not met. Unfortunately, total parenteral nutrition continues to be used frequently in patients with acute pancreatitis.

Early initiation of nasoenteric feeding (within 24 hours after admission) is not superior to a strategy of attempting an oral diet at 72 hours, with tube feeding only if oral feeding is not tolerated over the ensuing 2 to 3 days.⁴³ Even patients predicted to have severe or necrotizing pancreatitis do not benefit from very early initiation of enteral nutrition through a tube. Oral feeding can usually be initiated when symptoms improve, with an interval of 3 to 5 days before tube feeding is considered. In patients who cannot tolerate oral feeding after this time, tube feeding can be initiated with the use of a standard nasoduodenal feeding (Dobhoff) tube and a standard polymeric formula.

ANTIBIOTIC THERAPY

Although the development of infected pancreatic necrosis confers a significant risk of death, well-designed trials^{44,45} and meta-analyses^{46,47} have shown no benefit of prophylactic antibiotics. Prophylaxis with antibiotic therapy is not recommended for any type of acute pancreatitis unless infection is suspected or has been confirmed (Fig. 1).^{27,28} Nonetheless, many patients continue to receive prophylactic antibiotics despite guidelines to the contrary.^{48,49}

ENDOSCOPIC THERAPY

ERCP is used primarily in patients with gallstone pancreatitis and is indicated in those who have evidence of cholangitis superimposed on gallstone pancreatitis. This procedure is also a reasonable treatment in patients with documented choledocholithiasis on imaging or findings strongly suggestive of a persistent bile duct stone (e.g., jaundice, a progressive rise in the results of liver biochemical studies, or a persistently dilated bile duct). ERCP is not beneficial in the absence of these features, in mild cases of acute gallstone pancreatitis, or as a diagnostic test before cholecystectomy.^{27,28,50} Endoscopic ultrasonography is used as a platform for minimally invasive treatment of a pancreatic pseudocyst or walled-off pancreatic necrosis (discussed below).

TREATMENT OF FLUID COLLECTIONS AND NECROSIS

Acute peripancreatic fluid collections (see the Supplementary Appendix) do not require therapy. Symptomatic pseudocysts are managed primarily with the use of endoscopic techniques,^{51,52} depending on local expertise.

Necrotizing pancreatitis includes pancreatic gland necrosis and peripancreatic fat necrosis.^{25,27,28,53} In the initial phases, the necrotic collection is a mix of semisolid and solid tissue. Over a period of 4 weeks or longer, the collection becomes more liquid and becomes encapsulated by a visible wall. At this point, the process is termed walled-off pancreatic necrosis.²⁵ Sterile necrosis does not require therapy except in the rare case of a collection that obstructs a nearby viscus (e.g., duodenal, bile duct, or gastric obstruction).

The development of infection in the necrotic collection is the main indication for therapy. Such infections are rare in the first 2 weeks of the illness. The infection is usually monomicrobial and can involve gram-negative rods, enterobacter species, or gram-positive organisms, including staphylococcus. Drug-resistant organisms are increasingly prevalent. The development of fever, leukocytosis, and increasing abdominal pain suggests infection of the necrotic tissue. A CT scan may reveal evidence of air bubbles in the necrotic cavity.

Therapy begins with the initiation of broad-spectrum antibiotics that penetrate the necrotic tissue. Aspiration and culture of the collection are not required. In current practice, efforts are made to delay any invasive intervention for at least 4 weeks to allow for walling off of the necrotic collection — that is, demarcation of the boundary between necrotic and healthy tissue, softening and liquefaction of the contents, and formation of a mature wall around the collection. This delay makes drainage and débridement easier and reduces the risk of complications or death.⁵⁴ Delayed intervention is possible in most patients whose condition remains reasonably stable, without the development of a progressive sepsis syndrome. In patients whose condition is not stable, the initial placement of a percutaneous drain in the collection is often enough to reduce sepsis and allow the 4-week delay to be continued.

