

Clinical and Technical Guideline for Endoscopic Ultrasound (EUS)-Guided Tissue Acquisition of Pancreatic Solid Tumor: Korean Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (KSGE).

Title: Clinical and Technical Guideline for Endoscopic Ultrasound (EUS)-Guided Tissue Acquisition of Pancreatic Solid Tumor: Korean Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (KSGE).

Publication year: 2021

Journal: Gut and liver

Authors: Division of Gastroenterology, Department of Internal Medicine, Severance Hospital, Yonsei University College of Medicine, Seoul, Korea.

Society: European Respiratory Society

Origin country: International (Europe)

Target countries: Europe

DOI: 10.5009/gnl20302

PMID: 33767027

Source: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33767027/>

Gut Liver Gut Liver 1213 gutliver 101316452 Gut and Liver 1976-2283 2005-1212 Editorial Office of Gut and Liver PMC8129669 PMC8129669.1 8129669 8129669 33767027 10.5009/gnl20302 gnl-15-3-354 1 Review Article Clinical and Technical Guideline for Endoscopic Ultrasound (EUS)-Guided Tissue Acquisition of Pancreatic Solid Tumor: Korean Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (KSGE) <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5920-8549> Chung Moon Jae 1 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1603-7468> Park Se Woo 2 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7592-8060> Kim Seong-Hun 3 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9903-1282> Cho Chang Min 4 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8792-6249> Choi Jun-Ho 5 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6376-1849> Choi Eun Kwang 6 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1826-5643> Lee Tae Hoon 7 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5668-1907> Cho Eunae 8 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2694-3598> Lee Jun Kyu 9 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6156-8746> Song Tae Jun 10 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0325-8712> Lee Jae Min 11 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9807-8962> Son Jun Hyuk 12 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8011-1995> Park Jin Suk 13 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4382-5876> Oh Chi Hyuk 14 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7225-3152> Park Dong-Ah 15 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9793-6379> Byeon Jeong-Sik 10 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0758-1923> Lee Soo Teik 3 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3365-1662> Kim Ho Gak 16 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5539-361X> Chun Hoon Jai 11 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3746-8742> Choi Ho Soon 17 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9581-2655> Park Chan Guk 18 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7182-5806> Cho Joo Young 19 1 Division of Gastroenterology, Department of Internal Medicine, Severance Hospital, Yonsei University College of Medicine, Seoul, Korea 2 Division of Gastroenterology, Department of Internal Medicine, Hallym University College of Medicine, Hwaseong, Korea 3 Department of Internal Medicine, Research Institute of Clinical Medicine of Jeonbuk National University-Biomedical Research Institute of Jeonbuk National University Hospital, Jeonju, Korea 4 Department of Internal Medicine, School of Medicine, Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea 5 Division of Gastroenterology, Department of Internal Medicine, Dankook University College of Medicine, Cheonan, Korea 6 Division of Gastroenterology, Department of Internal Medicine, Jeju National University College of Medicine, Jeju, Korea 7 Division of Gastroenterology, Department of Internal Medicine, Soonchunhyang University College of Medicine, Cheonan, Korea 8 Division of Gastroenterology, Department of Internal Medicine, Chonnam National University College of Medicine, Gwangju, Korea 9 Division of Gastroenterology, Department of Internal Medicine, Dongguk University College of Medicine, Goyang, Korea 10 Division of Gastroenterology, Department of Internal Medicine, University of Ulsan College of Medicine, Seoul, Korea 11 Division of Gastroenterology, Department of Internal Medicine, Korea University College of Medicine, Seoul, Korea 12 Division of

Gastroenterology, Department of Internal Medicine, Inje University College of Medicine, Busan, Korea 13 Division of Gastroenterology, Department of Internal Medicine, Inha University College of Medicine, Incheon, Korea 14 Division of Gastroenterology, Department of Internal Medicine, Kyung Hee University College of Medicine, Seoul, Korea 15 Division of Healthcare Technology Assessment Research, Office of Health Technology Assessment Research, National Evidence-Based Healthcare Collaborating Agency, Seoul, Korea 16 Division of Gastroenterology, Department of Internal Medicine, Daegu Catholic University School of Medicine, Daegu, Korea 17 Division of Gastroenterology, Department of Internal Medicine, Hanyang University College of Medicine, Seoul, Korea 18 Division of Gastroenterology, Department of Internal Medicine, Chosun University College of Medicine, Gwangju, Korea 19 Division of Gastroenterology, Department of Internal Medicine, Cha University College of Medicine, Seongnam, Korea Corresponding Author Se Woo Park, ORCID <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1603-7468>, E-mail britnepak@hallym.or.kr 15 5 2021 26 3 2021 15 3 382035 354 374 5 10 2020 13 12 2020 15 1 2021 26 03 2021 24 05 2021 25 05 2021 Copyright © Gut and Liver. 2021 <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/> This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>) which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. Endoscopic ultrasound (EUS)-guided tissue acquisition of pancreatic solid tumor requires a strict recommendation for its proper use in clinical practice because of its technical difficulty and invasiveness. The Korean Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (KSGE) appointed a task force to draft clinical practice guidelines for EUS-guided tissue acquisition of pancreatic solid tumor. The strength of recommendation and the level of evidence for each statement were graded according to the Minds Handbook for Clinical Practice Guideline Development 2014. The committee, comprising a development panel of 16 endosonographers and an expert on guideline development methodology, developed 12 evidence-based recommendations in eight categories intended to help physicians make evidence-based clinical judgments with regard to the diagnosis of pancreatic solid tumor. This clinical practice guideline discusses EUS-guided sampling in pancreatic solid tumor and makes recommendations on circumstances that warrant its use, technical issues related to maximizing the diagnostic yield (e.g., needle type, needle diameter, adequate number of needle passes, sample obtaining techniques, and methods of specimen processing), adverse events of EUS-guided tissue acquisition, and learning-related issues. This guideline was reviewed by external experts and suggests best practices recommended based on the evidence available at the time of preparation. This guideline may not be applicable for all clinical situations and should be interpreted in light of specific situations and the availability of resources. It will be revised as necessary to cover progress and changes in technology and evidence from clinical practice. (Gut Liver 2021;15:-374)

Endoscopic ultrasound (EUS)-guided fine-needle aspiration (FNA) plays an essential role in the establishment of an accurate tissue diagnosis and tailored treatment plan for pancreatic solid tumors, and is associated with few major adverse events. 1 Diagnosis based on EUS-FNA has relatively high but widely variable sensitivity and specificity (75% to 92% and 82% to 100%, respectively), with a diagnostic accuracy and adverse events rate ranging from 70% to 100% and from 0% to 3%, respectively. 2 - 4 With the recent introduction of EUS-guided fine needle biopsy (FNB), histological analysis now allows for the differential diagnosis of various pancreatic solid tumors. In the current personalized medicine era, it is becoming increasingly essential to obtain optimal histologic core for molecular analysis. 5 Despite these advances in tissue acquisition of pancreatic solid tumors, many aspects still require clinical and technical standardization. This clinical and technical practice guideline for EUS-guided tissue acquisition of pancreatic solid tumor includes recommendations on circumstances that warrant its use, the technique for obtaining the highest possible yield, sample processing method, adverse events related to the procedure, and the learning curve of the average trainee.

Our purpose was to establish a practical guideline for EUS-guided tissue acquisition that applies to the current medical practice. The target for this guideline includes patients with pancreatic solid tumor requiring tissue diagnostic confirmation. We aimed to provide a suitable framework for making decisions regarding the appropriate and accurate diagnosis for preoperative evaluation and

postoperative management of patients with pancreatic solid tumors. The target audience for this guideline includes clinicians who perform EUS-guided tissue acquisition ranging from general clinicians to physicians that specialize in pancreatology, clinical researchers, and health policymakers involved in the diagnosis and treatment of pancreatic solid tumors. A summary of the evidence statement and recommendations is provided at the end of this paper.

The Korean Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (KSGE) Task Force on Guideline for EUS-guided tissue acquisition of pancreatic solid tumor comprised a development panel of 16 endosonographers, who were experts in this field, and an expert in methodology for guideline development. Conflicts of interest were disclosed according to the guideline of the KSGE. During the development of this guideline, no members of the Task Force were solicited or asked about the development activities by other stakeholders. There was also an internal evaluation panel within members of the committee comprising six gastroenterologists, one pathologist, and one statistician in charge of methodology for guideline development. Six external validation panel members were also asked to conduct a full evaluation (Table 1). Then, the guidelines were evaluated and validated by a wide range of additional external experts, including the epidemiologist, health care provider, clinical physicians, and surgeons.

The members of the committee set up the following eight items: indication of EUS-guided tissue acquisition of pancreatic solid tumor; selection of the appropriate needle; the optimal number of needle passes; strategy for inadequate or inconclusive pathological results; specific endoscopic techniques; methods of specimen processing; adverse events and their prevention; and learning-related issues. Because the definition of pancreatic solid tumor and the significance of diagnosing pancreatic solid tumor by image modalities represents the major premise on which this guideline is formulated, we did not handle this item as a statement. Therefore, key questions (KQs) were prepared for the other eight items, and modifications were made based on opinions of the internal evaluation panel such that there were 12 statements in total. The KQs were established through the PICO process; P (population) represents patients with pancreatic solid tumors; I (intervention) represents main therapeutic interventions including EUS-guided tissue acquisition; C (comparison) represents main alternative therapeutic interventions to compare with the interventions; and O (outcome) represents the usefulness of diagnostic performance.

For each KQ, a systematic literature search was conducted until December 2017 using PubMed and the Cochrane database. A detailed description of keywords and search formulas were given for each statement. In addition, a manual search was conducted when there were insufficient research results to refer to. The literature search was performed by members of the team of experts for clinical practice guideline development who suggested search queries and presented search results in collaboration with the committee members. We searched the Cochrane Library, EMBASE, KoreaMed, MEDLINE, and the Guideline International Network in July 2019. Keywords related to the pancreatic solid tumor (("pancreatic" OR "pancreas" OR "pancreato") AND ("cancer" OR "tumor" OR "carcinoma" OR "adenocarcinoma" OR "neoplasm")), and endoscopic ultrasound (EUS)-guided tissue acquisition (("endoscopic ultrasound" OR "EUS" OR "Echoendoscopic") AND ("aspiration" OR "biopsy" OR "histologic" OR "pathologic" OR "cytologic")) were used. Different keywords or different combinations of keywords were also used based on each KQ.

