Technical aspects of endoscopic ultrasound (EUS)-guided sampling in gastroenterology: European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ESGE) Technical Guideline – March 2017

Authors

Marcin Polkowski[1,2], Christian Jenssen[3], Philip Kaye[4], Silvia Carrara[5], Pierre Deprez[6], Angels Gines[7], Gloria Fernández-Esparrach[7], Pierre Eisendrath[8], Guruprasad P. Aithal[4], Paolo Arcidiacono[9], Marc Barthet[10], Pedro Bastos[11], Adele Fornelli[12], Bertrand Napoleon[13], Julio Iglesias-Garcia[14], Andrada Seicean[15], Alberto Larghi[16], Cesare Hassan[16], Jeanin E. van Hooft[17], Jean-Marc Dumonceau[18]

Institutions

1 Department of Gastroenterology, Hepatology, and Oncology, Medical Centre for Postgraduate Education, Warsaw, Poland
2 Department of Gastroenterological Oncology, The M. Skłodowska-Curie Memorial Cancer Centre, Warsaw, Poland
3 Department of Internal Medicine, Krankenhaus Märkisch Oderland Strausberg/Wriezen, Academic Teaching Hospital of the Medical University of Brandenburg, Germany
4 Nottingham Digestive Diseases Centre, NIHR Nottingham Biomedical Research Centre, Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust and University of Nottingham, UK
5 Digestive Endoscopy Unit, Division of Gastroenterology, Humanitas Research Hospital, Rozzano, Italy
6 Cliniques Universitaires St-Luc, Université Catholique de Louvain, Brussels, Belgium
7 Endoscopy Unit, Department of Gastroenterology, ICMDM, IDIBAPS, CIBEREHD, Hospital Clínic, Barcelona, Spain
8 Department of Gastroenterology, Hepatopancreatology, and Digestive Oncology, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Hôpital Erasme & Hôpital Saint-Pierre, Brussels, Belgium
9 Pancreato-Biliary Endoscopy and Endosonography Division, San Raffaele University, Milan, Italy
10 Service de Gastroentérologie, Hôpital NORD AP-HM, Aix-Marseille-Université, Marseille, France
11 Gastroenterology Department Instituto Português de Oncologia do Porto, Porto, Portugal
12 Anatomic Pathology Unit, AUSL of Bologna, Maggiore Hospital, Bologna, Italy
13 Department of Gastroenterology, Ramsay Générale de Santé, Private Hospital Jean Mermoz, Lyon, France
14 Gastroenterology Department, University Hospital of Santiago de Compostela, Santiago de Compostela, Spain
15 Regional Institute of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Iuliu Hatieganu University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Cluj-Napoca, Romania
16 Digestive Endoscopy Unit, Catholic University, Rome, Italy
17 Department of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Academic Medical Center, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
18 Gedyt Endoscopy Center, Buenos Aires, Argentina

Corresponding author
Marcin Polkowski, MD, Department of Gastroenterological Oncology, M. Sklodowska-Curie Memorial Cancer Center and Institute of Oncology, Roentgena 5, 02-781 Warsaw, Poland
Fax: +48–22–5463035
mp.polkowski@gmail.com

🌐 Appendix e1, e2 and Supplementary material Table s1 – s14 Online content viewable at: https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0043-119219

RECOMMENDATIONS

For routine EUS-guided sampling of solid masses and lymph nodes (LNs) ESGE recommends 25G or 22G needles (high quality evidence, strong recommendation); fine needle aspiration (FNA) and fine needle biopsy (FNB) needles are equally recommended (high quality evidence, strong recommendation).

When the primary aim of sampling is to obtain a core tissue specimen, ESGE suggests using 19G FNA or FNB needles or 22G FNB needles (low quality evidence, weak recommendation).

ESGE recommends using 10-mL syringe suction for EUS-guided sampling of solid masses and LNs with 25G or 22G FNA needles (high quality evidence, strong recommendation) and other types of needles (low quality evidence, weak recommendation).

ESGE suggests neutralizing residual negative pressure in the needle before withdrawing the needle from the target lesion (moderate quality evidence, weak recommendation).

ESGE does not recommend for or against using the needle stylet for EUS-guided sampling of solid masses and LNs with FNA needles (high quality evidence, strong recommendation) and suggests using the needle stylet for EUS-guided sampling with FNB needles (low quality evidence, weak recommendation).

ESGE suggests fanning the needle throughout the lesion when sampling solid masses and LNs (moderate quality evidence, weak recommendation).

ESGE equally recommends EUS-guided sampling with or without on-site cytologic evaluation (moderate quality evidence, strong recommendation). When on-site cytologic evaluation is unavailable, ESGE suggests performance of three to four needle passes with an FNA needle or two to three passes with an FNB needle (low quality evidence, weak recommendation).

For diagnostic sampling of pancreatic cystic lesions without a solid component, ESGE suggests emptying the cyst with a single pass of a 22G or 19G needle (low quality evidence, weak recommendation). For pancreatic cystic lesions with a solid component, ESGE suggests sampling of the solid component using the same technique as in the case of other solid lesions (low quality evidence, weak recommendation).

ESGE does not recommend antibiotic prophylaxis for EUS-guided sampling of solid masses or LNs (low quality evidence, strong recommendation), and suggests antibiotic prophylaxis with fluoroquinolones or beta-lactam antibiotics for EUS-guided sampling of cystic lesions (low quality evidence, weak recommendation).

ESGE suggests that evaluation of tissue obtained by EUS-guided sampling should include histologic preparations (e.g., cell blocks and/or formalin-fixed and paraffin-embedded tissue fragments) and should not be limited to smear cytology (low quality evidence, weak recommendation).

ABBREVIATIONS

CI	confidence interval
ESGE	European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy
EUS	endoscopic ultrasound
FNA	fine needle aspiration
FNB	fine needle biopsy
G	gauge
GRADE	Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation
LN	lymph node
RCT	randomized controlled trial
ROSE	rapid on-site cytologic evaluation

This Guideline from the European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ESGE) focuses on the technical aspects of endoscopic ultrasound (EUS)-guided sampling in gastroenterology, such as the choice of needle, the sampling technique, and specimen handling and processing. A separate Clinical Guideline addresses the indications, results, and clinical impact of EUS-guided sampling.

Guideline focus

This Guideline from the European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ESGE) focuses on technical aspects of endoscopic ultrasonography (EUS)-guided sampling in gastroenterology – the choice of needle, sampling technique, and specimen handling and processing – and updates the previous guideline on these topics published in 2012 [1]. The target audience for this Guideline is endoscopists who perform EUS-guided sampling. Indications, results, and clinical impact of EUS-guided sampling are addressed in a separate clinical Guideline from ESGE [2].

Guideline development process

ESGE commissioned this Guideline and appointed a Guideline leader (J.M.D.) who invited the listed authors to participate in the project development. The key questions were prepared by the coordinating team (M.P., J.M.D.) and then approved by the other members. The coordinating team formulated key questions and assigned them to task force subgroups (**Appendix e1** and **Appendix e2**, available online-only).

Each task force performed a systematic literature search to prepare evidence-based and well-balanced statements on their assigned key questions. The literature search was performed in Medline through PubMed to identify new publications since

February 2011, focusing on meta-analyses and prospective studies, particularly randomized controlled trials (RCTs). Retrospective analyses and pilot studies were also included if they addressed topics not covered in the prospective studies. Each task force proposed statements on their assigned key questions which were discussed during a meeting in September 2016. The Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) system was adopted to define the quality of evidence and strength of recommendation [3–7].

The significance of the four levels of evidence quality is explained in ► Table1 [4]. The strength of a recommendation, either strong or weak, was defined according to GRADE guidelines as the extent to which one can be confident that the desirable effects of an intervention outweigh its undesirable effects [5]. The decision on the recommendation strength considers both the quality of evidence and the risks, benefits, and costs of the approach being recommended. A strong recommendation supports a decision that should apply to most patients most of the time; a weak recommendation means that the decision is more nuanced and some clinicians might not choose the recommended approach [5, 8].

Literature searches were re-run in March 2017. This timepoint should be the starting point in the search for new evidence for future updates to this Guideline. In April 2017 a draft prepared by M.P. was sent to all group members for review. The draft was also reviewed by two members of the ESGE Governing Board and sent for further comments to the ESGE National Societies and Individual Members. After agreement on a final version, the manuscript was submitted to the journal *Endoscopy* for publication. All authors agreed on the final revised version.

This Guideline will be considered for review in 2022, or sooner if new and relevant evidence becomes available. Any updates to the Guideline in the interim period will be noted on the ESGE website: http://www.esge.com/ esge-guidelines.html.

Outcomes used in studies on EUS-guided sampling techniques

Technical aspects of EUS-guided sampling have been evaluated in more than 40 RCTs [9–49], several meta-analyses [50–60], and numerous studies with lower quality evidence levels. These studies used a variety of outcomes that can be broadly divided into five categories: (i) diagnostic accuracy; (ii) safety; (iii) sample adequacy and quality; (iv) technical performance of the needle; and (v) costs (► Table 2). Diagnostic accuracy is considered a surrogate outcome for patient-important outcomes and hence the most important outcome in studies evaluating diagnostic tests [55, 61]. Despite this fact, many studies did not evaluate accuracy and focused on outcomes related to sample adequacy and quality and to technical performance of the needle. These outcomes are inconsistently defined across the studies and their clinical significance is generally not well established. In addition, they are assessed using various nonvalidated scales and most likely subject to significant interobserver variability [62]. Adverse events are another patient-important outcome; however, none of the available RCTs was primarily designed and adequately powered to evaluate safety issues.

Limitations of the available evidence

Results of EUS-guided sampling may depend on numerous factors related to the target lesion, needle size and type, sampling technique, specimen handling and processing, and the endosonographer and pathologist. These factors are often interrelated and it is hardly possible to disentangle their relative effects in studies that look at them in isolation. In addition, the high number of involved factors makes it impossible to evaluate all of their potential combinations in 2 × 2 RCTs. Most RCTs focus on sampling technique and there is a paucity of studies evaluating various methods of specimen handling and processing. The same holds true for studies evaluating issues related to costs of the procedure.

► **Table 1** Significance of the four levels of evidence quality according to Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) guidelines [4].

Quality level	Definition	Source of the evidence
High	We are very confident that the true effect lies close to that of the estimate of the effect	Randomized controlled trials without methodological limitations.
Moderate	We are moderately confident in the effect estimate: The true effect is likely to be close to the estimate of the effect, but there is a possibility that it is substantially different	Randomized controlled trials with serious methodological limitations.
Low	Our confidence in the effect estimate is limited: The true effect may be substantially different from the estimate of the effect	Randomized controlled trials with very serious methodological limitations and/or observational studies.
Very low	We have very little confidence in the effect estimate: The true effect is likely to be substantially different from the estimate of effect	

▶ **Table 2** Outcomes evaluated in randomized controlled trials on techniques of endoscopic ultrasound (EUS)-guided sampling.