Nearly 60% of patients with necrotizing pancreatitis can be treated noninvasively and will have a low risk of death.^{54,55} For patients in whom

infected necrosis develops, a step-up approach with a delay in definitive treatment is now standard. The step-up approach consists of antibiotic administration, percutaneous drainage as needed, and after a delay of several weeks, minimally invasive débridement, if required. This approach is superior to traditional open necrosectomy with respect to the risk of major complications or death,⁵⁶ and approximately one third of patients treated with this approach will not require débridement. A number of minimally invasive techniques (e.g., percutaneous, endoscopic, laparoscopic, and retroperitoneal approaches^{56,57}) are available to débride infected necrotic tissue in patients with walled-off pancreatic necrosis. A small proportion of patients with infected necrosis can be treated with antibiotics alone.^{57,58}

**LONG-TERM CONSEQUENCES
OF ACUTE PANCREATITIS**

After acute pancreatitis, pancreatic exocrine and endocrine dysfunction develops in approximately 20 to 30% of patients and clear-cut chronic pancreatitis develops in one third to one half of those patients.^{2,59,60} Risk factors for the transition to recurrent attacks and chronic pancreatitis include the severity of the initial attack, the degree of pancreatic necrosis, and the cause of acute pancreatitis. In particular, long-term, heavy alcohol use as the cause and smoking as a cofactor dramatically increase the risk of a transition to chronic pancreatitis and reinforce the need for strong efforts to encourage abstinence.

PREVENTION OF RELAPSE

Cholecystectomy prevents recurrent gallstone pancreatitis. A delay of cholecystectomy for more than a few weeks places the patient at a high (up to 30%) risk for relapse.^{61,62} Cholecystectomy performed during the initial hospitalization for mild pancreatitis due to gallstones reduces the rate of subsequent gallstone-related complications by almost 75%, as compared with cholecystectomy performed 25 to 30 days after discharge.⁶³ For patients with severe or necrotizing pancreatitis, cholecystectomy may be delayed in order to address other clinically significant conditions or provide time for the pancreatic inflammation to diminish, allowing for better operative exposure. For patients who are not considered to be candi-

dates for surgery, endoscopic biliary sphincterotomy will reduce (but not eliminate) the risk of recurrent biliary pancreatitis but may not reduce the risk of subsequent acute cholecystitis and biliary colic.⁶⁴

Patients with alcohol-associated acute pancreatitis who continue to drink alcohol have a high risk of recurrent pancreatitis and, ultimately, chronic pancreatitis.^{2,65,66} Half of such patients have a recurrence; the risk is markedly lower for those who are abstinent.⁶⁶ A structured, consistent intervention to encourage abstinence is effective at preventing relapse⁶⁷ but is often not used. Interventions directed at smoking cessation are also effective preventive measures, since both alcohol and smoking are common risk factors for pancreatitis.

Implicating a specific drug as a cause of acute pancreatitis is difficult, often incorrect, and potentially dangerous if the role of another drug is overlooked.¹¹ In the absence of any alternative causes, withdrawing an implicated medication may prevent relapse.

Tight control of hyperlipidemia can prevent a relapse of pancreatitis caused by hypertriglyceridemia.^{68,69} Serum triglyceride levels will fall in the absence of oral intake of food and fluids. Thus, if it is unclear whether hyperlipidemia caused the acute attack, repeated measurements of blood triglyceride levels after discharge, while the patient is on a stable oral diet, can be informative.

Primary prevention of pancreatitis is possible

only in the case of pancreatitis caused by ERCP. ERCP should be avoided in patients who are not likely to benefit from it (e.g., those with suspected sphincter of Oddi dysfunction).³ Preventive therapies can be used in patients at high risk for post-ERCP pancreatitis on the basis of demographic, clinical, or procedural factors.⁷⁰ Two moderately effective therapies are now available: temporary placement of pancreatic duct stents⁷¹ and pharmacologic prophylaxis with nonsteroidal antiinflammatory drugs⁷² (Table 1).

CONCLUSIONS

Acute pancreatitis is an increasingly common clinical problem. New approaches to fluid resuscitation, antibiotic use, nutritional support, and treatment of necrosis have changed management but have not yet been widely adopted. More effective prevention of post-ERCP pancreatitis is possible, and gallstone pancreatitis can be prevented with timely cholecystectomy. The management of acute pancreatitis should continue to improve, as new consensus definitions help to guide clinical research and, even more important, as large clinical consortia collaborate on randomized trials.

Dr. Swaroop Vege reports receiving consulting fees from Calci Medica, Takeda, Bharat Serums and Vaccines, and Teva and fees for educational activities for residents and fellows from BCH Mumbai. No other potential conflict of interest relevant to this article was reported.

