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Abstract
Simulation-based mastery learning (SBML) is an emerging form of competency-based training that has been proposed as the next standard method for procedural task training, including that in gastrointestinal endoscopy. Current basic gastroenterological endoscopy training relies on the number of procedures performed, and it has been criticized for its lack of objective standards that result in variable skills among trainees and its association with patient safety risk. Thus, incorporating simulators into a competency-based curriculum seems ideal for gastrointestinal endoscopy training. The curriculum for SBML in gastrointestinal endoscopy is currently being developed and has promising potential to translate into the clinical performance. Unlike the present apprenticeship model of “see one, do one, teach one,” SBML integrates a competency-based curriculum with specific learning objectives alongside simulation-based training. This allows trainees to practice essential skills repeatedly, receive feedback from experts, and gradually develop their abilities to achieve mastery. Moreover, trainees and trainers need to understand the learning targets of the program so that trainees can focus their learning on the necessary skills and trainers can provide structured feedback based on the expected outcomes. In addition to learning targets, an assessment plan is essential to provide trainees with future directions for their improvement and ensure patient safety by issuing a passing standard. Finally, the SBML program should be planned and managed by a specific team and conducted within a developed and tested curriculum. This review discusses the current state of gastrointestinal endoscopy training and the role of SBML in that field.
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Core Tip: The traditional apprenticeship model for gastrointestinal training has been widely criticized for its lack of standards and patient safety risks. Thus, the basic gastrointestinal endoscopy training method needs to be revised from the apprenticeship model to a simulation-based mastery learning (SBML) model, which relies on specific learning objectives with the integration of simulators. SBML is a competency-based training method aimed at creating highly competent trainees and reducing differences in skills among them. The present review discusses the current state of gastrointestinal endoscopy training, the role of SBML in that field, and recent experiences and future prospects of SBML.

INTRODUCTION

Endoscopy is the gold standard technique for the diagnosis of various gastrointestinal (GI) tract diseases and also allows examiners to directly provide therapeutic interventions if needed. This procedure is performed by a trained gastroenterologist or endoscopic surgeon. The need for endoscopic procedures is projected to increase every year due to the growing prevalence of GI diseases and technical improvements in GI endoscopy[1]. Most GI endoscopy training still follows the traditional apprenticeship model of “see one, do one, teach one.” This model relies on the number of exposures to procedural caseloads, which causes varying results among trainees[2]. This lack of a standardized curriculum has recently come under intense scrutiny because it is associated with patient safety risks, as trainees cannot safely perform a medical procedure after having observed it only once[3].

A mastery learning model is an approach to competency-based training, in which participants must acquire specific skills before moving on to the next stage of training. The basic principle of mastery learning is that all participants can achieve the highest standard of learning objectives with the minimum possible variation in results. Meta-analyses show that mastery learning significantly leads to skill improvement, has a moderate effect on patient outcomes compared to the traditional apprenticeship method, but might demand more time than other methods. Mastery learning-based training provides consistent positive results and has a beneficial effect on both patient care and the budget spent during the training process[4].

A simulation-based training (SBT) method has been also proposed as an alternative to replace the old teaching method. The use of simulators to acquire psychomotor abilities has been widely studied and recommended by leading educational institutions. With a SBT method, trainees can achieve procedural competence without compromising patient safety, particularly in those procedures that require practical experience and visual-spatial skills[5]. Additionally, skills of the operator can be improved and the length of the procedure reduced by using a simulator. Finally, simulators can also be used to evaluate trainee progress[6].

SBT and mastery learning methods have several benefits over the traditional apprenticeship model. This article reviews the role of simulation-based mastery learning (SBML) in GI endoscopy and describes the planning and management for the implementation of this model, including experiences regarding its application.

DEVELOPMENT OF GI ENDOSCOPY TRAINING

Since 1962, the American Society for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy has held symposiums about teaching methods in GI endoscopy and later formed a formal endoscopy training program. Along with the development of science and advancement in the complexity of endoscopic procedures, gastroenterological education began to be developed independently as part of a subspecialty of internal medicine[4]. The development of specific training in endoscopy and gastroenterology also impacted the education period for this field, which initially consisted of 1 year to 2 years and then was extended to 3 years[4]. Currently, there is no global standardization of the gastroenterology education length. Some countries, such as the Netherlands, are now expanding their gastroenterology curriculum to 3 years to 4 years,
starting with 2 years of general internal medicine training\cite{7,8}. In Korea, endoscopy training is conducted for 1 year to 2 years during a gastroenterology fellowship program\cite{9}. Meanwhile, in Japan, a physician must complete 3 years of internal medicine residency and 5 years of gastroenterology fellowship to become a board-certified endoscopist\cite{10}. The World Gastroenterology Organization states that a student must complete 3 years of internal medicine residency before pursuing gastroenterological-specific education and training for the next 3 years\cite{11}.

The current state of endoscopy training is defined by the conventional apprenticeship model, with a strong emphasis on case/procedure volume and without a formal curriculum. Trainees are usually assigned the minimum number of cases or procedures they need to achieve competency or practical eligibility. The duration of the training program is commonly fixed, and an assessment is conducted near the end of the program. This training method has potential variability in terms of skill outcomes. As trainees might be overwhelmed at the start of the program, the initial cases they encounter can be ineffective for learning. A European survey showed significant differences in various gastroenterology training among 16 European countries, ranging from the minimum number of procedures required, training period, form of supervision to whether some interventional procedures were performed\cite{12}. Recently, curriculum-based medical education (CBME) has recently been proposed to improve endoscopy training. The CBME model includes The American Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy Skills, Training, Assessment, and Reinforcement program with a curriculum that combines hands-on training, formative feedback, and postcourse skills and knowledge assessments\cite{13}.

One of the learning methods that has been developed for endoscopy training is a simulated-based approach. Endoscopy simulator models have continued to be developed and advanced in the last decades, ranging from mechanical simulators, animal model simulations, and computer simulators\cite{14}. The evolution of endoscopy simulators is described in Table 1. These developments provide opportunities for trainees to learn various diagnostic and therapeutic techniques. Generally, these simulators use an endoscope that is inserted into a mannequin. Consequently, trainees can be more familiar with endoscopic procedures and be able to practice them on an actual patient. Some advanced computer simulators also provide a realistic picture on the monitor and can simulate a patient’s response. The computer simulator also combines training to learn hand-eye coordination, recognition of pathological features, and immediate feedback output\cite{15}. A systematic review showed that skills acquired from SBT were transferable to the clinical setting, as participants of SBT scored higher global assessment scores and fewer errors\cite{16}. Moreover, forms of simulation that can be considered in endoscopy training include the following\cite{17-24}.

- Patient simulation: A simulated mannequin that resembles a human with respiration, pulse, and other vital signs is used. This type of simulation can be used for simple physical examination scenarios.
- Clinical environment simulation: In this simulation, a room that resembles an actual clinical practice room, for example, an operating room, is prepared. Thus, trainees become more familiar with the actual situation.
- Virtual procedure simulation: These simulations have equipment relevant to the procedure, such as esophagogastroduodenoscopy or colonoscopy, and can also present various disease scenarios according to the needs of the trainees.
- Electronic medical record simulation: This simulation uses artificial data about cases, including disease history and laboratory results, which can be integrated with other systems.

### MASTERY LEARNING IN GI ENDO SCOPY

Mastery learning is a form of competency-based training in which trainees have to achieve specific skills or be deemed good enough to perform a procedure before moving on to the next stage of training. Competence is the minimum level of skill, knowledge, or expertise acquired through training necessary to perform a task or procedure and to ensure that safe and technically successful procedures are carried out and that observations and results are accurate\cite{25,26}. Mastery learning focuses on the trainees instead of the patient. The old teaching has resulted in inconsistent teaching, testing, and retention of skills, while mastery learning demands trainees to acquire and maintain specific skills and knowledge through deliberate practice without time limit. Deliberate practice consists of nine elements: highly motivated learners with good concentration, clear learning objectives, an appropriate difficulty level, repetitive practice, rigorous measurements, informative feedback, monitoring and error correction, performance evaluation, and advancement to the next task\cite{27}. Mastery learning effectively develops both therapeutic skill and high self efficacy to utilize the skill\cite{28}.

Mastery of basic endoscopic techniques is essential for every endoscopist, because if the procedure is performed incorrectly, it can cause severe complications that might threaten the condition of patients. The essential steps of endoscopy are endoscope insertion, precise observation, and appropriate imaging\cite{29}. Skills developed by each endoscopist may vary and are influenced by differences among supervisors during the procedure. Hence, standardized training is necessary to maintain the competence of trainees\cite{30}. 

---

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simulation Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patient simulation</td>
<td>A simulated mannequin that resembles a human with respiration, pulse, and other vital signs is used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical environment simulation</td>
<td>In this simulation, a room that resembles an actual clinical practice room, for example, an operating room, is prepared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual procedure simulation</td>
<td>These simulations have equipment relevant to the procedure, such as esophagogastroduodenoscopy or colonoscopy, and can also present various disease scenarios according to the needs of the trainees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic medical record simulation</td>
<td>This simulation uses artificial data about cases, including disease history and laboratory results, which can be integrated with other systems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Traditionally, competence in endoscopy is acquired after completing a specific number of recommended procedures based on expert opinions published by medical gastroenterology societies or associations, as described in Table 2. However, according to the aforementioned mastery learning principles, competence cannot be determined only by the number of procedures performed. A defined and detailed assessment tool should be incorporated to objectively assess trainees to deliver high-quality care[31].

To ensure competence in mastery learning, two aspects are needed: training and subsequent assessment by endoscopy experts or trainers. Through this training, trainees acquire the necessary technical and cognitive skills[25]. Examples of technical and psychomotor skills associated with endoscopy include scope handling and strategies for scope advancement, loop reduction, recall, and mucosal inspection. Cognitive competence reflects knowledge acquired about endoscopy and its application in clinical practice. Cognitive skills include choosing the most appropriate endoscopy test to assess and treat clinical problems, recognizing the lesion, and managing sedation. Crucial integrative competencies to endoscopy include decision-making, teamwork, communication, leadership, awareness of the situation, professionalism, and patient safety awareness[26].

Based on the psychological aspect, three factors underlie mastery learning: Behavioral development, constructive learning, and social cognition. Behavioral development pursues the acquisition and maintenance of technical and communication skills. Clinical thinking, community approach, ethics, advocacy, and regular self-reflection aim to shape social and cognitive constructs. Social cognition is a prerequisite for professionalism. These three aspects support the formation of SBML, which includes a curriculum design to set learning objectives[32-37].

SIMULATION-BASED TRAINING IN GI ENDOSCOPY

The SBML method uses an instructional approach, meaning that trainees must have a certain level of competence in a simulated environment before performing procedures on actual patients[24]. With this method, trainees progress through different simulations with increasing difficulty. SBML provides opportunities for students to practice as often as possible to improve their performance before operating
on patients. This method can optimize clinical outcomes and reduce the risk of complications or other hazards for patients that may occur during the operation period of a novice endoscopist[17,38]. In addition, SBML can minimize variations between trainees upon completion of the program[24,39].

Several studies in other fields of medical procedural training have shown the benefits of SBT and mastery learning over the traditional apprenticeship model. A meta-analysis by Harrison et al[40] included 14 studies involving 633 trainees in cardiology procedures and found that SBT followed by structured training provided superior results than traditional methods. The quality of patient care and patient feedback obtained by this method were better than those obtained by a conventional training approach. A meta-analysis by Cook et al[41] included 82 studies evaluating SBML in procedural settings such as surgeries and airway management. They found that SBML was significantly better at improving procedural skills than traditional methods but might takes more time. A systematic review on patient outcomes in simulation based medical education also reported small to moderate patient benefits in comparison with no intervention[38]. A study published in 2014 revealed the effectiveness of colonoscopy training with virtual simulation in the early learning curve of novices. Performance improvements were also found later during patient-based colonoscopy[42]. Another multicenter study found higher objective competency rates during the early phase of colonoscopy training[43].

A prospective randomized study that evaluated the diagnostic abilities of trainees using upper GI endoscopy concluded that structured SBT was superior to SBT or clinical training alone. This study also found that the use of the simulator was valuable as the first step in developing diagnostic skills to perform upper GI endoscopy, but it was not sufficient to ensure the overall competencies[30]. Several reports on SBT for GI endoscopy are described in Table 3.

Generally, studies on SBT in GI endoscopy training have shown favorable results, especially in the early phase of training, as it reduces the time required to reach technical competence and the number of endoscopic procedures needed to perform it independently. With SBT, trainees can perform the procedures and exercises repeatedly using a simulator. This repetition improves the cognitive and practical skills of students and allows them to become more acquainted with endoscopic features and settings. A meta-analysis showed that simulation can increase patient safety and decrease the risk of adverse events, as trainees are more skilled and familiarized with the clinical settings at the moment of performing the endoscopy[44-49]. It also provides an opportunity for trainees to learn at their own pace[50-54].

However, some systematic reviews have reported inconclusive evidence supporting SBT as a replacement for conventional training. SBT might be more beneficial as a supplement to conventional training, especially in the early phase. Nevertheless, reducing patient-based training in favor of SBT is not recommended as it cannot replace conventional patient-based training[48,51,52]. Hence, simulation must be accompanied by direct clinical experience with patients in order to understand the actual clinical setting[39]. A study conducted in 2004 found that simulation without feedback from experts did not improve the skills of trainees. Providing trainees access to a simulator cannot guarantee appropriate learning by itself. Therefore, SBT should be delivered purposefully within a developed curriculum to allow trainees to practice essential skills, receive feedback from experts, and develop skills gradually and appropriately to achieve mastery[55]. Feedback and debriefing are essential in SBT to allow trainees identify their weakness and improve their performance accordingly[56]. Simulation with a proper environment or scenario is also beneficial to the improvement of endoscopic non-technical skills such as communication and teamwork, situation awareness, leadership, judgment, and decision making[57]. A previous study showed that integrating endoscopic non-technical skills training improved novice trainees’ performance and competency, which might benefit patients[58].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>EGD</th>
<th>Colonoscopy</th>
<th>ERCP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Diploma of Gastroenterology[32]</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASGE[33]</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAGES[34]</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy[35]</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Society of Gastroenterology[36]</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 2 Minimum number of trainings needed to achieve competence in different procedures according to gastroenterology associations.
Table 3 Studies on simulation-based endoscopy training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ferlitsch et al [39], 2002</td>
<td>Prospective randomized trial</td>
<td>13 endoscopy trainees were divided into two groups: simulator training and no simulator training</td>
<td>Simulator-trained group had better skills, shorter scope insertion time, and fewer adverse events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giulio et al [44], 2004</td>
<td>Prospective randomized trial</td>
<td>22 fellows with no experience in endoscopy were divided into two groups: preclinical training with computer-based simulator and no preclinical training</td>
<td>The first group performed a more complete procedure, required less assistance, and was assessed as better by the instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen et al [45], 2006</td>
<td>Prospective randomized trial</td>
<td>45 1st-yr GI fellows were divided into two groups: unsupervised simulator training using GI mentor and no simulator</td>
<td>Fellows in the simulator group had significantly higher objective competency rates during the first 100 cases. Fellows who underwent GI mentor training performed significantly better during the early phase of real colonoscopy training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirai et al [45], 2008</td>
<td>Prospective randomized trial</td>
<td>10 trainees were divided into two groups: simulator and non-simulator</td>
<td>5 h of simulator training improved EGD performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferlitsch et al [46], 2010</td>
<td>Prospective randomized trial</td>
<td>28 internal medicine residents were divided into two groups: simulator-trained before conventional training and conventional training only</td>
<td>Virtual simulator training improved technical accuracy during the early and mid-term phase of training, thus reducing the time needed to reach technical competency. However, the clinical effect is limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haycock et al [47], 2010</td>
<td>Prospective randomized trial</td>
<td>36 novice colonoscopists were divided into two groups: simulator training and patient-based training</td>
<td>Simulator-trained group performance matched the patient-based group performance, and showed superior technical skills on simulated cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ende et al [30], 2012</td>
<td>Prospective randomized trial</td>
<td>Residents with no previous experience in endoscopy were divided into three groups: clinical and simulator training, clinical training only, and simulator training only</td>
<td>First group showed better results than the other groups. Third group showed a shorter procedure duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhao et al [48], 2014</td>
<td>Systematic review</td>
<td>Fifteen studies comparing virtual colonoscopy or gastroscopy training with other intervention were analyzed</td>
<td>Virtual endoscopy simulator training might be effective for gastroscopy, but no data are available for colonoscopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singh et al [49], 2014</td>
<td>Systematic review and meta-analysis</td>
<td>Thirty-nine articles, including twenty-one randomized trials on simulation-based training in gastrointestinal endoscopy were analyzed</td>
<td>Simulation-based training significantly enhanced the skills of trainees, reduced the time needed to finish a procedure, and improved patient outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekkelenkamp et al [50], 2016</td>
<td>Systematic review</td>
<td>Twenty-three studies on simulator training and learning curves, including seventeen randomized controlled trials, were analyzed</td>
<td>Validated VR simulator training in the early phase accelerated the learning of practical skills. Assessment of performance level on GI endoscopy procedures should be done continuously with validated assessment tool, rather than threshold number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahmood et al [5], 2018</td>
<td>Systematic review</td>
<td>Twenty-one randomized controlled trials on VR simulation in endoscopy training were analyzed</td>
<td>VR simulation showed improved skills in all areas at the beginning of learning; nonetheless it was not effective as a replacement for conventional training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khan et al [51], 2018</td>
<td>Systematic review</td>
<td>Eighteen trials on endoscopic procedures were analyzed</td>
<td>VR-based training in combination with conventional training showed superior result over VR training alone. Evidence was inconclusive regarding whether VR-based training can replace conventional training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith et al [52], 2021</td>
<td>Systematic review and meta-analysis</td>
<td>Twenty-four studies on simulation of EGD, colonoscopy, ERCP, flexible sigmoidoscopy, or hemostasis procedures were analyzed</td>
<td>Likely positive impact of simulation training on patient comfort, cecal and biliary intubation. However, studies on the effect of simulation training are small and have a short follow-up time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang et al [53], 2021</td>
<td>Systematic review</td>
<td>Twenty-two studies on endoscopy VR simulation training were analyzed</td>
<td>VR simulation training resulted in comparable or significantly better performance than clinical training, no training, other types of simulation, and another form of VR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GI: Gastrointestinal; ERCP: Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography; EGD, Esophagogastroduodenoscopy; VR: Virtual reality.

