		Count (20 Pts)	%
PV dilatation	Yes	9	45.0%
	No	11	55.0%
PV thrombosis	Yes	5	25.0%
	No	15	75.0%

Table (1): Descriptive table showing	distribution of the	e studied patients	regarding their PV
patency and diameter.			

 Table (2):
 Correlation between PV diameter and sites of portosystemic collaterals in the studied patients.

		PV dilatation									
			Ye	S		No			P value		
	Mean	SD	Median	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD	Median	Minimum	Maximum	
Sites of collateral by CT	4.00	.8 7	4.00	3.00	5.00	6.00	1.05	6.00	4.00	8.00	.0009

 Table (3):
 Distribution of all studied patients regarding other portal hypertension radiological criteria and common associations.

	Patients (20)		
Findings	Number	%	
Cirrhosis	17	85%	
HFL	2	10%	
HCC	1	5%	
Splenomegaly	14	70%	
Ascites	18	90%	
PV thrombosis	5	25%	

systemic conditions.				
Type of detected collaterals	Frequenc (n=20 Patie	Frequency (n=20 Patients)		
	Number	%		
Perisplenic	14	70%		
Periumbilical	11	55%		
Splenorenal	9	45%		
Esophageal	8	40%		
Anterior abdominal wall	8	40%		
Perigastric	7	35%		
Portahepatic	5	25%		
Rectal	1	5%		

Table (4)Distribution of the studied patients regarding frequency of the detected porto-
systemic collaterals.

Table (5) : Distribution of the collaterals regarding the portal vein patency.

	Portal vein dilatation	Portal vein thrombosis
Percentage of cases of collaterals	80 %	20 %
Frequent site of collaterals	Perisplenic	Portahepatic

Table (6): Grading of the studied patients who have esophageal varices by CT.

	Count (20Pts)	%
Ι	13	65%
II	1	5%
III	3	15%
IV	3	15%

Table (7): Grading of the studied patients who have esophageal varices by endoscopy .

	Count (20Pts)	%
I (Negative for varices)	13	65%
II	4	20%
III	1	5%
IV	2	10%

Table (8): Grading	of the studied	patients who have	gastric varices	by CT.
--------------------	----------------	-------------------	-----------------	--------

	Count (20Pts)	%
Ι	15	75%
II	1	5%
III	3	15%
IV	1	5%

Table (9): Grading of the studied patients who have gastric varices by endoscopy.

	Count (20Pts)	%
I (Negative for varices)	15	75%
II	3	15%
III	1	5%
IV	1	5%

 Table (10) : CT sensitivity & specificity in esophageal varices compared to endoscopy.

Statistic	Value
Sensitivity	100.00%
Specificity	82 %

Table (11) : CT sensitivity & specificity in gastric varices compared to endoscopy

Statistic	Value
Sensitivity	100.00%
Specificity	89 %