Disclosure forms provided by the authors are available with the full text of this article at NEJM.org.

REFERENCES

1. Yadav D, Lowenfels AB. Trends in the epidemiology of the first attack of acute pancreatitis: a systematic review. *Pancreas* 2006;33:323-30.
2. Yadav D, Lowenfels AB. The epidemiology of pancreatitis and pancreatic cancer. *Gastroenterology* 2013;144:1252-61.
3. Cotton PB, Durkalski V, Romagnuolo J, et al. Effect of endoscopic sphincterotomy for suspected sphincter of Oddi dysfunction on pain-related disability following cholecystectomy: the EPISOD randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 2014;311:2101-9.
4. Bertin C, Pelletier AL, Vullierme MP, et al. Pancreas divisum is not a cause of pancreatitis by itself but acts as a partner of genetic mutations. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2012;107:311-7.
5. DiMagno MJ, Dimagno EP. Pancreas divisum does not cause pancreatitis, but associates with CFTR mutations. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2012;107:318-20.
6. Coté GA, Imperiale TF, Schmidt SE, et al. Similar efficacies of biliary, with or without pancreatic, sphincterotomy in treatment of idiopathic recurrent acute pancreatitis. *Gastroenterology* 2012;143(6):1502-1509.e1.
7. Coté GA, Yadav D, Slivka A, et al. Alcohol and smoking as risk factors in an epidemiology study of patients with chronic pancreatitis. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2011;9:266-73.
8. Whitcomb DC, LaRusch J, Krasinskas AM, et al. Common genetic variants in the CLDN2 and PRSS1-PRSS2 loci alter risk for alcohol-related and sporadic pancreatitis. *Nat Genet* 2012;44:1349-54.
9. Apte MV, Pirola RC, Wilson JS. Mechanisms of alcoholic pancreatitis. *J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2010;25:1816-26.
10. Phillip V, Huber W, Hagemes F, et al. Incidence of acute pancreatitis does not increase during Oktoberfest, but is higher than previously described in Germany. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2011;9(11):995-1000.e3.
11. Nitsche C, Maertin S, Scheiber J, Ritter CA, Lerch MM, Mayerle J. Drug-induced pancreatitis. *Curr Gastroenterol Rep* 2012;14:131-8.
12. Forsmark CE. Incretins, diabetes, pancreatitis and pancreatic cancer: what the GI specialist needs to know. *Pancreatol* 2016;16:10-3.
13. Bertilsson S, Kalaitzakis E. Acute pancreatitis and use of pancreatitis-associated drugs: a 10-year population-based cohort study. *Pancreas* 2015;44:1096-104.
14. Whitcomb DC. Genetic risk factors for pancreatic disorders. *Gastroenterology* 2013;144:1292-302.
15. Sadr-Azodi O, Orsini N, Andrén-Sandberg Å, Wolk A. Abdominal and total adiposity and the risk of acute pancreatitis: a population-based prospective