The exclusion criteria were as follows: (1) studies not involving human subjects or the target populations of the guideline's KQs; (2) studies that did not perform an intervention related to the KQs and intervention for comparison; (3) studies that were case reports, unpublished studies, abstract-only publications, or review articles; (4) studies that were published in a language other than English; and (5) the original full-text could not be found. In the first stage of study selection, duplicate studies were removed. For each KQ, titles and abstracts of articles returned from our keyword search were examined independently by two assigned committee members to exclude irrelevant articles. The entire contents of all selected full-texts were then screened as per our inclusion and exclusion criteria. 6 Two independent investigators for each KQ evaluated the studies for eligibility and resolved any disagreements through discussion and consensus. When no agreement could be reached, the team leader (S.W.P) of the corresponding sub-committee made

the final conclusion. Moreover, additional research was undertaken to identify extra studies through the references of the screened articles. The last date of updating our search was March 31, 2020.

Qualitative systematic reviews were conducted to evaluate the risk of biases and heterogeneity of each study. The domains of risk of bias included performance bias, selection bias, attrition bias, detection bias, and other biases. The revised Cochrane risk of bias tool was used to evaluate randomized controlled trials (RCTs), 6, 7 and the Newcastle-Ottawa assessment scale was used to evaluate nonrandomized studies. 6, 8 The Quality Assessment of Diagnostic Accuracy Studies (QUADAS)-2 tool was used for the study of diagnostic test accuracy. 9 The members of the committee determined the level of evidence for each study within their allocated field, and the strength of recommendation and level of evidence for each statement were determined according to the Minds Handbook for Clinical Practice Guideline Development 2014.

The strength of recommendations was graded with reference to (1) the quality of the evidence, (2) the homogeneity of the study population, (3) risks-benefits analysis, and (4) cost analysis. Regarding consensus establishment, a total of 12 committee members voted for each proposed statement according to the modified Delphi method, which uses a scoring system (sum of the score 1–2: non-consensus, 3: dissatisfaction, 4–5: consensus). The options were adopted as confirmative statements if any of the statements achieve a consensus of 2/3 agreement or higher as agree or agree strongly (as point 4 or 5). If the proposed statements had an agreement <2/3 among 12 committee members, either it had to be modified or the strength of recommendation had to be amended through discussion within the committee; subsequently, voting was repeated until a higher agreement above 2/3 was achieved. According to the sum of the score, the grading of recommendations was divided into two categories, “1: Strong Recommendations” and “2: Weak Recommendations,” which are described as “recommendations” and “suggestions,” respectively. 10, 11 Table 2 summarizes the recommendations with their grades of recommendation and levels of evidence.

For an internal review by the KSGE, a total of 34 members of the KSGE Steering Committee and 14 members from the Insurance Committee of KSGE reviewed the first draft using open questions and provided comments. The draft was revised according to the comments to ensure balance and completeness of the guideline. Furthermore, for an external review of the guideline, a modified e-Delphi mechanism process such as employing the online platform was then used for 11 expert panels to produce an evidence-based consensus. This consensus consisted of two main rounds of web-based voting, using a custom-built online voting platform scoring each using a 5-point scale with updated iterations of the statements and evaluative text based on feedback after each round. Following the first round of voting, the statements that achieved a consensus of 2/3 agreement or higher as agree or agree strongly (as point 4 or 5) were accepted as final statements and recommendations. The statements that did not achieve 2/3 were entered into the second round of voting after appropriate revision based on discussions during the e-Delphi mechanism process. The statements and recommendations that did not reach the 2/3 consensus agreement following two rounds of voting were removed.

For universal provision and distribution of the practical guideline, we plan to publish the guideline in *Clinical Endoscopy*, the *Korean Journal of Gastroenterology*, the *Korean Journal of Pancreas and Biliary Tract*, and *Gut and Liver*. We will also upload the guideline on the website of KSGE and submit it to the Korean Medical Guideline Information Center. Because the rapid distribution of this guideline to endosonographers through the databases is expected to be difficult, the KSGE will distribute the guideline for free via various routes including emails, and will actively promote it in academic conferences, seminars, and workshops. Current recommendations in the practical guideline are based on up to date research and will be revised regularly with new evidence related to technical and instrumental advances, with the KSGE Guideline Committee taking a key role.

It is not anticipated that treatment decisions will be made using this practical guideline without first considering the specific conditions of individual patients. Medical conditions such as demographic background, underlying comorbidities, clinical stage, and economic environment vary among

individuals. Furthermore, this guideline is not intended to establish an absolute diagnostic or therapeutic standard that physicians should use to manage patients in real clinical settings but aims to assist physicians in making evidence-based clinical judgments with regard to the diagnosis of pancreatic solid tumor. It is impossible for the guideline development committee to consider the specific conditions of each individual patient when formulating recommendations. Thus, this practical guideline should not be used to support legal judgments in the assessment of the appropriateness of individual medical practice.

It is essential that the indications for EUS-guided tissue acquisition can provide information on the potential treatment strategy of patients with pancreatic solid tumor. Furthermore, endoscopists should consider the technical feasibility in terms of the distance from the echoendoscope to the target lesion as well as blood vessel location during needle puncture. In some countries, tissue confirmation of specific cell types is mandatory before anti-tumor therapy such as chemotherapy or radiotherapy to ensure effective response as well as conformance with the policy of the country's national health insurance system. Recently, the European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ESGE) guidelines 12 on EUS-guided tissue acquisition attempted to establish some recommendations by reporting the suggested and accepted indications for this procedure. Generally, EUS-guided tissue acquisition provides high diagnostic accuracy (sensitivity and specificity, 85% to 89% and 96% to 99%, respectively, according to three meta-analyses 13 - 15) with a relatively low negative predictive value for the diagnosis of pancreatic malignancy, and is also associated with a very low incidence of adverse events, even in long-term adverse events such as tumor seeding. 16 Before this, tissue confirmation had not generally been recommended prior to curative resection for potentially resectable pancreatic tumors inoperable patients. Although the predominant cell type is adenocarcinoma, the differential diagnosis of a solid pancreatic tumor can include other definite malignant tumors such as lymphoma, squamous cell carcinoma, and neuroendocrine tumors, potentially the premalignant tumors such as a gastrointestinal stromal tumor, solid pseudopapillary tumor, other metastatic malignancies from kidney, colon, lung or other organs, and even benign lesions such as autoimmune pancreatitis and focal mass-forming chronic pancreatitis. Fig. 1 shows several EUS findings from solid pancreatic tumors other than the typical pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma. In addition, pancreatic tumor with cystic components such as intrapapillary mucinous neoplasm, mucinous cystadenoma, serous cystadenoma, and even simple cyst or pseudocyst has been estimated to account for approximately 6% of patients undergoing pancreatic resection. 17 Therefore, to minimize unnecessary surgeries, a pretreatment tissue confirmation is mandatory and recommended in most cases: (1) unresectable pancreatic tumor; (2) resectable/borderline resectable pancreatic tumor; (3) autoimmune pancreatitis or mass-forming chronic pancreatitis; or (4) neuroendocrine pancreatic tumors and other pancreatic tumors.

There are various types and diameters of needle used in EUS-guided tissue acquisition for solid pancreatic tumors in the market. Furthermore, a new type of needle specially designed to procure histologic core preserving intact histologic architecture for suitable pathological evaluation has been introduced recently. These devices, collectively called FNB needles, has the unique feature of a needle tip which has either a side-slot (core trap) or a special geometry of the cutting tip (Table 3). 18

EUS-guided tissue acquisition for cytopathologic evaluation through FNA or FNB using specially designed core needles has become a key technique in the diagnosis of solid pancreatic tumors. 19 Standard needles without these reinforcement geometries are here classified as FNA needles. Needles with a side port (EZ-Shot 3 with side port, Olympus) were classified as FNA needles because the side port of this needle system does not have a bevel design for cutting the tissue. 18 A recent network meta-analysis 19 consisting of 15 parallel trials and 12 cross-over studies demonstrated that traditional pairwise meta-analyses failed to report superiority in the diagnostic accuracy of any needle over another in a head-to-head comparison. In detail, there was no difference regarding the diagnostic accuracy between the 22-gauge FNB and FNA approach (relative risk [RR], 1.02; 95% confidence interval [CI], 0.97 to 1.08) or between the 25-gauge and 22-gauge FNA needle (RR, 1.03; 95% CI, 0.98 to 1.07). Furthermore, no differences were noted between the 22-gauge FNA and 19-gauge FNA needles (RR, 1.07; 95% CI, 0.78 to 1.46). In this

meta-analysis, no significant difference was reported between the two types of 22-gauge FNB needles (Fork-tip vs Franseen: RR, 0.96; 95% CI, 0.87 to 1.06). Similar to the results of direct meta-analyses, there was no significant difference in diagnostic accuracy between FNB and FNA needles, or 22-gauge and 25-gauge needles.

In regard to sample adequacy, 22-gauge FNB had significantly better sample adequacy than 25-gauge FNA (RR, 0.79; 95% CI, 0.68 to 0.92) in the direct meta-analysis, whereas 22-gauge FNA was more likely to obtain an adequate sample compared with 19-gauge FNA needles (RR, 1.13; 95% CI, 1.00 to 1.28). However, the results of network meta-analyses did not indicate that any of the tested needles were superior to another in terms of obtaining an adequate sample.

In regard to histologic core procurement rate, 25-gauge FNB had a significantly superior outcome than 25-gauge FNA (RR, 1.17; 95% CI, 1.00 to 1.36) according to a direct meta-analysis. 20 Furthermore, 22-gauge FNB was found to be superior to 25-gauge FNA (RR, 4.56; 95% CI, 2.49 to 8.35). In other direct comparisons, the histologic core procurement rate was comparable for different needles including the 22-gauge FNB and 22-gauge FNA needle (RR, 1.01; 95% CI, 0.89 to 1.15).