EXPERIENCES IN SIMULATION-BASED MASTERY LEARNING FOR ENDOSCOPY TRAINING

Several studies have shown endoscopy mastery learning experiences. Nguyen-Vu et al [59] reported a 2-wk course for gastroenterology fellows at the University of California with no prior experience in endoscopy. They divided the learning period into two phases: the 1st week for learning the basics of endoscopy and the 2nd week for learning various therapies in endoscopy. These phases were further divided into specific endoscopic skills such as endoscopic tip control, image documentation, biopsy, and clip administration. Trainees were assigned readings and underwent online assessments before attending hands-on training with a simulator. They had to pass the competency assessment for a specific skill before moving to the next topic. This study showed that the SBML program could rapidly...
help trainees acquire endoscopic skills through a comprehensive curriculum. Online reading and assessments enabled trainees to learn at their own pace, and using a simulator provided them with a chance to engage in repetitive practice. Dividing endoscopic skills also allowed trainees to focus on the specific skills they needed to refine.

Ritter et al[60] reported an endoscopy training system (ETS) using an SBML curriculum implemented with general surgery residents to pass the Fundamentals of Endoscopic Surgery (FES) skills examination. They divided ETS into five tasks which were organized in two tabletop units. The first unit included scope manipulation, tool targeting, and retroflexion tasks using a simple endoscopic tool. The second unit consisted of loop management and mucosal inspection tasks using a stylized body form. Most participants completed this simulation-based curriculum in less than 1 wk with more than 90 min of practice per day. This study suggested that the application of the SBML curriculum to flexible endoscopes provides significantly improved results on posttraining assessments compared with pretraining assessments. This study also found that after five sessions of SBT, participants could produce posttest scores equivalent to those of doctors who had performed 150-300 endoscopy procedures. This result implies that vast clinical experience is not needed to participate in the SBML program. The ETS was further developed by setting the training standards for the SBML curriculum, resulting in attainable standards that improved FES scores in the skills exam[61]. Another subsequent study published in 2021 evaluated the effect of SBML curriculum implementation early in residency. It revealed that early implementation of SBML curriculum for flexible endoscopy training resulted in comparable performance to those with high level of clinical endoscopic experience[62].

Soetikno et al[63] developed a 6-wk SBML program for 1st-year gastroenterology fellows of the Philippine Society of Digestive Endoscopy. SBML involved learning fine-tip control, structured upper endoscopy examination, and endoscopic therapies. Basic knowledge and interpretation of endoscopy findings were learned simultaneously. Interestingly, the first 5 wk of the program were conducted remotely using virtual coaching. Trainees used simulators and recorded their own performance, number of attempts, and completion time for each attempt, and then supervisors provided feedback based on these attempts. During the last week, trainees underwent in-person endoscopic therapy training after having passed the standard for fine-tip control and structured upper endoscopy examination. This study found that the adoption rates for basic endoscopic techniques such as image documentation and biopsy were 93% and 100%, respectively, after 2 mo of training. Meanwhile, the adoption rates of endoscopic therapies such as clipping, band ligation, and injection were more variable (7%-79%)[63]. Soetikno et al[64] also conducted an SBML course in GI bleeding endoscopic therapy and found that SBML quickly disseminated technical knowledge and skills. They proposed SBML as an additional method for teaching before trainees performed the procedure on patients.

PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT OF SIMULATION-BASED MASTERY LEARNING IN GI ENDOSCOPY

As stated above, the SBML program requires a developed and tested curriculum to ensure that all trainees can achieve competence in endoscopy. Kern et al[65] constructed a six-step approach to build an SBML curriculum. The steps are problem identification and general need assessment, specific need assessment, targets and objectives, educational strategies, implementation, and evaluation and feedback. Hospitals and medical institutions should delegate a specific team to plan the SBML curriculum. After planning, a pilot study should be conducted to evaluate satisfaction of trainees with the program and patient outcomes. Once SBML has been implemented, continuous monitoring and evaluation should be performed to maintain the quality of the program[37].

SBML begins with an initial assessment of the knowledge and abilities of trainees. After training, students will be tested again, and training will continue until they meet the minimum passing standards. Once trainees meet the minimum passing standards, they can advance to the next stage of training (Figure 1). Periodic examinations will be conducted along with planned practices to ensure that expected competencies are maintained[37]. Some training centers might provide materials for self-learning before the simulation starts to improve the initial knowledge of trainees. A study by Cheung et al[66] showed that preparation before SBML is substantial to improve the effectiveness of SBML. They found that web-based observational practice is superior to reading materials alone, as it increases learner engagement with instructional materials.

Learning targets should be determined from the beginning of the SBML program and arranged according to the SMART acronym: specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, and time-bound[39,60]. Trainees, trainers, and supervisors have to understand learning targets before starting the program. This understanding is beneficial because trainees can focus their learning on the important and necessary skills, and trainers and supervisors can provide structured feedback. Feedback is important in SBML and should be delivered in a specific manner: with only one or two important points at a time and preferably immediately after the procedure or simulation to be properly understood by trainees[67,68]. Feedback should also be constructive and not vague, allowing trainees to self-reflect and come up with potential solutions[31].
In addition to training or lesson planning, an assessment plan is needed to create a training environment with maximum results. Assessment is vital to provide trainees with future directions for improvement and to ensure patient safety by issuing a passing standard[69]. At the beginning of mastery learning, a pretest has to be conducted to evaluate the initial knowledge of trainees[67]. Within the program, assessments are classified as formative or summative assessments. Formative assessment aims to direct training and support the self-reflection and intrinsic motivation of trainees[70]. Meanwhile, summative assessment seeks to evaluate competency and practice eligibility[71]. There are five criteria to indicate the quality of an assessment: reliability, which shows the accuracy and reproducibility of a test; validity, which shows whether the test can be performed to evaluate the intended focused parameter; future impact of the assessment; acceptability by trainees and supervisors; and reasonable cost. Assessments can be conducted through written examinations, direct evaluations by clinical supervisors, direct observations, clinical simulations, or portfolios[69].

THE FUTURE OF SIMULATION-BASED MASTERY LEARNING IN GI ENDOSCOPY

It is reasonable and expected that novice endoscopists do not perform endoscopic procedures on human patients unless they have shown satisfactory skills on a simulator. Endoscopy training should move from the traditional apprenticeship model to objective competency-based mastery learning, integrating simulators, deliberate practice, and prompt feedback from supervisors. The SBML curriculum is acknowledged as a method to boost the efficiency and efficacy of endoscopy training through repetitive practice and expert feedback, which allow trainees to learn the basic structure of endoscopic techniques. One of the limitations of the traditional apprenticeship model is the reduced time for questions, feedback, and adequate skill assessment during a procedure on an actual patient, which results in self-learning; thus, not all trainees might develop a proper form and technique. Incorporating simulators can improve this limitation of the conventional apprenticeship model by allowing trainees to practice basic endoscopic maneuvers repeatedly, as each trainee has a different absorption rate. In fact, acquiring proper techniques is essential for trainees, as they can progress to the next stage of training which is more complex. Simulators also limit the possibility of patient discomfort and injury, thereby allowing trainees to improve their skills. Additionally, the standardization of simulator-based instruction methods is essential to maximize the positive impact of the training method[8]. The integration of simulator in endoscopy training should be within a structured curriculum that combines constructive feedback and complementary knowledge[72]. A previous randomized trial compared the outcome of structured comprehensive curriculum to progressive learning-based curriculum, and revealed that those who received SBT that progressed in complexity and difficulty had superior technical and communication skills and global performance in the simulated setting[73].

A proper SBML curriculum for GI endoscopy should subsequently consist of cognitive, technical, and integrative skill training. The coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic has accelerated the acceptance of online video/web-based learning, video mentoring, and video proctoring. Web-based learning in the form of online modules is now expected for cognitive skill training, which allows trainees to review learning modules at their own pace and to avoid cognitive overload due to a stressful environment[59]. The main drawbacks of simulation-based learning are model realism and less real-world experience for new endoscopists. Hence, hybrid learning that combines simulator-based and one-on-one training is ideal for building the learning curves of trainees and identifying their deficiencies[74]. Improved performance in simulator training has been shown to translate into the clinical area[60].

**Figure 1 Stages in simulation-based mastery learning.** Simulation-based mastery learning begins with a pretest to assess trainees’ initial knowledge and abilities. Subsequently, trainees will undergo simulation-based training with formative assessment to direct their training. Lastly, trainees will be evaluated for competency through summative assessment (posttest) according to the minimum passing standards. Trainees who pass the test can advance to the next stage of training, while those who do not pass must receive additional training and practice until they meet the minimum passing standards.
CONCLUSION

The traditional apprenticeship model in GI endoscopy training must be revised to ensure competency and practical eligibility of novice endoscopists. By moving the focus from a case volume-based to a competency-based training, mastery learning can help lower the variability between skills of trainees and provide optimal results. Previous experiences with the SBML program in endoscopy training showed promising results and positioned that method as an additional course to be incorporated before the apprenticeship is started and also as a complementary course to one-on-one training. The use of a simulator in SBML can help trainees become acquainted with the endoscopic equipment, settings, and situations that might arise during their direct practice on patients. The SBML program should be planned and managed by a specific team and conducted within a developed and tested curriculum.
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Abstract

BACKGROUND
Endoscopic ultrasound (EUS) can detect small lesions throughout the digestive tract; however, it remains challenging to accurately identify malignancies with this approach. EUS elastography measures tissue hardness, by which malignant and nonmalignant pancreatic masses (PMs) and lymph nodes (LNs) can be differentiated. However, there is currently little information regarding the strain ratio (SR) cutoff in Hispanic populations.

AIM
To determine the diagnostic accuracy of EUS elastography for PMs and LNs with an SR cutoff value in Hispanics.

METHODS
A retrospective study of patients who underwent EUS elastography for PMs between December 2013 and December 2014. A qualitative (analysis of color maps) and quantitative (SR) analysis of PMs and their associated LNs was performed. The accuracy of EUS elastography in identifying malignant PMs and LNs and cutoff value for SR were analyzed. A PM and/or its associated LNs were considered malignant based on histopathological findings from fine-needle aspiration biopsy samples.

RESULTS
A sample of 121 patients was included, 45.4% of whom were female. 69 (57.0%) PMs were histologically malignant, with a median SR of 50.4 vs 33.0 for malignant vs nonmalignant masses (P < 0.001). EUS evaluation identified associated LNs in 43/121 patients (35.5%), in whom 22/43 (51.2%) patients had histologically confirmed malignant diagnosis, with a median SR of 30 vs 40 for malignant vs nonmalignant LNs (P = 0.7182). In detecting malignancy in PMs, an SR cutoff value of > 21.5 yielded a sensitivity of 94.2%, while a cutoff value of > 121 yielded a specificity of 96.2.2%. There were significant differences in the Giovannini scores, a previously established elastic score system, between the patients grouped by their final histology results (P < 0.001). For LNs, SR cutoff values of > 14.0 and > 155 yielded a sensitivity of 90.9% and a specificity of 95.2%, respectively, in detecting malignancy.

CONCLUSION

EUS elastography is a helpful technique for the diagnosis of solid PMs and their associated LNs. The proposed SR cutoff values have a high sensitivity and specificity for the detection of malignancy.

Key Words: Ultrasound; Elastography; Pancreas; Lymph nodes; Neoplasm

©The Author(s) 2022. Published by Baishideng Publishing Group Inc. All rights reserved.

Core Tip: This single-center retrospective study aimed to determine the diagnostic accuracy of endoscopic ultrasound (EUS) elastography in the diagnosis of pancreatic masses (PMs) and associated lymph nodes (LNs) with a defined strain ratio (SR) cutoff value in a Hispanic population. In determining if PMs were malignant, an SR cutoff value > 21.5 had a sensitivity of 94.2%, while a cutoff value > 121 had a specificity of 96.2.2%. For diagnosing LNs, an SR cutoff value > 14.0 had a sensitivity of 90.9%, while a cutoff value > 155 had a specificity of 95.2% for malignancy. The proposed SR cutoff values have high sensitivity and specificity for malignancy detection during EUS elastography.

DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.4253/wjge.v14.i9.524

INTRODUCTION

Pancreatic masses (PMs) include neoplastic and nonneoplastic lesions (i.e., anatomical variants, inflammatory lesions). One of the essential tasks during the assessment of PMs is identifying their benign or malignant nature. Along with the identification of malignant lesions, the presence of involved lymph nodes (LNs) is a prognostic factor of the disease. To date, one of the most sensitive methods for detecting PMs is endoscopic ultrasound (EUS), which allows for the visualization of small lesions throughout the digestive tract; however, EUS has a limited capacity in accurately determining the malignant or nonmalignant nature of a lesion. In addition, EUS-guided fine-needle aspiration (EUS-FNA) provides a histological diagnosis for lesions suspicious of malignancy; nevertheless, this invasive technique has a false-negative rate of 25%[1].

These shortcomings have been addressed with EUS elastography, an additional imaging technique used to determine tissue hardness. Malignant tissue is often more rigid than the normal surrounding tissue; thus, EUS elastography can differentiate between malignant and nonmalignant lesions. As a result, this technique has been applied in the diagnostic workup of PMs and their associated LNs[2-4]. EUS elastography is considered an accurate imaging technique for characterizing and detecting pancreatic lesions[2].

EUS elastography can be used to evaluate PMs and their associated LNs through qualitative and quantitative analyses; the former involves the analysis of color maps, while the latter is achieved by assessing the strain ratio (SR). However, previous studies, such as the one published by Altonbary et al [4], have reported differences in the SR cutoff value and the optimal internal sensitivity and specificity, suggesting a potential limitation of this technique[3,4]. The accuracy of this technique in differentiating malignant from nonmalignant lesions has only been assessed for masses consisting of solid tissue. The suitability of EUS elastography for solid-cystic lesions, which comprise an important percentage of...
pancreatic tumoral lesions, has not been reported.

Based on the above, through this retrospective study, we aim to determine the diagnostic accuracy of EUS elastography for diagnosing malignant PMs and LNs in a Hispanic cohort and define the SR cutoff values in this population, comparing the results with those obtained through FNA biopsy.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**Study design**

This was an observational, analytic, retrospective, case-control study performed at the Instituto Ecuatoriano de Enfermedades Digestivas (IECED, Guayaquil, Ecuador) from December 2013 to December 2014. Consecutive Hispanic patients (≥ 18 years old) were referred for the evaluation of suspected PMs using EUS following computed tomography (CT) or magnetic resonance imaging (MRI). Patients with incomplete clinical records were excluded. The patients were allocated into two groups (malignant or nonmalignant) according to the histological findings of biopsy samples and results from a 6-mo clinical follow-up (i.e., laboratory tests, imaging, and surgical findings). All participants or their legal guardians gave written informed consent before the procedure. The Institutional Review Board approved the use and management of the corresponding data, and the study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki.

**EUS elastography**

All procedures were performed by two expert endoscopists (CRM and RV), who perform ≥ 300 EUS procedures per year. The patients were examined under general anesthesia using a 3.8 mm working-channel linear-array echoendoscope (EG3870UTK, Pentax Medical, Pentax, Hamburg, Germany) attached to a Hitachi AVIUS Ultrasound Console (Avius Hitachi, Tokyo, Japan).

First, PMs or any associated LNs were examined under conventional B-mode scanning. Then, EUS elastography of the region of interest was performed using the ultrasound console. Tissue hardness was measured qualitatively and quantitatively in all regions of interest via EUS color maps and the SR, respectively. Subsequently, EUS-guided FNA was performed using a 22-gauge needle (Expect®, Boston Scientific, Marlborough, MA). A pathologist blinded to the EUS elastography results performed the histological analysis.

**Scoring system**

Two expert endoscopists (CRM and RV) performed the qualitative assessed by classifying the elastography images using the elastic score, as reported by Giovannini[3]. Giovannini elastic scores of 1 and 2 correspond to large green areas of soft and nonmalignant tissue; a score of 3 corresponds to a mainly blue area, considered a small adenocarcinoma; scores of 4 and 5 correspond to blue areas of hard and malignant tissue. For practical purposes, scores of 1 and 2 were considered nonmalignant lesions, whereas scores of 3, 4, and 5 were considered malignant lesions. Conventional EUS B-mode characteristics, such as size, shape, density, and ability to determine the border of suspicious lesions, were also recorded as part of the qualitative analysis. According to these factors, lesions with a size greater than 1 cm, irregular shape, anechoic density, or undefined borders were considered malignant[3-6].

The quantitative diagnosis was performed by calculating the *semiquantitative proportion* of tissue elasticity by measuring the SR of the region of interest. According to the method described by Iglesias-Garcia et al[6], at least three elasticity measurements for the mass lesion (A) and one for the surrounding area (B) were obtained. The corresponding SRs were then calculated by dividing B by each of the A values, and their mean was calculated[7].