- cohort study. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2013;108:133-9.
16. Hong S, Qiwen B, Ying J, Wei A, Chao-yang T. Body mass index and the risk and prognosis of acute pancreatitis: a meta-analysis. *Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2011;23:1136-43.
 17. Krishna SG, Hinton A, Oza V, et al. Morbid obesity is associated with adverse clinical outcomes in acute pancreatitis: a propensity-matched study. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2015;110:1608-19.
 18. Andersen DK, Andren-Sandberg A, Duell EJ, et al. Pancreatitis-diabetes-pancreatic cancer: summary of an NIDDK-NCI workshop. *Pancreas* 2013;42:1227-37.
 19. Peery AF, Crockett SD, Barritt AS, et al. Burden of gastrointestinal, liver, and pancreatic diseases in the United States. *Gastroenterology* 2015;149(7):1731-41.e1.
 20. Hazra N, Gulliford M. Evaluating pancreatitis in primary care: a population-based cohort study. *Br J Gen Pract* 2014;64(622):e295-301.
 21. Spanier B, Bruno MJ, Dijkgraaf MG. Incidence and mortality of acute and chronic pancreatitis in the Netherlands: a nationwide record-linked cohort study for the years 1995-2005. *World J Gastroenterol* 2013;19:3018-26.
 22. Lindkvist B, Appelros S, Manjer J, Borgström A. Trends in incidence of acute pancreatitis in a Swedish population: is there really an increase? *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2004;2:831-7.
 23. Pant C, Deshpande A, Olyae M, et al. Epidemiology of acute pancreatitis in hospitalized children in the United States from 2000-2009. *PLoS One* 2014;9(5):e95552.
 24. Wu BU, Johannes RS, Kurtz S, Banks PA. The impact of hospital-acquired infection on outcome in acute pancreatitis. *Gastroenterology* 2008;135:816-20.
 25. Banks PA, Bollen TL, Dervenis C, et al. Classification of acute pancreatitis — 2012: revision of the Atlanta classification and definitions by international consensus. *Gut* 2013;62:102-11.
 26. Dellinger EP, Forsmark CE, Lacer P, et al. Determinant-based classification of acute pancreatitis severity: an international multidisciplinary consultation. *Ann Surg* 2012;256:875-80.
 27. Tenner S, Baillie J, DeWitt J, Vege SS. American College of Gastroenterology guideline: management of acute pancreatitis. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2013;108:1400-15.
 28. Working Group IAP/APA Acute Pancreatitis Guidelines. IAP/APA evidence-based guidelines for the management of acute pancreatitis. *Pancreatol* 2013;13: Suppl 2:e1-15.
 29. Mounzer R, Langmead CJ, Wu BU, et al. Comparison of existing clinical scoring systems to predict persistent organ failure in patients with acute pancreatitis. *Gastroenterology* 2012;142:1476-82.
 30. Yang CJ, Chen J, Phillips AR, Windsor JA, Petrov MS. Predictors of severe and critical acute pancreatitis: a systematic review. *Dig Liver Dis* 2014;46:446-51.
 31. Gardner TB, Vege SS, Chari ST, et al. Faster rate of initial fluid resuscitation in severe acute pancreatitis diminishes in-hospital mortality. *Pancreatol* 2009;9:770-6.
 32. Gardner TB, Vege SS, Pearson RK, Chari ST. Fluid resuscitation in acute pancreatitis. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2008;6:1070-6.
 33. Wu BU, Hwang JQ, Gardner TH, et al. Lactated Ringer's solution reduces systemic inflammation compared with saline in patients with acute pancreatitis. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2011;9(8):710-717.e1.
 34. Mole DJ, Hall A, McKeown D, Garden OJ, Parks RW. Detailed fluid resuscitation profiles in patients with severe acute pancreatitis. *HPB (Oxford)* 2011;13:51-8.
 35. Mao EQ, Tang YQ, Fei J, et al. Fluid therapy for severe acute pancreatitis in acute response stage. *Chin Med J (Engl)* 2009;122:169-73.
 36. Haydock MD, Mittal A, Wilms HR, Phillips A, Petrov MS, Windsor JA. Fluid therapy in acute pancreatitis: anybody's guess. *Ann Surg* 2013;257:182-8.
 37. Al-Omran M, Albalawi ZH, Tashkandi MF, Al-Ansary LA. Enteral versus parenteral nutrition for acute pancreatitis. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2010;1:CD002837.
 38. Yi F, Ge L, Zhao J, et al. Meta-analysis: total parenteral nutrition versus total enteral nutrition in predicted severe acute pancreatitis. *Intern Med* 2012;51:523-30.
 39. Eckerwall GE, Tingstedt BB, Bergenstam PE, Andersson RG. Immediate oral feeding in patients with mild acute pancreatitis is safe and may accelerate recovery — a randomized clinical study. *Clin Nutr* 2007;26:758-63.
 40. Jacobson BC, Vander Vliet MB, Hughes MD, Maurer R, McManus K, Banks PA. A prospective, randomized trial of clear liquids versus low-fat solid diet as the initial meal in mild acute pancreatitis. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2007;5:946-51.
 41. Teich N, Aghdassi A, Fischer J, et al. Optimal timing of oral refeeding in mild acute pancreatitis: results of an open randomized multicenter trial. *Pancreas* 2010;39:1088-92.
 42. Chang YS, Fu HQ, Xiao YM, Liu JC. Nasogastric or nasojejunal feeding in predicted severe acute pancreatitis: a meta-analysis. *Crit Care* 2013;17:R118.
 43. Bakker OJ, van Brunschot S, van Santvoort HC, et al. Early versus on-demand nasoenteric tube feeding in acute pancreatitis. *N Engl J Med* 2014;371:1983-93.
 44. Isenmann R, Rünzi M, Kron M, et al. Prophylactic antibiotic treatment in patients with predicted severe acute pancreatitis: a placebo-controlled, double-blind trial. *Gastroenterology* 2004;126:997-1004.
 45. Dellinger EP, Tellado JM, Soto NE, et al. Early antibiotic treatment for severe acute necrotizing pancreatitis: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study. *Ann Surg* 2007;245:674-83.
 46. Lim CL, Lee W, Liew YX, Tang SS, Chlebicki MP, Kwa AL. Role of antibiotic prophylaxis in necrotizing pancreatitis: a meta-analysis. *J Gastrointest Surg* 2015;19:480-91.
 47. Villatoro E, Mulla M, Larvin M. Antibiotic therapy for prophylaxis against infection of pancreatic necrosis in acute pancreatitis. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2010;5:CD002941.
 48. Vlada AC, Schmit B, Perry A, Trevino JG, Behrns KE, Hughes SJ. Failure to follow evidence-based best practice guidelines in the treatment of severe acute pancreatitis. *HPB (Oxford)* 2013;15:822-7.
 49. Sun E, Tharakan M, Kapoor S, et al. Poor compliance with ACG guidelines for nutrition and antibiotics in the management of acute pancreatitis: a North American survey of gastrointestinal specialists and primary care physicians. *JOP* 2013;14:221-7.
 50. 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:CD009779.
 51. Varadarajulu S, Bang JY, Sutton BS, Trevino JM, Christein JD, Wilcox CM. Equal efficacy of endoscopic and surgical cystogastrostomy for pancreatic pseudocyst drainage in a randomized trial. *Gastroenterology* 2013;145(3):583-90.e1.
 52. Law R, Baron TH. Endoscopic management of pancreatic pseudocysts and necrosis. *Expert Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2015;9:167-75.
 53. Bakker OJ, van Santvoort H, Besselink MG, et al. Extrapaneatic necrosis without pancreatic parenchymal necrosis: a separate entity in necrotizing pancreatitis? *Gut* 2013;62:1475-80.
 54. van Santvoort HC, Bakker OJ, Bollen TL, et al. A conservative and minimally invasive approach to necrotizing pancreatitis improves outcome. *Gastroenterology* 2011;141:1254-63.
 55. Freeman ML, Werner J, van Santvoort HC, et al. Interventions for necrotizing pancreatitis: summary of a multidisciplinary consensus conference. *Pancreas* 2012;41:1176-94.
 56. van Santvoort HC, Besselink MG, Bakker OJ, et al. A step-up approach or open necrosectomy for necrotizing pancreatitis. *N Engl J Med* 2010;362:1491-502.
 57. Bakker OJ, van Santvoort HC, van Brunschot S, et al. Endoscopic transgastric vs surgical necrosectomy for infected necrotizing pancreatitis: a randomized trial. *JAMA* 2012;307:1053-61.
 58. Mouli VP, Sreenivas V, Garg PK. Efficacy of conservative treatment, without necrosectomy, for infected pancreatic necro-