The optimal number of needle passes for accurate diagnosis of solid pancreatic tumors has been the subject of debate. The execution of more needle passes than necessary may cause potential procedure-related adverse events and also a longer procedure time. 21 In contrary to this, carrying out a suboptimal number of needle passes may increase the rate of false-negative results and lead to unnecessary expenses due to repeat interventions.

Per-pass analyses from recent prospective trials 21 - 25 have demonstrated that 3 to 4 passes with a standard FNA needle or 2 to 3 passes with an FNB needle with a reversed bevel system are required to establish optimal sampling for pancreatic solid tumors; this produces a sensitivity for malignancy of more than 90%. According to one recent study, the cumulative sensitivity is significantly inferior for tumors ≤ 2 cm than for tumors >2 cm, based on 4 passes with a standard FNA needle. More than 4 needle passes significantly improved the diagnostic sensitivity, even for smaller tumor sizes. 21 Recently, needle designs have markedly evolved to optimize the acquisition of histologic core in EUS-guided tissue acquisition (i.e., ProCore, Acquire and SharkCore needle). Several prospective comparative studies 21 - 25 between FNB and conventional FNA needles have revealed that fewer needle passes are required for diagnostic confirmation when using an FNB needle.

The Papanicolaou Society of Cytopathology developed a set of guidelines for standardized terminology and nomenclature of pancreatobiliary cytology specimens in 2014 (Table 4). 26 It emanates from expert opinions, a systematic review of the literature, international discussions among pathologists at several meetings during an 18 month, and synthesized conclusion from online conferences on the draft document on the Papanicolaou Society of Cytopathology web site (www.papsociety.org). Repeat EUS-guided tissue acquisition appears to be a reasonable option for an inconclusive pathologic result for suspected pancreatic malignancy. 27 , 28 Eloubeidi et al. 29 suggested the usefulness of repeat EUS-guided tissue acquisition for inconclusive index pathologic results. Among 24 (4.6%) patients who underwent repeat EUS-guided tissue acquisition, a true final diagnosis could be determined in 20 patients, with an accuracy of 84%. In another multicenter retrospective cohort study, 30 292 cases with adequate follow-up among a total of 4,522 EUS-FNA procedures were assigned to "atypical" or "suspicion of malignancy" categories. The proportion of malignancy in "atypical" and "suspicion of malignancy" categories were 79.2% and 96.3%, respectively. If the "suspicion of malignancy" category was defined as malignancy and the "atypical" category was defined as a benign disease, the positive predictive value was 96.3% (95% CI, 92.6 to 98.5), and the negative predictive value was 20.8% (95% CI, 13.4 to 30.0). Thus, the authors demonstrated that defining "suspicion of malignancy" categorized tumors as malignant optimizes the diagnostic sensitivity and specificity.

Furthermore, K-ras mutation analysis can be another useful option for differentiation of pancreatic mass lesions and may complement other diagnostic tools, especially when the results of EUS-FNA are inconclusive. In one meta-analysis, 31 the author reported that the estimated sensitivity and specificity of K-ras gene analysis alone were 76.8% and 93.3%, respectively, and those of combined EUS-FNA plus K-ras mutation analysis were 88.7% and 92%, respectively. Overall, applying K-ras mutation analysis to patients with inconclusive EUS-FNA results may reduce the false-negative rate to approximately 50%, the false-positive rate to approximately 10%, and the repeat-biopsy rate from 12.5% to 6.8%. Although K-ras mutation analysis can be useful for cases with inconclusive results and spare unnecessary repetition of EUS-guided tissue acquisition, it is not always commercially available in many centers and should be cautiously interpreted within the clinical context. 31

The diagnostic accuracy of EUS-guided tissue acquisition under ROSE is reported to be higher than 90% in most studies; 32 - 35 however, comparable results have also been reported from some trials without ROSE. In one recent meta-analysis, 36 authors found that there was no indication that the application of ROSE improved the diagnostic yield (risk difference [RD], 0.04; 95% CI, 0.05 to 0.13). Therefore, routine application of ROSE could not guarantee superior outcomes in clinical practice at tertiary care centers. In samples where the diagnosis was properly performed, and malignancy was defined as samples categorized as "highly suggestive" and "definitive malignancy," there was no significant difference in the rate of malignant diagnoses when ROSE was and was not applied (RD, 0.08; 95% CI, 0.09 to 0.25). Therefore, the results have shown that the application of ROSE does not provide superior outcomes in terms of the impact of ROSE on diagnostic performance. Furthermore, it has been reported that applying ROSE does not also have a beneficial effect on cellular yield. Thus, the above finding seems to be reasonable since a similar cellular yield should result in comparable diagnostic efficacy. 36

However, for a given sample adequacy rate and the number of needle passages, ROSE is expected to have higher per-case accuracy than sampling without ROSE. 37 In other words, trials with ROSE have demonstrated a higher per-case diagnostic accuracy than trials without ROSE. This suggests that the relationship between per-case diagnostic accuracy and needle passes depends on the use of ROSE.

Regarding sample adequacy, the pooled data from a recent meta-analysis 38 demonstrated that there were no significant differences between groups in which the stylet was or was not used, although one study 39 showed superior adequacy of the sample without the stylet. Furthermore, there were no differences in the cellularity between groups in which the stylet was or was not used despite the theoretical advantage of the stylet preventing blockage or contamination of the needle by the intestinal mucosa. 38 In one prospective RCT of 550 lesions in which the performance of EUS-FNA with or without a stylet was compared, Wani et al. 40 concluded that there was no significant difference between groups in which the stylet was or was not used in terms of sample cellularity. This lack of a significant difference among several studies may be attributed to heterogeneity in the cytopathologists' definitions of sample adequacy and cellularity, although predefined criteria were used to compare the cytopathologic characteristics of the specimens and the cytopathologists were blinded to the specimen procurement technique. Furthermore, there may have been intra- and inter-observer agreement variability among cytopathologists in the assessment of EUS-FNA specimens. Additionally, the use of a stylet did not change the contamination rate nor the frequency of bloody and/or inadequate samples despite the theory that using a stylet will prevent tissue from blocking the needle tip and/or contamination of the sample before entering the FNA target lesion. 39

Theoretically, the application of suction on the needle mount was a standard practice based on the understanding that negative pressure would increase cellularity. One RCT, 41 comparing EUS-FNA with and without suction, demonstrated that suction resulted in superior diagnostic outcomes in terms of higher sensitivity and lower blood contamination rates, although the proportion of pancreatic tumors in this study was less than 20% among the various included lesions. Another recent RCT, 42 comparing only pancreatic solid tumor samples acquired with and without suction,

found that the application of suction resulted in higher cellularity and sensitivity but also a higher blood contamination rate. Although the effectiveness of suction has been demonstrated in several trials, it can decrease the sample quality due to the increased blood contamination. Puri et al. 41 found that the suction technique to be also associated with an increased number of microscopic slides (17.8 ± 7.1 vs 10.2 ± 5.5 ; $p=0.001$) and higher blood-contamination rate when using a 22-gauge needle. Another study, 42 assessing the results of 324 samples from 81 patients, identified a significantly higher diagnostic yield (85.2% vs 75.9%; $p=0.004$), sensitivity (82.4% vs 72.1%; $p=0.005$), cellularity ($p<0.001$), and blood-contamination ($p<0.001$) in the suction group, with no significant differences in terms of specificity (96.8% vs 100%).

As an alternative to suction, the slow-pull-back technique was recently introduced for EUS-FNA or FNB of solid pancreatic lesions. 23 , 43 , 44 In contrast to standard suction techniques, this technique minimizes negative pressure by removing the stylet from the needle slowly and continuously. 45 In a recent RCT 46 comparing the slow-pull-back technique, standard negative-suction technique after stylet removal, and non-suction technique after stylet removal for EUS-FNB, the negative-suction technique had a higher blood contamination rate and did not increase the rate of core-tissue acquisition. The authors demonstrated that the slow-pull-back technique provided greater cellularity with less blood contamination compared with the other techniques, although there was no significant difference in the core-tissue diagnostic adequacy for malignancy between the groups. Furthermore, the slow-pull-back technique was associated with increased diagnostic accuracy. In another prospective study, 47 the slow-pull-back technique, compared to the standard suction technique, provided faster and more cost-effective results due to lower blood contamination and decreased the number of slides while guaranteeing comparable results in terms of diagnostic yield, cellularity, and sufficient histological samples.

Since its introduction in 2013, 24 the fanning technique has emerged as a standard technique for EUS-guided tissue acquisition of pancreatic solid tumors. This technique is based on the targeting of multiple areas within the mass during to-and-fro movements of the needle using the up/down knob of the endoscope on each needle pass. Bang et al. reported that the fanning technique required fewer passes than the standard technique for an accurate diagnosis; however, this trial failed to show a difference in diagnostic accuracy between the fanning and standard techniques (96.4% and 76.9%). Theoretically, the application of the fanning technique can increase the likelihood of achieving a true diagnosis under ROSE on the first pass, thereby reducing the risk of inconclusive results. Moreover, the fanning technique has no additional risk or financial costs. However, the evidence is limited to only one study by Bang et al. 24 that revealed some advantages with respect to the number of needle passes and achievement of a true diagnosis but failed to verify a significant impact of the technique on diagnostic outcomes.

Seeking another maneuver with equal or superior diagnostic outcomes as the fanning technique without its limitations, Park et al. 48 invented an alternative and similar technique called the “torque technique.” Torque is applied by twisting the body of the echoendoscope to the right (clockwise) or left (counter-clockwise) without using the left/right control knob. In that study, the authors demonstrated that the torque technique was significantly superior to the standard technique with respect to sensitivity and diagnostic accuracy. In addition, this technique had a superior procurement rate of histologic core tissue and more optimal histologic cores compared to the standard technique.

Diagnostic performance differs by cytologic or histologic sample preparations (smear, rapid cytology, LBC, cell block, and histology) and by staining methods. 49 Ideally, samples from solid pancreatic tumors should be examined by both histological and cytological evaluation.