Outcome groups	Specific outcomes
Diagnostic accuracy	Sensitivity, specificity, accuracy for malignancy/neoplasia
Safety	Adverse event rate and severity
Sample adequacy and quality	Proportion of samples adequate for cytologic evaluation/histologic evaluation/diagnosis
	Diagnostic yield of malignancy*
	Number of needle passes: to establish diagnosis/to obtain an adequate or diagnostic sample
	Sample cellularity/bloodiness/contamination with gastrointestinal tract cells
	Proportion of core tissue procurement, length/width of the core tissue specimen
Needle technical performance	Technical failure rate
	Needle visibility/maneuverability
	Ease-of-puncture/rate of difficult puncture
Cost	Direct cost of the procedure, cost–effectiveness

* The definition of diagnostic yield of malignancy varies considerably across the studies.

Available RCTs evaluated relatively small patient samples and were underpowered to detect small but clinically relevant differences in evaluated outcomes. Only two parallel-group RCTs included more than 100 patients per group [14, 47]. Only a few crossover RCTs evaluated more than 100 patients [20, 25, 39, 41, 44]. While a difference in accuracy for malignancy of 10 % seems clinically significant, the studies were often designed to exclude a much larger difference of 15 % – 25 % between groups [12, 14, 15, 17, 27, 30, 32, 34, 47]. Most studies included exclusively or predominantly patients with solid pancreatic masses; evidence on EUS-guided sampling of other target lesions is limited. The pathologists who assessed the samples were blinded to the type of needle and sampling technique used; however, the endosonographer was not, and hence bias from this source cannot be excluded. Standard of reference was predominantly based on clinical and imaging follow-up, and verification by surgical pathology was available in only a minority of patients. Needles from two manufacturers were used in most of the discussed RCTs (**Tables S1 – S5** and **S7 – S13**, online-only in **Supplementary material**) and it is uncertain whether the results of these studies can be extrapolated to needles by other manufacturers. Finally, results from studies conducted at high volume centers by experts may not be generalizable to low volume centers and less experienced operators.

Sampling of solid masses and lymph nodes
Choice of needle

> **RECOMMENDATION**
> For routine EUS-guided sampling of solid masses and lymph nodes (LNs) ESGE recommends 25G or 22G needles (high quality evidence, strong recommendation); fine needle aspiration (FNA) and fine needle biopsy (FNB) needles are equally recommended (high quality evidence, strong recommendation).
> When the primary aim of sampling is to obtain a core tissue specimen, ESGE suggests using 19G FNA or FNB needles or 22G FNB needles (low quality evidence, weak recommendation).

Summary of evidence
Needle type
New needle types primarily designed to procure samples with preserved tissue architecture, suitable for histologic evaluation, have been introduced in recent years. These devices, here collectively referred to as FNB needles, feature either a special geometry of the cutting tip or a side-slot (core trap) at the needle distal portion (▶**Table 3**). Conventional needles without these refinements are here referred to as FNA needles. Needles with a side port (EZ-Shot 2/EZ-shot 3 with side port, Olympus) are considered to be FNA needles, because the nonbeveled side port is not designed to cut tissue [23].

Among the FNB needles, it is the reverse bevel needle (Pro-Core; Cook Medical) that has been evaluated most thoroughly. Evidence on other FNB needles, such as the fork-tip needle (SharkCore; Medtronic), Franseen-type needle (Acquire; Boston

Needle type (available gauge sizes), manufacturer	Key features
Echotip ProCore (19G, 22G, 25G), Cook Medical	Reverse bevel: modified Menghini-type needle with a beveled side-slot near the needle tip. Slot cutting edge directed backward to collect tissue during retrograde movement of the needle.
Echotip ProCore (20G), Cook Medical	Antegrade core trap: modified Menghini-type needle with a beveled side-slot near the needle tip. Slot cutting edge directed forward to cut tissue during antegrade movement of the needle.
SharkCore (19G, 22G, 25G), Medtronic	Fork-shaped tip: end-cutting needle with a fork-shaped distal tip including six cutting edges and an opposing bevel. No side-slot.
Acquire (22G, 25G), Boston Scientific	Franseen tip geometry: end-cutting needle with a crown-shaped distal tip including three symmetrical beveled cutting edges. No side-slot.

▶ **Table 3** Fine needle biopsy (FNB) needles.

Scientific), or 20G FNB needle with antegrade core trap (Pro-Core 20G; Cook Medical) is limited [63 – 71]. The chronologically first FNB needle, the trucut biopsy needle (QuickCore; Cook Medical) is not manufactured anymore and will not be discussed here.

FNA vs. reverse bevel needles
A total of 13 RCTs [9 – 21] compared FNA and reverse bevel needles in patients with various solid masses or LNs [9, 10, 12, 13, 16, 17, 20], solid pancreatic masses [14, 15, 18, 21], or subepithelial lesions [11, 19] (**Table S1**, online-only **Supplementary material**). These studies evaluated almost exclusively 22G and 25G needles, and sampling technique in most cases involved the use of stylet and suction. Rapid on-site cytologic evaluation (ROSE) was available in selected studies. One study compared FNA and reverse bevel needles of different diameter (22G FNA vs. 25G reverse-bevel) [16].

Diagnostic accuracy was evaluated in eight of these RCTs; none of them found a significant difference between the needles in the main analysis [10, 12, 14 – 18, 20]. However, a subgroup analysis in one study suggested that reverse bevel needles, compared with FNA needles of the same diameter, offered a higher accuracy for malignancy in patients with pancreatic masses and a lower accuracy for malignancy in patients with LNs [20]. Another RCT found a higher accuracy of on-site diagnosis on samples obtained with reverse bevel needles, with no difference in the accuracy of final diagnosis [18]. Two meta-analyses did not show significant differences in diagnostic accuracy between FNA and reverse bevel needles, both overall (in patients with various solid masses or LNs) and specifically in patients with solid pancreatic masses (**Table S2**, online-only **Supplementary material**) [50, 51].

Conclusions about the impact of needle type on sample adequacy and quality are hampered by inconsistent definitions of these outcomes across studies; however, there is some evidence to suggest that samples obtained with reverse bevel needles are more often adequate for histologic diagnosis and of higher histologic quality than those obtained with FNA needles of the same gauge (**Table S1**, online-only **Supplementary material**). Six RCTs showed that when compared with FNA needles, reverse bevel needles required fewer passes to obtain tissue adequate for histologic diagnosis [15, 20], core tissue speci-

mens [10, 19], or samples adequate for diagnosis based on a combination of cytologic and histologic examination [11, 18]. Also the rates of diagnostic samples [13], samples adequate for histologic diagnosis [14, 19], samples adequate for on-site cytologic evaluation [13], and sample histologic quality [14, 15] were higher for reverse bevel than for FNA needles. One RCT showed that samples obtained with reverse bevel needles were of lower histologic quality than samples obtained with FNA needles; however, this study compared a single pass with the reverse bevel needle with two passes with a FNA needle [17]. Seven RCTs found samples obtained with FNA and reverse bevel needles of comparable quality and/or adequacy [9 – 12, 16, 20, 21].

Two meta-analyses did not find significant differences between FNA and reverse bevel FNB needles in the rate of samples adequate for pathologic examination and in the rate of histologic core tissue procurement, both overall (various solid masses and LNs) and in patients with pancreatic masses; however, the number of needle passes to obtain a diagnostic sample was significantly lower for reverse bevel needles than for FNA needles (**Table S2**, online-only **Supplementary material**) [50, 51]. There were no significant differences in overall complications and technical failure [51].

A cost analysis in a decision tree model found that reverse bevel needles are cost-saving compared to FNA needles over a wide range of cost and outcome probabilities; however, this study used cost variables from the US that might not apply to other countries [13].

Other types of FNB needles
An RCT that compared the 19G reverse bevel needle with the 19G trucut needle in patients with various solid masses and parenchymal liver disease showed advantages of the former in terms of higher diagnostic accuracy for malignancy, higher rate of samples adequate for histologic diagnosis, higher technical success rate of the first pass, and lower rate of crossover to the other needle (**Table S3**, online-only **Supplementary material**) [22].

RCTs evaluating other FNB needles, such as the fork-tip needle [63 – 65, 67 – 70], Franseen-type needle [66], or through-the-needle biopsy forceps [72], are lacking. Studies in patients with pancreatic masses [63, 67], various pancreatic and

nonpancreatic masses [64, 68, 70], or subepithelial masses [69] suggest that the fork-tip needle may confer advantages over FNA needles in terms of diagnostic accuracy [67] and/or sample adequacy and quality [63, 64, 67 – 69]; however, these studies are limited by retrospective design [64, 67 – 70] or small number of evaluated patients [63]. A study in nondiseased cadaveric liver tissue showed that 19G and 22G fork-tip needles provide superior histologic yield, as measured by the number of portal tracts and tissue fragmentation, when compared with 19G FNA or 19G reverse bevel needles [71]. The Franseen-type needle was evaluated in only a single noncomparative study [66]. Studies evaluating the 20G FNB needle with antegrade core trap are not yet available.

FNA needles with side port
An RCT in patients with pancreatic masses that compared 22G FNA needles with and without a side port did not demonstrate significant differences in diagnostic accuracy for malignancy, or in sample adequacy or quality (**Table S4**, online-only **Supplementary material**) [23].

Needle gauge
25G FNA vs. 22G FNA
Eight RCTs compared EUS-FNA with 22G and 25G needles in patients with various solid masses and LNs [24, 25, 27, 28] or with solid pancreatic masses [26, 29 – 31] (**Table S5**, online-only **Supplementary material**). The technique involved the use of stylet and suction.

Only one RCT demonstrated a significantly higher accuracy for the 25G needle [24]; the differences in accuracy observed in the remaining seven studies were nonsignificant [25 – 31]. No significant differences were found between the needles in terms of sample adequacy and quality. One study found that the 25G needle is easier to manipulate [26]; another one found that the 22G needle is superior in terms of needle visibility and technical performance [27]. In one study the adverse event rate was lower with the 25G needle [26]; no adverse events were reported in the remaining seven studies [24, 25, 27 – 31].