**Data collection**

Baseline data were extracted from medical records. The location, size, diameter, and color pattern of PMs and their associated LNs on EUS elastography, SR, and histological diagnosis were thoroughly described. Malignancy in solid and solid-cystic PMs was defined following the Fukuoka Consensus Guidelines, as detailed in Table 1[5].

**Statistical analysis**

**Technical considerations:** All statistical analyses were performed by an institutional GI attending and biostatistician (MPT) with 8 years of experience, using R v4.0 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing; Vienna, Austria). A *P* value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

**Sample size:** The sample size was estimated considering a 100% specificity for an SR > 6.04 on EUS elastography in predicting malignancy in solid PMs, with a corresponding disease prevalence of 67.4% [5], δ = 10%, and α- and β-errors of 5% and 20%, respectively. Using these parameters, a sample size of twenty-four cases and eleven controls was estimated, with 80% statistical power. To respect the central limit theorem (in which thirty observations are necessary to reach a Gaussian distribution), we aimed to analyze no fewer than thirty patients with malignant PMs during the study period.
Table 1 Classification of pancreatic lesions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Malignant</th>
<th>Nonmalignant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solid Adenocarcinoma</td>
<td>Acute pancreatitis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lymphoma</td>
<td>Chronic pancreatitis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNETs</td>
<td>Adenoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pancreatoblastoma</td>
<td>Insulinoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metastatic cancer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid-Cystic Mucinous cystadenoma¹</td>
<td>Serous cystadenoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serous cystadenocarcinoma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mucinous cystadenocarcinoma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPMN¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Considered malignant if the Fukuoka criteria are met.

PNET: Pancreatic neuroendocrine tumor; IPMN: Intraductal papillary mucinous neoplasm.

Comparisons of baseline data, EUS, and EUS elastography diagnostic outcomes: Quantitative variables are described as the mean (standard deviation) or median (minimum-maximum range) according to their statistical distribution (Kolmogorov-Smirnov test). Qualitative variables are described as frequency (%). The potential differences in baseline data (i.e., age, sex, PM location) and EUS elastography diagnostic outcomes between malignant and nonmalignant PMs and LNs were confirmed with statistical hypothesis testing and illustrated with a boxplot, when necessary. Associations of PM and LN SR with diameter were demonstrated through Spearman’s rank correlation (rho).

EUS and EUS elastography qualitative analysis: The sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), negative predictive value (NPV), and accuracy of a Giovannini elastic score of 3 to 5 (cyan and dark blue) in predicting malignancy in PMs and their associated LNs were estimated. In the case of PMs, the subgroup analysis considered only solid PMs (excluding solid-cystic PMs). In the case of associated LNs, the sensitivity, specificity, PPV, NPV, and accuracy of conventional B-mode EUS criteria in predicting malignancy were also determined.

EUS elastography quantitative analysis: The sensitivity, specificity, PPV, NPV, and accuracy of SR measurements in predicting malignancy in PMs and their associated LNs were estimated. Subgroup analysis was also performed only for solid PMs (excluding solid-cystic PMs). In each situation, two internally derived SR cutoff values, one yielding the optimal sensitivity (and accuracy) and the other the optimal specificity, were calculated from the study data. We also calculated the corresponding areas under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUROCs), in which AUROCs of 0.5 suggested a prediction of malignancy equivalent to chance, with values of 0.7 to 0.8 considered acceptable, 0.8 to 0.9 considered excellent, and more than 0.9 considered outstanding discriminability[6]. The corresponding ROC curves were also generated and compared using the roc.test function of the pROC (v1.16.2; Robin X, 2020) package when necessary.

RESULTS

A sample of 121 patients with previous CT or MRI scans for PMs underwent EUS evaluation and were enrolled in the study. In this cohort, 55/121 (45.5%) were female, and the median age was 67 years (13–99). There was a histologically confirmed diagnosis of malignancy in 69/121 (57%) patients who were allocated to the malignant group; the remaining patients were placed in the nonmalignant group. Additionally, 43/121 (35.5%) patients had associated LNs surrounding the gastrointestinal tract. The baseline data and EUS elastography diagnostic outcomes of the cohort are summarized in Table 2.

We compared both PM groups in terms of the variables obtained from the EUS elasticity qualitative and quantitative analyses. Regarding the qualitative outcomes, there were significant differences in the Giovannini scores between the patients grouped by their final histology results (P < 0.001). For the quantitative outcomes, there was a significant difference in the median SR between patients with malignant (50.4, range 7.8–22.5) and nonmalignant PMs (33.0, range 2.6–321.0) (P < 0.001). In the solid PM subgroup, the median SR values were 51.0 (7.8–225.0) and 21.9 (2.6–321.0), respectively (Figure 1). A proportionally significant association was demonstrated between a higher PM SR and a larger PM diameter (rho = 0.251, 95%CI: 0.0481; P = 0.05).
Table 2 Baseline data and endoscopic ultrasound elastography diagnostic outcomes of pancreatic masses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Malignancy (n = 69)</th>
<th>Nonmalignancy (n = 52)</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (yr), median (range)</td>
<td>67 (13–93)</td>
<td>68 (20–99)</td>
<td>0.8907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (female), n (%)</td>
<td>36 (52.2)</td>
<td>19 (36.5)</td>
<td>0.1271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM location, n (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head</td>
<td>50 (72.5)</td>
<td>35 (67.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck</td>
<td>3 (4.3)</td>
<td>4 (7.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body</td>
<td>13 (18.8)</td>
<td>12 (23.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tail</td>
<td>3 (4.3)</td>
<td>1 (1.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM diameter (mm), median (range)</td>
<td>37.0 (7.4–70.0)</td>
<td>30 (10.0–60.0)</td>
<td>0.0616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovannini elastic score, n (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green (score 1 to 2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11 (21.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyan (score 3)</td>
<td>5 (7.2)</td>
<td>11 (21.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark blue (score 4 to 5)</td>
<td>64 (92.8)</td>
<td>30 (57.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strain ratio, median (range)</td>
<td>50.4 (7.8–225.0)</td>
<td>33.0 (2.6–321.0)</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firmness/histopathology, n (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid-cystic masses (n = 36)</td>
<td>26/69</td>
<td>10/52</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serous cystadenoma</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10 (19.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mucinous cystadenoma</td>
<td>5 (7.2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mucinous cystadenocarcinoma</td>
<td>3 (4.3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPMN</td>
<td>18 (26.1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid masses (n = 85)</td>
<td>43/69</td>
<td>42/52</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 (7.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute pancreatitis</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10 (19.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic pancreatitis</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26 (50.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adenoma</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (1.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulinoma</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (1.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adenocarcinoma</td>
<td>33 (47.8)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lymphoma</td>
<td>3 (4.3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNETs</td>
<td>6 (8.7)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pancreatoblastoma</td>
<td>1 (1.4)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aMann-Whitney U test.
bPearson Chi-Quadrat Test.
IPMN: Intraductal papillary mucinous neoplasm; PNET: Pancreatic neuroendocrine tumor; PM: Pancreatic masses.

In detecting malignancies among all PMs, a Giovannini elastic score of 3 to 5 had a sensitivity, specificity, PPV, NPV, and accuracy of 100.0%, 21.2%, 62.7%, 100.0%, and 66.1%, respectively. For the subgroup of solid PMs, the corresponding sensitivity, specificity, PPV, NPV, and accuracy were 100%, 23.8%, 57.3%, 100%, and 62.4%, respectively (Table 3).

In the quantitative analysis, we found that optimal sensitivity and specificity values were obtained for SR cutoff values of 21.5 and 121.0, respectively, for both all PMs and solid PMs. The diagnostic accuracy parameters for both groups of PMs are shown in Table 3. Notably, in the overall PM analysis, the lower SR cutoff value (≥ 21.5) was associated with a higher sensitivity (94.2%) and NPV (84.0%), and the higher SR cutoff value (≥ 121.0) was associated with higher specificity (96.2%) and PPV (83.3%). A similar observation was made in the solid PM subgroup analysis; however, the SR cutoff value of ≥ 121.0 yielded higher accuracy in the subgroup analysis than in the overall PM analysis (54.1% vs 49.6%), while the SR cutoff of ≥ 21.5 yielded a lower accuracy (69.4% vs 71.1%). Additionally, the AUROC was slightly higher in the solid PM subgroup analysis (AUROC = 0.713) than in the overall PM analysis.
Table 3 Qualitative and quantitative diagnostic accuracy of endoscopic ultrasound elastography for detecting malignant pancreatic masses: All lesions (n = 121) and only solid pancreatic masses (n = 85)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EUS-elastography qualitative analysis</th>
<th>EUS-elastography quantitative analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All masses</td>
<td>Only solid pancreatic masses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity (%)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specificity (%)</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPV (%)</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPV (%)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy (%)</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>62.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All PMs</td>
<td>Only solid PMs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR ≥ 21.5</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR ≥ 121.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR ≥ 21.5</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR ≥ 121.0</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Internally derived optimal strain ratio (SR) cutoff for sensitivity (and accuracy).
2Internally derived optimal SR cutoff for specificity.

EUS: Endoscopic ultrasound; SR: Strain ratio; PPV: Positive predictive value; NPV: Negative predictive value; PM: Pancreatic masses.

Figure 1 Distribution of strain ratio values among malignant (red) and nonmalignant (blue) pancreatic masses and their associated lymph nodes. *Mann-Whitney U test. SR: Strain ratio.

(AUROC = 0.685) (P = 0.7073) (Figure 2A and B).

Among the 43 patients with associated LNs, the median age was 67.5 (39–95) years, and 14/43 (32.6%) were female. Histology confirmed malignancy in 22/43 (51.2%) patients, who were subsequently placed in the malignant group. There were no significant differences between the malignant and nonmalignant LN groups in LN location, diameter, EUS characteristics, Giovannini elastic score, or SR (Table 4). Specifically, the average SR was 30.0 (3.0–120.0) for malignant LNs and 40.0 (5.0–269.0) for nonmalignant LNs (P = 0.7182) (Figure 1). There was no association between LN SR and diameter (rho = -0.017, 95%CI: -0.503–0.421; P = 0.937).

Qualitative EUS elastography analysis yielded a sensitivity, specificity, PPV, NPV, and accuracy of 68.1%, 38.1%, 53.6%, 53.3%, and 53.5%, respectively; these values were lower than those obtained using the structural characteristics detected via conventional B-mode scanning (Table 5). For the PMs, we obtained two SR cutoff values by identifying the values that yielded optimal sensitivity and specificity. Specifically, an SR cutoff value of 14.0 yielded a sensitivity, specificity, PPV, NPV, and accuracy of 90.0%, 28.6%, 51.4%, 75.0% and 60.4, respectively; the corresponding values for an SR cutoff value of 155.0 were 4.5%, 95.2%, 50.0%, 48.8% and 48.8% (Table 5). The use of SR for diagnosing malignancy yielded an AUROC of 0.417 (Figure 2C).

DISCUSSION

In the present study, we found that qualitative EUS elastography analysis was highly sensitive for solid PMs. Moreover, in the quantitative assessment, an SR cutoff value of ≥ 21.5 had a 90% sensitivity for
defining malignancy in solid PMs (Figure 3). In contrast, a cutoff value of ≥ 121.0 had a 95% specificity for malignant PMs. For the evaluation of associated LNs, an SR of ≥ 14.0 had a 91% sensitivity, whereas an SR of ≥ 155.0 had a 95% specificity.

Various studies have shown the ability of EUS to distinguish between malignant and nonmalignant lesions. Itokawa et al. [8] proposed that a Giovannini elastic score of 5 during EUS elastography evaluation is a characteristic of pancreatic malignancy [8,9], with 98.6% of patients having a score of five and a confirmed pancreatic malignancy. However, our study found that 91.4% of patients with malignant PMs had a score of 4 to 5.

The qualitative elastic score had a high sensitivity of 100.0% in our study for solid and solid-cystic PMs. On the other hand, Itokawa et al. [8] found that a considerable number of nonmalignant cases scored 5, decreasing the specificity of the elastic score to 64.3% [2]. Our study found a specificity of 21.15% for solid and solid-cystic PMs and 23.81% for solid masses alone. No malignant pancreatic lesions had an elastic score of 1 or 2 following Giovannini’s classification. According to the qualitative analysis, our cases reported high sensitivity and NPV.

Iglesias-Garcia et al. [6], in a prospective study of 86 patients, described one of the highest diagnostic accuracy values based on qualitative and quantitative EUS elastography analysis. For the qualitative measurements, the sensitivity, specificity, PPV, NPV, and overall accuracy were 100%, 71%, 87%, 100%, and 90%, respectively. For the quantitative values, a lower SR cutoff value of > 6.0 had a sensitivity, specificity, PPV, NPV, and overall accuracy of 100%, 92%, 96%, 100%, and 97%, respectively [6].

### Table 4 Baseline data, endoscopic ultrasound, and endoscopic ultrasound elastography diagnostic outcomes of the associated lymph nodes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Malignancy (n = 22)</th>
<th>Nonmalignancy (n = 21)</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (yr), median (range)</strong></td>
<td>76 (57–95)</td>
<td>65 (39–85)</td>
<td>0.2037a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex (female), n (%)</strong></td>
<td>8 (36.4)</td>
<td>6 (28.6)</td>
<td>0.5860b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LN location, n (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4259b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esophagus</td>
<td>13 (59.1)</td>
<td>15 (71.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stomach</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
<td>1 (4.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver</td>
<td>1 (4.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pancreas</td>
<td>5 (22.7)</td>
<td>5 (23.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidney</td>
<td>1 (4.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LN diameter, median (range)</strong></td>
<td>20.0 (4.0–50.0)</td>
<td>15.5 (7.0–21.6)</td>
<td>0.2662a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EUS-LN characteristics, n (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irregular shape</td>
<td>11 (50.0)</td>
<td>10 (47.6)</td>
<td>0.8760b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undefined border</td>
<td>13 (59.1)</td>
<td>8 (38.1)</td>
<td>0.2730b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anechoic density</td>
<td>7 (31.8)</td>
<td>3 (14.3)</td>
<td>0.1740b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovannini elastic score, n (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green (score 1 to 2)</td>
<td>1 (4.5)</td>
<td>2 (9.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyan (score 3)</td>
<td>6 (27.3)</td>
<td>6 (28.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark blue (score 4 to 5)</td>
<td>15 (68.2)</td>
<td>13 (61.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strain ratio, median (range)</strong></td>
<td>30.0 (3.0–120.0)</td>
<td>40.0 (5.0–269.0)</td>
<td>0.7182c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Histopathology, n (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 0.001b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute lymphadenitis</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10 (47.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic lymphadenitis</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11 (52.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lymphoma</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metastasis</td>
<td>20 (90.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a*Mann-Whitney U test.

*b*Pearson Chi-Quadrat Test.

EUS: Endoscopic ultrasound; LN: Lymph node.
Table 5 Diagnostic accuracy of conventional B-mode endoscopic ultrasound and qualitative and quantitative endoscopic ultrasound elastography analysis for malignancy in the associated lymph nodes (n = 43)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conventional B-mode EUS</th>
<th>EUS-elastography qualitative analysis</th>
<th>EUS-elastography quantitative analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Shape</td>
<td>Border</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity (%)</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specificity (%)</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPV (%)</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPV (%)</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy (%)</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Internally derived optimal strain ratio cutoff for sensitivity (and accuracy).
2Internally derived optimal cutoff for specificity.
EUS: Endoscopic ultrasound; SR: Strain ratio; PPV: Positive predictive value; NPV: Negative predictive value.

Figure 2 Areas under the receiver operating characteristic curve. A: Areas under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUROC) of the strain ratio in the detection of malignancy in pancreatic masses [AUROC = 0.685 (0.586–0.783)]. B: AUROC of the strain ratio in the detection of malignancy in only solid pancreatic masses [AUROC = 0.713 (0.602–0.825)]. C: AUROC of the strain ratio in the detection of malignancy in associated lymph nodes [AUROC = 0.417 (0.076–0.757)]. There was no significant difference between AUROC–A and AUROC–B (P = 0.7073). AUROC: Areas under the receiver operating characteristic curve.

Dawwas et al[10] obtained a higher diagnostic accuracy for EUS elastography using an SR cutoff value of 4.65 to achieve a 100% sensitivity and a cutoff value of 59.25 to achieve a 100% specificity. Okasha et al[11] concluded that the best SR cutoff level was 7.8, which gave a sensitivity of 92%, a specificity of 77%, a PPV of 91%, an NPV of 80%, and an accuracy of 88%. Our study achieved a higher sensitivity using a lower cutoff value. Actors such as tissue inflammation, fibrosis, necrosis, advanced age, or ethnicity may affect the hardness of tissue, explaining the difference in the cutoff values proposed in the literature.[12-14] Moreover, the size of the region of interest and tissue compression level could affect the quantitative evaluation of EUS elastography.