Direct smear facilitates rapid staining and cytological diagnosis; thus, is an essential step in processing EUS-FNA specimens from pancreatic tumors. The assistant nurse places the stylet into the needle channel to extrude the aspirated sample onto the slide. Appropriate quantities of acquired sample material should be mounted on the slide for inspection of optical properties of the optimal specimen. Applying large quantities of the sample at once can lead to thick smears (with

cells obscured within clusters) or clotting artifacts, while watery or small quantities of sample do not smear well on the slide causing air-drying artifacts. 50 Insufficient sample quantities, which cannot pick up the whitish component, can be processed by the cytopspin method. In this method, the sample should first be immersed in saline and then centrifuged at 2,000–3,000 rpm for 2 to 3 minutes before being applied to the slide. 51 This technique involves separating the sample into multiple small aliquots as well as treatment with a hemolytic agent and mucus softener. This is favorable as it allows for optimal sample preparation with adequate cellularity and minimal artifacts.

When smear specimens are made using two slide glasses, usually one slide is prepared using the conventional air-dried method for rapid cytology with Diff-Quik, whereas the other slide is fixed in ethanol for later staining using Papanicolaou and hematoxylin and eosin stain. 52 Diff-Quik, a rapid version of Giemsa and Papanicolaou staining, allows for rapid cytological analysis in under a minute, even with watery samples containing an abundance of exfoliated cells. 50

Almost all false-negative cytologic results are due to errors in sampling, preparation of the sample, and interpretation of the sample. For this reason, LBC is an effective technique for sample preparation which can be manipulated automatically within only 2 to 4 minutes per sample after the acquisition of cytologic materials. 53 The results of comparisons between the diagnostic performance of LBC and smears for pancreatic cancer are conflicting. While Siddiqui et al. 54 found LBC to be superior (LBC vs smear; 91% vs 58%), Qin et al. 55 found the techniques to be similar (LBC vs smear; 73.3% vs 70%), and others found LBC to be inferior 56 - 58 (LBC vs smear; 61.7%–75.0% vs 91.6%–97.9%). However, there was a consensus that LBC specimens showed clearer backgrounds. LBC has the advantage of reducing false-negative results because it provides better specimen preservation, a clearer background with less mucin, necrotic material, and inflammatory cells, and higher cellularity, by reducing artifacts and extracellular elements compared with conventional smear cytology. Furthermore, prepared samples from LBC can be used for genetic analysis and IHC to provide further cytologic information.

The cell block is an effective technique that overcomes the disadvantages of conventional smear cytology and can lead to a definite diagnosis through IHC and molecular assays. Various cell block techniques have been developed over time: the traditional manual, involving rinsing the sample with 50% ethanol; the sodium alginate method, involving fixing the sample in 10% formalin and 1% sodium alginate; and the novel Cellient Automated Cell Block System (Hologic Inc). All methods involve embedding the collected cell pellets in paraffin and cutting thin 3 to 5 μ m sections before staining. 59 Sample prepared by cell block can be applied to IHC and specific molecular assays to differentiate between malignant and benign lesions and to determine tumor phenotypes. In one study 60 comparing the diagnostic abilities of the cell block and smear cytology using 33 pancreatic tumors or lymph node samples acquired through EUS-FNA, the cell block technique with IHC was superior to smear cytology in regard to sensitivity (92% vs 60%; $p=0.02$) and accuracy (94% vs 61%; $p=0.003$).

Recent technical and instrumental improvements in EUS-FNB for pancreatic solid tumors have enabled adequate histologic sampling, even using 22-gauge or 25-gauge needles. According to a recent network meta-analysis, 19 two RCTs reported that 25-gauge FNB was superior to 25-gauge FNA (RR, 1.17; 95% CI, 1.00 to 1.36) 20 and that 22-gauge FNB was more predominant than 25-gauge FNA (RR, 4.56; 95% CI, 2.49 to 8.35) 61 in regards to optimal histologic core procurement. They also reported that the 22-gauge FNB and 22-gauge FNA needles (RR, 1.01; 95% CI, 0.89 to 1.15) did not differ in terms of optimal histologic core procurement. IHC and molecular assays can be applied more easily to FNB samples than to samples from cytology or cell block. Ideally, EUS-guided tissue acquisition of pancreatic tumors should routinely include a histological evaluation by biopsy in addition to cytology.

IHC staining focuses on the diagnosis of epithelial components with histological atypia and differential diagnosis of various tumors such as mass-forming chronic pancreatitis, pancreatic neuroendocrine tumor (PNET), and autoimmune pancreatitis through preserving histologic architecture. Genetic analysis can aid in tailored treatment in individuals with pancreatic cancer and

prediction of prognosis. Telecytology, which is a remote cytopathology diagnostic system based on online transmitted microscope images, enables real-time diagnosis of the samples by expert cytopathologists.

IHC can be applied to histologic cores from EUS-FNB, cell block, and even LBC. It can differentiate benign and malignant lesions and reduces false negatives by staining for tumor suppressor gene proteins (e.g., TP53 or E-cadherin) 62 and tumor-associated proteins (e.g., mesothelin, S100P or fascin). 63 Furthermore, IHC can determine tumor aggressiveness or predict the clinical behavior of PNET using the Ki-67 index on large prepared pieces of tumor tissue from EUS-FNB (>2,000 cells). 64 In addition, IHC can also identify the phenotype of the tumor and eventually the cell origin (Table 5). 49

The most ideal system for the rapid cytological diagnosis of samples from EUS-FNA is ROSE. As mentioned earlier, however, the usefulness of the ROSE system is limited both in terms of time required and availability of technology, even in an experienced tertiary hospital. As a substitute for ROSE, telecytology was introduced in 1997 by the International Academy of Cytology Task Force summary to save time and labor of cytopathologists and to enable real-time analysis of samples from EUS-FNA performed at remote locations, even at field hospitals. 65 It is a remote cytopathology diagnostic system based on online transmitted microscope images. It consists of bidirectional communication using an internet connection; physicians process samples from each pass of a EUS-FNA using Diff-Quik smear and selects several representative cytological images. Thereafter, the images are transmitted to the pathologist's computer through a network system. Cytopathologists then report the results of the images by phone. Recent trials have demonstrated that each image can be transmitted within 0.5 to 3 seconds with high resolution. 66 When combining the pre-screen time, scan time, and diagnosis time, telecytology takes an average of approximately 12 minutes per sample. 66 This is considerably shorter than the time required for traditional methods including the time of transportation to the department of pathology and the interval between aspirations, which can take an average of over 30 minutes. 67 When comparing telecytopathology with regular ROSE regarding diagnostic accuracy, one retrospective study 66 reported that the Kappa values of telecytopathology were less than those of ROSE for reaching the final diagnosis although the difference was not statistically significant. Thus, the author concluded that the application of telecytopathology could be a valid substitute for ROSE in EUS-guided tissue acquisition of solid pancreatic tumors. The slight inferiority of telecytology compared with ROSE was considered to reflect the fact that accurate assessment using telecytology largely depends on the initial screener who sends the images for review. 68 , 69 The principle drawback of a static telecytology method is the subjectivity of image sampling, since a snapshot image may not truly be representative of the whole slide. Therefore, experienced physicians are recommended for sample preparation and image selection.

Many molecular analyses for the detection of epigenetic and genetic alterations have been conducted using samples from EUS-guided tissue acquisition for a pancreatic tumor. 70 - 72 In addition, fluorescence in situ hybridization or digital image analysis are also performed for detecting chromosomal abnormalities in chromosomes 3, 7, 17, or 9p21, with 11% to 27% sensitivity. 73 , 74 Among these, K-ras gene mutations are reported in more than 75% of pancreatic cancer cases, 75 and it appears to be present in the early stages of the carcinogenesis process. 76 Thus, K-ras gene mutation analysis has been considered a possible biomarker for early detection of pancreatic cancer. In a recent meta-analysis of the diagnostic accuracy of K-ras mutation analysis for pancreatic cancer, the pooled sensitivity and specificity of EUS-FNA with the traditional cytopathologic examination were 80.6% and 97%, respectively. However, K-ras mutation analysis could be helpful for inconclusive results from index EUS-FNA by reducing the false-negative rate to 55.6% and the false-positive rate to 10.7%. Moreover, the repeat sampling rate was reduced from 12.5% to 6.8%. 31 Therefore, the examination of the K-ras mutation can be generally applied to inconclusive cases after index EUS-guided tissue acquisition. However, when K-ras mutation analysis is applied as an additional tool in the differential diagnosis of solid pancreatic tumors, clinicians must recognize that the significant reduction in the false-negative rate is counterbalanced by a relatively small increase in the false-positive rate. Thus, K-ras mutation analysis should always

be cautiously interpreted within a clinical context.

Many molecular abnormalities based on DNA, RNA, or proteins in pancreatic tumor tissues have been evaluated and determined to be indicators for prognosis 77 and sensitivity to chemoagents. 78 , 79 Among these, a point mutation of the K-ras oncogene, which is found in more than 90% of pancreatic cancers, is reported as a negative prognostic factor. 71 , 78 Overexpression of epidermal growth factor receptor in mRNA is also confirmed as a strong prognostic marker 78 which is easily detected in EUS-FNA samples. 80 As well as prognostic factors, histologic samples using EUS-guided tissue acquisition for pancreatic cancer can predict the response to gemcitabine-based chemotherapy. 81 , 82 According to a recent study by a French group, a transcriptome analysis from 17 xenografts of pancreatic cancer cells obtained by EUS-guided tissue acquisition could predict sensitivity to several anticancer drugs commonly used to treat pancreatic cancer. 83 In addition, Wakatsuki et al. 84 used the adenosine triphosphate assay kit to determine the chemosensitivity of pancreatic cancer to chemotherapeutic agents. Following an indication of sensitivity to paclitaxel, they proceeded with this treatment, resulting in complete response and disappearance of pancreatic cancer.

Wang et al. 85 reported a systematic review including 51 articles with a total of 10,941 patients who underwent EUS-FNA. According to this systematic review, the overall morbidity rate related to EUS-FNA was 0.98% (107/10,941). Of the 8,246 patients who underwent EUS-FNA for pancreatic lesions, including 909 with pancreatic cystic lesions and 7,337 with pancreatic solid tumors, procedure-related adverse events were reported in 85 patients (1.03%). Of the 36 (0.44% of all patients) patients with pancreatitis, 27 (75.0%) had mild, six (16.7%) had moderate, and three (8.3%) had severe pancreatitis. Significant bleeding occurred in eight patients (0.1% of all patients). Furthermore, the overall incidence rates of fever and infection were 0.08%, and 0.02%, respectively (Table 6). Total procedure-related adverse events were reported in 60 patients (0.81%) with solid pancreatic tumors and 25 (2.75%) with pancreatic cyst (Table 6).