- sis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Gastroenterology* 2013;144(2):333-340.e2.
59. Yadav D, Lee E, Papachristou GI, O'Connell M. A population-based evaluation of readmissions after first hospitalization for acute pancreatitis. *Pancreas* 2014;43:630-7.
60. Sankaran SJ, Xiao AY, Wu LM, Windsor JA, Forsmark CE, Petrov MS. Frequency of progression from acute to chronic pancreatitis and risk factors: a meta-analysis. *Gastroenterology* 2015;149(6):1490-1500.e1.
61. Gurusamy KS, Nagendran M, Davidson BR. Early versus delayed laparoscopic cholecystectomy for acute gallstone pancreatitis. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2013; 9:CD010326.
62. van Baal MC, Besselink MG, Bakker OJ, et al. Timing of cholecystectomy after mild biliary pancreatitis: a systematic review. *Ann Surg* 2012;255:860-6.
63. da Costa DW, Bouwense SA, Schepers NJ, et al. Same-admission versus interval cholecystectomy for mild gallstone pancreatitis (PONCHO): a multicentre randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2015;386: 1261-8.
64. McAlister VC, Davenport E, Renouf E. Cholecystectomy deferral in patients with endoscopic sphincterotomy. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2007;4:CD006233.
65. Sand J, Lankisch PG, Nordback I. Alcohol consumption in patients with acute or chronic pancreatitis. *Pancreatology* 2007; 7:147-56.
66. Pelli H, Lappalainen-Lehto R, Piironen A, Sand J, Nordback I. Risk factors for recurrent acute alcohol-associated pancreatitis: a prospective analysis. *Scand J Gastroenterol* 2008;43:614-21.
67. Nordback I, Pelli H, Lappalainen-Lehto R, Järvinen S, Rätty S, Sand J. The recurrence of acute alcohol-associated pancreatitis can be reduced: a randomized controlled trial. *Gastroenterology* 2009;136: 848-55.
68. Valdivielso P, Ramírez-Bueno A, Ewald N. Current knowledge of hypertriglyceridemic pancreatitis. *Eur J Intern Med* 2014; 25:689-94.
69. Yadav D, Pitchumoni CS. Issues in hyperlipidemic pancreatitis. *J Clin Gastroenterol* 2003;36:54-62.
70. Ding X, Zhang F, Wang Y. Risk factors for post-ERCP pancreatitis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Surgeon* 2015; 13:218-29.
71. Mazaki T, Mado K, Masuda H, Shiono M. Prophylactic pancreatic stent placement and post-ERCP pancreatitis: an updated meta-analysis. *J Gastroenterol* 2014;49:343-55.
72. Elmunzer BJ, Scheiman JM, Lehman GA, et al. A randomized trial of rectal indomethacin to prevent post-ERCP pancreatitis. *N Engl J Med* 2012;366:1414-22.