Additionally, a study published by Kongkam et al[15] showed that a cutoff SR level of 3.17 along with EUS-FNA provided a sensitivity, specificity, PPV, NPV and accuracy of 95.2%, 71.4%, 90.9%, 83.3%, and 89.3%, respectively, compared to the 90%, 100%, 100% 80% and 92.8% of EUS elastography alone. Based on these results, the authors raised the possibility of a future combination of both techniques for evaluating PMs.[15]

Paterson et al[12] focused their research on the utility of quantitative EUS elastography analysis for defining malignancy in the LNs related to esophageal and gastric cancer and compared this approach to an analysis using conventional EUS LN features. Compared to our results, they found a lower diagnostic accuracy for conventional EUS but a higher diagnostic accuracy for EUS elastography.[12]

The present study has several limitations, including its retrospective design and single-center nature, leading to a limited number of operators. A few patients from the malignant case group underwent surgery, limiting the histological description of this research. The nonmalignant control group was defined as patients with nonmalignant masses instead of a healthy population. However, this study has...
Figure 3 Quantitative and qualitative endoscopic ultrasound elastography assessment. A: Case No. 84: A 26-year-old woman with a pancreatic mass. A plain B-mode image (left) and a color-code strain image (right) are shown, strain ratio (SR) = 2.66, Giovannini elastic score of 2 (green). Biopsy confirmed chronic pancreatitis; B: Case No. 73: A 46-year-old man with a pancreatic mass. A plain B-mode image (left) and a color-coded strain image (right) are shown, SR = 23.8, Giovannini elastic score of 4 (dark blue). Biopsy confirmed pancreatic adenocarcinoma.

Figure 4 Proposed algorithm for the workup of pancreatic masses. SR: Strain ratio; EUS: Endoscopic ultrasound; CT: Computed tomography; MR: Magnetic resonance.

The advantage of using the qualitative elastic score proposed by Giovannini[3]. For the interpretation of PMs and their associated LNs, instead of the 4-score by Furukawa et al.[16], and may be one of the first studies to evaluate the utility of EUS elastography in Hispanic patients. Future research on this topic will be designed as diagnostic trials, considering the Giovannini score for PMs and associated LN descriptions.

Finally, hard PMs are not necessarily malignant all the time, whereas soft lesions are not necessarily nonmalignant[2,17]. Therefore, a validated cutoff value for defining malignancy in PMs and their associated LNs is imperative for obtaining an appropriate diagnosis and providing management guidance. Based on our findings, we recommend an SR cutoff values of > 121.0 and > 155.0 as criteria for supporting the need for FNA sampling of pancreatic lesions or their associated LNs, respectively. In
patients with SR values ranging from 21.5-121.0 and 14.0-155.0, sampling should be indicated if there is a high clinical suspicion of malignancy. Figure 4 shows a proposed clinical algorithm using EUS elastography evaluations. We recommend starting with a qualitative measurement. For those with a low risk of malignancy (elastic score I-II), a 6-mo follow-up is necessary. However, for those with an elastic score between 3 and 5, a quantitative evaluation is required to define the SR measurement and determine the necessity of FNA and whether a malignancy is suspected.

CONCLUSION
We found that EUS combined with qualitative and quantitative elastography analysis via SR is a helpful resource when assessing PMs and their associated LNs. This approach is more effective and convenient than limiting the evaluation to only conventional EUS-fine needle aspiration for the detection of malignancy. Although histological analysis is mandatory for a final diagnosis, elastography should be included in the diagnostic workup of PMs and their associated LNs. However, validating this recommendation through a prospective, multi-center, controlled trial is preferable.

ARTICLE HIGHLIGHTS

Research background
Endoscopic ultrasound (EUS) elastography can be a useful technique for the evaluation of pancreatic masses (PMs) and their associated lymph nodes (LNs) through qualitative (analysis of color maps) and quantitative (assessing the strain ratio).

Research motivation
The accuracy of this technique in differentiating malignant from nonmalignant lesions has only been assessed for masses consisting of solid tissue. For the evaluation of solid-cystic lesions, the suitability of EUS-elastography has not been reported.

Research objectives
To determine the diagnostic accuracy of EUS elastography and the strain ratio (SR) cutoff value for malignant PMs and LNs in a Hispanic cohort.

Research methods
A retrospective study of patients who underwent EUS elastography for PMs between December 2013 and December 2014. A qualitative and quantitative (SR) analysis of PMs and their associated LNs was performed. The accuracy of EUS elastography in identifying malignant PMs and LNs and cutoff value for SR were analyzed. A PM and/or its associated LNs were considered malignant based on histopathological findings from fine-needle aspiration biopsy samples.

Research results
Malignant PMs have a superior median SR compared to nonmalignant lesions (50.4 vs 33.0, respectively) (P < 0.001). When analyzing LNs, there was no statistical significance (SR 30.0 for PMs vs 40.0 for LNs) (P = 0.7182). An SR cutoff value > 21.5 in PMs yielded a 94.2% sensitivity. Meanwhile, an SR cutoff value > 14.0 yielded a 90.9% sensitivity.

Research conclusions
The proposed EUS elastography SR cutoff values have a high sensitivity and specificity for the detection of malignancy.

Research perspectives
Future research evaluating the utility of EUS elastography in Hispanic patients through a prospective, multi-center, controlled trial is necessary to validate our data.
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Abstract

BACKGROUND
The treatment for ampullary cancer is pancreatoduodenectomy or local ampulllectomy. However, effective methods for the preoperative investigation of hilar biliary invasion in ampullary cancer patients have not yet been identified.

AIM
To determine the necessity of and an appropriate method for investigating hilar biliary invasion of ampullary cancer.

METHODS
Among 43 ampullary cancer patients, 34 underwent endoscopic treatment (n = 9) or surgery (n = 25). The use of imaging findings (thickening and enhancement of the bile duct wall on contrast-enhanced computed tomography, irregularity on endoscopic retrograde cholangiography, thickening of the entire bile duct wall on intraductal ultrasonography (IDUS), and partial thickening of the bile duct wall on IDUS) and biliary biopsy results for diagnosing hilar biliary invasion of ampullary cancer was compared.

RESULTS
Hilar invasion was not observed in every patient. Among the patients who did not undergo biliary stent insertion, the combination of partial thickening of the bile duct wall on IDUS and biliary biopsy results showed the highest accuracy (100%) for diagnosing hilar biliary invasion. However, each imaging method and biliary biopsy yielded some false-positive results.

**CONCLUSION**

Although some false-positive results were obtained with each method, the combination of partial thickening of the bile duct wall on IDUS and biliary biopsy results was useful for diagnosing hilar biliary invasion of ampullary cancer. However, hilar invasion of ampullary cancer is rare; therefore, the investigation of hilar biliary invasion of ampullary cancer might be unnecessary.

**Key Words:** Ampullary cancer; Biliary biopsy; Contrast-enhanced CT; Hilar biliary invasion; Intraductal ultrasonography
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**Core Tip:** The standard treatment for ampullary cancer is surgical resection. However, the necessity of and appropriate diagnostic method for assessing hilar invasion is unknown. In this study, the use of contrast-enhanced computed tomography, endoscopic retrograde cholangiography, intraductal ultrasonography (IDUS), and biliary biopsy for diagnosing hilar invasion of ampullary cancer was compared. Although false positives were observed for each method, the combination of partial thickening of the bile duct wall on IDUS and biliary biopsy results was efficient for accurately diagnosing hilar invasion of ampullary cancer. On the other hand, hilar invasion of ampullary cancer is rare; thus, hilar biliary investigation might be unnecessary.

**INTRODUCTION**

The standard treatment for ampullary cancer is pancreatoduodenectomy. In addition, local surgical resection of the ampulla or endoscopic ampullectomy has been recently performed for ampullary cancer that does not invade the sphincter of Oddi[1-6]. To perform these treatments, an accurate assessment of the extent of biliary invasion is important. Although ampullary lesions show ductal invasion[7-9], hilar biliary invasion by ampullary lesions has not been reported. When a tumor advances to the hilar biliary duct, the extent of resection is modified accordingly.

The efficacy of contrast-enhanced computed tomography (CECT), endoscopic retrograde cholangiography (ERC), and intraductal ultrasonography (IDUS) for diagnosing the horizontal progression of bile duct cancer has been reported[10-15]. The diagnostic accuracy of CECT for lateral extension of hilar biliary cancer has been reported to be 71 %-96%[13,14,16-23]. In addition, ERC following IDUS has been reported to be useful for diagnosing lateral extension of biliary ductal cancer[24-27]. The diagnostic accuracy of mapping biopsy for lateral extension of biliary ductal cancer has been reported to be 73.0%-89.0%[28-31]. However, whether these methods are effective for investigating hilar invasion in ampullary cancer patients is unknown. In this study, we aimed to reveal the best method for diagnosing hilar invasion in ampullary cancer patients.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**Study design and ethics**

This retrospective study aimed to identify an appropriate screening method for hilar biliary invasion of ampullary cancer. This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of Fukushima Medical University (approval number: 2453).


**Patients**
This study enrolled 43 ampullary cancer patients who were treated at Fukushima Medical University between September 2009 and December 2020. Among them, 34 patients underwent resection by endoscopic treatment (n = 9) or surgery (n = 25) (Table 1). Endoscopic ampullectomy was performed when invasion into the muscular layer or bile and pancreatic ducts was not observed by ERC or IDUS. It was not necessary to obtain informed consent from the patients because this study was retrospective in design and used previously anonymized clinical data. All the patients agreed to the clinical examination and treatment by providing written consent; in the case of participants under 18 years of age, consent was obtained from a parent and/or legal guardian. The details of the study can be found on the homepage of Fukushima Medical University. All methods were carried out in accordance with relevant guidelines and regulations.

**Examination items**
The final diagnosis of hilar biliary invasion was determined according to histological diagnosis and the nonexistence of local recurrence during follow-up for more than six months. When the horizontal margin of the resected specimen was negative, hilar invasion was considered negative.

Useful methods for diagnosing hilar invasion were investigated in 34 ampullary cancer patients who underwent endoscopic therapy or surgery. The assessed imaging findings of hilar biliary invasion were thickening and enhancement of the bile duct wall on CECT (Figure 1A), irregularity on ERC (Figure 1B), thickening of the entire bile duct wall on IDUS (Figure 1C), and partial thickening of the bile duct wall on IDUS (Figure 1D). The usefulness of hilar biliary biopsy was also considered. Thickening of the bile duct wall on IDUS was defined as a diameter of the bile duct wall greater than 2 mm.

All imaging findings were evaluated by more than two pancreaticobiliary disease specialists. Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP) was performed as follows. With the patient in a prone position, a duodenoscope was inserted after sufficient sedation was achieved with midazolam. When the duodenoscope reached the Vater papilla, biliary cannulation was initiated. Tumor progression was evaluated by using ERC, IDUS, and hilar biliary biopsy. It is difficult to observe the whole circumference of the bile duct wall by EUS. Therefore, the evaluation of hilar invasion by EUS was not considered in this study.

JF260 V, JF240, and TJF240 duodenoscopes (Olympus, Tokyo, Japan) were used. An MTW ERCP tapered catheter (MTW Endoskopie, Wesel, Germany) and Tandem XL cannula (Boston Scientific Japan, Tokyo, Japan) were used as the ERC catheters. Endo Jaw FB231K (Olympus) or Radial Jaw™ 4 Biopsy Forceps (Boston Scientific Japan) were used for biliary biopsy.

Post-ERC pancreatitis (PEP) and adverse events were diagnosed according to Cotton’s criteria[32]. PEP was defined as an elevated serum amylase level more than three times the normal upper limit with abdominal pain for more than 24 h after ERC. In addition, all PEP patients were confirmed to have peripancreatic inflammation by CECT. The severity of PEP was categorized as follows: mild: extended hospitalization for 2-3 d; moderate: extended hospitalization for 4-10 d; and severe: Extended hospitalization for more than 10 d, hemorrhagic pancreatitis, and pseudocysts that required intervention. The severity of bleeding was categorized as follows: Mild: Clinical evidence of bleeding, hemoglobin decrease < 3 g/dL, and no need for transfusion; moderate: Transfusion (4 units or less) and no angiographic intervention or surgery; and severe: Transfusion (5 units or more) or intervention (angiographic or surgical).

**Statistical analyses**
The imaging findings and biliary biopsy results were compared with respect to their ability to diagnose hilar invasion of ampullary cancer by Fisher’s exact test. The Bonferroni method and Holm method were used to adjust for multiple comparisons. EZR (Saitama Medical Centre, Jichi Medical University, Saitama, Japan) was used for statistical analysis. A P value < 0.05 was considered indicative of a significant difference.

**RESULTS**

**Patient characteristics and treatment**
The patient characteristics and treatment results are shown in Table 1. The mean age of the patients was 68.0 ± 11.1 years. There were 20 male patients and 14 female patients. The numbers of the different lesion stages were as follows: I: 16; II: 8; and III: 10. Disease stage was classified according to the Union for International Cancer Control classification 8th edition[33]. Four patients had already undergone biliary stent insertion in other hospitals. No histological hilar biliary invasion or local recurrence was observed in any patient.

**Imaging findings and biopsy results of all patients**
Among the methods explored for diagnosing hilar biliary invasion of ampullary cancer, hilar biliary...
Table 1 Patient characteristics and treatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Total patients, n</th>
<th>Unresectable or treated in other hospitals, n</th>
<th>Underwent resection, n</th>
<th>Age, yr (mean ± standard deviation)</th>
<th>Sex, n (male/female)</th>
<th>UICC stage 8th edition, n</th>
<th>Patients already having biliary stents, n</th>
<th>Treatment, n</th>
<th>Endoscopic ampullectomy</th>
<th>Surgery</th>
<th>Hilar biliary invasion, n</th>
<th>Local recurrence, n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>68.0 ± 11.1</td>
<td>20/14</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Endoscopic ampullectomy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Surgery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Hilar biliary invasion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1 Imaging findings of the hilar biliary duct. A: Thickening and enhancement of the bile duct wall on contrast-enhanced computed tomography; B: Irregularity on endoscopic retrograde cholangiography; C: Thickening of the entire bile duct wall on intraductal ultrasonography (IDUS); D: Partial thickening of the bile duct wall on IDUS.

irregularity on ERC showed the highest diagnostic accuracy (thickening and enhancement of the bile duct wall on CECT: 53.1% (17/32); irregularity on ERC: 89.7% (26/29); thickening of the entire bile duct wall on IDUS: 87.5% (21/24); partial thickening of the bile duct wall on IDUS 87.5% (21/24), biliary biopsy results 72.7% (8/11), P value < 0.01) (Figure 2A). The diagnostic accuracy of irregularity on ERC for hilar invasion of ampullary cancer was significantly higher than that of thickening and enhancement of the bile duct wall on CECT (P value = 0.02).

Comparisons of the various combinations [imaging findings and biliary biopsy results] for diagnosing hilar biliary invasion revealed that the diagnostic accuracies of irregularity on ERC + biliary biopsy results (96.7% (29/30)), thickening of the entire bile duct wall on IDUS + biliary biopsy results [95.8% (23/24)], and partial thickening of the bile duct wall on IDUS + biliary biopsy results [95.8% (23/24)] were significantly higher than that of thickening and enhancement of the bile duct wall on CECT + biliary biopsy results [62.5% (20/32), P value < 0.01, = 0.02, and = 0.02, respectively] (Figure 2B).
Figure 2 Comparison of methods for diagnosing hilar biliary invasion of ampullary cancer in all patients. A: Irregularity on endoscopic retrograde endoscopic retrograde cholangiography (ERC) showed the highest diagnostic accuracy; B: Among the various combinations (imaging findings and biliary biopsy results) for diagnosing hilar biliary invasion, irregularity on ERC + biliary biopsy results showed the highest diagnostic accuracy. *P < 0.05, *P < 0.01. CECT: Contrast-enhanced computed tomography; ERC: Endoscopic retrograde cholangiography; IDUS: Intraductal ultrasonography.

Imaging findings and biopsy of patients who had not received biliary duct stents

Partial thickening of the bile duct wall on IDUS showed the highest diagnostic accuracy among the explored methods (thickening and enhancement of the bile duct wall on CECT: 57.1% (16/28); irregularity on ERC: 88.0% (22/25); thickening of the entire bile duct wall on IDUS: 84.2% (16/19); partial thickening of the bile duct wall on IDUS 89.5% (17/19); biliary biopsy: 66.7% (6/9); P value < 0.035 but no significant differences in pairwise comparisons) (Figure 3A).

Among the investigated combinations (imaging findings and biliary biopsy results) for diagnosing hilar biliary invasion of ampullary cancer, the combination of partial thickening of the bile duct on IDUS and biliary biopsy results showed the highest diagnostic accuracy (thickening and enhancement of the bile duct wall on CECT + hilar biliary biopsy results: 64.3% (18/28); irregularity on ERC + biliary biopsy results: 96.2% (25/26); thickening of the entire bile duct wall on IDUS + biliary biopsy results: 95.0% (19/20); partial thickening of the bile duct wall on IDUS + biliary biopsy results: 100% (20/20); P value < 0.01) (Figure 3B). The combination of irregularity on ERC and biliary biopsy results and the combination of partial thickening of the bile duct wall on IDUS and biliary biopsy results each had a significantly higher diagnostic accuracy for hilar biliary invasion of ampullary cancer than the combination of thickening and enhancement of the bile duct wall on CECT and biliary biopsy results (P value = 0.027, 0.017).

Adverse events
The adverse events are listed in Table 2. Postendoscopic ampullectomy bleeding occurred in two patients. Both patients improved with endoscopic hemostasis and transfusion. PEP occurred in three patients, all of whom improved with conservative treatment.

DISCUSSION
In this study, we investigated appropriate methods for diagnosing hilar biliary invasion of ampullary cancer. Hilar biliary invasion was not observed in all ampullary cancer patients. Although some false-positive results were obtained with each method, the diagnostic accuracy of the combination of partial...
Table 2 Adverse events of treatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adverse event</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-endoscopic ampullectomy bleeding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-ERC pancreatitis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ERC: Endoscopic retrograde cholangiography.