Among 4,909 EUS-FNA samples analyzed in a U.S. multicenter survey of solid pancreatic tumors, acute pancreatitis was identified in 14 (0.29%). 86 The targeted lesion was located in the head for the majority of the cases (n=12), whereas the lesion was located in the body and tail in one patient each. Furthermore, a recent prospective comparative study 87 for adverse events due to EUS-guided FNA of pancreatic cystic and solid lesions demonstrated that moderate or higher grade acute pancreatitis occurred in only one patient among 73 patients with pancreatic cystic lesions, while no patients with solid pancreatic lesions were found to have moderate or higher grade acute pancreatitis. Furthermore, two studies demonstrated that hyperamylasemia (defined as a serum amylase concentration above the upper limit of normal without any symptoms) occurred after EUS-guided tissue acquisition of pancreatic lesions. 88 , 89 The authors concluded that acute pancreatitis was present in less than 2% of these patients after EUS-FNA analysis, with silent hyperamylasemia being present in 3% to 11%. No predictive factor for hyperamylasemia resulting from EUS-FNA has been identified.

According to multivariate logistic regression risk factor analysis for acute pancreatitis, 90 there were significant correlations with tumor sizes less than 20 mm (odds ratio [OR], 18.48; 95% CI, 3.55 to 96.17) and with PNET (OR, 36.5; 95% CI, 1.73 to 771.83). Therefore, EUS-guided tissue acquisition of small pancreatic masses suspected to be PNETs should also be approached with caution. Although the mechanism is not clear, procedure-related pancreatitis may occur by mechanical injury to the intervening normal pancreatic duct or parenchyma. Therefore, it is reasonable to ensure the shortest distance between the echoendoscope and target lesion when performing sample acquisition to avoid not only the main pancreatic duct but also dilated side branches; in particular, those located upstream from an obstructive mass causing high-pressure build-up of pancreatic juice. The puncture of such a duct may lead to extravasation of pancreatic juice. 91

The incidence of bacteremia or even infection after EUS-guided tissue acquisition is very low, usually insignificant, and similar to that of diagnostic endoscopy including EUS without tissue

acquisition.⁹² Furthermore, patients who develop bacteremia after EUS-guided tissue acquisition rarely manifest with a clinical infectious illness. A recent prospective study⁸⁹ found three potential infectious events after EUS-FNA that were self-limited and recovered within a few days using antibiotics. All three cases were pancreatic cystic lesions (total 73 patients) while no patients with solid pancreatic lesions complained of infectious symptoms such as fever. Although all patients received prophylactic antibiotics in this study, there is no strong evidence supporting this clinical practice. Although there is an argument supporting the administration of prophylactic antibiotics in pancreatic cystic lesion,⁹³ it only appears to be appropriate when it is impossible to completely aspirate all fluid components.

In conclusion, current guidelines⁹⁴ do not recommend using prophylactic antibiotics in patients undergoing EUS-guided tissue acquisition of solid tumors, even in patients at high risk of infective endocarditis because the risk of infection is not higher than other endoscopic interventions. However, endoscopists should consider the RR versus clinical needs for prophylactic antibiotics when target lesions are pure cystic lesions or have partially cystic components. Although there is insufficient evidence to prove the need for prophylactic antibiotics, physicians should consider administering antibiotics whenever the needle penetrates the bile duct, pancreatic duct, or major vascular structure.

Intraluminal bleeding following EUS-guided tissue acquisition is typically mild and self-limiting without clinical consequences. Significant bleeding is very rare, but possible if large or major vasculatures are punctured or if patients have a coagulopathy.⁹⁵ In a recent study⁹⁶ using a Japanese nationwide administrative database regarding bleeding after EUS-FNA for pancreatic tumors, seven of 3,090 patients (0.23%) required red blood cell transfusion, endoscopic treatment, or angiographic intervention. In addition, three patients (0.10%) with severe bleeding required red blood cell transfusion within 3 days after the procedure. However, subgroup analysis revealed that the incidence of severe bleeding in low-volume centers was 5-fold higher than in medium- and high-volume centers ($p=0.045$). Despite the lower incidence of intraluminal bleeding related to EUS-guided tissue acquisition, it can be easily controlled with local adrenaline injection or hemostatic clips.⁹⁷

Extra-luminal bleeding manifests as visibly expanding echo-poor regions near the target area, or confirmation of blood flow under color-Doppler ultrasonography, and has been reported to occur in 1.3% to 2.6% of all cases.⁹⁸ In addition, intra-cystic bleeding manifests as small hyper-echoic areas that progress gradually over a few minutes, or blood flow within the cyst under color-Doppler ultrasonography, and has been reported to occur in 6% of EUS-FNA procedures for pancreatic cysts.⁹⁹ In this situation, endoscopists should terminate further movement or needle passes immediately, observe the apparent bleeding endosonographically, and administer a short course of antibiotics to prevent infection.⁹⁹ Regarding antithrombotic treatment, EUS-guided tissue acquisition should be avoided in patients taking oral anticoagulants such as thienopyridines (e.g., clopidogrel), but not aspirin or nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs according to recently issued American Society for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ASGE) and ESGE guidelines.^{87, 100} If postponing or stopping antithrombotic therapy is not possible in patients with a high risk of thromboembolic events, consulting cardiologists regarding alternative agents and measurement of the risk-to-benefit ratio should be considered.

Needle tract seeding after EUS-guided tissue acquisition has been considered to be an extremely rare adverse event,¹⁰¹ although there has been an increasing number of case reports in recent years.¹⁰² However, a recent study¹⁰³ of 301 patients who underwent distal pancreatectomy demonstrated that six patients (3.4%), among the 176 who underwent preoperative EUS-FNA, were diagnosed with needle tract seeding. This rate of needle tract seeding is not negligible, although preoperative EUS-guided tissue acquisition from the body or tail of the pancreas has not been shown to have a negative effect on recurrence-free survival of pancreatic cancer patients.

The relationship between the incidence of adverse events after EUS-guided tissue acquisition and needle size is an important issue. Theoretically, the incidence of adverse events with a larger

diameter needle was expected to be higher than that using needles that were smaller in diameter.

There is little available evidence regarding the minimal average number of performed procedures required to achieve competency in endoscopy. Several trials 104 - 107 have reported the results of learning curves in EUS-FNA for solid pancreatic tumors, which are considered to be more complex than diagnostic EUS. In these trials, all trainees had performed at least 132–300 EUS-FNA procedures with the appropriate number of needle passes according to the ROSE guidelines. The sensitivity for the cytopathological diagnosis of pancreatic malignancy is closely related to the operator's experience, of which 20 to 30 performed procedures can lead to a sensitivity of 80%. 56 , 108

Recent guidelines 109 regarding the endoscopic training by the ASGE recommend that at least 150 supervised EUS procedures be performed before the assessment of competence. It is further recommended that these 150 cases include a minimum of 50 EUS-FNA, 75 pancreaticobiliary cases, 75 mucosal cancer staging cases, and evaluation of 40 subepithelial lesions. 110 However, a study concluded that 150 cases might be inadequate for achieving competency and recommended that at least 225 hands-on procedures be performed before competence can be assessed. 111

A more recent study 112 demonstrated that the minimum number of procedures that trainees should be offered during their training to achieve competence in the core skills of EUS was approximately 225 cases. For EUS-guided tissue acquisition, considerable variations were found between the trainees with respect to the speed of training; 113 thus, this number should be considered to be the minimum before assessment of competence. A previous study evaluated 300 consecutive EUS-FNA procedures performed by a single endosonographer on solid pancreatic tumors over a 3-year period and reported that the proportion of EUS-FNA procedures that required more than 5 needle passes significantly decreased after 100 additional procedures and that the adverse events rate decreased after 200 additional procedures. 104

This guideline proposes a standard process for physicians who perform EUS-guided tissue acquisition based on the available evidence at the time of preparation in order to prevent unnecessary or unsuitable medical treatments and to facilitate appropriate and practical recommendations for the tissue confirmation of solid pancreatic tumors. We aim to provide a suitable decision-making framework for the accurate diagnosis and appropriate management of patients with solid pancreatic tumors. This guideline is not intended to establish an absolute standard that physicians should use to manage patients in real clinical settings but aims to assist physicians in making evidence-based judgments for the diagnosis of pancreatic solid tumors. Therefore, this guideline should not be used to support legal judgments, establish a legal standard of care or to encourage, advocate, require, or discourage any particular treatment. EUS-guided tissue acquisition has clearly been established as the first-line procedure for the diagnosis of solid pancreatic tumors and will continue to be improved as further research is conducted.

This work was supported By the Korean Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (KSGE) Task Force for Clinical Guideline. Any costs for literature searching, conferences, and other statistical activities were covered by a research fund provided by the KSGE.

This guideline is being co-published in Gut and Liver, Clinical Endoscopy, the Korean Journal of Gastroenterology , and the Korean Journal of Pancreas and Biliary Tract .

C.M.C. is an editorial board member of the journal but did not involve in the peer reviewer selection, evaluation, or decision process of this article. No other potential conflicts of interest relevant to this article were reported.