Copyright © 2016 Massachusetts Medical Society.

Supplemental Information

In 2013, an updated revision to the original 1992 “Atlanta” Classification for acute pancreatitis was published, the result of an iterative web-based consultative process (1). In addition to defining acute pancreatitis, the classification system defined two overlapping phases of acute pancreatitis, defined the severity of acute pancreatitis, and clarified the definitions of the variety of pancreatic and peripancreatic complications that can occur.

The early phase of acute pancreatitis, lasting up to 2 weeks, was felt to be characterized by the host response to pancreatitis with the development of the systemic inflammatory response syndrome (SIRS) and organ system failure. Organ failure was to be measured utilizing the Marshall scoring system (Supplemental Table 1).

A later phase, lasting weeks or longer, was characterized by persisting organ failure and by the development of sterile or infected pancreatic necrosis. The revised classification categorized severity into three groups, based upon the presence or absence of local and systemic complications. Systemic complications were defined as organ system failure (respiratory, cardiovascular, or renal) or an exacerbation of a preexisting comorbidity (such as chronic COPD, heart failure, or chronic liver disease). Organ system failure was defined as a score of 2 or more on the modified Marshall scoring system, with increasing points given for increasing levels of organ dysfunction (e.g. serum creatinine, need for supplemental oxygen, hypotension, acidosis). Transient organ system failure was defined as lasting less than 48 hours, while persistent organ failure lasts > 48 hours. Of note, the system does not further grade severity based on the degree of persistent organ failure (i.e. higher modified Marshall score), and as such persistent single organ system failure and multiple organ system failure are considered together.

Local (i.e. pancreatic and peripancreatic) complications were more specifically defined, in particular the radiographic appearance of these complications. Interstitial pancreatitis is defined as pancreatic swelling and peripancreatic fluid visible on a contrast enhanced CT scan (CECT), but the entire gland enhances with intravenous contrast. Necrotizing pancreatic is defined by the lack of intravenous contrast enhancement in portions of the pancreas, or in the surrounding peripancreatic tissues. Additional definitions of local complications include acute peripancreatic fluid collection, pancreatic pseudocyst, acute necrotic collection, and walled-off necrosis, based on their timing, the contents of the collection, and the presence or absence of a surrounding wall of granulation tissue visible on CECT or other cross sectional imaging (Supplemental Table 2). In addition, pancreatic pseudocysts or walled-off necrosis may be classified as either sterile or infected.