Figure 3 Comparison of methods for diagnosing hilar biliary invasion of ampullary cancer in patients without biliary stents. A: Partial thickening of the bile duct wall on IDUS showed the highest diagnostic accuracy; B: Among the various combinations (imaging findings and biliary biopsy results) for diagnosing hilar biliary invasion, partial thickening of the bile duct wall on IDUS + biliary biopsy results showed the highest diagnostic accuracy. *P < 0.05. CECT: Contrast-enhanced computed tomography; ERC: Endoscopic retrograde cholangiography; IDUS: Intraductal ultrasonography; NS: Not significant.

thickening of the bile duct wall on IDUS and hilar biliary biopsy results for hilar biliary invasion was 100% for patients without biliary stents. On the other hand, thickening and enhancement of the hilar bile duct wall on CECT was not effective for diagnosing this condition.

Ampullary cancer occasionally develops concurrently with upstream biliary ductal cancer[34,35]. However, as described in the introduction, hilar biliary invasion of resectable ampullary cancer has rarely been reported. In fact, hilar invasion of ampullary cancer was not observed in this study. In past reports that have described the results of treatment or surgery for ampullary cancer, pancreaticobiliary
Takagi T et al: Hilar invasion of ampullary cancer

Thickening of the bile duct wall on CECT has been reported in cholestasis caused by several diseases (for example, cholangitis, common bile duct stones, pancreatitis and malignant biliary stricture)\[42\]. In a past systematic review and meta-analysis, the diagnostic accuracy of computed tomography (CT) for assessing the extent of bile duct invasion was 64%-96%\[13\]. In this study, the diagnostic accuracy of CECT for assessing hilar biliary invasion of ampullary cancer was lower than that reported in a previous meta-analysis. Regarding the CECT findings of ampullary cancer, papillary bulging and organ invasion have been identified as predictive factors of tumor recurrence or poor survival\[43\]. However, hilar bile duct wall thickness was not mentioned in the associated study. Thickening and enhancement of the hilar bile duct wall on CECT was not useful. It is thought that ampullary cancer exists at the exit of the bile duct and that the tumors more often close the biliary duct than other biliary diseases. This closure leads to thickening of the hilar bile duct wall; however, in this study, ampullary cancer did not invade the hilar bile duct.

The diagnostic accuracy of IDUS was higher among those patients without biliary stents. Biliary drainage can cause thickening of the bile duct wall, and IDUS should be performed before biliary drainage. Thickening on the cancerous portion of the bile duct wall has been reported to be heterogeneous and partially protruded\[24-27,44\]. In this study, partial thickening of the bile duct wall on IDUS showed the best accuracy among the investigated methods for diagnosing hilar invasion of ampullary cancer in patients without a biliary stent\[45\]. Naitoh et al\[45\] reported that bile duct wall thickening in the nonstricture region was unremarkable in bile duct cancer patients. However, false-positive cases (diameter of the hilar bile duct wall from 2-3.3 mm) were observed in this study. Therefore, the evaluation of the nonstricture portion on IDUS in patients with ampullary cancer is not believed to be equivalent to that in patients with common bile duct cancer. Therefore, the detection of partial thickening of the bile duct wall should be combined with other methods.

False-positive hilar biliary biopsy results were found in three cases. Although this number is low, such results might influence the operative method. Therefore, false positives in hilar biliary biopsy should be avoided. Regarding the reason for these false positives, it is highly likely that biopsy forceps contact the ampullary cancer. The efficacy of cholangioscopy in diagnosing biliary lesions has been reported\[46-56\]. However, passing the ampullary cancer is difficult with cholangioscopy. To avoid contact of the biopsy forceps with the tumor and to improve the diagnostic accuracy of hilar biliary biopsy for ampullary cancer patients, biliary biopsy with a catheter that introduces biopsy forceps could be useful\[30,31\]. When biliary biopsy with a catheter is unavailable, the combination of biliary biopsy and IDUS should be considered.

This study has some limitations. First, this was a retrospective study performed at a single institution. A multicenter prospective study is needed to verify the results of this study. Second, a few patients underwent all examinations (CECT, ERC, IDUS, and biliary biopsy). In future studies, a higher number of cases would be desirable. Third, as described above, ampullary cancer patients with hilar biliary invasion were not included in this study. To improve the false-negative rate, a study involving cases of hilar biliary invasion is needed.

CONCLUSION

Although false-positive results were obtained with each method, the combination of partial thickening of the bile duct on IDUS and biliary biopsy results was useful for diagnosing hilar biliary invasion of ampullary cancer. In addition, it is recommended that hilar biliary biopsy be performed through a catheter to avoid contamination from the cancer. However, hilar invasion of ampullary cancer is rare, and the risk of PEP from hilar investigation exists. Therefore, hilar investigation might be unnecessary for ampullary cancer patients.

ARTICLE HIGHLIGHTS

Research background
The standard treatment for ampullary cancer is pancreaticoduodenectomy or focal ampullectomy. Before resection, it is important to accurately diagnose the biliary invasion of ampullary cancer. However, the method that accurately evaluates hilar invasion of ampullary cancer is unknown.

Research motivation
Several methods [contrast-enhanced computed tomography (CECT), endoscopic retrograde cholangiography (ERC), intraductal ultrasonography (IDUS), biliary biopsy] can be used to diagnose the range
of ampullary cancer invasion. However, detailed data of these methods for diagnosing the biliary invasion range of ampullary cancer have not been previously reported. Therefore, presurgical examination is not established in ampullary cancer patients.

**Research objectives**
To reveal the necessity of hilar investigation in ampullary cancer and a useful method for diagnosing whether ampullary cancer invades the hilar biliary duct.

**Research methods**
Diagnosability was compared between CECT, ERC, IDUS, and biliary biopsy in ampullary cancer patients who underwent pancreaticoduodenectomy or focal ampullectomy.

**Research results**
The combination of biliary biopsy results and partial thickening of the bile duct wall on IDUS was efficient for diagnosing hilar invasion of ampullary cancer.

**Research conclusions**
Although false positives were observed for each method, hilar invasion was appropriately diagnosed based on the combination of biliary biopsy results and partial thickening of the bile duct wall on IDUS. However, hilar biliary invasion is rare in ampullary cancer. Therefore, hilar investigation might be unnecessary for ampullary cancer patients.

**Research perspectives**
The results of this study contribute to the establishment of a systematic method for diagnosing hilar invasion and selecting treatments for ampullary cancer patients.
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Abstract

BACKGROUND
Endoscopic therapy using multiple plastic stents (MPSs) is the standard therapy for postorthotopic liver transplantation (p-OLT) anastomotic biliary stricture (ABS). However, this approach demands repeated procedures. Recent studies using fully covered self-expandable metallic stents (FCSEMS) have shown encouraging results, but migration occurs in 10% to 40% of cases. The objective of this retrospective study was to evaluate the efficacy of endoscopic treatment using FCSEMS with an anti-migration system (Am-FCSEMS) in patients with p-OLT ABS.

AIM
To evaluate the efficacy of endoscopic treatment using an Am-FCSEMS in patients with p-OLT ABS.

METHODS
This study was conducted in a private tertiary care centre in São Paulo, Brazil and was approved by our institution's Human Research Committee. From April 2018 to October 2020, regardless of previous endoscopic treatment (MPS or FCSEMS), 17 patients with p-OLT ABS and indications for endoscopic therapy were included in this study. The exclusion criteria were pregnancy, nonanastomotic...
biliary or hilar stricture, hepatic artery stenosis/thrombosis, isolated biliary fistulae, a distance shorter than 2 cm from the stricture to the hepatic hilum, and patient refusal. The primary endpoint was the efficacy of p-OLT ABS endoscopic treatment using an Am-FCSEMS that remained in place for a 12-mo period. Biliary sphincterotomy was performed in patients with native papilla, and an Am-FCSEMS (10 mm in final diameter and 60 or 80 mm in length) was placed (Hanarostent™ MI Tech, Co). Balloon stricture dilation was performed only if necessary to introduce the stent.

RESULTS
Three patients were excluded due to loss to follow-up before stent removal. Among the 14 patients included and followed, 7 were women, and the average age was 56 years (range: 28-76). The average period of Am-FCSEMS placement was 362 ± 109 d. Technical success occurred in all 14 patients (100%). There were no cases of distal stent migration. Complete resolution of the stricture occurred in 13/14 patients (92.85%). Adverse events occurred in 3/14 patients (21.42%): 2 patients with mild acute pancreatitis (14.28%) and 1 patient (7.14%) with stent dysfunction (occlusion by biliary sludge and stones, which was treated endoscopically without the need for stent removal). No deaths occurred related to therapy. All stents were removed using foreign body forceps or snares without difficulty. After Am-FCSEMS removal, all 13 patients who had ABS resolution were followed-up for an average of 411 ± 172 d, and there was no stricture recurrence or need for further endoscopic therapy.

CONCLUSION
In this retrospective study, endoscopy therapy using an Am-FCSEMS for p-OLT ABS was safe and effective, with a high stricture re-solution rate that was probably due to the absence of stent migration.

Key Words: Liver transplantation; Endoscopy; Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography; Biliary strictures; Self-expandable metallic biliary stents
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INTRODUCTION
Biliary tract lesions are common postoperative adverse events (AEs) after orthotopic liver transplantation (OLT). Anastomotic biliary strictures (ABSs) occur most frequently and are responsible for approximately 40% of all complications after OLT[1-4].

Endoscopic balloon dilation followed by placement of side-by-side multiple plastic stents (MPSs) in repeated procedures every 3-4 mo, up to 12 mo, is the standard treatment for ABS. This treatment strategy has a high success rate, ranging from 70% to 100%[1,5].

Despite such a high success rate, this strategy demands repeated procedures[1,6-9]. Recent studies using fully covered self-expandable metallic stents (FCSEMS) have shown encouraging results, with resolution rates similar to those observed with the MPS strategy[5,7,10]. However, a high FCSEMS migration rate of between 10% and 40% has been reported, which is a possible limitation for its use[5-7, 10].
We hypothesized that a FCSEMS with an anti-migration system (Am-FCSEMS) could be an alternative for postorthotopic-OLT (p-OLT) ABS treatment. Recently, a study with promising results compared the use of an Am-FCSEMS with other types of conventional metallic stents in regards to the p-OLT ABS resolution rate and their respective migration rates[11].

The objective of this study was to evaluate the efficacy of endoscopic treatment using an Am-FCSEMS in patients with p-OLT ABS.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

This study was conducted at Hospital Israelita Albert Einstein (HIAE), São Paulo, Brazil. HIAE is a private tertiary care referral centre where approximately 150 OLTs are performed yearly.

**Patients**

From April 2018 to October 2020, 17 patients between 18 and 76 years of age diagnosed with p-OLT ABS who were referred to the endoscopy unit were considered for inclusion in this retrospective study, regardless of previous endoscopic treatment (MPS or FCSEMS). The exclusion criteria were pregnancy, nonanastomotic biliary or hilar stricture, hepatic artery stenosis/thrombosis, isolated biliary fistulae, and patient refusal. To avoid the risk of biliary intrahepatic duct occlusion secondary to stent placement, a distance shorter than 2 cm from the stricture to the hepatic hilum was also considered an exclusion criterion.

This study was conducted in accordance with the World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki Ethical Principles for Medical Research Involving Human Subjects and was approved by our institution’s Human Research Committee. The patients provided written informed consent prior to inclusion in the study.

**Procedures**

Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP) was performed using a therapeutic video duodenoscope (TJF-180 Olympus Optical Co., Ltd., Tokyo, Japan) with patients under monitored anaesthesia. After selective biliary cannulation, cholangiography was performed for the evaluation and characterization of biliary stricture, followed by the passage of a guidewire. After positioning the guidewire, biliary sphincterotomy was performed in patients with native papilla, and an Am-FCSEMS (10 mm in final diameter and 60 or 80 mm in length, BCT Hanarostent™M.I. Tech, Co.) was placed (Figure 1A and B). Balloon dilation of the stricture was performed only if necessary to introduce the stent. According to the physician’s choice, the length of the stent was determined during cholangiography to place the proximal end between the stricture and the hepatic hilum and the distal end in the duodenum. Patients were followed up for clinical signs of biliary obstruction and scheduled to have the stent removed after 12 mo if no complications occurred.

**Endpoints**

The primary study endpoint was the efficacy of the endoscopic treatment of p-OLT ABS using an Am-FCSEMS for a 12-mo period. Efficacy was evaluated based on ABS resolution. After stent removal, the biliary stricture was considered resolved if there was no stricture observed on cholangiography or a minimum stricture that allowed the passage of a 12-mm inflated extractor balloon without difficulty. Secondary endpoints were technical success (defined as stent placement), adverse effects related to ERCP (bleeding or pancreatitis), and stent dysfunction (migration or obstruction).

**RESULTS**

A total of 17 patients were included. Three patients were excluded due to loss to follow-up before stent removal (12 mo) (Figure 2). The average age of the 14 patients included and followed was 56 years (range: 28-76); 7 women had an average age of 42 ± 11.2 years, and 7 men had an average age of 69 ± 5.8 years. Patient characteristics are shown in Table 1. Among the 14 patients, 8 (57.14%) had already undergone treatment with FCSEMS and/or MPSs, but endoscopic management was considered unsuccessful, with an average number of procedures before inclusion in this study of 2.25 ± 1.04 (range: 1-4). The other 6 patients (42.85%) received an Am-FCSEMS as the first treatment. Regardless of previous treatment, the average interval from p-OLT to the first ERCP was 116 wk (range: 4-570). The average duration of placement of an Am-FCSEMS in this study was 362 ± 109 d (range: 226-609). The length of stent placement was 6 cm in 8 patients and 8 cm in 6 patients. Technical success (stent placement) occurred in all 14 patients (100%). The clinical follow-up after stent removal was 411 ± 172 d (range: 55-692). All stents were removed using foreign body forceps or snares without any technical difficulty (Figure 1C).
Table 1 Demographics of patients and baseline characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall patient characteristics</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of patients, ( n )</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender, female sex, ( n ) (%)</td>
<td>7 (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (yr), mean (range)</td>
<td>56 (28-76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause of liver transplant: ( n )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBV</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBV + HCV</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cryptogenic</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASH</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autoimmune hepatitis</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary biliary cirrhosis</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familial amyloidosis</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary hyperoxaluria</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of HCC: ( n )</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time from OLT to ERCP (wk)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean ± SD</td>
<td>116 ± 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>4-570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patients with previous endoscopic treatment before Am-FCSEMS, ( n ) (%)</td>
<td>8 (57.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures before Am-FCSEMS (mean)</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patients with no previous endoscopic treatment, ( n ) (%)</td>
<td>6 (42.86)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Figure 1 Images of the fully covered self-expandable metallic stent with an anti-migration system or flaps. A: Endoscopic view of the stent; B: Radiographic view of the stent in the biliary tract; C: Removal of the stent.

Complete resolution of the stricture occurred in 13/14 patients (92.85%). Only 1 patient (7.14%) experienced endoscopic treatment failure after 338 d with the stent in place, which was determined by cholangiography as persistence of stricture. This patient was referred for endoscopic treatment using MPSs for a longer period. AEs occurred in 3 out of 14 patients (21.42%). There were 2 patients (14.28%) with mild acute pancreatitis and 1 patient (7.14%) with stent dysfunction (occlusion by biliary sludge and stones with cholangitis), which was treated endoscopically without the need for stent removal. There was no distal migration of the stent in any patient (Table 2). There was no mortality related to ERCP and/or endoscopic therapy with the stent. After removal of the Am-FCSEMS, all 13 patients who
Table 2 Overall results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall results</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of patients, n</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical success, n (%)</td>
<td>14 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stricture resolution, n (%)</td>
<td>13 (92.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment failure, n (%)</td>
<td>1 (7.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean ALT before stent (U/L)</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean ALT at the end of follow-up (U/L)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean total bilirubin before stent (mg/dL)</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean total bilirubin at the end of follow-up (mg/dL)</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stricture recurrence, n</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stent migration</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other complications, n (%)</td>
<td>3 (21.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute pancreatitis</td>
<td>2 (14.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stent occlusion</td>
<td>1 (7.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean follow-up after stent removal (d)</td>
<td>411 ± 172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ALT: Alanine aminotransferase.

Figure 2 Flowchart of the selection of patients in the study.

had ABS resolution were followed-up (411 ± 172 d), and there was no need for further endoscopic therapy or stricture recurrence. Two patients died from causes unrelated to endoscopy therapy.
DISCUSSION

Our present study shows that p-OLT ABS treatment with an Am-FCSEMS is effective and safe, with a stricture resolution rate of 92.85%, which is comparable to the results of other studies involving MPSs[5, 9,12] and FCSEMSs[5,7,13]. In our study, the average time between liver transplantation and endoscopy therapy for ABS was lengthy (116 wk), which may have impacted the results and thus, is a possible limitation of this study[3,6,8]. Nevertheless, our results were comparable with those of other studies that used this anti-migration stent model[11].

The longer stent maintenance period (12 mo) in our study in relation to other studies with metallic stents[2,7] and the absence of migration possibly related to the antimigration mechanism may have contributed to the favourable result observed in our patients.

The technical success rate of 100% in this series, which is comparable to that in other studies[6,12,14], demonstrates the applicability of this technique. No patients experienced distal migration of the stent. As described in previous studies, the main disadvantage of using FCSEMS is the high migration rate of up to 37.5%[10,12,14,15]. It is possible that treatment with an Am-FCSEMS may present better results due to the lower risk of migration and longer stent patency. Although in our study assessment of costs was not an included objective, it is possible that since this stent has a lower migration rate its use could result in a lower number of procedures and thus lower costs, but this hypothesis should be verified in future controlled studies.