Vilman P Jacobsen GK Henriksen FW Hancke S 1992 Endoscopic ultrasonography with guided fine needle aspiration biopsy in pancreatic disease Gastrointest Endosc 38 172 173

10.1016/s0016-5107(92)70385-x 1568614 2 Eisen GM Chutkan R Goldstein JL 2000 Role of endoscopic ultrasonography *Gastrointest Endosc* 52 6 Pt 1 852 859 10.1016/j.giec.2013.06.001 11182690 3 Maluf-Filho F Dotti CM Halwan B 2009 An evidence-based consensus statement on the role and application of endosonography in clinical practice *Endoscopy* 41 979 987 10.1055/s-0029-1215192 19866396 4 Kida M 2009 Pancreatic masses *Gastrointest Endosc* 69 2 Suppl S102 S109 10.1016/j.gie.2019.07.009 19179132 5 Park SW Chung MJ Lee SH 2016 Prospective study for comparison of endoscopic ultrasound-guided tissue acquisition using 25- and 22-gauge core biopsy needles in solid pancreatic masses *PLoS One* 11 e0154401 10.1371/journal.pone.0154401 27149404 PMC4858215 6 Cumpston M Li T Page MJ 2019 Updated guidance for trusted systematic reviews: a new edition of the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 10 ED000142 10.1002/14651858.ED000142 31643080 PMC10284251 7 Sterne JA Savovi J Page MJ 2019 RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomized trials *BMJ* 366 l4898 10.1136/bmj.l4898 31462531 8 Stang A 2010 Critical evaluation of the Newcastle-Ottawa scale for the assessment of the quality of nonrandomized studies in meta-analyses *Eur J Epidemiol* 25 603 605 10.1007/s10654-010-9491-z 20652370 9 Whiting PF Rutjes AW Westwood ME 2011 QUADAS-2: a revised tool for the quality assessment of diagnostic accuracy studies *Ann Intern Med* 155 529 536 10.7326/0003-4819-155-8-201110180-00009 22007046 10 Yokoe M Takada T Mayumi T 2015 Japanese guidelines for the management of acute pancreatitis: Japanese Guidelines 2015 *J Hepatobiliary Pancreat Sci* 22 405 432 10.1002/jhbp.259 25973947 11 Park SK Ye BD Kim KO 2015 Guidelines for video capsule endoscopy: emphasis on Crohn's disease *Clin Endosc* 48 128 135 10.5946/ce.2015.48.2.128 25844340 PMC4381139 12 Dumonceau JM Polkowski M Larghi A 2011 Indications, results, and clinical impact of endoscopic ultrasound (EUS)-guided sampling in gastroenterology: European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ESGE) Clinical Guideline *Endoscopy* 43 897 912 10.1055/s-0043-109021 21842456 13 Hébert-Magee S Bae S Varadarajulu S 2013 The presence of a cytopathologist increases the diagnostic accuracy of endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration cytology for pancreatic adenocarcinoma: a meta-analysis *Cytopathology* 24 159 171 10.1111/cyt.12071 23711182 PMC4159090 14 Hewitt MJ McPhail MJ Possamai L Dhar A Vlavianos P Monahan KJ 2012 EUS-guided FNA for diagnosis of solid pancreatic neoplasms: a meta-analysis *Gastrointest Endosc* 75 319 331 10.1016/j.gie.2011.08.049 22248600 15 Puli SR Bechtold ML Buxbaum JL Eloubeidi MA 2013 How good is endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspiration in diagnosing the correct etiology for a solid pancreatic mass? A meta-analysis and systematic review *Pancreas* 42 20 26 10.1097/MPA.0b013e3182546e79 23254913 16 Micames C Jowell PS White R 2003 Lower frequency of peritoneal carcinomatosis in patients with pancreatic cancer diagnosed by EUS-guided FNA vs. percutaneous FNA *Gastrointest Endosc* 58 690 695 10.1016/s0016-5107(03)02009-1 14595302 17 van Gulik TM Reenders JW Bosma A 1997 Incidence and clinical findings of benign, inflammatory disease in patients resected for presumed pancreatic head cancer *Gastrointest Endosc* 46 417 423 10.1016/s0016-5107(97)70034-8 9402115 18 Ang TL Kwek AB Seo DW 2015 A prospective randomized study of the difference in diagnostic yield between endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspiration (EUSFNA) needles with and without a side port in pancreatic masses *Endosc Int Open* 3 E329 E333 10.1055/s-0034-1391964 26356802 PMC4554507 19 Facciorusso A Wani S Triantafyllou K 2019 Comparative accuracy of needle sizes and designs for EUS tissue sampling of solid pancreatic masses: a network meta-analysis *Gastrointest Endosc* 90 893 903 10.1016/j.gie.2019.07.009 31310744 20 Kamata K Kitano M Yasukawa S 2016 Histologic diagnosis of pancreatic masses using 25-gauge endoscopic ultrasound needles with and without a core trap: a multicenter randomized trial *Endoscopy* 48 632 638 10.1055/s-0042-106294 27129137 21 Erickson RA Sayage-Rabie L Beissner RS 2000 Factors predicting the number of EUS-guided fine-needle passes for diagnosis of pancreatic malignancies *Gastrointest Endosc* 51 184 190 10.1016/s0016-5107(00)70416-0 10650262 22 LeBlanc JK Ciaccia D Al-Assi MT 2004 Optimal number of EUS-guided fine needle passes needed to obtain a correct diagnosis *Gastrointest Endosc* 59 475 481 10.1016/s0016-5107(03)02863-3 15044881 23 Bang JY Hebert-Magee S Trevino J Ramesh J Varadarajulu S 2012 Randomized trial comparing the 22-gauge aspiration and 22-gauge biopsy needles for EUS-guided sampling of solid pancreatic mass lesions *Gastrointest Endosc* 76 321 327 10.1016/j.gie.2012.03.1392 22658389 PMC4148209 24 Bang JY Magee SH Ramesh J Trevino JM Varadarajulu S 2013 Randomized trial comparing fanning with standard technique for endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspiration of solid

pancreatic mass lesions *Endoscopy* 45 445 450 10.1055/s-0032-1326268 23504490 PMC4158695

25 Möller K Papanikolaou IS Toerner T 2009 EUS-guided FNA of solid pancreatic masses: high yield of 2 passes with combined histologic-cytologic analysis *Gastrointest Endosc* 70 60 69 10.1016/j.gie.2008.10.008 19394012 26 Pitman MB Centeno BA Ali SZ 2014 Standardized terminology and nomenclature for pancreatobiliary cytology: the Papanicolaou Society of Cytopathology Guidelines *Cytojournal* 11 Suppl 1 3 10.4103/1742-6413.133343 25191517 PMC4153338 27 Kliment M Urban O Cegan M 2010 Endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration of pancreatic masses: the utility and impact on management of patients *Scand J Gastroenterol* 45 1372 1379 10.3109/00365521.2010.503966 20626304 28 Horwhat JD Paulson EK McGrath K 2006 A randomized comparison of EUS-guided FNA versus CT or US-guided FNA for the evaluation of pancreatic mass lesions *Gastrointest Endosc* 63 966 975 10.1016/j.gie.2005.09.028 16733111 29 Eloubeidi MA Varadarajulu S Desai S Wilcox CM 2008 Value of repeat endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration for suspected pancreatic cancer *J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 23 567 570 10.1111/j.1440-1746.2007.05119.x 18397485 30 Layfield LJ Schmidt RL Hirschowitz SL Olson MT Ali SZ Dodd LL 2014 Significance of the diagnostic categories "atypical" and "suspicious for malignancy" in the cytologic diagnosis of solid pancreatic masses *Diagn Cytopathol* 42 292 296 10.1002/dc.23078 24578254 31 Fuccio L Hassan C Laterza L 2013 The role of K-ras gene mutation analysis in EUS-guided FNA cytology specimens for the differential diagnosis of pancreatic solid masses: a meta-analysis of prospective studies *Gastrointest Endosc* 78 596 608 10.1016/j.gie.2013.04.162 23660563 32 Iglesias-Garcia J Dominguez-Munoz JE Abdulkader I 2011 Influence of on-site cytopathology evaluation on the diagnostic accuracy of endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration (EUS-FNA) of solid pancreatic masses *Am J Gastroenterol* 106 1705 1710 10.1038/ajg.2011.119 21483464 33 Wani S Mullady D Early DS 2015 The clinical impact of immediate on-site cytopathology evaluation during endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration of pancreatic masses: a prospective multicenter randomized controlled trial *Am J Gastroenterol* 110 1429 1439 10.1038/ajg.2015.262 26346868 34 Ganc RL Carbonari AP Colaiacovo R 2015 Rapid on-site cytopathological examination (ROSE) performed by endosonographers and its improvement in the diagnosis of pancreatic solid lesions *Acta Cir Bras* 30 503 508 10.1590/S0102-865020150070000009 26270143 35 Cermak TS Wang B DeBrito P Carroll J Haddad N Sidawy MK 2012 Does on-site adequacy evaluation reduce the nondiagnostic rate in endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspiration of pancreatic lesions? *Cancer Cytopathol* 120 319 325 10.1002/cncy.21201 22517672 36 Kong F Zhu J Kong X 2016 Rapid on-site evaluation does not improve endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration adequacy in pancreatic masses: a meta-analysis and systematic review *PLoS One* 11 e0163056 10.1371/journal.pone.0163056 27657529 PMC5033338 37 Matynia AP Schmidt RL Barraza G Layfield LJ Siddiqui AA Adler DG 2014 Impact of rapid on-site evaluation on the adequacy of endoscopic-ultrasound guided fine-needle aspiration of solid pancreatic lesions: a systematic review and meta-analysis *J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 29 697 705 10.1111/jgh.12431 24783248 38 Kim JH Park SW Kim MK 2016 Meta-analysis for cyto-pathological outcomes in endoscopic ultrasonography-guided fine-needle aspiration with and without the stylet *Dig Dis Sci* 61 2175 2184 10.1007/s10620-016-4130-5 27010546 39 Sahai AV Paquin SC Gariépy G 2010 A prospective comparison of endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration results obtained in the same lesion, with and without the needle stylet *Endoscopy* 42 900 903 10.1055/s-0030-1255676 20725886 40 Wani S Early D Kunkel J 2012 Diagnostic yield of malignancy during EUS-guided FNA of solid lesions with and without a stylet: a prospective, single blind, randomized, controlled trial *Gastrointest Endosc* 76 328 335 10.1016/j.gie.2012.03.1395 22695205 41 Puri R Vilmann P Siftoiu A 2009 Randomized controlled trial of endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle sampling with or without suction for better cytological diagnosis *Scand J Gastroenterol* 44 499 504 10.1080/00365520802647392 19117242 42 Lee JK Choi JH Lee KH 2013 A prospective, comparative trial to optimize sampling techniques in EUS-guided FNA of solid pancreatic masses *Gastrointest Endosc* 77 745 751 10.1016/j.gie.2012.12.009 23433878 43 Kudo T Kawakami H Hayashi T 2014 High and low negative pressure suction techniques in EUS-guided fine-needle tissue acquisition by using 25-gauge needles: a multicenter, prospective, randomized, controlled trial *Gastrointest Endosc* 80 1030 1037 10.1016/j.gie.2014.04.012 24890422 44 Nakai Y Isayama H Chang KJ 2014 Slow pull versus suction in endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspiration of pancreatic solid masses *Dig Dis Sci* 59 1578 1585 10.1007/s10620-013-3019-9 24429514 45 Matsubayashi H Matsui T Yabuuchi Y 2016 Endoscopic