Mild acute pancreatitis consists of no organ failure and no local or systemic complications. Moderately severe acute pancreatitis is defined as transient organ failure resolving within 48 hours and/or local or other systemic complications.

Severe acute pancreatitis is defined as persistent organ failure lasting more than 48 hours (either single or multiple organ system failure). Pancreatic necrosis may occur without organ system failure, although the reverse is rare. Both retrospective and prospective studies have validated this updated Atlanta Classification, demonstrating that it accurately reflects clinical outcomes. Although they comprise a minority of patients, mortality in those with persistent organ system failure approaches 30% (2,3).

While the Atlanta Classification consists of three severity groups, a four-group classification termed the Determinate Based Classification has also been proposed. In addition to the mild, moderate and severe groups, a fourth group termed critical is also included (4). The newly introduced critical group includes patients with both persistent organ failure and infected pancreatic necrosis, representing a group with higher mortality than either separately (Supplemental Table 3). Prospective studies have also shown this determinate based classification to be predictive, and comparable in predicting outcome to the revised Atlanta Classification (2,5). The advantage of the Determinate-Based System is a more nuanced assessment of severity, the disadvantage is that very few patients end up in this critical group.

These systems to define severity have their greatest value in clinical research, in comparing outcomes of therapeutic interventions across studies. They also have value in providing standardized definitions and descriptions, particularly of radiographic findings in acute pancreatitis. The radiographic definitions have clinical consequences. One common clinical mistake has been to label walled off necrosis as a pseudocyst. The liquid contents of a pseudocyst are easily drained through a variety of minimally invasive techniques. Walled off necrosis requires more aggressive interventions and an appreciation of the location, age and contents of the collection. Mistaking these two entities has led to numerous clinical errors, mainly in placing percutaneous tubes into walled off necrosis and assuming that alone would provide effective therapy. In addition, interventions for recognized infected pancreatic necrosis were often done early in the clinical course with open debridement, and an appreciation of the imaging characteristics of walled off necrosis allow delay to occur until the collection is amenable to more minimally invasive approaches.

It should be noted that an early CT scan may underestimate the degree of necrosis, and a CT scan early after onset of symptoms is not necessary for diagnosis. The presence of necrosis becomes most apparent 72 hours after onset of symptoms. Early CT can be considered in those in whom there is diagnostic uncertainty. A CT scan with intravenous contrast at 72-96 hours is best able to document the presence of pancreatic necrosis. CT scans are also appropriate when there is unexplained deterioration in a patient. MRI can be useful, particularly when a pancreatic or peripancreatic collection is identified on CT and it is not clear if this represents a pseudocyst or walled-off necrosis.

For those readers with interest, two recent guidelines are available for review of more detailed and in depth discussion (6,7).

References

1. Banks PA, Bollen TL, Dervenis C, Gooszen HG, Johnson CD, Sarr MG, Tsiotos GG, Vege SS, Acute Pancreatitis Classification Working Group. Classification of acute pancreatitis – 2012: Revision of the Atlanta classification and definitions by international consensus. *Gut* 2013;62:102-111.
2. Yang CJ, Chen J, Phillips AR, Windsor JA, Petrov MS. Predictors of severe and critical acute pancreatitis: a systematic review. *Dig Liver Dis* 2014;46:446-51.
3. Petrov MS, Shanbag S, Chakraborty M, Phillips AR, Windsor JA. Organ failure and infection of pancreatic necrosis as determinants of mortality in patients with acute pancreatitis. *Gastroenterology* 2010;139:813-20.
4. Dellinger EP, Forsmark CE, Layer P, Levy P, Maravi-Poma E, Petrov MS, Shimosegawa T, Siriwardena AK, Uomo G, Whitcomb DC, Windsor JA: Pancreatitis Across Nations Clinical Research and Education Alliance (PANCREA). Determinant-based classification of acute pancreatitis severity: an international multidisciplinary consultation. *Ann Surg* 2012;256:875-80.
5. Nawaz H, Mounzer R, Yadav D, Yabes JG, Slivka A, Whitcomb DC, Papachristou GI. Revised Atlanta and Determinant-based classification: Application in a prospective cohort of acute pancreatitis patients. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2013;108:1911-1917.
6. 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;108:1400-15;1416.
7. Working Group IAP/APA Acute Pancreatitis Guidelines. IAP/APA evidence-based guidelines for the management of acute pancreatitis. *Pancreatology* 2013;13(4 Suppl 2):e1-15.