Studies comparing FNA with 25G and 22G needles were subject to four meta-analyses [52 – 55] that provided conflicting results (**Table S6** online-only **Supplementary material**). The recent meta-analysis by Facciorusso et al. restricted to RCTs (7 studies published in 2009 – 2016) did not demonstrate significant differences between the needles in terms of sensitivity or specificity for malignancy in patients with solid pancreatic masses [52]. In contrast to this study, Xu et al., who analyzed studies from the same period (7 RCTs and 4 prospective nonrandomized studies), found higher sensitivity for pancreatic malignancy for the 25G needle with no significant difference in specificity [53]. The remaining two meta-analyses were published in 2013, did not analyze recent data, and are limited by significant heterogeneity and inclusion of retrospective studies. The meta-analysis by Madhoun et al. (4 RCTs, 1 prospective and 3 retrospective studies published in 2009 – 2011) showed that the 25G needle was associated with higher sensitivity but similar specificity compared with the 22G needle [54]. However, when the retrospective study by Yusuf et al. [73], including

842 patients and markedly larger than the remaining evaluated studies, was removed from the analysis, the difference in sensitivity missed statistical significance. It was also nonsignificant when only prospective studies were analyzed. The meta-analysis by Affolter et al. (4 RCTs and 3 retrospective studies published in 2005 – 2011, including two studies in patients with pancreatic and nonpancreatic masses) did not find significant difference in accuracy between the needles [55].

Conclusions from the discussed meta-analyses on outcomes other than diagnostic accuracy are limited. Low numbers of adverse events precluded safety analysis. Madhoun et al. did not find significant differences in needle malfunction rates [54]. A trend toward higher sample adequacy for the 25G needle shown by Affolter et al. [55] was not confirmed by Facciorusso et al. [52]. In addition, the sample adequacy analysis in the former study was based on heterogeneous data on various outcomes such as diagnostic yield, adequacy, or technical success rates that were inconsistently defined in the source studies.

25G vs. 22G reverse bevel needles
An RCT in patients with solid pancreatic masses did not find significant differences between 25G and 22G reverse bevel needles in terms of accuracy for malignancy and in sample adequacy and quality (**Table S7**, online-only **Supplementary material**) [32].

19G vs. thinner needles
19G needles are used primarily to obtain samples with preserved tissue architecture adequate for histologic evaluation. These needles, as shown both in benchtop and clinical studies, are stiffer and more difficult to operate as compared to thinner needles, especially when sampling is performed with the scope in an angulated position, for example from the duodenum [33, 74, 75]. A 19G FNA needle made out of nitinol was shown to offer mechanical performance advantages in benchtop testing [75], but clinical evidence is limited and no comparative data are available [76].

Studies comparing 19G needles and thinner needles are scarce [33]. An RCT that compared EUS-FNA with 19G and 22G needles in patients with solid pancreatic masses did not demonstrate a significant difference in accuracy; however, a secondary analysis limited to technically successful cases found significantly higher accuracy for the 19G needle. This advantage, however, was offset by a higher technical failure rate of the 19G needle in pancreatic head masses. No clinically significant adverse events were reported (**Table S8**, online-only **Supplementary material**). A nonrandomized, prospective comparison of 19G and 22G needles in patients with mediastinal masses and lymph nodes did not show significant differences between the needles in the rate of diagnostic samples and in diagnostic accuracy [77]. The only RCT that compared the nitinol 19G and 25G FNA needles in patients with solid pancreatic masses was retracted from publication [78, 79].

Both 19G FNA and 19G reverse bevel needles have been evaluated in a number of noncomparative studies in patients with various solid masses [76, 80 – 83], LNs [84], or subepithelial masses [85]. Sampling was technically feasible in 98 % – 100 %

of cases; however, patients were highly selected and sampling was performed transduodenally only in a small percentage of cases (5 % – 32 %). Core tissue samples adequate for histologic evaluation, including immunostaining when indicated, were obtained at a rate of 89 % – 100 % when calculated per procedure [80, 81, 84, 85] or 79 % – 94 % per single needle pass [81, 82]. With the use of the nitinol 19G FNA needle, core tissue samples adequate for histologic examination were obtained in 94 % of patients despite the fact that most lesions (89 %) were sampled transduodenally [76]. These data suggest that when sampling with the 19G needle is technically feasible, specimens adequate for histologic evaluation can be obtained in > 90 % of cases. This figure is higher when indirectly compared to the rate at which histologic samples were obtained with the 22G reverse bevel needle (69 % – 83 % per procedure and 69 – 81 % per single pass) [12, 15, 19, 20, 32, 86, 87] or the 25G reverse bevel needle (32 % – 88 % per procedure and 12 % – 69 % per single pass) [14, 32, 88]. In a series of patients with small (< 2 cm) pancreatic lesions, core tissue specimens were obtained in 53 % of cases using the 22G reverse bevel needle [89]. Good results – histologic samples obtained in 68 % – 98 % of cases – have also been reported in several retrospective studies evaluating 22G FNA needles [90]; however, as discussed earlier, direct randomized comparisons suggest that 22G reverse bevel needles provide tissue of better histologic quality than FNA needles of the same gauge. It has to be emphasized that, in the studies under discussion, the definition of a "core tissue sample" or "sample adequate for histologic evaluation" has not been standardized.

Rationale for recommendations

There is high quality evidence from numerous RCTs and two meta-analyses that reverse bevel needles and FNA needles of the same gauge do not differ significantly in terms of diagnostic accuracy for malignancy. The discussed RCTs were not primarily designed to compare safety; however, adverse events occurred very rarely, with most studies reporting zero rates, and there is no evidence for differences in safety profiles of both types of needle. The panel recognized that selected studies have shown some advantages of reverse bevel needles over FNA needles, including higher quality of histologic specimens procured with the former and a lower number of needle passes required to obtain a diagnostic sample; however, the clinical significance of these advantages for the patient remain uncertain. It is also uncertain whether these advantages offset the higher cost of the reverse bevel needle. Therefore, the panel decided not to recommend the reverse bevel needles over FNA needles. No specific recommendations can yet be given about other types of FNB needles because of insufficient evidence.

All but one of the eight available RCTs failed to demonstrate significant differences between 25G and 22G FNA needles in diagnostic accuracy for malignancy; the results of four meta-analyses available on this topic are conflicting. There is consistent evidence that the cytologic quality of samples obtained with 25G FNA and 22G FNA needles is similar. No convincing advantages of 25G vs. 22G needle or vice versa in terms of their technical performance, ease of use, or safety profile have been demonstrated. All this probably holds true for the comparison

of 25G vs. 22G reverse bevel needles, although evidence here is limited. In light of these data the panel decided to equally recommend the 25G and 22G needles for use in routine sampling of pancreatic masses, other solid masses, and LNs.

There is a growing interest in obtaining histologic rather than cytologic samples from pancreatic masses, subepithelial tumors, and other target lesions [2]. Although larger-caliber needles may provide better specimens for this purpose when compared to thinner needles, the use of the former is limited by their stiffness, especially when sampling is performed from the duodenum. To overcome this problem, flexible nitinol 19G needles have been designed. Another option is to use thinner, 22G (or 25G) needles of special design to procure histologic specimens (FNB needles). Studies comparing these approaches are lacking, and there is only low quality, indirect evidence to suggest that when the priority is to obtain a core tissue sample, and sampling with a 19G needle is feasible, these needles should be preferred over thinner needles. Because various types of 19G needles (standard FNA, nitinol FNA, and FNB) have not been directly compared, there is not enough evidence to recommend one type over another. When sampling with a 19G needle is not technically feasible, there is low quality evidence to suggest that a 22G reverse bevel needle should be used rather than a 22G FNA needle or a 25G needle. Because of the lack of evidence no recommendation can be given at present on FNB needles other than the reverse bevel needle.

The use of suction

> **RECOMMENDATION**
> ESGE recommends using 10-mL syringe suction for EUS-guided sampling of solid masses and LNs with 25G or 22G FNA needles (high quality evidence, strong recommendation) and other types of needles (low quality evidence, weak recommendation).

> **RECOMMENDATION**
> ESGE suggests neutralizing residual negative pressure in the needle before withdrawing the needle from the target lesion (moderate quality evidence, weak recommendation).

Summary of evidence

Standard suction

The impact of negative pressure, applied with a 10- or 20-mL suction syringe to the needle, on the results of EUS-guided sampling was evaluated in four RCTs (**Table S9,** online-only **Supplementary material**) [34 – 37]. These studies predominantly used 22G FNA needles. Three RCTs (two in patients with pancreatic masses [34, 35] and one in patients with various mediastinal and abdominal lesions [36]) showed that 10-mL suction improves sensitivity [34 – 36] and accuracy [34,

35] for malignancy compared to no suction. One of these studies also showed that 20-mL suction is superior to 10-mL suction [34]. In contrast, in an RCT in patients with mediastinal or abdominal lymphadenopathy using suction did not influence the probability of obtaining a correct diagnosis [37]. Suction increases the rate of procuring diagnostic samples and the sample cellularity. It may also increase sample bloodiness; however, this fact does not appear to affect the diagnostic performance [34–37].

High negative pressure

Using high negative pressure (50-mL vacuum syringe) rather than standard suction (10-mL) during EUS-FNA of pancreatic masses did not improve accuracy for malignancy in an RCT that evaluated 25G needles. Samples obtained with high negative pressure were more likely to be adequate for histologic diagnosis and contained more blood. There was no difference in sample contamination by gastrointestinal tract cells (**Table S9**, online-only **Supplementary material**) [38].

"Wet suction"

The "wet suction" technique was developed to enhance tissue acquisition by applying principles of fluid dynamics to aspiration technique [91]. The wet technique involves pre-flushing the needle with saline to replace the column of air with liquid which is less compressible than gas and better transmits to the needle tip the negative pressure applied to the proximal port of the needle [39, 91]. In an RCT that compared the wet technique vs. standard suction FNA in patients with various solid masses and LNs, the wet suction technique improved sample adequacy and quality. The impact on diagnostic accuracy was not evaluated (**Table S9**, online-only **Supplementary material**) [39].

"Stylet slow-pull"

It has been suggested that slow removal of the stylet during sampling creates minimal negative pressure within the needle that enhances sampling. This technique, referred to as "stylet slow-pull" has not been standardized as to the speed of stylet removal, and the suction force it generates is estimated at only 5% of the force generated with the standard suction method [92]. Retrospective studies suggested advantages over standard suction [93, 94]; however, a nonrandomized prospective study [95] and an RCT (available only in abstract form) [96] did not show significant differences between standard suction and stylet slow-pull techniques in terms of diagnostic accuracy.

Eliminating the residual negative pressure

A benchtop study showed that despite closing of the stopcock of the suction syringe, negative pressure persists in the needle. This residual pressure can be neutralized by disconnecting the syringe stopcock from the needle port before withdrawing the needle from the target lesion [40]. In an RCT in patients with pancreatic masses, this method was shown to decrease sample contamination with gastrointestinal tract cells and to increase sensitivity for malignancy (**Table S9**, online-only **Supplementary material**) [40].

