

# Cost effectiveness, safety and efficiency of using a cannulatome versus a cannula for initial cannulation at endoscopic retro-grade cholangiopancreatography (ERCP) in suspected choledocolithiasis

<b>Submission date</b> 30/09/2004	<b>Recruitment status</b> No longer recruiting	<input type="checkbox"/> Prospectively registered <input type="checkbox"/> Protocol
<b>Registration date</b> 30/09/2004	<b>Overall study status</b> Completed	<input type="checkbox"/> Statistical analysis plan <input type="checkbox"/> Results
<b>Last Edited</b> 15/04/2015	<b>Condition category</b> Digestive System	<input type="checkbox"/> Individual participant data <input type="checkbox"/> Record updated in last year

**Plain English summary of protocol**  
Not provided at time of registration

## Contact information

**Type(s)**  
Scientific

**Contact name**  
Dr A S Mee

**Contact details**  
Gastroenterology Department  
Royal Berkshire & Battle Hospitals NHS Trust  
London Road  
Reading  
United Kingdom  
RG1 5AN

## Additional identifiers

**EudraCT/CTIS number**

**IRAS number**

**ClinicalTrials.gov number**

## Secondary identifying numbers

N0199129927

# Study information

## Scientific Title

Cost effectiveness, safety and efficiency of using a cannulatome versus a cannula for initial cannulation at endoscopic retro-grade cholangiopancreatography (ERCP) in suspected choledocolithiasis

## Study objectives

Is the initial use of a cannulatome more cost effective than the initial use of a diagnostic cannula in patients with suspected choledocolithiasis?

## Ethics approval required

Old ethics approval format

## Ethics approval(s)

Not provided at time of registration

## Study design

Single centre randomised controlled trial

## Primary study design

Interventional

## Secondary study design

Randomised controlled trial

## Study setting(s)

Hospital

## Study type(s)

Diagnostic

## Participant information sheet

## Health condition(s) or problem(s) studied

Digestive System: Choledocholithiasis

## Interventions

Cannulatome vs diagnostic cannula

## Intervention Type

Other

## Phase

Not Specified

## Primary outcome measure

Success of cannulation, time to cannulation and sphincterotomy and complication rates

**Secondary outcome measures**

Not provided at time of registration

**Overall study start date**

11/06/2003

**Completion date**

27/02/2006

## **Eligibility**

**Key inclusion criteria**

50 patients who require endoscopic retro-grade cholangiopancreatography (ERCP) for suspected choledocolithiasis

**Participant type(s)**

Patient

**Age group**

Not Specified

**Sex**

Not Specified

**Target number of participants**

50

**Key exclusion criteria**

Not provided at time of registration

**Date of first enrolment**

11/06/2003

**Date of final enrolment**

27/02/2006

## **Locations**

**Countries of recruitment**

England

United Kingdom

**Study participating centre**

Royal Berkshire & Battle Hospitals NHS Trust  
Reading

United Kingdom  
RG1 5AN

## Sponsor information

### Organisation

Department of Health

### Sponsor details

Richmond House  
79 Whitehall  
London  
United Kingdom  
SW1A 2NL

### Sponsor type

Government

### Website

<http://www.dh.gov.uk/Home/fs/en>

## Funder(s)

### Funder type

Government

### Funder Name

Royal Berkshire and Battle Hospitals NHS Trust (UK)

## Results and Publications

### Publication and dissemination plan

Not provided at time of registration

### Intention to publish date

### Individual participant data (IPD) sharing plan

### IPD sharing plan summary

Not provided at time of registration