#### Esophageal manometry

L-T2\*\*\*\*1794 2019/12/24 Patient name: Investigation date: Gender: Female Investigation nr: 01 Date of birth: Hospital: ?????? Patient number: Investigator: Height: Referred by: Weight:

# Average of 10: Wet swallow 5 ml

# Chicago classification3 \*

#### Ineffective esophageal motility

\* The normal values and analysis are according to the Chicago Classification³ as published in Neurogastroenterology & Motility, 2015, Vol. 27, Issue 2, p160-174. The classification is valid for adults and based on series of 10 swallows of 5 ml water each, swallowed in a supine posture. The Chicago Classification is only applicable for primary esophageal motility disorders. The actual diagnosis remains under all circumstances the responsibility of the clinician/physician.

#### Esophagus

DCI 197 mmHg.s.cm **CFV** <-100 cm/s Peristaltic breaks 11.2 cm 10.4 cm Largest break Distal Latency 7.7 s

# UES

Upper border 16.3 cm IRP 0.2 s 3.2 mmHg IRP 0.8 s 5.6 mmHg

### LES

41.9 cm Upper border IRP 4 s 2.4 mmHg Intraabdominal length 2.2 cm

#### Scoring parameter percentages<sup>3</sup>

Scoring		Intrabolus pressure pattern	
Normal	20 %	Normal	0 %
Ineffective	80 %	EGJ	0 %
Failed contraction	60 %	Compartmentalized	0 %
Premature	0 %	Panesophageal	0 %
Hyper	0 %	Unknown pressurization	100 %
Fragmented	0 %		

#### Average esophagus results

Wet swallow 5 ml	DCI	CFV	Peristaltic breaks	Distal Latency
	mmHg.s.cm	cm/s	cm	S
1	0	2.8	18.0	6.2
2	416	3.3	2.8	9.6
3	6	2.8	15.5	10.4
4	0	2.8	16.6	4.2
5	619	5.7	2.5	8.6
6	0	2.8	16.8	5.3
7	703	3.9	1.6	7.6
8	1	2.8	14.7	6.7
9	228	<-100	3.4	10.9
10	0	2.8	20.3	7.6
Average	197	<-100	11.2	7.7

#### Patient number:

#### Average UES results

Wet swallow 5 ml	Upper border	IRP 0.2 s	IRP 0.8 s
	cm	mmHg	mmHg
1	16.3	2.8	4.4
2	16.3	4.1	6.7
3	16.3	-1.5	4.8
4	16.3	3.7	4.9
5	16.3	5.5	6.7
6	16.3	1.3	5.5
7	16.3	4.2	6.5
8	16.3	4.6	5.8
9	16.3	3.7	5.1
10	16.3	3.7	5.1
Average	16.3	3.2	5.6

Average LES results				
Wet swallow 5 ml	Upper border	IRP 4 s	Intraabdominal length	
	cm	mmHg	cm	
1	41.9	3.1	2.2	
2	41.9	4.5	2.2	
3	41.9	2.7	2.2	
4	41.9	1.8	2.2	
5	41.9	3.1	2.2	
6	41.9	0.8	2.2	
7	41.9	2.8	2.2	
8	41.9	1.6	2.2	
9	41.9	2.2	2.2	
10	41.9	1.5	2.2	
Average	41.9	2.4	2.2	

# Average of 5: leg--Wet swallow

# Chicago classification3 \*

Ineffective esophageal motility

\* The normal values and analysis are according to the Chicago Classification<sup>3</sup> as published in Neurogastroenterology & Motility, 2015, Vol. 27, Issue 2, p160-174. The classification is valid for adults and based on series of 10 swallows of 5 ml water each, swallowed in a supine posture. The Chicago Classification is only applicable for primary esophageal motility disorders. The actual diagnosis remains under all circumstances the

responsibility of the clinician/physician.	
Esophagus	
DCI	349 mmHg.s.cm
CFV	4.3 cm/s
Peristaltic breaks	8.5 cm
Largest break	8.4 cm
Distal Latency	8.2 s
LES	
Upper border	41.9 cm

0.1 mmHg

2.2 cm

16.3 cm
1.0 mmHg
2
3.2 mmHg

# Patient number:

Scoring parameter percentages <sup>3</sup>				
Scoring		Intrabolus pressure pattern		
Normal	40 %	Normal	0 %	
Ineffective	60 %	EGJ	0 %	

IRP 4 s

Intraabdominal length

Failed contraction	60 %	Compartmentalized	0 %
Premature	0 %	Panesophageal	0 %
Hyper	0 %	Unknown pressurization	100 %
Fragmented	0 %		