Impact of suction on FNB results

The impact of suction on FNB results has not been evaluated in RCTs and it remains uncertain whether the results from studies using FNA needles discussed above can be extrapolated to sampling with FNB needles. Most studies that evaluated the reverse bevel needle used 10-mL suction [12, 15, 17, 18, 20–22, 32, 81, 83, 86] or the stylet slow-pull technique [14, 16, 19, 88]. In a benchtop study using chicken tenderloin and liver, the amount of tissue obtained with the 22G reverse bevel needle depended on the suction applied to the needle. Sampling using suction (10-mL) procured significantly more tissue than sampling using the stylet slow-pull method and sampling without suction; stylet slow-pull was more effective than no suction [97]. In contrast, in a retrospective study that used the 22G reverse bevel needle in patients with solid pancreatic masses, the stylet slow-pull technique provided samples of superior cellularity (higher proportion of tumor cells and more tissue microfragments) than the standard suction technique. Better sample quality, however, did not translate into a higher rate of diagnostic samples [98]. The effect of suction on results of sampling with fork-tip or Franseen-type needles has not been evaluated. Studies that assessed these needles used various approaches, including no suction [65, 66], stylet slow-pull technique [65, 67, 69], or syringe suction [67, 70].

Rationale for recommendations

Results of three RCTs indicate that using 10 mL of suction during sampling with 22G or 25G FNA needles improves accuracy and/or sensitivity for malignancy when compared to the no-suction technique. The evidence in favor of suction is strongest for 22G FNA needles in the setting of pancreatic masses and it is less clear for other target lesions, especially LNs, and for sampling with 25G FNA needles. Comparative studies to specifically evaluate the effect of suction on sampling with 19G FNA needles are lacking; however, suction was used in most studies that evaluated these needles. The same holds true for the reverse bevel needles. Although the evidence on the effect of using suction is limited in some areas, there are also no perceivable risks or disadvantages of this technique. Increased sample bloodiness shown in some studies does not appear to affect diagnostic performance and as a result does not constitute a significant problem. Therefore, the panel decided to recommend using suction for all indications and all needle gauges and types.

Neutralizing residual negative pressure in the needle before withdrawing the needle from the target lesion was shown to improve sensitivity for malignancy. Although the mechanism behind this effect remains uncertain and the evidence is limited to a single RCT, the panel decided to recommend this simple maneuver, because it is not associated with any inconvenience or burden.

There is limited evidence that suction applied with a 20-mL or 50-mL syringe or using the wet suction technique may confer some advantages over standard suction with a 10-mL syringe. These techniques can be considered, especially if the standard suction technique fails to obtain an adequate sample, but confirmatory data from other studies are needed before they can

be recommended for routine use. There is not enough evidence to recommend for or against using the stylet slow-pull technique.

Needle stylet

> **RECOMMENDATION**
> ESGE does not recommend for or against using the needle stylet for EUS-guided sampling of solid masses and LNs with FNA needles (high quality evidence, strong recommendation) and suggests using the needle stylet for EUS-guided sampling with FNB needles (low quality evidence, weak recommendation).

Summary of evidence

The effect of using a needle stylet during EUS-FNA was evaluated in four RCTs [41–44] (**Table S10**, online-only **Supplementary material**), one prospective nonrandomized crossover study [99], and two retrospective studies [100, 101]. These studies included patients with solid lesions (predominantly pancreatic masses) and LNs, and evaluated outcomes related to specimen quality such as sample adequacy, cellularity, gastrointestinal cell contamination, and bloodiness. With minor and insignificant exceptions sampling technique involved using 22G needles, suction, and ROSE; 25G needles were used in only 23 patients in one study [43].

None of the individual studies or their meta-analysis [56] showed any advantages of using the stylet. On the contrary, differences in secondary outcome measures favoring not using the stylet were shown in one study, including a higher rate of sample adequacy and lower rate of bloody samples [99]. The significance of these findings is uncertain because the remaining studies [41, 43, 44, 100, 101] and the meta-analysis [56] did not show advantages of stylet-free technique. The stylet is also used to express the aspirate from the needle; however, this method offered no advantage in terms of specimen quality when compared to flushing the needle with air in a slow controlled manner. In fact, sample bloodiness was higher when samples were expressed by reinserting the stylet [35] (**Table S10**, online-only **Supplementary material**).

The impact of the needle stylet on FNB results has not been evaluated in RCTs and it remains uncertain whether the results from studies using FNA needles discussed above can be extrapolated to sampling with FNB needles. Most studies that evaluated the reverse bevel needle used the stylet [12, 14–20, 22, 81, 83, 86]. Data on stylet-free sampling with this needle are very limited and do not allow for any comparison [21, 83]. Studies evaluating the fork-tip needle used the stylet [63, 65, 69] or failed to mention whether or not it was used [64, 67, 68, 70]. In the only study evaluating the Franseen-type needle, the stylet was used only during the first needle pass [66].

Rationale for recommendations

Potential advantages of using the stylet, such as preventing clogging of the needle and contamination of the sample with gastrointestinal cells, or easier and controlled expressing of the sample from the needle, have not been proven and there is high quality evidence that sampling using 22G FNA needles with or without the stylet provides samples of similar quality and adequacy. On the other hand, potential disadvantages, such as the risk of needlestick injury during stylet manipulation, increased procedure time, and decreased needle flexibility have not been evaluated and their significance remains uncertain. In this situation, the panel decided not to recommend for or against using the stylet for sampling with FNA needles, leaving this to the discretion of the endosonographer. Despite lack of comparative evidence the panel suggested using the stylet for sampling with FNB needles because only limited data exist on stylet-free technique in this setting.

Targeting specific parts of the lesion

> **RECOMMENDATION**
> ESGE suggests fanning the needle throughout the lesion when sampling solid masses and LNs (moderate quality evidence, weak recommendation).

Summary of evidence

Sampling from the periphery vs. central part of the lesion
In an RCT in patients with suspected malignant LNs, aspiration from the edge of the LN, compared with the center, did not increase the likelihood of a correct diagnosis (**Table S11**, online-only **Supplementary material**) [37].

Fanning vs. standard targeting technique
In an RCT in patients with pancreatic masses, use of a fanning technique, compared to the standard targeting technique, decreased the number of needle passes required to establish the diagnosis and increased the proportion of patients in whom an on-site diagnosis was achieved on the first pass. The difference in accuracy for malignancy in favor of the fanning technique only narrowly missed statistical significance (**Table S11**, online-only **Supplementary material**) [46]. In this RCT the fanning technique involved positioning the needle at four different areas within the mass and performing four back-and-forth movements in each of them to procure tissue (4 × 4). The standard targeting technique involved positioning the needle at one location within the mass and performing 16 back-and-forth movements to procure tissue (1 × 16) [46].

Contrast harmonic EUS-guided sampling
Contrast harmonic EUS can be used to guide sampling by distinguishing viable, enhancing tumor tissue from nonenhancing necrotic areas; however, in a small RCT in patients with pancreatic masses this technique did not improve sample adequacy, sensitivity, and accuracy for malignancy when compared to

sampling under conventional EUS guidance. (**Table S11**, online-only **Supplementary material**) [45]. A prospective, non-randomized study [102] and a retrospective study [103] in patients with a pancreatic mass also failed to show significant advantages of using contrast harmonic EUS guidance.

Rationale for recommendations

Fanning the needle allows for targeting multiple areas within the mass during each needle pass and hence reduces the chance of sampling error. The technique is not associated with an additional risk or cost. Therefore the panel recommended its use, although the evidence is limited to one RCT in patients with pancreatic masses that showed advantages of fanning in terms of sample adequacy but failed to show a significant impact on diagnostic accuracy. Because of insufficient evidence, the panel did not give a recommendation on contrast harmonic EUS-guided sampling.

On-site cytologic evaluation

> **RECOMMENDATION**
> ESGE equally recommends EUS-guided sampling with or without on-site cytologic evaluation (moderate quality evidence, strong recommendation).

Summary of evidence

The effects of ROSE on FNA results were evaluated in two RCTs in patients with solid pancreatic masses (**Table S12,** online-only **Supplementary material**) [47,48]. In both studies a fixed number of seven needle passes was performed in patients randomized to FNA without ROSE and this number was significantly higher compared to the number of passes directed by the on-site cytopathologist. Other outcome measures, including diagnostic accuracy [47,48] and sample adequacy and quality [47] did not differ between these two approaches. The lower number of needle passes in the on-site directed approach did not translate into lower number of adverse events or shorter procedural time [47]. A post hoc analysis of one of these RCTs did not find significant differences in cumulative sensitivity for malignancy after each subsequent needle pass between groups with and without ROSE [104]. On-site evaluation did not reduce the cost of EUS-guided sampling and in fact may increase it [47, 48]. The results of four meta-analyses of mostly observational studies in patients with pancreatic masses are conflicting. Two of them found improvement in EUS-FNA adequacy rates [58] and diagnostic accuracy [57] associated with the use of ROSE. The remaining two failed to confirm these advantages [59,60].

According to a recent survey on practice patterns in EUS-guided sampling, ROSE was available to 48 % of responders from Europe, 55 % of responders from Asia and almost all responders (98 %) from the US [105]. The barriers to implementing this service include limited pathology staffing, costs, additional procedure time, and non-belief in its additional value [105].

Rationale for recommendations

ROSE is unavailable in about half of the EUS centers in Europe. The Guideline panel recognized that selected observational studies have shown advantages of ROSE, including increased diagnostic yield and decreased need for repeat sampling; however, evidence from two recent RCTs indicate that ROSE does not improve results of EUS-guided sampling, and the results of four meta-analyses on this topic are conflicting. Therefore, the panel did not find sufficient reasons to recommend that centers not using ROSE should change their practice.

Number of needle passes in the absence of on-site evaluation

> **RECOMMENDATION**
> When on-site cytologic evaluation is unavailable, ESGE suggests performance of three to four needle passes with an FNA needle or two to three passes with an FNB needle (low quality evidence, weak recommendation).

Summary of evidence

Per-pass analyses of data from recent prospective studies in patients with pancreatic masses showed that three to four passes with an FNA needle or two to three passes with the reverse bevel needle are sufficient to achieve high rates of diagnostic samples and high sensitivity for malignancy, both exceeding 90 % (**Table S13**, online-only **Supplementary material**) [15,18,21, 46,88,104]. A lower number of passes was associated with sub-optimal performance. On the other hand, increasing the number of passes beyond four (FNA) or three (reverse bevel needle) did not improve or only marginally improved the results [18, 88,104]. For tumors ≤2 cm in size, the cumulative sensitivity after four FNA passes was significantly lower than for tumors >2 cm; however, also in the setting of smaller tumors, increasing the number of passes beyond four only marginally improved the sensitivity (**Table S13**, online-only **Supplementary material**) [104]. Per-pass analysis in patients with lymphadenopathy found that sensitivity for malignancy reaches 100 % after three passes with an FNA needle [37]. Per-pass analyses for target lesions other than pancreatic masses or lymph nodes are missing.