ultrasonography guided-fine needle aspiration for the diagnosis of solid pancreaticobiliary lesions: clinical aspects to improve the diagnosis *World J Gastroenterol* 22 628 640 10.3748/wjg.v22.i2.628 26811612 PMC4716064 46 Lee KY Cho HD Hwangbo Y 2019 Efficacy of 3 fine-needle biopsy techniques for suspected pancreatic malignancies in the absence of an on-site cytopathologist *Gastrointest Endosc* 89 825 831 10.1016/j.gie.2018.10.042 30403966 47 Bor R Vasas B Fábíán A 2019 Prospective comparison of slow-pull and standard suction techniques of endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration in the diagnosis of solid pancreatic cancer *BMC Gastroenterol* 19 6 10.1186/s12876-018-0921-9 30626331 PMC6327397 48 Park SW Lee SS Song TJ 2020 The diagnostic performance of novel torque technique for endoscopic ultrasound-guided tissue acquisition in solid pancreatic lesions: a prospective randomized controlled trial *J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 35 508 515 10.1111/jgh.14840 31425640 49 Matsubayashi H Sasaki K Ono S 2018 Pathological and molecular aspects to improve endoscopic ultrasonography-guided fine-needle aspiration from solid pancreatic lesions *Pancreas* 47 163 172 10.1097/MPA.0000000000000986 29346217 50 Kocjan G Chandra A Cross P 2009 BSCC Code of Practice: fine needle aspiration cytology *Cytopathology* 20 283 296 10.1111/j.1365-2303.2009.00709.x 19754835 51 Thierry R Marie-Christine R Marièle M Richard B Anca M 2012 Modified technique of toluidine blue staining in rapid on-site evaluation *Diagn Cytopathol* 40 847 848 10.1002/dc.21753 21681975 52 Lee YN Moon JH Kim HK 2014 A triple approach for diagnostic assessment of endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration in pancreatic solid masses and lymph nodes *Dig Dis Sci* 59 2286 2293 10.1007/s10620-014-3119-1 24737383 53 Arbyn M Bergeron C Klinkhamer P Martin-Hirsch P Siebers AG Bulten J 2008 Liquid compared with conventional cervical cytology: a systematic review and meta-analysis *Obstet Gynecol* 111 167 177 10.1097/01.AOG.0000296488.85807.b3 18165406 54 Siddiqui MT Gokaslan ST Saboorian MH Ashfaq R 2005 Split sample comparison of ThinPrep and conventional smears in endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography-guided pancreatic fine-needle aspirations *Diagn Cytopathol* 32 70 75 10.1002/dc.20174 15637676 55 Qin SY Zhou Y Li P Jiang HX 2014 Diagnostic efficacy of cell block immunohistochemistry, smear cytology, and liquid-based cytology in endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspiration of pancreatic lesions: a single-institution experience *PLoS One* 9 e108762 10.1371/journal.pone.0108762 25259861 PMC4178202 56 LeBlanc JK Emerson RE Dewitt J 2010 A prospective study comparing rapid assessment of smears and ThinPrep for endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspirates *Endoscopy* 42 389 394 10.1055/s-0029-1243841 20101566 57 Lee JK Choi ER Jang TH 2011 A prospective comparison of liquid-based cytology and traditional smear cytology in pancreatic endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration *Acta Cytol* 55 401 407 10.1159/000330811 21986165 58 Lee KJ Kang YS Cho MY Kim JW 2016 Comparison of cytologic preparation methods in endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration for diagnosis of pancreatic adenocarcinoma *Pancreatol* 16 824 828 10.1016/j.pan.2016.05.006 27279466 59 Ieni A Barresi V Todaro P Caruso RA Tuccari G 2015 Cell-block procedure in endoscopic ultrasound-guided-fine-needle-aspiration of gastrointestinal solid neoplastic lesions *World J Gastrointest Endosc* 7 1014 1022 10.4253/wjge.v7.i11.1014 26322154 PMC4549658 60 Noda Y Fujita N Kobayashi G 2010 Diagnostic efficacy of the cell block method in comparison with smear cytology of tissue samples obtained by endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspiration *J Gastroenterol* 45 868 875 10.1007/s00535-010-0217-5 20177713 61 Rusch M Nakitandwe J Shurtleff S 2018 Clinical cancer genomic profiling by three-platform sequencing of whole genome, whole exome and transcriptome *Nat Commun* 9 3962 10.1038/s41467-018-06485-7 30262806 PMC6160438 62 Gao L Antic T Hyjek E 2013 Immunohistochemical analysis of E-cadherin and zeste homolog 2 expression in endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspiration of pancreatic adenocarcinoma *Cancer Cytopathol* 121 644 652 10.1002/cncy.21310 23674382 63 Dim DC Jiang F Qiu Q 2014 The usefulness of S100P, mesothelin, fascin, prostate stem cell antigen, and 14-3-3 sigma in diagnosing pancreatic adenocarcinoma in cytological specimens obtained by endoscopic ultrasound guided fine-needle aspiration *Diagn Cytopathol* 42 193 199 10.1002/dc.21684 21538952 64 Hasegawa T Yamao K Hijioaka S 2014 Evaluation of Ki-67 index in EUS-FNA specimens for the assessment of malignancy risk in pancreatic neuroendocrine tumors *Endoscopy* 46 32 38 10.1055/s-0033-1344958 24218309 65 O'Brien MJ Takahashi M Brugal G 1998 Digital imagery/telecytology. International Academy of Cytology Task Force summary. *Diagnostic Cytology Towards the 21st Century: An International Expert Conference and Tutorial Acta Cytol* 42 148 164 10.1159/000331540 9479334 66 Kim B Chhieng DC Crowe DR 2006 Dynamic telecytopathology of

on site rapid cytology diagnoses for pancreatic carcinoma Cytojournal 3 27
10.1186/1742-6413-3-27 17156485 PMC1713251 67 Nasuti JF Gupta PK Baloch ZW 2002
Diagnostic value and cost-effectiveness of on-site evaluation of fine-needle aspiration specimens:
review of 5,688 cases Diagn Cytopathol 27 1 4 10.1002/dc.10065 12112806 68 Alsharif M
Carlo-Demovich J Massey C 2010 Telecytopathology for immediate evaluation of fine-needle
aspiration specimens Cancer Cytopathol 118 119 126 10.1002/cncy.20074 20544707 69 Marotti JD
Johncox V Ng D Gonzalez JL Padmanabhan V 2012 Implementation of telecytology for immediate
assessment of endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspirations compared to conventional
on-site evaluation: analysis of 240 consecutive cases Acta Cytol 56 548 553 10.1159/000339546
23075898 70 Brosens LA Hackeng WM Offerhaus GJ Hruban RH Wood LD 2015 Pancreatic
adenocarcinoma pathology: changing "landscape" J Gastrointest Oncol 6 358 374
10.3978/j.issn.2078-6891.2015.032 26261723 PMC4502163 71 Matsubayashi H Watanabe H
Ajioka Y 2000 Different amounts of K-ras mutant epithelial cells in pancreatic carcinoma and
mass-forming pancreatitis Pancreas 21 77 85 10.1097/00006676-200007000-00055 10881936 72
Kleeff J Korc M Apte M 2016 Pancreatic cancer Nat Rev Dis Primers 2 16022
10.1038/nrdp.2016.22 27158978 73 Levy MJ Oberg TN Campion MB 2012 Comparison of methods
to detect neoplasia in patients undergoing endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspiration
Gastroenterology 142 1112 1121 10.1053/j.gastro.2012.02.002 22326996 74 Ribeiro A Peng J
Casas C Fan YS 2014 Endoscopic ultrasound guided fine needle aspiration with fluorescence in
situ hybridization analysis in 104 patients with pancreatic mass J Gastroenterol Hepatol 29 1654
1658 10.1111/jgh.12575 24628622 75 Koorstra JB Hustinx SR Offerhaus GJ Maitra A 2008
Pancreatic carcinogenesis Pancreatol 8 110 125 10.1159/000123838 18382097 PMC2663569
76 Jhala NC Eltoun IA Eloubeidi MA 2007 Providing on-site diagnosis of malignancy on
endoscopic-ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspirates: should it be done? Ann Diagn Pathol 11 176
181 10.1016/j.anndiagpath.2006.03.005 17498591 77 Oshima M Okano K Muraki S 2013
Immunohistochemically detected expression of 3 major genes (CDKN2A/p16, TP53, and
SMAD4/DPC4) strongly predicts survival in patients with resectable pancreatic cancer Ann Surg
258 336 346 10.1097/SLA.0b013e3182827a65 23470568 78 Lee J Jang KT Ki CS 2007 Impact of
epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) kinase mutations, EGFR gene amplifications, and KRAS
mutations on survival of pancreatic adenocarcinoma Cancer 109 1561 1569 10.1002/cncr.22559
17354229 79 Kobayashi M Mizuno S Murata Y 2014 Gemcitabine-based chemoradiotherapy
followed by surgery for borderline resectable and locally unresectable pancreatic ductal
adenocarcinoma: significance of the CA19-9 reduction rate and intratumoral human equilibrative
nucleoside transporter 1 expression Pancreas 43 350 360 10.1097/MPA.000000000000059
24622063 PMC4210173 80 Fujita H Ohuchida K Mizumoto K 2011 High EGFR mRNA expression
is a prognostic factor for reduced survival in pancreatic cancer after gemcitabine-based adjuvant
chemotherapy Int J Oncol 38 629 641 10.3892/ijo.2011.908 21243324 81 Ma G Sun Y Fu S 2015
Evaluation of S100A4 mRNA in EUS-FNA specimens for the assessment of chemosensitivity to
gemcitabine from patients with unresectable pancreatic cancer Int J Clin Exp Pathol 8 13284 13288
26722531 PMC4680476 82 Preis M Gardner TB Gordon SR 2011 MicroRNA-10b expression
correlates with response to neoadjuvant therapy and survival in pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma
Clin Cancer Res 17 5812 5821 10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-11-0695 21652542 PMC3167031 83
Duconseil P Gilibert M Gayet O 2015 Transcriptomic analysis predicts survival and sensitivity to
anticancer drugs of patients with a pancreatic adenocarcinoma Am J Pathol 185 1022 1032
10.1016/j.ajpath.2014.11.029 25765988 84 Wakatsuki T Irisawa A Imamura H 2010 Complete
response of anaplastic pancreatic carcinoma to paclitaxel treatment selected by chemosensitivity
testing Int J Clin Oncol 15 310 313 10.1007/s10147-010-0038-9 20195681 85 Wang KX Ben QW
Jin ZD 2011 Assessment of morbidity and mortality associated with EUS-guided FNA: a systematic
review Gastrointest Endosc 73 283 290 10.1016/j.gie.2010.10.045 21295642 86 Eloubeidi MA
Gress FG Savides TJ 2004 Acute pancreatitis after EUS-guided FNA of solid pancreatic masses: a
pooled analysis from EUS centers in the United States Gastrointest Endosc 60 385 389
10.1016/s0016-5107(04)01714-6 15332028 87 Rodríguez-D'Jesús A Fernández-Esparrach G
Marra-Lopez C 2016 Adverse events of EUS-guided FNA of pancreatic cystic and solid lesions by
using the lexicon proposed in an ASGE workshop: a prospective and comparative study
Gastrointest Endosc 83 780 784 10.1016/j.gie.2015.08.035 26301408 88 Fernández-Esparrach G
Ginès A García P 2007 Incidence and clinical significance of hyperamylasemia after endoscopic
ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspiration (EUS-FNA) of pancreatic lesions: a prospective and