The AEs observed with ERCP-related therapy and/or stenting were mild pancreatitis and delayed stent obstruction. All patients in whom the stent was placed underwent biliary sphincterotomy, and mild acute pancreatitis was related to the ERCP procedure in 2 out of the 14 patients (14.2%). Despite this higher rate of complications compared to that in the literature[5,7,13], these patients underwent successful clinical treatment. Stent dysfunction (obstruction) occurred late and was caused by biliary sludge or stones, with jaundice and cholangitis occurring in only one patient (7.1%). This complication and its endoscopic treatment with or without stent replacement is described in the literature[5,6]. This patient was treated with antibiotics and endoscopy without the need for stent replacement.

No complications occurred during stent removal. In this study, no serious complications or deaths related to endoscopic treatment were reported. The average follow-up of patients who had stricture resolution after removal of the metallic stent was 411 d. There was no ABS recurrence during follow-up. This positive result may be related to the prolonged maintenance of the metallic stent, which was longer than 6 mo[2,5].

Considering the treatment of patients with p-OLT ABS, the use of FCSEMs may be an interesting alternative in relation to MPS therapy, considering FCSEMS placement presents comparable results with fewer ERCP procedures[4,5,7,10]. However, spontaneous stent migration may be a limitation of FCSEMS placement[10,12,14].

This retrospective study has some limitations, such as a small sample size from a single centre. Another limiting point for this study is the lack of a control group. However, our results showed that treatment with Am-FCSEMS can be an alternative for patients with p-OLT ABS. Therefore, prospective and comparative studies should be encouraged to evaluate the efficacy of endoscopic treatment using Am-FCSEMS versus MPSs. Nevertheless, we present similar results for the resolution of ABS compared to those in other studies using MPSs and FCSEMSs as well as a recent study using an Am-FCSEMS. In this series, the advantage of treatment using an Am-FCSEMS in relation to treatment with MPSs was the need for only two ERCP procedures over 12 mo, while the advantage in relation to FCSEMS therapy was the absence of migration.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, in this retrospective study, endoscopy therapy using an Am-FCSEMS or flaps for p-OLT ABS is safe and effective, with the stricture’s high-resolution rate probably being due to the absence of stent migration.

ARTICLE HIGHLIGHTS

Research background

Endoscopic therapy using multiple plastic stents is the standard therapy for postorthotopic liver transplantation (p-OLT) anastomotic biliary stricture (ABS). However, this approach demands repeated procedures. Recent studies using fully covered self-expandable metallic stents (FCSEMS) have shown encouraging results, but migration occurs in 10% to 40% of cases. We hypothesized that a FCSEMS with an anti-migration system (Am-FCSEMS) could be an alternative for treatment in patients with p-OLT ABS.
Research motivation
The efficacy of treatment using an Am-FCSEMS for p-OLT ABS is not yet well established. The outcomes of endoscopic treatment using this type of stent have become clinically relevant.

Research objectives
This study aimed to evaluate the efficacy of endoscopic treatment using an Am-FCSEMS in patients with p-OLT ABS.

Research methods
This study was conducted in a private tertiary care centre in São Paulo, Brazil. From April 2018 to October 2020, patients with p-OLT ABS and indications for endoscopic therapy were included in this study, and an Am-FCSEMS (10 mm in final diameter and 60 or 80 mm in length) was placed (Hanarostent MI Tech, Co).

Research results
Technical success occurred in all 14 patients (100%). There were no cases of distal stent migration. Complete resolution of the stricture occurred in 13/14 patients (92.85%). Adverse events occurred in 3/14 patients (21.42%): 2 patients with mild acute pancreatitis and 1 patient with stent dysfunction (occlusion). No deaths occurred related to therapy. After Am-FCSEMS removal, all 13 patients who had ABS resolution were followed-up for an average of 411 ± 172 d, and there was no stricture recurrence or need for further endoscopic therapy.

Research conclusions
Endoscopy therapy using an Am-FCSEMS for p-OLT ABS is safe and effective, with the stricture’s high-resolution rate probably being due to the absence of stent migration.

Research perspectives
This study shows that treatment using Am-FCSEMS has a high rate of stenosis resolution, probably due to the absence of stent migration, and may result in a lower number of procedures.
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Clinical profile, diagnostic yield, and procedural outcomes of single balloon enteroscopy: A tertiary care hospital experience

Maha Inam, Masood M Karim, Umar Tariq, Faisal Wasim Ismail

Abstract

BACKGROUND

Single balloon enteroscopy (SBE) allows ease of access for small bowel visualization and has multiple diagnostic and therapeutic indications. It provides the advantage of performing various therapeutic interventions alongside the diagnostic procedure. SBE has also been considered a relatively safe procedure with no major complications.

AIM

To investigate the indications, safety, and clinical yield of SBE, and determine its effect on disease outcome.

METHODS

A retrospective, descriptive study was conducted at a tertiary care hospital in Karachi, Pakistan. Medical records of 56 adult patients (≥ 18 years) who underwent SBE between July 2013 and December 2021 were reviewed and data were collected using a structured proforma. A descriptive analysis of the variables was performed using Statistical Package of Social Sciences Version 19. Results are reported as the mean ± SD for quantitative variables and numbers and percentages for qualitative variables. Missing data are reported as unknown.

RESULTS

A total of 56 patients who underwent 61 SBE procedures were included. The mean age was 50.93 ± 16.16 years, with 53.6% of them being males. Hypertension (39.3%) and diabetes mellitus (25.0%) were the most common pre-existing comorbidities. Obstructive gastrointestinal bleed (39.3%) was the most common indication for enteroscopy, followed by chronic diarrhea (19.7%) and unexplained anemia (16.4%). The majority of procedures were performed in the endoscopy...
Single balloon enteroscopy (SBE) is a suitable modality for investigating diseases in the small bowel. It is shown to be technically efficient and reasonably safe and is associated with high diagnostic and therapeutic yield.
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Core Tip: Single balloon enteroscopy (SBE) is a safe and effective modality which allows ease of access for small bowel visualization. The procedure has multiple diagnostic and therapeutic indications. However, there is insufficient data published reporting its efficacy and impact. In this study, we analysed our single centre data of adults who underwent SBE between 2013 and 2021. We report patient demographics, procedure indications, and procedure findings. Based on our results, we can assess the indications, safety, and clinical yield of SBE, and determine its effect on disease outcome.
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INTRODUCTION

For decades, gastroenterologists have been challenged by the lack of proper visualization provided by standard endoscopies to the small intestine, with many of its areas being difficult to access without an intra-operative endoscopy procedure[1]. Enteroscopy has been a significant breakthrough in this field, allowing access to most of the small bowel using endoscopic techniques without the need for surgery [2]. Initially, Push enteroscopy was established in the 1980s. However, it was associated with a limited depth of penetration into the small bowel, up till the level of the proximal jejunum, due to difficulty in manoeuvring it further. This was followed by the advent of the push-and-pull enteroscopy in 2001, also known as double balloon enteroscopy (DBE). DBE, as its name suggests, consists of two balloons: One on the tip of the enteroscope and the other on an overtube at the scope’s distal end. The controlled inflation and deflation of the balloons allow the enteroscope to properly proceed without causing overlapping of the intestine. The volumes and pressures in the balloons are also measurable and are monitored throughout the procedure. As a result, DBE furthered the reach of the enteroscope and was seen to improve diagnostic yield, thereby overcoming the limitations of its preceding modality[1-4].

The single balloon enteroscopy (SBE) system was launched in 2007 as an alternative to DBE. SBE consists of only one balloon attached to the overtube at the scope’s distal end and is relatively easier to use. The tip of the enteroscope is angled during withdrawal of the scope in the small bowel to achieve stable positioning and insufflation of the overtube is performed using a pressure-controlled pump[5]. Both methods have been shown to yield significant and similar therapeutic and diagnostic yield[6-9].

Small bowel capsule endoscopy is currently the first-line recommended technique for investigation of the small bowel in patients with obscure gastrointestinal bleed. This is often used as a preliminary examination prior to device assisted enteroscopy (DAE) if further investigation is clinically indicated[10, 11]. According to the most recent European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy guidelines, DAE is also particularly recommended in patients with co-morbidities and/or those undergoing a therapeutic procedure since all endoscopic therapeutic procedures can be undertaken at the time of DAE[12].

The most common indication for small bowel enteroscopy is obscure gastrointestinal bleeding, defined as bleeding from the gastrointestinal (GI) tract that persists or recurs without an obvious cause after esophagogastroduodenoscopy, colonoscopy, and radiographic evaluation of the small bowel[13]. Other indications include chronic diarrhea, Crohn’s disease, refractory celiac disease, small bowel malignancies, suspected nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug-induced small bowel injury, suspicion of
small bowel obstruction, and detection of polyps in patients with polyposis syndromes[7]. Enteroscopy can also be performed in patients presenting with several different symptoms, with no specific diagnostic results yielding from regular endoscopy. The advantage of SBE compared to other techniques for visualizing the small bowel, such as capsule endoscopy and radiologic methods, is in the ability to perform a wide variety of therapeutic interventions alongside the diagnostic procedure[14]. SBE has also been considered a relatively safe procedure with no major complications. The safety profile has been shown to match that of DBE overall, and the only major complications seen have been those that have resulted due to perforations[15].

While the existing literature has highlighted great diagnostic and therapeutic benefits of SBE, the data regarding its outcomes are scarce and not widely generalizable. The equipment costs and specialized training requirements could be reasons as to why SBE is not a commonly practiced procedure.

There is currently limited published data from developing countries detailing enteroscopy utility and outcomes. We aimed to explore the role of small bowel push enteroscopy in our population and study its indications, safety, findings, complications, diagnostic yield, and effect on disease outcome, in order to increase the body of knowledge regarding this procedure.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This was a retrospective observational study conducted in a tertiary care referral centre in Karachi, the largest and most populated metropolitan city of Pakistan. Ethical approval and exemption were granted by the Ethical Review Committee of the institution on December 31, 2020 (2020-5760-15324).

Medical records of all adult patients above the age of 18 years who underwent a SBE procedure at the Aga Khan University Hospital from July 3, 2013 to December 31, 2021 were identified by random sampling, using the hospital’s information medical record system. A chart review was conducted for all eligible patients. For each medical record, a proforma was completed regarding patient demographics, comorbidities, clinical presentation, medication history, procedure details, and enteroscopy and biopsy findings. In order to determine the procedure yield, a through chart review of the in- and out-patient hospital course was conducted (see Appendix: Enteroscopy questionnaire).

Our inclusion criteria were all adult patients over the age of 18 years who underwent a SBE procedure at the hospital within our study period. There were no exclusion criteria. All patients signed an informed consent form prior to the procedure (see Appendix: Consent form). Patient outcomes were defined as a change or otherwise in the patient’s diagnosis and management as a result of the findings of the procedure.

A descriptive analysis was performed for patient demographics, clinical characteristics, and enteroscopy details. Data were analysed descriptively. Results are reported as the mean ± SD for quantitative variables and numbers and percentages for qualitative variables. Missing data are reported as unknown. Data were analysed using Statistical Package of Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 19. The statistical methods of this study were reviewed by Safia Awan of the Aga Khan University Hospital.

RESULTS

Our final study population comprised of a total of 56 patients (Table 1) who underwent a total of 61 procedures. The mean age of our sample was 50.93 ± 16.16 years, with the majority being males (53.6%, n = 30). Hypertension (39.3%, n = 22) and diabetes mellitus (25.0%, n = 14) were the most common pre-existing comorbidities. Prior medication use included antiplatelet (5.4%, n = 3) and non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (3.6%, n = 2) therapy, which is known to be associated with GI injury such as obscure bleeding and inflammation[13-14]. No patient in our study sample was on anticoagulation medications.

The clinical findings and outcomes of the 61 enteroscopy procedures are outlined in Table 2. Obscure gastrointestinal bleed was the most common enteroscopy indication (39.3%, n = 24), followed by chronic diarrhea (19.7%, n = 12). Other indications included unexplained anemia (16.4%, n = 10), enteric thickening and inflammatory changes on imaging (11.5%, n = 7), small intestinal space occupying lesion (11.5%, n = 7), persistent vomiting (9.8%, n = 6), weight loss (6.6%, n = 4), and malabsorption syndrome (6.6%, n = 4). Most of the procedures were performed in the endoscopy suite (90.2%, n = 55) under monitored anaesthesia care (93.4%, n = 57). However, 9.8% (n = 6) of cases were done in the main operating room, with 8.2% (n = 5) due to patient comorbidities and 1.6% (n = 1) in conjunction with an additional surgical procedure.

The majority of the enteroscopy procedures were diagnostic (91.8%, n = 56). Interventions were carried out following 27.8% of the cases. Out of these, 13.1% (n = 8) were enteroscopic interventions like polypectomy, argon plasma coagulation, adrenaline sclerotherapy, hemoclip attachment and stent removal, 9.8% (n = 6) were surgical interventions, and 4.9% (n = 3) were radiological interventions like angiembolization, which followed post procedure.
The depth of the enteroscopy examination ranged from 95 cm to 500 cm with a mean of 282.05 ± 90.04 cm. Enteroscopy examination was normal in 44.3% (n = 27) of the cases, while inflammation and ulcerations were seen in 29.5% (n = 18), space occupying lesions and masses in 19.7% (n = 12), vascular malformations in 14.8% (n = 9), and active bleeding in 8.2% (n = 5). A biopsy was obtained in 33 (54.1%) cases and the results included non-specific inflammation (63.6%, n = 21), malignancies or dysplasia (27.2%, n = 9), villous atrophy (3.0%, n = 1), and presence of Giardia (3.0%, n = 1). Out of the malignancies/dysplasia, 15.2% (n = 5) of the cases were adenocarcinoma, and there was one case each of adenomatous polyp (3.0%), inflammatory polyp (3.0%), hamartomous polyp (3.0%), and lymphoma (3.0%).

There was no mortality recorded in our study. Most procedures were successfully completed without any complications, while complications were seen in three (4.9%) procedures. All complications were either conservatively managed or resolved spontaneously following the procedure. One patient had premature ventricular contractions during the procedure which were conservatively managed and resolved while another developed hemodynamic instability which resolved spontaneously post procedure. The third patient developed aspiration pneumonia post procedure which resolved with antibiotics.

The clinical yield of the SBE procedures in our study was determined by quantifying the change in diagnosis and management. A classification of a change in diagnosis was made when a diagnosis which was made prior to the enteroscopy procedure was either modified or disproven following the procedure findings. There was a change in diagnosis in 72.1% (n = 44) of the cases. Out of these, a new diagnosis was made in 47.5% (n = 29) of the cases (termed as positive changes) while a previous diagnosis was disproven in 24.6% (n = 15) (termed as negative changes). A classification of a change in management was made when a management plan which was made prior to the enteroscopy procedure was either modified or disproven following the procedure findings. There was a change in management in 65.6% (n = 40) of the cases.

**DISCUSSION**

Our study adds to the limited published literature regarding SBE experience from a tertiary care hospital in a developing country. A few studies analysing the indications, efficacy, outcomes, and safety of enteroscopy procedures have been carried out in various countries. The efficacy of SBE was also compared with that of double balloon enteroscopy in several retrospective studies and meta-analyses [16-20]. Moreels et al [21] conducted a case series in 2016 evaluating the therapeutic actions of SBE using a new prototype and highlighting its benefits. Studies have also been carried out to evaluate the efficacy of SBE in non-invasive evaluation of obscure gastrointestinal bleeding and Crohn’s disease, but there
Table 2 Clinical variables of single balloon enteroscopy (n = 61)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enteroscopy indication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obscure gastrointestinal bleeding</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic diarrhea</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unexplained anemia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enteric thickening/inflammatory changes on imaging</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small intestinal space occupying lesion</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistent vomiting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight loss</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malabsorption syndrome</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endoscopy suite</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>90.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating room</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitored anaesthesia care</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>93.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General anaesthesia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>91.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapeutic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of procedure (cm)</td>
<td>282.05 ± 90.04</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enteroscopy findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflammation and ulcerations</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space occupying lesions and masses</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vascular malformations</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleeding</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascaris worm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biopsy findings (n = 33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-specific inflammation</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malignancy/dysplasia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adenocarcinoma</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adenomatous polyp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflammatory polyp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamartomous polyp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lymphoma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villous atrophy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of Giardia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>95.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in diagnosis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative change</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interventions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterosopic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
was a dearth of data describing experiences over many years for all cause indications, which additionally limits data providing information regarding the safety and efficacy of the procedure[22-24].

The demographics of our patient population are comparable to those of other studies from Korea and India, which reported a mean age of 50-55 years and the majority of males (52.9%-69.1%). However, a study conducted in the United States had a higher mean age at 62 ± 17 years[25]. In agreement with our results, published studies report obscure GI bleeding as the most common indication, ranging from 48% to 97%, in patients undergoing SBE. Other common indications included anemia, chronic diarrhea, lesions, polyposis, and Crohn’s disease, amongst others, in various proportions[18,22,25].

Ucers (19.6%), tumors (16.7%), and vascular malformations (14.7%) were the most common findings in a single-centre retrospective study conducted in China to test the diagnostic yield and safety of SBE [23]. Overall, the findings reported in the literature are similar and proportional to those seen in our study population.