Methods of gross visual (macroscopic) inspection of the specimen obtained during EUS-guided sampling, to determine its adequacy for cytologic or histologic evaluation, have not been standardized and the evidence on their usefulness to guide the number of needle passes is limited and conflicting. A recent prospective study evaluating specimens obtained with a 19G FNA needle found that the presence of a macroscopically visible core of ≥4 mm in length accurately estimated the presence of a histologic core and was associated with significantly higher diagnostic performance in the histologic and cytologic evaluations [82]. Studies using 22G or 25G needles failed to show efficacy of macroscopic evaluation [88,106].

Rationale for recommendations

Previous ESGE guidelines recommended performing three needle passes for lymph nodes and liver lesions and at least five passes for solid pancreatic masses [1]. These recommendations were based on limited evidence from older studies. More robust evidence from recent studies indicates that two to three passes with the reverse bevel needle or three to four passes with the FNA needle are an adequate approach in patients with solid pancreatic masses. There is not sufficient evidence to recommend that these numbers should be different for other target lesions. Although selected studies, in which a single pass with the reverse bevel needle or two passes with the FNA needle were performed, reported good results [17, 25, 29], the Guideline panel found this evidence insufficient to recommend a number of passes lower than indicated above. Because of the lack of robust evidence on the efficacy of macroscopic visual inspection of the specimen to guide the number of needle passes, no recommendation is given on this topic.

Sampling of pancreatic cystic lesions

> **RECOMMENDATION**
> For diagnostic sampling of pancreatic cystic lesions without a solid component, ESGE suggests emptying the cyst with a single pass of a 22G or 19G needle (low quality evidence, weak recommendation).

> **RECOMMENDATION**
> For pancreatic cystic lesions with a solid component, ESGE suggests sampling of the solid component using the same technique as in the case of other solid lesions (low quality evidence, weak recommendation).

Summary of evidence

The role of EUS-guided sampling in pancreatic cystic lesions has been evaluated in numerous studies; however, most of them focused on various aspects of cyst fluid analysis rather than on the sampling technique itself [107 – 110]. In most centers the technique involves the use of 19G or 22G FNA needles and an attempt to empty the cyst as much as possible with a single needle pass, in order to maximize diagnostic yield and minimize the risk of infection [105]. This approach, based on expert opinion, has never been adequately evaluated, and its effectiveness remains unproven. The risk of adverse events in studies in which multiple needle passes were performed was similar to that in studies in which a single-pass technique was used (2.17 % [95 %CI 1.21 % – 3.40 %] and 3.45 % [95 %CI 1.41 % – 6.33 %], respectively) [111]. Larger-caliber needles facilitate aspiration of thick or viscous fluid, but are more difficult to operate. Studies directly comparing needles of various gauge sizes are not available. A recent meta-analysis estimated that the risk of adverse events was similar with 19G and 22G needles (5.84 % [95 %CI 0.88 % – 13.64 %] and 2.38 %

[95 %CI 1.38 % – 3.63 %], respectively) [111]. Failure to aspirate the fluid with a 22G needle because of fluid viscosity has been reported in up to 20 % of patients evaluated in consecutive case series [112, 113]. More than one needle pass into a cyst without a solid component did not result in a significantly higher rate of samples adequate for cytologic diagnosis when compared to a single pass (50 % vs. 29 %; *P* = 0.08) [114].

Targeted cyst wall puncture after aspiration of cyst fluid was shown to provide a specimen adequate for cytologic or cytologic/histologic evaluation in 65 % – 81 % of cases, and to offer an additional incremental diagnostic yield for mucinous cyst of 29 % – 37 % over cyst fluid analysis/cytology alone [112, 113, 115]. Non-severe adverse events were observed in 1.5 % – 4.5 % of cases. These results were obtained with 22G FNA [113, 115] or 22G reverse bevel needles [112], and data for other needle gauges are lacking. The role of this technique for diagnosis of malignant cyst has not been established because of the low number of reported cases.

When a cystic lesion contains a solid component, samples from the solid part are more often adequate for diagnosis than fluid aspirates [112, 114]. The rate of samples adequate for cytologic diagnosis increased significantly from 44 % with one needle pass to 78 % with more than one pass (*P* = 0.016) [114].

Experience with through-the-needle forceps biopsy of the cyst wall or mural nodules is limited to case reports and small pilot series and this technique remains investigational [72, 116, 17].

Rationale for recommendations

There are no RCTs or nonrandomized comparative studies evaluating the technical aspects of sampling of pancreatic cystic lesions. Consequently, the evidence available on this topic is limited and of low quality. Despite these limitations, the Guideline panel decided to suggest using the sampling technique widely employed at many centers that involves emptying the cyst with a single pass of a 19G or 22G needle. 19G needles are preferred for large cysts and for cysts filled with presumably thick or viscous fluid, although no evidence-based criteria for cyst size and appearance can be given. Because of limited evidence on the efficacy and safety of targeted cyst wall puncture, the panel did not recommend routine implementation of this technique. Solid parts of the cystic lesions should be sampled using techniques recommended for solid pancreatic masses; however, it has to be noted that the term "solid component" is not well defined and may overlap in some studies with "mural nodule" or "thickened cyst wall." There is insufficient evidence to issue a recommendation on through-the-needle forceps biopsy of the cyst wall.

Safety of EUS-guided sampling

Patients on antithrombotic therapy

Issues related to the management of patients on antithrombotic therapy undergoing EUS-guided sampling are covered in the Guideline recently issued by ESGE and the British Society of Gastroenterology (BSG) [118]. Readers are referred to this document for detailed information. Briefly, the ESGE/BSG

Guideline classifies EUS-guided sampling as a high risk procedure and recommends against sampling in patients on P2Y12 receptor antagonists or oral anticoagulants including vitamin K antagonists and direct oral anticoagulants. If sampling is indicated, these medications should be temporarily discontinued for an appropriate drug-specific interval. The need for bridge therapy with low molecular weight heparin or switching to acetylsalicylic acid should be determined on the basis of the underlying indication for antithrombotic therapy and the risk for thromboembolic events. EUS-guided sampling can be performed in patients on low dose acetylsalicylic acid therapy.

Antibiotic prophylaxis

> **RECOMMENDATION**
> ESGE does not recommend antibiotic prophylaxis for EUS-guided sampling of solid masses or LNs (low quality evidence, strong recommendation).

> **RECOMMENDATION**
> ESGE suggests antibiotic prophylaxis with fluoroquinolones or beta-lactam antibiotics for EUS-guided sampling of cystic lesions (low quality evidence, weak recommendation).

Summary of evidence

Infectious adverse events related to EUS-guided sampling of solid lesions performed through the wall of the upper gastrointestinal tract are very rare [1, 119, 120]. No studies systematically evaluated antibiotic prophylaxis in this setting. The incidence of infectious adverse events following lower gastrointestinal tract EUS-FNA in a large prospective study was about 1% and did not differ between patients who had or had not received antibiotic prophylaxis administered at the discretion of the endoscopist [121].

Prophylaxis with fluoroquinolones or beta-lactam antibiotics was routinely used in the majority of studies on sampling of pancreatic cystic lesions; however, the effectiveness of this preventive measure has never been proven [111, 122]. The optimal choice of drug and dosage regimen has not been adequately studied. Most studies used an initial intravenous dose followed by oral administration for 3–5 days; however, there is limited evidence from two noncomparative studies that a single intravenous dose may be sufficient [123, 124].

Rationale for recommendations

Antibiotic prophylaxis is commonly used for EUS-guided sampling of pancreatic cystic lesions (and cystic lesions in other locations); however, this approach is based on long-standing clinical practice and very limited evidence. On the other hand there is not sufficient evidence to recommend against prophylaxis and in this situation the Guideline panel conservatively decided to uphold its previous recommendation for prophylaxis. There is no evidence to recommend prophylaxis for sampling of solid masses or LNs.

Specimen processing

> **RECOMMENDATION**
> ESGE suggests that evaluation of tissue obtained by EUS-guided sampling should include histologic preparations (e.g., cell blocks and/or formalin-fixed and paraffin-embedded tissue fragments) and not be limited to smear cytology (low quality evidence, weak recommendation).

Methods of specimen processing

Samples obtained by EUS-guided sampling may contain free cells, cell groups, and macroscopically visible tissue fragments, together with blood clots which themselves may contain all of the aforementioned. Samples may be processed for cytology or histology. In classical terms, cytology is the study and diagnosis of cells, received in liquid or on prepared slides. Larger tissue fragments including large groups of cells and stroma are not easily interpretable in a cytologic preparation because they are too thick and are usually ignored. Histology is the study and diagnosis of pieces of tissue, usually fixed in formalin and processed in a paraffin wax block. This is suitable for large fragments including stroma, but with routine processing, loose cells and small groups of cells are likely to be lost.

Once the sample is obtained it can be used to prepare direct smears and/or submitted to the laboratory in liquid. Direct smears are prepared in the endoscopy suite by extruding the needle content onto a glass slide and spreading the material in an evenly thin way. Smears may be allowed to dry or be fixed immediately by spray fixation or immersion into 95% alcohol. Unfixed smears are a potential biohazard and should be handled accordingly. For the preparation of a liquid sample the material is expressed into a liquid that could be saline, cell culture medium, or a fixative. If a fixative is not used, the sample should be rapidly transported to the laboratory and prepared. Although keeping the sample cool in a fridge will delay cellular degeneration, for optimal results delays should be minimized. Popular fixatives include alcohol and proprietary alcohol-based fixatives. These fixatives ensure good preservation and allow for more time to reach the laboratory. It also means that the material is available for further studies. Formalin may also be used but is not considered optimal for cytological purposes. However, it has the advantage of being the usual fixative for histologic samples and the fixative for which further immunohistochemistry is optimized. Liquid samples may be used for direct smear preparations or spun down to concentrate the material. This may be done either by a cytospin technique, or by using a proprietary liquid-based cytology machine (thin-layer liquid-based cytology). Liquid samples also allow for the making of a cell block. This is constructed by taking all or part of the spun down deposit from the liquid sample, forming a hardened structure by one of several different methods and putting it

into a paraffin wax block. The material is then processed as a normal histologic specimen, cut and stained. The material is also then available for further ancillary tests if required, and also preserved for future studies.

Methods for collecting tissue fragments for histologic examination include expelling the specimen directly into a fixative, or onto a glass slide or into saline and picking up tissue fragments to immerse them into a fixative. Tumor tissue is usually whitish; however, red coagula may also contain tumor tissue. Collecting tissue fragments for histology does not seem to interfere with further cytologic evaluation of the remaining specimen. A liquid sample may also contain clearly visible tissue fragments or clots that may be removed in the laboratory from the liquid and processed separately in a conventional paraffin block.