controlled study *Endoscopy* 39 720 724 10.1055/s-2007-966719 17661248 89 Gress FG Barawi M Kim D Grendell JH 2002 Preoperative localization of a neuroendocrine tumor of the pancreas with EUS-guided fine needle tattooing *Gastrointest Endosc* 55 594 597 10.1067/mge.2002.122580 11923783 90 Katanuma A Maguchi H Yane K 2013 Factors predictive of adverse events associated with endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration of pancreatic solid lesions *Dig Dis Sci* 58 2093 2099 10.1007/s10620-013-2590-4 23423501 PMC3695684 91 Fujii LL Levy MJ 2014 Basic techniques in endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration for solid lesions: adverse events and avoiding them *Endosc Ultrasound* 3 35 45 10.4103/2303-9027.123006 24949409 PMC4063261 92 Janssen J König K Knop-Hammad V Johanns W Greiner L 2004 Frequency of bacteremia after linear EUS of the upper GI tract with and without FNA *Gastrointest Endosc* 59 339 344 10.1016/s0016-5107(03)02707-x 14997128 93 Guarner-Argente C Shah P Buchner A Ahmad NA Kochman ML Ginsberg GG 2011 Use of antimicrobials for EUS-guided FNA of pancreatic cysts: a retrospective, comparative analysis *Gastrointest Endosc* 74 81 86 10.1016/j.gie.2011.03.1244 21704808 94 Banerjee S Shen B ASGE Standards of Practice Committee 2008 Antibiotic prophylaxis for GI endoscopy *Gastrointest Endosc* 67 791 798 10.1016/j.gie.2014.08.008 18374919 95 Polkowski M Larghi A Weynand B 2012 Learning, techniques, and complications of endoscopic ultrasound (EUS)-guided sampling in gastroenterology: European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ESGE) Technical Guideline *Endoscopy* 44 190 206 10.1055/s-0031-1291543 22180307 96 Hamada T Yasunaga H Nakai Y 2014 Severe bleeding and perforation are rare complications of endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration for pancreatic masses: an analysis of 3,090 patients from 212 hospitals *Gut Liver* 8 215 218 10.5009/gnl.2014.8.2.215 24672664 PMC3964273 97 Dumonceau JM Deprez PH Jenssen C 2017 Indications, results, and clinical impact of endoscopic ultrasound (EUS)-guided sampling in gastroenterology: European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ESGE) Clinical Guideline: updated January 2017 *Endoscopy* 49 695 714 10.1055/s-0043-109021 28511234 98 Affi A Vazquez-Sequeiros E Norton ID Clain JE Wiersema MJ 2001 Acute extraluminal hemorrhage associated with EUS-guided fine needle aspiration: frequency and clinical significance *Gastrointest Endosc* 53 221 225 10.1067/mge.2001.111391 11174300 99 Varadarajulu S Eloubeidi MA 2004 Frequency and significance of acute intracystic hemorrhage during EUS-FNA of cystic lesions of the pancreas *Gastrointest Endosc* 60 631 635 10.1016/s0016-5107(04)01891-7 15472697 100 Veitch AM Vanbiervliet G Gershlick AH 2016 Endoscopy in patients on antiplatelet or anticoagulant therapy, including direct oral anticoagulants: British Society of Gastroenterology (BSG) and European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ESGE) guidelines *Gut* 65 374 389 10.1136/gutjnl-2015-311110 26873868 PMC4789831 101 Eloubeidi MA Decker GA ASGE Standards of Practice Committee 2016 The role of endoscopy in the evaluation and management of patients with solid pancreatic neoplasia *Gastrointest Endosc* 83 17 28 10.1016/j.gie.2015.09.009 26706297 102 Minaga K Kitano M Enoki E Kashida H Kudo M 2016 Needle-tract seeding on the proximal gastric wall after EUS-guided fine-needle aspiration of a pancreatic mass *Am J Gastroenterol* 111 1515 10.1038/ajg.2016.307 27808133 103 Yane K Kuwatani M Yoshida M 2020 Non-negligible rate of needle tract seeding after endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspiration for patients undergoing distal pancreatectomy for pancreatic cancer *Dig Endosc* 32 801 811 10.1111/den.13615 31876309 104 Eloubeidi MA Tamhane A 2005 EUS-guided FNA of solid pancreatic masses: a learning curve with 300 consecutive procedures *Gastrointest Endosc* 61 700 708 10.1016/s0016-5107(05)00363-9 15855975 105 Mertz H Gautam S 2004 The learning curve for EUS-guided FNA of pancreatic cancer *Gastrointest Endosc* 59 33 37 10.1016/s0016-5107(03)02028-5 14722544 106 Harewood GC Wiersema LM Halling AC Keeney GL Salamao DR Wiersema MJ 2002 Influence of EUS training and pathology interpretation on accuracy of EUS-guided fine needle aspiration of pancreatic masses *Gastrointest Endosc* 55 669 673 10.1067/mge.2002.123419 11979248 107 Eisen GM Dominitz JA Faigel DO 2001 Guidelines for credentialing and granting privileges for endoscopic ultrasound *Gastrointest Endosc* 54 811 814 10.1016/s0016-5107(01)70082-x 11726873 108 Klapman JB Logrono R Dye CE Waxman I 2003 Clinical impact of on-site cytopathology interpretation on endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration *Am J Gastroenterol* 98 1289 1294 10.1111/j.1572-0241.2003.07472.x 12818271 109 Faulx AL Lightdale JR ASGE Standards of Practice Committee 2017 Guidelines for privileging, credentialing, and proctoring to perform GI endoscopy *Gastrointest Endosc* 85 273 281 10.1016/j.gie.2016.10.036 28089029 110 DiMaio CJ Mishra G ASGE Training Committee 2012 EUS core curriculum *Gastrointest Endosc* 76 476 481 10.1016/j.gie.2012.04.437 22898403 111

Wani S Coté GA Keswani R 2013 Learning curves for EUS by using cumulative sum analysis: implications for American Society for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy recommendations for training Gastrointest Endosc 77 558 565 10.1016/j.gie.2012.10.012 23260317 112 Wani S Han S Simon V 2019 Setting minimum standards for training in EUS and ERCP: results from a prospective multicenter study evaluating learning curves and competence among advanced endoscopy trainees Gastrointest Endosc 89 1160 1168 10.1016/j.gie.2019.01.030 30738985 PMC6527477 113 Sarker SK Albrani T Zaman A Kumar I 2010 Procedural performance in gastrointestinal endoscopy: live and simulated World J Surg 34 1764 1770 10.1007/s00268-010-0579-0 20440616 Fig. 1 Endoscopic ultrasound image of different solid pancreatic tumors (arrows). (A) Solid lesion located in the pancreatic head, corresponding to pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma. (B) Pancreatic neuroendocrine tumor located in the pancreatic tail. (C) Insulinoma located in the pancreatic tail. (D) Solid pseudopapillary tumor located in the pancreatic tail. (E) Mass-forming chronic pancreatitis located in the pancreatic neck. (F) Mass-forming autoimmune pancreatitis located in the pancreatic head with bile duct obstruction.

Task Force Team for the Guidelines for EUS-Guided Tissue Acquisition from Solid Pancreatic Tumors

KSGE, Korean Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy; EUS, endoscopic ultrasound.

Summary and Strength of Recommendations for EUS-Guided Tissue Acquisition from Solid Pancreatic Tumors

EUS, endoscopic ultrasound; FNA, fine-needle aspiration; FNB, fine needle biopsy; KSGE, Korean Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy; ROSE, rapid on-site evaluation; CT, computed tomography.

Needles Available on the Market in Korea for Use in EUS-Guided Tissue Acquisition from Solid Pancreatic Tumors 18

*A newly marketed needle has been designed with a core trap and bevel system to increase diagnostic yield and enhance the procurement of the histologic core, while other gauge needles (19, 22, and 25 gauge) have a reversed bevel system; †A newly marketed needle has been designed with a core trap and bibevel system to increase diagnostic yield and enhance the procurement of the histologic core.

Standardized Terminology and Nomenclature for Pancreatobiliary Cytology Specimens in 2014 26

CEA, carcinoembryonic antigen; KRAS, Kirsten rat sarcoma viral oncogene homolog; GNAS, guanine nucleotide-binding protein/ α -subunit.

Specific Indicators in Immunohistochemistry Staining 47

Procedure-Related Adverse Events from Endoscopic Ultrasound-Guided Tissue Acquisition from Pancreatic Lesions