We determined a high safety profile of SBE in our patients, with non-severe complications arising in only three (4.9%) of the cases, which were subsequently conservatively managed. There were no cases of severe complications reported in our patients. This is in accordance with the previous literature which shows a very low incidence of any adverse effects following SBE. A meta-analysis including four studies showed no evidence of any severe adverse effects such as bowel perforation, bleeding, or pancreatitis [26]. It has also been previously reported that the adverse effects seen in SBE procedures were comparable to those seen in DBE procedures, with both being marked as safe according to a single-centre retrospective analysis. However, the study accounted for a performance bias as all the procedures were carried out by a single endoscopist, who was trained in the procedure[20]. One study on the usage of emergency SBE concluded that the incidence of adverse effects was lower when general anaesthesia was used as compared to when it was performed under conscious sedation[23]. Our SBE procedures were always performed by the same team of endoscopists with significant expertise as well, resulting in no major adverse effects.

A similar study reported a mean depth as 23 ± 87 cm beyond the ligament of Treitz with a range of 20-400 cm, in accordance with our findings[22]. In a randomized controlled trial, the mean depth of insertion of anterograde SBE procedures was found to be 203.8 cm[24]. A previous study has also been shown to explain a method used by endoscopists to assess the depth of insertion which is based on advancement with each push-and-pull manoeuvre in cases of DBE[25].

In our study, 65.6% (n = 40) of the procedures resulted in a change in management and 72.1% (n = 44) had a change in diagnosis following enteroscopy findings. The literature reports diagnostic yields of SBE ranging from 47% to 65%, and therapeutic yields from 25% to 42%[18,20,22,25].

A single centre retrospective study published in 2020 studied the safety and diagnostic yield of capsule endoscopy in the investigation of obscure gastrointestinal bleeds[10]. The study population included 58.6% of males with a mean age of 67.7 ± 14.4 years. The results showed a diagnostic yield of 73.8%, revealing clinically significant bleeds which were missed at gastroscopy or colonoscopy in 30.3% of patients.

The limitations of our study include a retrospective, single-centre analysis. While our sample size is relatively small compared to that of other similar studies, it included all patients who underwent a SBE procedure at our institution over an 8-year period. However, our study findings are solely representative of a South Asian population in a low-middle income country (LMIC). Our study also notes a lack of a standardized reporting template for SBE depth of examination that may be used internationally.

Our observed findings can be used to guide further research, as the current literature on the clinical indications, safety profile, diagnostic yield, and patient outcomes of enteroscopy is not sufficient to provide the basis for the development of guidelines, especially in LMICs. Additional prospective studies with larger sample sizes are recommended to grasp a thorough understanding of the indications and efficacy of SBE. Long-term follow-up studies will also be beneficial in demonstrating the clinical impact of SBE.
CONCLUSION

Our study reports an encouraging single centre tertiary care experience of SBE over an 8-year period. We conclude that SBE is a safe and effective method with a high clinical impact on precise diagnosis and management of small bowel diseases.

ARTICLE HIGHLIGHTS

Research background

Single balloon enteroscopy (SBE) is a procedure that has greatly improved the access to small bowel visualization, particularly of the mid and distal parts of the small bowel. In addition to being used as a diagnostic tool, SBE can also be used to perform a number of therapeutic interventions. SBE is a relatively safe procedure with a low incidence of complications and a good diagnostic and therapeutic yield. One of the most common indications generally seen is intestinal bleeding.

Research motivation

Since SBE is a relatively new procedure, there is still an absence of viable literature about it from the developing world countries like Pakistan. Due to the good yields from this procedure, proper adaptation of this technique in these places can greatly be used to improve healthcare outcomes particularly pertaining to small bowel problems by improving timely diagnosis and management.

Research objectives

To investigate the indications, procedures, findings, and safety of SBE procedures and to correlate their effects on the disease outcomes.

Research methods

We performed a retrospective descriptive study at a tertiary care hospital in Pakistan and investigated all the SBE procedures carried out between July 2013 and December 2021. A total of 56 patients underwent 61 SBE procedures during this time period. We collected data using patient files and electronic health records using a structured proforma. It was interpreted and then categorized and analyzed using the SPSS software.

Research results

Our study population consisted of 56 patients who underwent 61 SBE procedures at a tertiary care hospital over the study period. The mean age of the sample was 50.93 ± 16.16 years and 53.6% of the sample was male. The most common comorbidities in the patient population were hypertension (39.3%) and diabetes mellitus (25.0%). The most common indications for conducting the SBE procedure were obscure gastrointestinal bleed (39.3%), chronic diarrhea (19.7%), and unexplained anemia (16.4%). Other indications included enteric thickening or inflammatory changes on imaging, space occupying lesions, persistent vomiting, weight loss, and malabsorption syndromes. Most of the procedures were conducted in the endoscopy suite while 9.8% (n = 6) required the operation room due to patient comorbidities or being in conjunction with a surgical procedure. The majority of the procedures were carried under monitored anesthesia care (93.4%) while the rest were done under general anesthesia. Most procedures were diagnostic (91.8%) and completed without complications (95.1%). The depth of examination ranged from 95 cm to 500 cm with a mean of 282.05 ± 90.04 cm. The most common enteroscopy findings were inflammation and ulcerations (29.5%), followed by masses (19.7%) and vascular malformations (14.8%). Biopsy samples were taken in 33 of the cases and the most common biopsy finding was non-specific inflammation (63.6%). As a result of the findings, a new diagnosis was made in 47.5% of the cases and a previous one was ruled out in 24.6% of them; 65.6% of the cases had a change in management.

Research conclusions

Through our study findings, we concluded that SBE is a useful method in diagnosing small bowel problems with a good yield. It is also relatively safe and has a low risk of complications.

Research perspectives

More research needs to be conducted on the usage and yields from SBE procedures in low-middle income countries with larger samples. There also needs to be a standardized method to record the details of enteroscopy procedures.
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Abstract

BACKGROUND
Choledocholithiasis develops in up to 20% of patients with gall bladder stones. The challenge in diagnosis usually occurs with small stones that may be missed by magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography (MRCP). Endoscopic ultrasound (EUS) is accurate in detecting common bile duct (CBD) stones missed by MRCP, especially the small ones or those impacted at the distal CBD or the papillary region.

AIM
To evaluate the accuracy of EUS in detecting CBD stones missed by MRCP.

METHODS
Patients with an intermediate likelihood of choledocholithiasis according to ESGE guidelines and those with acute pancreatitis of undetermined cause were included. The presence of choledocholithiasis was evaluated by MRCP and EUS, and then results were confirmed by endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP). The sensitivity and specificity of EUS and MRCP were compared regarding the presence of stones, the size, and the number of detected stones.

RESULTS
Ninety out of 100 involved patients had choledocholithiasis, while ten patients were excluded as they had pancreatic or gall bladder masses during EUS examination. In choledocholithiasis patients, the mean age was 52.37 ± 14.64 years, and 52.2% were males. Most patients had biliary obstruction (74.4%), while only 23
(25.6%) patients had unexplained pancreatitis. The overall prevalence of choledocholithiasis was 83.3% by EUS, 41.1% by MRCP, and 74.4% by ERCP. Also, the number and size of CBD stones could be detected accurately in 78.2% and 75.6% by EUS and 41.1% and 70.3% by MRCP, respectively. The sensitivity of EUS was higher than that of MRCP (98.51% vs 55.22%), and their predictive value was statistically different (P < 0.001). Combination of both tools raised the sensitivity to 97.22% and specificity to 100%.

CONCLUSION
EUS could be a useful tool in assessing patients with suspected choledocholithiasis especially if combined with MRCP. However, its usefulness depends on its availability and the experience of the local centers.

Key Words: Magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography; Endoscopic ultrasonography; Choledocholithiasis; Missed common bile duct stones
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Core Tip: Still, there is a great challenge in diagnosing suspected cases of choledocholithiasis that could develop in up to 20% of patients with gall bladder stones. Endoscopic ultrasound (EUS) can easily detect small stones that magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography (MRCP) could miss. EUS still has many diagnostic purposes with high accuracy in detecting common bile duct (CBD) stones missed by MRCP, especially the small ones or those impacted at the distal CBD or the papillary region.

INTRODUCTION
Choledocholithiasis is considered one of the most important causes of abdominal pain in patients with gall bladder stones. It can occur in 3%-16% of patients with gall stones and can reach up to 21% in patients with gall stone pancreatitis[1,2]. Diagnosis of choledocholithiasis is not always straightforward [3]. Clinical evaluation and biochemical tests are insufficient to establish a firm diagnosis without reliable confirmatory testing, so magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography (MRCP) is routinely used to clarify the diagnosis after ultrasound results[4]. Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP) is now considered the gold standard for diagnosis; however, its invasive nature and complications such as pancreatitis defer its use in diagnosis as a first option[5].

Since the recommendations by the ASGE and ESGE guidelines for diagnosing patients with an intermediate likelihood of choledocholithiasis by MRCP, endoscopic ultrasound (EUS) is now widely used to assess the presence of choledocholithiasis[6,7]. Despite its overall high accuracy, the role of EUS in the diagnosis of choledocholithiasis has not been firmly established since EUS is relatively invasive compared with MRCP and computed tomography[8].

The cause of biliary obstruction is not always detected by the available non-invasive imaging modalities like MRCP and may be detected later during biliary drainage as small stones, so in our study, we evaluated the usefulness and accuracy of EUS in detecting missed stones by MRCP as a cause of biliary obstruction.

MATERIALS AND METHODS
Methodology
This observational cohort study aimed primarily to evaluate the usefulness and accuracy of EUS in detecting missed stones by MRCP as a cause of biliary obstruction.

Patients and assessments
This prospective study was conducted on 100 patients recruited from National Liver Institute and Internal Medicine Department, Kasr Al-Ainy Hospital from 2019 to 2021. We included patients with dilated CBD (diameter ranging from 6 to 10 mm), those with unexplained elevated liver enzymes, and
those with unexplained causes of acute pancreatitis. All patients with cholangitis were excluded from the study and referred for urgent ERCP drainage. Also, we excluded patients with malignant masses found by EUS and confirmed by histopathology. All included patients were above 18 years of age.

Assessment of our patients was performed by liver function tests, serum amylase, lipase, abdominal ultrasound, MRCP, and EUS. ERCP was conducted on all patients for confirmation of the findings of MRCP and EUS. MRCP was done few days before EUS, then ERCP was done later on. The EUS operator was blind to MRCP examination. We followed up with the patients for 3 mo after the procedures clinically and biochemically.

Results from MRCP and EUS were compared with those from ERCP to calculate the sensitivity and specificity of EUS and MRCP in detecting choledocholithiasis in our patients. Also, the accuracy of both MRCP and EUS in detecting the size and number of stones in CBD was evaluated.

Our institution’s Research Ethical Committee approved the study, and all patients gave their informed written consent before inclusion in the study, according to the ethical guidelines of the 1975 Declaration of Helsinki.

**Examination procedure**

All the patients, after thorough full history taking and clinical examination, were subjected to: (1) EUS examination using a linear Echoendoscope Pentax EG3870UTK (HOYA Corporation, PENTAX Life Care Division, Showanomori Technology Center, Tokyo, Japan) connected to a Hitachi AVIUS machine (Hitachi Medical Systems, Tokyo, Japan). All examinations were performed under deep sedation with IV propofol. For EUS-FNA, we used the Cook 19G and 22G needles (Echotip; Wilson-Cook, Winston Salem, NC). Prophylactic ceftriaxone (1 g) was administrated before the procedure; and (2) ERCP examination that was performed using a side view scope Pentax ED-3490TK (HOYA Corporation, Tokyo, Japan). All examinations were performed under deep sedation with IV propofol. Prophylactic ceftriaxone (1 g) was administrated before the procedure.

**Statistical analysis**

Data were fed to the computer and analyzed using IBM SPSS software version 20.0 (Armonk, NY: IBM Corp). Qualitative data are described using numbers and percentages. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to verify the normality of distribution. Quantitative data are described using range (minimum and maximum), mean, standard deviation, median, and interquartile range. The significance of the obtained results was judged at the 5% level. The chi-square test was applied to compare categorical variables between different groups. The Fisher’s exact test was used for correction for chi-square when more than 20% of the cells had an expected count of less than 5.

**RESULTS**

After excluding the ten patients with malignancy, the total number of male patients was 47 (52%), and that of female patients was 43 (48%), who were included till the end of the study with a mean age of 52.37 ± 14.64 years (Figure 1). The number of patients who fulfilled the criteria of an intermediate probability of biliary obstruction were 67 (74.4%), while that of patients with unexplained acute pancreatitis was 23 (25.6%). Only seven patients proved to have CBD stones, of whom all were detected by EUS, but only four were detected by MRCP. No other causes of acute pancreatitis as cystic pancreatic lesions, pancreatic divisum, or pancreatic duct stones could be detected by MRCP or EUS. Most patients had elevated liver enzymes (60%) and direct hyperbilirubinemia (81%), as shown in Table 1. Abdominal ultrasound showed that 72.2% of patients had gall bladder stones; meanwhile, only nine had a history of cholecystectomy with a mean CBD diameter of 9.13 ± 2.35 mm (Figure 2).

Cholecystolithiasis was detected in 83.3% of patients by EUS, 74.4% by ERCP but only 41.1% by MRCP. EUS detected the number of stones more accurately than MRCP (95% vs 41%, respectively), as shown in Table 2.

Regarding the size of stones, EUS had a higher accuracy in detecting stones less than 5 mm (25 out of 53 negatives for stones by MRCP), as shown in Table 2.

EUS was statistically more accurate than MRCP in detecting stones (P < 0.001), especially in stones less than 5 mm (88.8% vs 66.6%, respectively). The sensitivity of EUS was 98.51%, while that of MRCP was only 55.5%, but the specificity of MRCP was higher than that of EUS (100% vs 60.87%, respectively), as shown in Table 3. The combination of EUS with MRCP showed a sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), negative predictive value (NPV), and overall accuracy of 97.22%, 100%, 100%, 91.67%, and 97.87%, respectively (Table 4).

Indeed, there are differences in endoscopic skill between endoscopists, so we analyzed the data for expert and non-expert endoscopists (Table 5).

We found ten cases considered false negative by EUS, where six cases had gravels on EUS, three had small non-floating stones less than 5 mm, and one had a stone over the old plastic stent. Figures 3-5 show different forms of detected CBD stones from our patients.
Table 1 Biochemical data of the included patients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alanine transaminase, aspartate aminotransferase</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 3 fold</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 3 fold</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bilirubin</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>81.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 5 mg/100 mL</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 5 mg/100 mL</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alkaline phosphatase</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 3 fold</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 3 fold</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IQR: Interquartile range; GGT: Gamma glutamyl transpeptidase.

The ten cases with the malignant cause of biliary obstruction were detected by EUS as seven cases with pancreatic head mass, two with gall bladder carcinoma, and one with CBD mass (diagnosed as cholangiocarcinoma by further evaluation with spyglass).


**Table 2 Cases of choledocholithiasis detected by endoscopic ultrasound**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common bile duct stones detected by endoscopic ultrasound</th>
<th>Patients (n)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stones (n)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No stones</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of stones (mm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No stones</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravels (1-2 mm)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3 Accuracy, sensitivity, and specificity of endoscopic ultrasound and magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography in detecting choledocholithiasis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography findings</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Specificity</th>
<th>PPV</th>
<th>NPV</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBD stones detected by EUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>60.87</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE P value</td>
<td>43.464 (&lt; 0.001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRCP stones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>43.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE P value</td>
<td>21.569 (&lt; 0.001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PPV: Positive predictive value; NPV: Negative predictive value; CBD: Common bile duct; EUS: Endoscopic ultrasound; MRCP: Magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography; ERCP: Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography.

**DISCUSSION**

MRCP has been used to detect biliary obstruction in the last decade, but the cause cannot be detected in many patients[5]. The latest ASGE and ESGE guidelines recommend performing MRCP or EUS for evaluating patients with an intermediate probability of choledocholithiasis. However, it does not recommend one modality over the other[6,7]. Since the wide use of EUS, many studies have evaluated its role in detecting the cause of biliary obstruction[8]. EUS has a high accuracy in diagnosing pancreatic diseases and sampling tissues, but its role in diagnosing choledocholithiasis has not been confirmed like in pancreatic diseases[9].
Table 4 Agreement (sensitivity, specificity, and accuracy) for combined endoscopic ultrasound and magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combined EUS &amp; MRCP</th>
<th>ERCP findings</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Specificity</th>
<th>PPV</th>
<th>NPV</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No (n = 11)</td>
<td>Yes (n = 36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>97.22</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>97.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE P value</td>
<td>41.887 (&lt; 0.001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PPV: Positive predictive value; NPV: Negative predictive value; EUS: Endoscopic ultrasound; MRCP: Magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography; ERCP: Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography.

Figure 2 Comparison of sensitivity and specificity of endoscopic ultrasound and magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography in detecting choledocholithiasis. EUS: Endoscopic ultrasound; MRCP: Magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography.

Figure 3 Two distal common bile duct stones as seen from the gastric body. CBD: Common bile duct.

This study evaluated the accuracy of EUS in detecting CBD stones, especially those missed by MRCP in patients with an intermediate probability of CBD stones and recurrent unexplained pancreatitis. Our study included 100 patients, which is considered a large number compared to other studies like Rana et al.[10] (40 patients) and Patel et al.[11] (78 patients), but a small number compared to Wee et al.[12] who included 593 patients but only 35.3% of those patients had MRCP (all our patients had MRCP).

Similar to the previously mentioned studies[10,11], we found no statistically significant variables regarding clinical and laboratory data that could predict the presence of CBD stones on EUS, MRCP, or ERCP.