Summary of evidence

Handling and processing of the specimens obtained by EUS-guided sampling have not been standardized and vary considerably between centers [105]. They may also vary depending on the target lesions being sampled and whether or not ROSE is used. According to a recent international survey, 65% of the responding endosonographers prepare direct cytology smears. Proprietary fixatives, alcohol or saline are used for liquid-based cytology. Formalin is mostly used to preserve FNB or histologic tissue specimens. In order to increase diagnostic yield, most respondents (>70%) also prepare and analyze tissue cores after FNA or cytologic material after FNB [105].

Methods used for specimen processing were compared in several, mostly observational studies in patients with pancreatic masses [49,125–134], subepithelial masses [133], or LNs [37,128,133,135] (**Table S14**, online-only **Supplementary material**). These studies predominantly used 22G FNA needles. Comparison was made by: (i) splitting the sample and processing separately by different methods; (ii) using different samples collected from the same lesion and processed differently; or (iii) by indirectly comparing results obtained with different methods in different patients and time periods. All these methods have inherent limitations.

Cell block preparation was shown to be superior to direct smear cytology [125,129,135] or liquid-based cytology [125] in terms of sensitivity [125,129,135], accuracy [125,129, 135], and negative predictive value [125,129] for malignancy. Combination of direct smears and cell block preparation was shown to be superior to smears alone [131,132]. Two studies did not find significant differences between the cell block preparation and the direct smear methods [37,127]. The technical details of cell block preparation substantially varied between the studies.

Direct comparisons of direct smear cytology and thin-layer liquid-based cytology, including one crossover RCT [49], showed the former technique to be more sensitive [49,125, 130], more accurate [49,125,128], and to have a higher negative predictive value [49,125] for malignancy in patients with pancreatic masses or suspected LNs. The combination of liquid-based and direct smear cytology was not superior to direct smear cytology alone [49].

Combined cytologic and histologic evaluation was shown to have higher sensitivity [134] or accuracy [133] when compared to either cytologic or histologic evaluation alone.

Rationale for recommendations

Evidence from nonrandomized studies indicates that acquisition of tissue for cell blocks increases the diagnostic accuracy of EUS-guided sampling. Preparation and evaluation of cell blocks is a routine approach in many EUS centers. Core tissue specimens and tissue fragments isolated from the samples are increasingly often processed as formalin-fixed and paraffin-embedded histologic specimens. The driver behind this is not only to improve the diagnostic accuracy for malignancy, but the increasing requirement to have material available for ancillary studies, especially immunohistochemistry. Although immunohistochemical examination may be done on smears or liquid material, in most laboratories the methods are primarily set up and antibodies validated for use in paraffin-embedded material. Further, in some areas there is also a growing requirement for molecular testing, and having paraffin-embedded cell block or core tissue specimens ensures that material is preserved for this purpose as well. The evidence in this field is limited; however, the panel felt that there is a potentially big advantage to getting histologic material, through preparing cell blocks and/or extracting visible tissue fragments, and recommended this approach for routine use. Because the methods of specimen handling and processing have not been standardized and vary across centers, close cooperation between the endosonographer, the pathologist, and the pathology laboratory is essential to ensure that all diagnostic material is salvaged and processed in the most efficient way, both for diagnosis and other requirements.

Disclaimer

ESGE guidelines represent a consensus of best practice based on the available evidence at the time of preparation. They may not apply in all situations and should be interpreted in the light of specific clinical situations and resource availability. Further controlled clinical studies may be needed to clarify aspects of the statements, and revision may be necessary as new data appear. Clinical consideration may justify a course of action at variance to these recommendations. ESGE guidelines are intended to be an educational device to provide information that may assist endoscopists in providing care to patients. They are not rules and should not be construed as establishing a legal standard of care or as encouraging, advocating, requiring, or discouraging any particular treatment.

Competing interests

References

[1] Polkowski M, Larghi A, Weynand B et al. Learning, techniques, and complications of endoscopic ultrasound (EUS)-guided sampling in gastroenterology: European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ESGE) Technical Guideline. Endoscopy 2012; 44: 190 – 206

[2] Dumonceau JM, Deprez PH, Jenssen C et al. Indications, results, and clinical impact of endoscopic ultrasound (EUS)-guided sampling in gastroenterology: European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ESGE) Clinical Guideline – Updated January 2017. Endoscopy 2017; 49: 695 – 714

[3] Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Akl EA et al. GRADE guidelines: 1. Introduction – GRADE evidence profiles and summary of findings tables. J Clin Epidemiol 2011; 64: 383 – 394

[4] Balshem H, Helfand M, Schunemann HJ et al. GRADE guidelines: 3. Rating the quality of evidence. J Clin Epidemiol 2011; 64: 401 – 406

[5] Andrews J, Guyatt G, Oxman AD et al. GRADE guidelines: 14. Going from evidence to recommendations: the significance and presentation of recommendations. J Clin Epidemiol 2013; 66: 719 – 725

[6] Andrews JC, Schunemann HJ, Oxman AD et al. GRADE guidelines: 15. Going from evidence to recommendation – determinants of a recommendation's direction and strength. J Clin Epidemiol 2013; 66: 726 – 735

[7] Dumonceau JM, Hassan C, Riphaus A et al. European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ESGE) Guideline Development Policy. Endoscopy 2012; 44: 626 – 629

[8] Vege SS, Ziring B, Jain R et al. American Gastroenterological Association Institute guideline on the diagnosis and management of asymptomatic neoplastic pancreatic cysts. Gastroenterology 2015; 148: 819 – 822

[9] Othman MO, Abdelfatah MM, Padilla O et al. The cellularity yield of three different 22-gauge endoscopic ultrasound fine needle aspiration needles. Diagn Cytopathol 2017; 45: 426 – 432

[10] Lee BS, Cho CM, Jung MK et al. Comparison of histologic core portions acquired from a core biopsy needle and a conventional needle in solid mass lesions: a prospective randomized trial. Gut Liver 2017; 11: 559 – 566

[11] Han JP, Lee TH, Hong SJ et al. EUS-guided FNA and FNB after on-site cytological evaluation in gastric subepithelial tumors. J Dig Dis 2016; 17: 582 – 587

[12] Sterlacci W, Sioulas AD, Veits L et al. 22-gauge core vs 22-gauge aspiration needle for endoscopic ultrasound-guided sampling of abdominal masses. World J Gastroenterol 2016; 22: 8820 – 8830

[13] Aadam AA, Wani S, Amick A et al. A randomized controlled cross-over trial and cost analysis comparing endoscopic ultrasound fine needle aspiration and fine needle biopsy. Endosc Int Open 2016; 4: E497 – E505

[14] Kamata K, Kitano M, Yasukawa S et al. Histologic diagnosis of pancreatic masses using 25-gauge endoscopic ultrasound needles with and without a core trap: a multicenter randomized trial. Endoscopy 2016; 48: 632 – 638

[15] Alatawi A, Beuvon F, Grabar S et al. Comparison of 22G reverse-beveled versus standard needle for endoscopic ultrasound-guided sampling of solid pancreatic lesions. United European Gastroenterol J 2015; 3: 343 – 352

[16] Mavrogenis G, Weynand B, Sibille A et al. 25-gauge histology needle versus 22-gauge cytology needle in endoscopic ultrasonography-guided sampling of pancreatic lesions and lymphadenopathy. Endosc Int Open 2015; 3: E63 – E68

[17] Vanbiervliet G, Napoleon B, Saint Paul MC et al. Core needle versus standard needle for endoscopic ultrasound-guided biopsy of solid pancreatic masses: a randomized crossover study. Endoscopy 2014; 46: 1063 – 1070

[18] Lee YN, Moon JH, Kim HK et al. Core biopsy needle versus standard aspiration needle for endoscopic ultrasound-guided sampling of solid pancreatic masses: a randomized parallel-group study. Endoscopy 2014; 46: 1056 – 1062

[19] Kim GH, Cho YK, Kim EY et al. Comparison of 22-gauge aspiration needle with 22-gauge biopsy needle in endoscopic ultrasonography-guided subepithelial tumor sampling. Scand J Gastroenterol 2014; 49: 347 – 354

[20] Hucl T, Wee E, Anuradha S et al. Feasibility and efficiency of a new 22G core needle: a prospective comparison study. Endoscopy 2013; 45: 792 – 798

[21] Bang JY, Hebert-Magee S, Trevino J et al. Randomized trial comparing the 22-gauge aspiration and 22-gauge biopsy needles for EUS-guided sampling of solid pancreatic mass lesions. Gastrointest Endosc 2012; 76: 321 – 327

[22] DeWitt J, Cho CM, Lin J et al. Comparison of EUS-guided tissue acquisition using two different 19-gauge core biopsy needles: a multicenter, prospective, randomized, and blinded study. Endosc Int Open 2015; 3: E471 – E478

[23] Ang TL, Kwek AB, Seo DW et al. A prospective randomized study of the difference in diagnostic yield between endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspiration (EUSFNA) needles with and without a side port in pancreatic masses. Endosc Int Open 2015; 3: E329 – E333

[24] Carrara S, Anderloni A, Jovani M et al. A prospective randomized study comparing 25-G and 22-G needles of a new platform for endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration of solid masses. Dig Liver Dis 2016; 48: 49 – 54

[25] Gimeno-Garcia AZ, Elwassief A, Paquin SC et al. Randomized controlled trial comparing stylet-free endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspiration with 22-G and 25-G needles. Dig Endosc 2014; 26: 467 – 473

[26] Lee JK, Lee KT, Choi ER et al. A prospective, randomized trial comparing 25-gauge and 22-gauge needles for endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration of pancreatic masses. Scand J Gastroenterol 2013; 48: 752 – 757

[27] Vilmann P, Saftoiu A, Hollerbach S et al. Multicenter randomized controlled trial comparing the performance of 22 gauge versus 25 gauge EUS-FNA needles in solid masses. Scand J Gastroenterol 2013; 48: 877 – 883

[28] Camellini L, Carlinfante G, Azzolini F et al. A randomized clinical trial comparing 22G and 25G needles in endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspiration of solid lesions. Endoscopy 2011; 43: 709–715

[29] Fabbri C, Polifemo AM, Luigiano C et al. Endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration with 22- and 25-gauge needles in solid pancreatic masses: a prospective comparative study with randomisation of needle sequence. Dig Liver Dis 2011; 43: 647–652

[30] Siddiqui UD, Rossi F, Rosenthal LS et al. EUS-guided FNA of solid pancreatic masses: a prospective, randomized trial comparing 22-gauge and 25-gauge needles. Gastrointest Endosc 2009; 70: 1093–1097

[31] Lee JH, Stewart J, Ross WA et al. Blinded prospective comparison of the performance of 22-gauge and 25-gauge needles in endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration of the pancreas and peri-pancreatic lesions. Dig Dis Sci 2009; 54: 2274–2281