Supplemental Table 1
Modified Marshall Score for organ failure

Organ System	Score				
	0	1	2	3	4
Respiratory (PaO ₂ /FiO ₂)	>400	301-400	201-300	101-200	<101
Renal (serum creatinine mg/dL)	<1.4	1.4-1.8	1.9-3.6	3.6-4.9	>4.9
Cardiovascular (systolic BP mm Hg- off inotropic support)	>90	<90, fluid responsive	<90, not fluid responsive	<90, pH<7.3	<90, pH,7.2

For non-intubated patients, the FiO₂ can be estimated:

Supplemental oxygen (l/min)	FiO ₂ (%)
Room air	21
2	25
4	30
6-8	40
9-10	50

A score of 2 or more is defined as organ system failure. In those with pre-existing renal failure, the extent of deterioration in renal function is utilized as an estimate.

From Banks PA, Bollen TL, Devenis C et al. Classification of acute pancreatitis- 2012: revision of the Atlanta classification and definitions by international consensus. Gut 2013;62:102-11.

Supplemental Table 2

Local Complication	Location	Timing	Contents	CECT Imaging Findings	Comments
Acute Peripancreatic Fluid Collection	Outside confines of pancreas but not across tissue planes, often tracking into peripancreatic spaces and retroperitoneum along fascial planes	Occur early in the course of acute pancreatitis	Fluid only	Amorphous collections of fluid in the retroperitoneum, often tracking to kidneys and gutters. There is no visible wall surrounding the collection, and the contents are homogeneous and of fluid density	The definition requires there is no associated pancreatic or peri-pancreatic necrosis, so this is only seen in interstitial pancreatitis. These are common, and usually resolve spontaneously over several weeks
Pancreatic pseudocyst	Outside confines of pancreas	Takes several weeks to develop a visible capsule	Fluid only	Well-circumscribed, low-density collections with a visible capsule of granulation tissue. The contents are homogeneous and of fluid density, without solid components	Rare as this evolves from acute peri-pancreatic fluid collections that usually resolve. Treatment is only indicated if it produces symptoms or complications. This might include pain, obstruction of a surrounding viscus, infection, or bleeding.
Acute Necrotic Collection	Within and/or outside the confines of the pancreas, may involve both pancreas and peripancreatic fat	Occurs early, but not usually apparent on CT until 3-5 days after disease onset	Solid and liquid	Amorphous, high density material replacing sections of pancreas or peripancreatic fat. Contents are heterogeneous and of non-liquid density and	Only in the setting of necrotizing pancreatitis. May be associated with organ failure. No specific therapy

				extend across tissue planes.	indicated.
Walled off necrosis	Within and or outside the confines of pancreas, may involve both pancreas and peripancreatic fat	The wall of granulation tissue usually requires 4 weeks to form	Solid and liquid	Heterogeneous mixed solid and liquid material surrounded by a visible wall of granulation tissue	Therapy may be indicated for ongoing severe symptoms or complications (infection)

From Banks PA, Bollen TL, Devenis C et al. Classification of acute pancreatitis- 2012: revision of the Atlanta classification and definitions by international consensus. Gut 2013;62:102-11.

Supplemental Table 3

System		Mild	Moderate	Severe	Critical
Atlanta 2012	Local Complications	No	Yes <i>and/or</i>	N/A	N/A
	Organ Failure	No	Transient	Persistent	N/A
Determinate-Based Classification	Pancreatic or peripancreatic necrosis	No	Sterile <i>and/or</i>	Infected <i>or</i>	Infected <i>and</i>
	Organ Failure	No	Transient	Persistent	Persistent

From:

Banks PA, Bollen TL, Devenis C et al. Classification of acute pancreatitis- 2012: revision of the Atlanta classification and definitions by international consensus. Gut 2013;62:102-11 and

Dellinger EP, Forsmark CE, Layer P, Levy P, Maravi-Poma E, Petrov MS, et al. Determinate-based classification of acute pancreatitis severity: an international multidisciplinary consultation. Ann Surg 2012;256:875-80.