Average esophagus results				
legWet swallow	DCI	CFV	Peristaltic breaks	Distal Latency
	mmHg.s.cm	cm/s	cm	S
1	652	4.9	1.1	8.2
2	5	2.8	12.2	10.6
3	61	6.0	12.9	4.9
4	1028	4.9	0.0	9.9
5	0	2.8	16.5	7.2
Average	349	4.3	8.5	8.2

Average UES results					
legWet swallow	Upper border	IRP 0.2 s	IRP 0.8 s		
	cm	mmHg	mmHg		
1	16.3	-3.0	0.3		
2	16.3	0.9	2.2		
3	16.3	0.8	2.5		
4	16.3	5.3	6.6		
5	16.3	0.9	4.2		
Average	16.3	1.0	3.2		

Average LES results					
legWet swallow	Upper border	IRP 4 s	Intraabdominal length		
	cm	mmHg	cm		
1	41.9	1.7	2.2		
2	41.9	0.2	2.2		
3	41.9	-0.1	2.2		
4	41.9	-0.5	2.2		
5	41.9	-1.1	2.2		
Average	41.9	0.1	2.2		

#### Patient number:

		•	_		_	$\sim$
Λ	verage	Ωŧ.	•	n.	ΛU	٠.
_	VELAVE			ıν		

# Chicago classification<sup>3</sup> \*

Ineffective esophageal motility

\* The normal values and analysis are according to the Chicago Classification³ as published in Neurogastroenterology & Motility, 2015, Vol. 27, Issue 2, p160-174. The classification is valid for adults and based on series of 10 swallows of 5 ml water each, swallowed in a supine posture. The Chicago Classification is only applicable for primary esophageal motility disorders. The actual diagnosis remains under all circumstances the responsibility of the clinician/physician.

Esophagus
-----------

DCI	59 mmHg.s.cm
CFV	3.1 cm/s
Peristaltic breaks	10.0 cm
Largest break	7.2 cm
Distal Latency	12.5 s

UES

LES

Upper border16.3 cmUpper border41.9 cmIRP 0.2 s0.0 mmHgIRP 4 s2.7 mmHgIRP 0.8 s2.8 mmHgIntraabdominal length2.2 cm

Scoring parameter percentages <sup>3</sup>			
Scoring	Intrabolus pressure pattern		
Normal	0 % Normal 0 %		
Ineffective 10	0 % EGJ 0 %		
Failed contraction 8	0 % Compartmentalized 0 %		
Premature	0 % Panesophageal 0 %		
Hyper	0 % Unknown pressurization 100 %		

Fragmented 0 %

Average esophagus results				
MRS	DCI	CFV	Peristaltic breaks	Distal Latency
	mmHg.s.cm	cm/s	cm	S
1	0	2.8	14.5	8.1
2	0	2.8	8.1	8.6
3	293	4.4	1.9	18.3
4	0	2.8	16.6	6.2
5	0	2.8	8.7	21.4
Average	59	3.1	10.0	12.5

Average UES results			
MRS	Upper border	IRP 0.2 s	IRP 0.8 s
	cm	mmHg	mmHg
1	16.3	0.9	4.0
2	16.3	-2.6	1.2
3	16.3	2.6	4.4
4	16.3	-1.9	1.6
5	16.3	0.8	2.8
Average	16.3	0.0	2.8

# Patient number:

Average LES results			
MRS	Upper border	IRP 4 s	Intraabdominal length
	cm	mmHg	cm
1	41.9	3.2	2.2
2	41.9	2.9	2.2
3	41.9	1.4	2.2
4	41.9	3.7	2.2
5	41.9	2.2	2.2
Average	41.9	2.7	2.2

Resting pressure #1		
	Scoring	
	Hiatal hernia	No
	UES resting pressure	Hypotensive
	LES resting pressure	Normal

UES		LES	
Upper border Resting pressure (mean) Resting pressure (minimal)	16.3 cm 32.9 mmHg 21.3 mmHg	Upper border Resting pressure (mean) Resting pressure (minimal) EGJ-CI	41.9 cm 21.5 mmHg 1.1 mmHg 35 mmHg.cm
Attending physician		Investigator	

#### Disclaimer<sup>3</sup>:

The normal values and analysis are according to the Chicago Classification<sup>3</sup> as published in Neurogastroenterology & Motility, 2015, Vol. 27, Issue 2, p160-174. The classification is valid for adults and based on series of 10 swallows of 5 ml water each, swallowed in a supine posture. The Chicago Classification is only applicable for primary esophageal motility disorders. The actual diagnosis remains under all circumstances the responsibility of the clinician/physician.

The analysis is based on:

IRP Normal upper limit

19.0 mmHg

MMS Water-perfused