[32] Park SW, Chung MJ, Lee SH et al. Prospective study for comparison of endoscopic ultrasound-guided tissue acquisition using 25- and 22-gauge core biopsy needles in solid pancreatic masses. PLoS One 2016; 11: e0154401

[33] Song TJ, Kim JH, Lee SS et al. The prospective randomized, controlled trial of endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspiration using 22G and 19G aspiration needles for solid pancreatic or peripancreatic masses. Am J Gastroenterol 2010; 105: 1739–1745

[34] Tarantino I, Di Mitri R, Fabbri C et al. Is diagnostic accuracy of fine needle aspiration on solid pancreatic lesions aspiration-related? A multicentre randomised trial Dig Liver Dis 2014; 46: 523–526

[35] Lee JK, Choi JH, Lee KH et al. A prospective, comparative trial to optimize sampling techniques in EUS-guided FNA of solid pancreatic masses. Gastrointest Endosc 2013; 77: 745–751

[36] Puri R, Vilmann P, Saftoiu A et al. Randomized controlled trial of endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle sampling with or without suction for better cytological diagnosis. Scand J Gastroenterol 2009; 44: 499–504

[37] Wallace MB, Kennedy T, Durkalski V et al. Randomized controlled trial of EUS-guided fine needle aspiration techniques for the detection of malignant lymphadenopathy. Gastrointest Endosc 2001; 54: 441–447

[38] Kudo T, Kawakami H, Hayashi T et al. High and low negative pressure suction techniques in EUS-guided fine-needle tissue acquisition by using 25-gauge needles: a multicenter, prospective, randomized, controlled trial. Gastrointest Endosc 2014; 80: 1030–1037 e1

[39] Attam R, Arain MA, Bloechl SJ et al. "Wet suction technique (WEST)": a novel way to enhance the quality of EUS-FNA aspirate. Results of a prospective, single-blind, randomized, controlled trial using a 22-gauge needle for EUS-FNA of solid lesions. Gastrointest Endosc 2015; 81: 1401–1407

[40] Aadam AA, Oh YS, Shidham VB et al. Eliminating the residual negative pressure in the endoscopic ultrasound aspirating needle enhances cytology yield of pancreas masses. Dig Dis Sci 2016; 61: 890–899

[41] Abe Y, Kawakami H, Oba K et al. Effect of a stylet on a histological specimen in EUS-guided fine-needle tissue acquisition by using 22-gauge needles: a multicenter, prospective, randomized, controlled trial. Gastrointest Endosc 2015; 82: 837–844 e1

[42] Nijhawan S, Singh B, Kumar A et al. Randomized controlled trial of comparison of the adequacy, and diagnostic yield of endoscopic ultrasound guided fine needle aspiration with and without a stylet in Indian patients: A prospective single blind study. J Dig Endosc 2014; 5: 149–153

[43] Wani S, Early D, Kunkel J et al. Diagnostic yield of malignancy during EUS-guided FNA of solid lesions with and without a stylet: a prospective, single blind, randomized, controlled trial. Gastrointest Endosc 2012; 76: 328–335

[44] Rastogi A, Wani S, Gupta N et al. A prospective, single-blind, randomized, controlled trial of EUS-guided FNA with and without a stylet. Gastrointest Endosc 2011; 74: 58–64

[45] Sugimoto M, Takagi T, Hikichi T et al. Conventional versus contrast-enhanced harmonic endoscopic ultrasonography-guided fine-needle aspiration for diagnosis of solid pancreatic lesions: A prospective randomized trial. Pancreatology 2015; 15: 538–541

[46] Bang JY, Magee SH, Ramesh J et al. Randomized trial comparing fanning with standard technique for endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspiration of solid pancreatic mass lesions. Endoscopy 2013; 45: 445–450

[47] Wani S, Mullady D, Early DS et al. The clinical impact of immediate on-site cytopathology evaluation during endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration of pancreatic masses: a prospective multicenter randomized controlled trial. Am J Gastroenterol 2015; 110: 1429–1439

[48] Lee LS, Nieto J, Watson RR et al. Randomized noninferiority trial comparing diagnostic yield of cytopathologist-guided versus 7 passes for EUS-FNA of pancreatic masses. Dig Endosc 2015; 28: 469–475

[49] Lee JK, Choi ER, Jang TH et al. A prospective comparison of liquid-based cytology and traditional smear cytology in pancreatic endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration. Acta Cytol 2011; 55: 401–407

[50] Bang JY, Hawes R, Varadarajulu S. A meta-analysis comparing ProCore and standard fine-needle aspiration needles for endoscopic ultrasound-guided tissue acquisition. Endoscopy 2016; 48: 339–349

[51] Oh HC, Kang H, Lee JY et al. Diagnostic accuracy of 22/25-gauge core needle in endoscopic ultrasound-guided sampling: systematic review and meta-analysis. Korean J Intern Med 2016; 31: 1073–1083

[52] Facciorusso A, Stasi E, Di Maso M et al. Endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration of pancreatic lesions with 22 versus 25 gauge needles: A meta-analysis. United European Gastroenterol J 2016: (Epub ahead of print) doi:10.1177/2050640616680972

[53] Xu MM, Jia HY, Yan LL et al. Comparison of two different size needles in endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspiration for diagnosing solid pancreatic lesions: a meta-analysis of prospective controlled trials. Medicine (Baltimore) 2017; 96: e5802

[54] Madhoun MF, Wani SB, Rastogi A et al. The diagnostic accuracy of 22-gauge and 25-gauge needles in endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration of solid pancreatic lesions: a meta-analysis. Endoscopy 2013; 45: 86–92

[55] Affolter KE, Schmidt RL, Matynia AP et al. Needle size has only a limited effect on outcomes in EUS-guided fine needle aspiration: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Dig Dis Sci 2013; 58: 1026–1034

[56] Kim JH, Park SW, Kim MK et al. Meta-analysis for cyto-pathological outcomes in endoscopic ultrasonography-guided fine-needle aspiration with and without the stylet. Dig Dis Sci 2016; 61: 2175–2184

[57] Hebert-Magee S, Bae S, Varadarajulu S et al. The presence of a cytopathologist increases the diagnostic accuracy of endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration cytology for pancreatic adenocarcinoma: a meta-analysis. Cytopathology 2013; 24: 159–171

[58] Matynia AP, Schmidt RL, Barraza G et al. Impact of rapid on-site evaluation on the adequacy of endoscopic-ultrasound guided fine-needle aspiration of solid pancreatic lesions: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Gastroenterol Hepatol 2014; 29: 697–705

[59] Kong F, Zhu J, Kong X et al. Rapid on-site evaluation does not improve endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration adequacy in pancreatic masses: a meta-analysis and systematic review. PLoS One 2016; 11: e0163056

[60] Hewitt MJ, McPhail MJ, Possamai L et al. EUS-guided FNA for diagnosis of solid pancreatic neoplasms: a meta-analysis. Gastrointest Endosc 2012; 75: 319–331

[61] Gopalakrishna G, Mustafa RA, Davenport C et al. Applying Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) to diagnostic tests was challenging but doable. J Clin Epidemiol 2014; 67: 760–768

[62] Mounzer R, Yen R, Marshall C et al. Interobserver agreement among cytopathologists in the evaluation of pancreatic endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration cytology specimens. Endosc Int Open 2016; 4: E812–E819

[63] Adler DG, Witt B, Chadwick B et al. Pathologic evaluation of a new endoscopic ultrasound needle designed to obtain core tissue samples: A pilot study. Endosc Ultrasound 2016; 5: 178–183

[64] Kandel P, Tranesh G, Nassar A et al. EUS-guided fine needle biopsy sampling using a novel fork-tip needle: a case-control study. Gastrointest Endosc 2016; 84: 1034–1039

[65] DiMaio CJ, Kolb JM, Benias PC et al. Initial experience with a novel EUS-guided core biopsy needle (SharkCore): results of a large North American multicenter study. Endosc Int Open 2016; 4: E974–E979

[66] Bang JY, Hebert-Magee S, Hasan MK et al. Endoscopic ultrasonography-guided biopsy using a Franseen needle design: Initial assessment. Dig Endosc 2017; 29: 338–346

[67] Nayar MK, Paranandi B, Dawwas MF et al. Comparison of the diagnostic performance of 2 core biopsy needles for EUS-guided tissue acquisition from solid pancreatic lesions. Gastrointest Endosc 2017; 85: 1017–1024

[68] Jovani M, Abidi WM, Lee LS. Novel fork-tip needles versus standard needles for EUS-guided tissue acquisition from solid masses of the upper GI tract: a matched cohort study. Scand J Gastroenterol 2017; 52: 784–787

[69] El Chafic AH, Loren D, Siddiqui A et al. Comparison of FNA and fine-needle biopsy for EUS-guided sampling of suspected GI stromal tumors. Gastrointest Endosc 2017; 86: 510–515

[70] Rodrigues-Pinto E, Jalaj S, Grimm IS et al. Impact of EUS-guided fine-needle biopsy sampling with a new core needle on the need for onsite cytopathologic assessment: a preliminary study. Gastrointest Endosc 2016; 84: 1040–1046

[71] Schulman AR, Thompson CC, Odze R et al. Optimizing EUS-guided liver biopsy sampling: comprehensive assessment of needle types and tissue acquisition techniques. Gastrointest Endosc 2017; 85: 419–426

[72] Nakai Y, Isayama H, Chang KJ et al. A pilot study of EUS-guided through-the-needle forceps biopsy (with video). Gastrointest Endosc 2016; 84: 158–162

[73] Yusuf TE, Ho S, Pavey DA et al. Retrospective analysis of the utility of endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspiration (EUS-FNA) in pancreatic masses, using a 22-gauge or 25-gauge needle system: a multicenter experience. Endoscopy 2009; 41: 445–448

[74] Itoi T, Itokawa F, Kurihara T et al. Experimental endoscopy: objective evaluation of EUS needles. Gastrointest Endosc 2009; 69: 509–516

[75] Itoi T, Itokawa F, Sofuni A et al. Evaluation of 19-gauge endoscopic ultrasonography aspiration needles using various echoendoscopes. Endosc Int Open 2013; 1: 24–30

[76] Varadarajulu S, Bang JY, Hebert-Magee S. Assessment of the technical performance of the flexible 19-gauge EUS-FNA needle. Gastrointest Endosc 2012; 76: 336–343

[77] Songur N, Songur Y, Bircan S et al. Comparison of 19- and 22-gauge needles in EUS-guided fine needle aspiration in patients with mediastinal masses and lymph nodes. Turk J Gastroenterol 2011; 22: 472–478

[78] Ramesh J, Bang JY, Hebert-Magee S et al. Randomized trial comparing the flexible 19G and 25G needles for endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration of solid pancreatic mass lesions. Pancreas 2015; 44: 128–133