In the current study, we found that EUS had a higher accuracy in detecting choledocholithiasis than MRCP (88.8% vs 66.6%, respectively) with a higher sensitivity (98% vs 55%, respectively) but lower specificity (60.8% vs 100%, respectively). This lower specificity of EUS might be attributed to the time gap between EUS and ERCP (passed stones), missed gravels during balloon sweeping, and false perception of air as stones in some cases. Many other studies that evaluated the diagnosis of
Choledocholithiasis by EUS showed variable results regarding sensitivities and specificities. For example, Jagtap et al.\cite{13} showed that the sensitivities of both EUS and MRCP were similarly high (92%-98%). Also, Patel et al.\cite{11} showed that the sensitivity and specificity of EUS were 93% and 97.3%, respectively, but most included patients had a high probability of choledocholithiasis. Wee et al.\cite{12} reported sensitivities from 85% to 100% for EUS and 73% to 99% for MRCP. In a meta-analysis of five head-to-head studies comparing EUS to MRCP for choledocholithiasis, the pooled sensitivity and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBD stones detected by EUS</th>
<th>Total (n = 90)</th>
<th>Non-expert (n = 27)</th>
<th>Expert (n = 63)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number**

| No. | 20   | 22.2 | 14   | 51.9 | 6    | 9.5  |
| 1   | 42   | 46.7 | 8    | 29.6 | 34   | 54.0 |
| 2   | 12   | 13.3 | 2    | 7.4  | 10   | 15.9 |
| 3   | 5    | 5.6  | 0    | 0.0  | 5    | 7.9  |
| 4   | 1    | 1.1  | 0    | 0.0  | 1    | 1.6  |
| 5   | 1    | 1.1  | 0    | 0.0  | 1    | 1.6  |
| 6   | 1    | 1.1  | 0    | 0.0  | 1    | 1.6  |
| Multiple | 8 | 8.9 | 3 | 11.1 | 5 | 7.9 |

**Size (mm)**

| No. | 22   | 24.4 | 14   | 51.9 | 8    | 12.7 |
| ≤ 5 | 25   | 27.8 | 4    | 14.8 | 21   | 33.3 |
| > 5 | 43   | 47.8 | 9    | 33.3 | 34   | 54.0 |

**Other findings of EUS**

| No  | 65   | 72.2 | 14   | 51.9 | 51   | 81.0 |
| Yes | 25   | 27.8 | 13   | 48.1 | 12   | 19.0 |

**ERCP findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Specificity</th>
<th>PPV</th>
<th>NPV</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample (n = 90)</td>
<td>n = 23</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-expert (n = 27)</td>
<td>n = 13</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>98.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert (n = 63)</td>
<td>n = 53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PPV:** Positive predictive value; **NPV:** Negative predictive value; **EUS:** Endoscopic ultrasound; **MRCP:** Magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography; **ERCP:** Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography.
specificity of EUS were 97% and 90%, respectively, vs 87% and 92% for MRCP, respectively[14].

Also, de Lédinghen et al[15] reported a good sensitivity (100%) but low specificity (62%) for MRCP in diagnosing choledocholithiasis. Meanwhile, Materne et al[16] showed a 91% sensitivity and 94% specificity for MRCP, close to the values for EUS. The study conducted by Scheiman et al[17] reported significantly better results with EUS (sensitivity, 95%; specificity, 80%) than with MRCP (sensitivity, 40%; specificity, 96%) in diagnosing choledocholithiasis.

Another study compared the accuracy of EUS with ERCP in detecting choledocholithiasis and showed that EUS had a sensitivity of 100% and specificity of 94.7%.

One of the reasons for missed stones by MRCP that were detected by EUS was non-floating stones at the papillary region or distal CBD, as this is considered one of the pitfalls in MRCP interpretation, as mentioned by Irie et al[18]. Another reason was the stones with a diameter less than 5 mm (25 cases detected by EUS vs only 10 by MRCP), which suggests the accuracy of EUS in detecting small stones[19]. Also, EUS was superior to MRCP in detecting the number of stones inside the CBD (70 cases by EUS vs only 26 by MRCP), which is contradictory to the study of Aubé et al[20] that found no significant difference between the two modalities (MRCP detected four of six cases while EUS detected five of six cases).

Many studies comparing EUS and MRCP in idiopathic acute pancreatitis have shown that EUS has higher diagnostic yields than MRCP[21]. In this context, EUS should be considered the first choice in diagnosing idiopathic acute pancreatitis[22]. Biliary diseases such as cholelithiasis, choledocholithiasis, microlithiasis, and biliary sludge are the leading cause of idiopathic acute pancreatitis[23].

In our study, cases with unexplained pancreatitis were evaluated by EUS and MRCP, which showed that EUS was more sensitive in detecting stones than MRCP (90% vs 78%, respectively), as only seven patients proved to have CBD stones, of whom all were detected by EUS but only four were detected by MRCP[23]. Meanwhile, no other causes of acute pancreatitis as cystic pancreatic lesions, pancreatic divisum, or pancreatic duct stones could be detected by MRCP or EUS. And this finding is in agreement with Akkuzu et al[24], who reported a sensitivity of EUS and MRCP in evaluating acute pancreatitis of 89.65% and 72.4%, respectively.

Combining EUS with MRCP is very valuable in diagnosis of missed CBD stones than each one alone. In our study, the combination of the two tools raised the sensitivity, specificity, PPV, NPV, and overall accuracy into 97.22, 100, 100, 91.67, and 97.87, respectively.

The main limitation in our study was the financial cost of doing EUS, ERCP, and MRCP for all of the included patients. The second limitation was that we considered ERCP as the gold standard in detecting CBD stones. Although it is an accurate modality for detecting CBD stones, some false-negative cases may occur. Small stones may be missed if the CBD is under- or over-filling with contrast. Minute stones
or gravels may be missed during balloon sweeping. Also, in some cases, there was a time gap between ERCP and EUS that might give a chance of passage of small stones out of the CBD that could give false-positive results on EUS.

**CONCLUSION**

Our study showed that EUS and MRCP are not equal tools in diagnosing choledocholithiasis in patients with an intermediate probability of choledocholithiasis. EUS is more accurate than MRCP in detecting non-floating stones in the papillary region and small stones, especially those less than 5 mm, and defining the size and number of stones. Furthermore, combining EUS with MRCP proved to be very valuable in accurate diagnosis of patients with an intermediate probability of choledocholithiasis.

EUS could be a good first option for evaluating patients with an intermediate probability of choledocholithiasis when it is available with good experience.

Combining EUS with MRCP is recommended for accurate evaluation of patients with an intermediate probability of choledocholithiasis if both are available.

**ARTICLE HIGHLIGHTS**

**Research background**

Choledocholithiasis develops in up to 20% of patients with gall bladder stones. The challenge in diagnosis usually occurs with small stones that may be missed by magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography (MRCP). Endoscopic ultrasound (EUS) is accurate in detecting common bile duct (CBD) stones missed by MRCP, especially the small ones or those impacted at the distal CBD or the papillary region.

**Research motivation**

Still, there is a great challenge in diagnosing cases with an intermediate probability of choledocholithiasis that develop in up to 20% of patients with gall bladder stones. EUS can easily detect small stones that MRCP could miss. EUS still has many diagnostic purposes with a high accuracy in detecting CBD stones missed by MRCP, especially the small ones or those impacted at the distal CBD or the papillary region.

**Research objectives**

To evaluate the accuracy of EUS in detecting CBD stones missed by MRCP.

**Research methods**

Patients with an intermediate likelihood of choledocholithiasis according to ESGE guidelines and those with acute pancreatitis of undetermined cause were included. The presence of choledocholithiasis was evaluated by MRCP and EUS, and then results were confirmed by endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP). The sensitivity and specificity of EUS and MRCP were compared regarding the presence of stones, the size, and the number of detected stones.

**Research results**

Ninety out of 100 involved patients had choledocholithiasis, while ten patients were excluded as they had pancreatic or gall bladder masses during EUS examination. In choledocholithiasis patients, the mean age was 52.37 ± 14.64 years, and 52.2% were males. Most patients had biliary obstruction (74.4%), while only 23 (25.6%) patients had unexplained pancreatitis. The overall prevalence of choledocholithiasis was 83.3% by EUS, 41.1% by MRCP, and 74.4% by ERCP. Also, the number and size of CBD stones could be detected accurately in 78.2% and 75.6% by EUS and 41.1% and 70.3% by MRCP, respectively. The sensitivity of EUS was higher than that of MRCP (98.51% vs 55.22%), and their predictive value was statistically different ($P < 0.001$). Combination of both tools raised the sensitivity to 97.22% and specificity to 100%.

**Research conclusions**

EUS could be a useful tool in assessing patients with suspected choledocholithiasis especially if combined with MRCP. However, its usefulness depends on its availability and the experience of the local centers.

**Research perspectives**

EUS could be a good first option for evaluating patients with an intermediate probability of choledocholithiasis when it is available with good experience. Combining EUS with MRCP is recommended for
accurate evaluation of patients with an intermediate probability of choledocholithiasis if both are available.
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Isolated esophageal tuberculosis: A case report

Ibrahima Diallo, Omar Touré, Elhadji Souleymane Sarr, Abdoul Sow, Bineta Ndiaye, Papa Silman Diawara, Cherif Mouhamed Dial, Ababacar Mbengue, Fatou Fall

BACKGROUND
Tuberculosis is endemic in Senegal. While its extra-pulmonary localization is rare, esophageal tuberculosis, particularly the isolated form, is exceptional. We report here a case of isolated esophageal tuberculosis in an immunocompetent patient.

CASE SUMMARY
A 58-year-old man underwent consultation for mechanical dysphagia that had developed over 3 mo with non-quantified weight loss, anorexia, and fever. Upper digestive endoscopy showed extensive ulcerated lesions, suggesting neoplasia. The diagnosis was confirmed by histopathology, which showed gigantocellular epithelioid granuloma surrounding a caseous necrosis. Thoracoabdominal computed tomography scan did not show another localization of the tuberculosis. The outcome was favorable with treatment.

CONCLUSION
Esophageal tuberculosis should be considered when dysphagia is associated with atypical ulcerated lesions of the esophageal mucosa, in an endemic area.
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Core Tip: Isolated esophageal tuberculosis is rare. Often discovered during the exploration of dysphagia, the endoscopic aspects are not specific, and can simulate several pathologies. Biopsies can help with diagnosis by showing the granuloma to histology or by allowing molecular biology examinations. In this manuscript, we report a case of isolated esophageal tuberculosis with vast ulcers of the esophagus, which evolved without sequelae after treatment.

INTRODUCTION
Tuberculosis is endemic in Senegal, where it constitutes a major public health problem. In 2020, 12808 new cases of tuberculosis were reported in Senegal, the majority of which were pulmonary (National Controlling Tuberculosis Program, data not published). Extrapulmonary forms of tuberculosis are frequent, whether or not they are associated with pulmonary involvement. In the digestive tract, the terminal ileum and the cecum are most often affected. Esophageal localization is rare, especially in its isolated form. We report herein a case of isolated esophageal tuberculosis in an immunocompetent patient who responded well to antibacillary treatment.

CASE PRESENTATION

Chief complaints
A 58-year-old patient was seen in our department for dysphagia that had developed over 3 mo.

History of present illness
The patient had dysphagia that had been evolving for 3 mo with non-quantified weight loss, nonselective anorexia, and nocturnal fever.

History of past illness
The patient had undergone appendectomy at 23-years-old.

Personal and family history
The patient’s other personal and family histories were unremarkable.

Physical examination
The patient was in good general condition (World Health Organization performance status of 0), with a body mass index of 21.55 kg/m². Clinical examination was normal.

Laboratory examinations
Biological investigations (blood count, liver function tests, glycemia, renal function, and C-reactive protein) were normal. The viral serologies for hepatitis B, hepatitis C, and human immunodeficiency virus were negative.

Imaging examinations
The thoracoabdominal computed tomography (CT) scan did not show any mediastinal lymph nodes in contact with the esophagus or other foci of tuberculosis.

ENDOSCOPIC EXAMINATION
Upper gastrointestinal (GI) endoscopy showed a jagged appearance of the thoracic esophageal mucosa for about 12 cm, stopping 3 cm above the cardia, with large irregular ulcers and raised contours. Nodules were present both at the level of the ulcers and in the normal-appearing mucosa (Figure 1A). Chromoendoscopy with narrow-band imaging did not detect areas that might suggest dysplasia or carcinoma (Figure 1B).
Esophageal biopsies revealed a deep loss of wall tissue, reaching the muscularis mucosa. The normal tissue was replaced by granulation tissue containing a tuberculoid granuloma with several follicles consisting of epithelioid and multinucleated Langerhans histiocytes, surrounding a caseous necrosis (Figure 2). Neither culture of tissue samples nor PCR test for *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* were performed. Sputum and gastric acid liquid after aspiration were negative for acid-fast bacilli (AFB).

**FINAL DIAGNOSIS**

Isolated esophageal tuberculosis.

**TREATMENT**

An antituberculosis treatment was initiated [rifampicin, isoniazid, ethambutol, and pyrazinamide (RHEZ) and administered for 2 mo, and with rifampicin and isoniazid (RH) for 4 mo]. The patient showed good tolerance.

**OUTCOME AND FOLLOW-UP**

The patient’s outcome was favorable, with a clear improvement of dysphagia after 15 d of treatment, which disappeared after 5 wk. Upper digestive endoscopy after 4 mo of treatment showed a normal esophageal mucosa. Six months after stopping the treatment, the patient was well, had regained weight, and did not complain of dysphagia.

**DISCUSSION**

Described for the first time in 1837 by Denonvilliers during an autopsy, infectious esophagitis due to tuberculosis is rare, even in countries with high tuberculosis endemicity. The esophageal localization represents 0.2%-1% of tuberculosis cases of the GI tract[1,2]. This low incidence can be explained by several mechanisms that allow the esophagus to fight infection, in particular, peristaltic movements leading to emptying of the contents into the stomach, and the presence of mucus and saliva lining the mucosa and its squamous epithelium[1]. These mechanisms provide a barrier against primary contamination caused by the ingestion of food or saliva containing germs such as *M. tuberculosis*. However, secondary contamination by contact with neighboring organs, especially in cases of tuberculosis in paraesophageal lymph nodes, is possible[3]. Blood-borne contamination is rare.

The most common symptom during esophageal tuberculosis is dysphagia (90% of cases), which was the main sign in our patient. Odynophagia, pyrosis, and chest pain may also be present[4]. The occurrence of coughing at mealtime should raise suspicion of an esotracheal or esophageal-mediastinal fistula, which is present in 13%-50% of cases[5]. The presence of hematemesis can also provide further evidence of a fistula[6].
The endoscopic appearance of esophageal tuberculosis is variable and nonspecific. In our patient, the lesion was located in the lower two-thirds of the esophagus and consisted of a large ulcer with raised contours, associated with micronodules. The esophagus can be affected throughout its length, although the lesion is most often located in the middle third [3,7,8], because of the extensive lymphoid tissue in this region. Endoscopy may show an ulcer of variable size, superficial with regular contours or irregular and infiltrative simulating neoplasia, or show a more or less ulcerated budding aspect of the mucosa [3,9]. An extrinsic compression aspect with a mucosa of normal appearance can also be found [8]. Endoscopic ultrasound can be helpful for diagnosis, allow analysis of the thick esophageal wall, and guide biopsies [7]. Endoscopic ultrasound can be helpful for diagnosis, allow analysis of the thick esophageal wall, and guide biopsies [7]. It also allows for exploration of the mediastinum and performance of fine-needle biopsy of potentially involved lymph nodes [7]. Thoracic CT scan often shows a thickening of the esophageal wall and allows for searching of adjacent lymph nodes, pulmonary location, or esotracheal or esophago-mediastinal fistulas.

Histology can help in the diagnosis of esophageal tuberculosis. Mucosal biopsies during upper GI endoscopy can show the presence of a tuberculous granuloma or AFB in about 50% of cases [10,11], but sometimes neither of these lesions is found [12]. In our patient, an epithelioid gigantocellular granuloma with caseous necrosis was present on histology (Figure 3), confirming the diagnosis of esophageal tuberculosis. To improve diagnostic success, deep biopsy samples should be taken from ulcerated areas, as granulomas are most often found in the submucosa [1,8,11]. If endoscopic biopsies are not contributive, deep esophageal biopsy or fine-needle aspiration of a satellite lymph node, guided by endoscopic ultrasound, may make it possible to find an epithelioid granuloma on histology (reportedly in 94.7% to 100% of cases, with caseous necrosis and/or AFB present in 55% to 75% of those cases) [7,11]. Histological samples are also used for PCR or culturing methods to identify *M. tuberculosis*. If an epithelioid granuloma without caseous necrosis is present, a differential diagnosis with sarcoidosis, Crohn’s disease, or a carcinoma must be considered.

The treatment of esophageal tuberculosis is essentially medical, according to the standard protocol (rifampicin, isoniazid, ethambutol, and pyrazinamide daily for 2 mo, followed by rifampicin and isoniazid daily for 4 mo) for at least 6 mo. However, the optimal duration is not clinically established. In the case of fistula, clips are the reference treatment for lesion closure [11,13]. The outcome during treatment for esophageal tuberculosis is favorable and without sequelae in almost all cases [3,7,8,11].
our patient, no sequelae were noted during the follow-up. Upper digestive endoscopy, 4 mo after the beginning of treatment, was normal. The patient had no complaints at 6 mo after the end of treatment.

CONCLUSION

Esophageal tuberculosis is a rare cause of infectious esophagitis, even in a country where tuberculosis is endemic. Nevertheless, esophageal tuberculosis should be considered when dysphagia is associated with atypical ulcerated lesions of the esophageal mucosa. The presence of gigantocellular epithelioid granulomas on esophageal biopsies confirms the diagnosis. The patient’s outcome is generally favorable after antibacillary treatment, as illustrated by our observation.
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