[79] Retraction. Randomized trial comparing the flexible 19G and 25G needles for endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration of solid pancreatic mass lesions. Pancreas 2016; 45: 160

[80] Larghi A, Verna EC, Ricci R et al. EUS-guided fine-needle tissue acquisition by using a 19-gauge needle in a selected patient population: a prospective study. Gastrointest Endosc 2011; 74: 504–510

[81] Iglesias-Garcia J, Abdulkader I, Larino-Noia J et al. Evaluation of the adequacy and diagnostic accuracy of the histology samples obtained with a newly designed 19-gauge EUS histology needle. Rev Esp Enferm Dig 2014; 106: 6–14

[82] Iwashita T, Yasuda I, Mukai T et al. Macroscopic on-site quality evaluation of biopsy specimens to improve the diagnostic accuracy during EUS-guided FNA using a 19-gauge needle for solid lesions: a single-center prospective pilot study (MOSE study). Gastrointest Endosc 2015; 81: 177–185

[83] Iglesias-Garcia J, Poley JW, Larghi A et al. Feasibility and yield of a new EUS histology needle: results from a multicenter, pooled, cohort study. Gastrointest Endosc 2011; 73: 1189–1196

[84] Yasuda I, Tsurumi H, Omar S et al. Endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspiration biopsy for lymphadenopathy of unknown origin. Endoscopy 2006; 38: 919–924

[85] Larghi A, Fuccio L, Chiarello G et al. Fine-needle tissue acquisition from subepithelial lesions using a forward-viewing linear echoendoscope. Endoscopy 2014; 46: 39–45

[86] Larghi A, Iglesias-Garcia J, Poley JW et al. Feasibility and yield of a novel 22-gauge histology EUS needle in patients with pancreatic masses: a multicenter prospective cohort study. Surg Endosc 2013; 27: 3733–3738

[87] Paik WH, Park Y, Park do H et al. Prospective evaluation of new 22 gauge endoscopic ultrasound core needle using capillary sampling with stylet slow-pull technique for intra-abdominal solid masses. J Clin Gastroenterol 2015; 49: 199–205

[88] Iwashita T, Nakai Y, Samarasena JB et al. High single-pass diagnostic yield of a new 25-gauge core biopsy needle for EUS-guided FNA biopsy in solid pancreatic lesions. Gastrointest Endosc 2013; 77: 909–915

[89] Fabbri C, Luigiano C, Maimone A et al. Endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle biopsy of small solid pancreatic lesions using a 22-gauge needle with side fenestration. Surg Endosc 2015; 29: 1586–1590

[90] Jenssen C, Hocke M, Fusaroli P et al. EFSUMB guidelines on interventional ultrasound (INVUS), Part IV – EUS-guided interventions: General aspects and EUS-guided sampling (long version). Ultraschall Med 2016; 37: E33–E76

[91] Villa NA, Berzosa M, Wallace MB et al. Endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration: The wet suction technique. Endosc Ultrasound 2016; 5: 17–20

[92] Katanuma A, Itoi T, Baron TH et al. Bench-top testing of suction forces generated through endoscopic ultrasound-guided aspiration needles. J Hepatobiliary Pancreat Sci 2015; 22: 379–385

[93] Chen JY, Ding QY, Lv Y et al. Slow-pull and different conventional suction techniques in endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspiration of pancreatic solid lesions using 22-gauge needles. World J Gastroenterol 2016; 22: 8790–8797

[94] Nakai Y, Isayama H, Chang KJ et al. Slow pull versus suction in endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspiration of pancreatic solid masses. Dig Dis Sci 2014; 59: 1578–1585

[95] Kin T, Katanuma A, Yane K et al. Diagnostic ability of EUS-FNA for pancreatic solid lesions with conventional 22-gauge needle using the slow pull technique: a prospective study. Scand J Gastroenterol 2015; 50: 900–907

[96] Saxena P, El Zein M, Stevens T et al. A randomized multicenter trial comparing capillary suction and standard suction for endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration (EUS-FNA) of solid pancreatic lesions. Gastrointest Endosc 2015; 81: AB539

[97] Yamabe A, Irisawa A, Shibukawa G et al. An experimental study to assess the best maneuver when using a reverse side-bevel histology needle for EUS-guided fine-needle biopsy. Endosc Int Open 2016; 4: E56 – E61

[98] El Haddad R, Barret M, Beuvon F et al. The slow-pull capillary technique increases the quality of endoscopic ultrasound fine needle biopsy samples in solid pancreatic lesions. Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol 2016; 28: 911 – 916

[99] Sahai AV, Paquin SC, Gariepy G. A prospective comparison of endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration results obtained in the same lesion, with and without the needle stylet. Endoscopy 2010; 42: 900 – 903

[100] Wani S, Gupta N, Gaddam S et al. A comparative study of endoscopic ultrasound guided fine needle aspiration with and without a stylet. Dig Dis Sci 2011; 56: 2409 – 2414

[101] Gimeno-Garcia AZ, Paquin SC, Gariepy G et al. Comparison of endoscopic ultrasonography-guided fine-needle aspiration cytology results with and without the stylet in 3364 cases. Dig Endosc 2013; 25: 303 – 307

[102] Seicean A, Badea R, Moldovan-Pop A et al. Harmonic contrast-enhanced endoscopic ultrasonography for the guidance of fine-needle aspiration in solid pancreatic masses. Ultraschall Med 2017; 38: 174 – 182

[103] Hou X, Jin Z, Xu C et al. Contrast-enhanced harmonic endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspiration in the diagnosis of solid pancreatic lesions: a retrospective study. PLoS One 2015; 10: e0121236

[104] Mohamadnejad M, Mullady D, Early DS et al. Increasing number of passes beyond 4 does not increase sensitivity of detection of pancreatic malignancy by endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspiration. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol 2017; 15: 1071 – 1078 e2

[105] van Riet PA, Cahen DL, Poley JW et al. Mapping international practice patterns in EUS-guided tissue sampling: outcome of a global survey. Endosc Int Open 2016; 4: E360 – E370

[106] Nguyen YP, Maple JT, Zhang Q et al. Reliability of gross visual assessment of specimen adequacy during EUS-guided FNA of pancreatic masses. Gastrointest Endosc 2009; 69: 1264 – 1270

[107] Al-Haddad MA, Kowalski T, Siddiqui A et al. Integrated molecular pathology accurately determines the malignant potential of pancreatic cysts. Endoscopy 2015; 47: 136 – 142

[108] Khalid A, Zahid M, Finkelstein SD et al. Pancreatic cyst fluid DNA analysis in evaluating pancreatic cysts: a report of the PANDA study. Gastrointest Endosc 2009; 69: 1095 – 102

[109] Thornton GD, McPhail MJ, Nayagam S et al. Endoscopic ultrasound guided fine needle aspiration for the diagnosis of pancreatic cystic neoplasms: a meta-analysis. Pancreatology 2013; 13: 48 – 57

[110] Wang QX, Xiao J, Orange M et al. EUS-guided FNA for diagnosis of pancreatic cystic lesions: a meta-analysis. Cell Physiol Biochem 2015; 36: 1197 – 1209

[111] Zhu H, Jiang F, Zhu J et al. Assessment of morbidity and mortality associated with endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspiration for pancreatic cystic lesions: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Dig Endosc 2017: (Epub ahead of print) doi:10.1111/den.12851

[112] Barresi L, Tarantino I, Traina M et al. Endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration and biopsy using a 22-gauge needle with side fenestration in pancreatic cystic lesions. Dig Liver Dis 2014; 46: 45 – 50

[113] Hong SK, Loren DE, Rogart JN et al. Targeted cyst wall puncture and aspiration during EUS-FNA increases the diagnostic yield of premalignant and malignant pancreatic cysts. Gastrointest Endosc 2012; 75: 775 – 782

[114] Lim LG, Lakhtakia S, Ang TL et al. Factors determining diagnostic yield of endoscopic ultrasound guided fine-needle aspiration for pancreatic cystic lesions: a multicentre Asian study. Dig Dis Sci 2013; 58: 1751 – 1757

[115] Rogart JN, Loren DE, Singu BS et al. Cyst wall puncture and aspiration during EUS-guided fine needle aspiration may increase the diagnostic yield of mucinous cysts of the pancreas. J Clin Gastroenterol 2011; 45: 164 – 169

[116] Attili F, Pagliari D, Rimbas M et al. Endoscopic ultrasound-guided histological diagnosis of a mucinous non-neoplastic pancreatic cyst using a specially designed through-the-needle microforceps. Endoscopy 2016; 48 : E188 – E189

[117] Pham KD, Engjom T, Gjelberg Kollesete H et al. Diagnosis of a mucinous pancreatic cyst and resection of an intracystic nodule using a novel through-the-needle micro forceps. Endoscopy 2016; 48: E125 – E126

[118] Veitch AM, Vanbiervliet G, Gershlick AH et al. Endoscopy in patients on antiplatelet or anticoagulant therapy, including direct oral anticoagulants: British Society of Gastroenterology (BSG) and European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ESGE) guidelines. Endoscopy 2016; 48: 385 – 402

[119] Wang KX, Ben QW, Jin ZD et al. Assessment of morbidity and mortality associated with EUS-guided FNA: a systematic review. Gastrointest Endosc 2011; 73: 283 – 290

[120] Banafea O, Mghanga FP, Zhao J et al. Endoscopic ultrasonography with fine-needle aspiration for histological diagnosis of solid pancreatic masses: a meta-analysis of diagnostic accuracy studies. BMC Gastroenterol 2016; 16: 108

[121] Levy MJ, Abu Dayyeh BK, Fujii LL et al. Prospective evaluation of adverse events following lower gastrointestinal tract EUS FNA. Am J Gastroenterol 2014; 109: 676 – 685

[122] Guarner-Argente C, Shah P, Buchner A et al. Use of antimicrobials for EUS-guided FNA of pancreatic cysts: a retrospective, comparative analysis. Gastrointest Endosc 2011; 74: 81 – 86

[123] Klein A, Qi R, Nagubandi S et al. Single-dose intra-procedural ceftriaxone during endoscopic ultrasound fine-needle aspiration of pancreatic cysts is safe and effective: results from a single tertiary center. Ann Gastroenterol 2017; 30: 237 – 241

[124] Marinos E, Lee S, Jones B et al. Outcomes of single-dose peri-procedural antibiotic prophylaxis for endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspiration of pancreatic cystic lesions. United European Gastroenterol J 2014; 2: 391 – 396

[125] Qin SY, Zhou Y, Li P et al. Diagnostic efficacy of cell block immunohistochemistry, smear cytology, and liquid-based cytology in endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspiration of pancreatic lesions: a single-institution experience. PLoS One 2014; 9: e108762

[126] Weynand B, Borbath I, Galant C et al. Optimizing specimen collection and laboratory procedures reduces the non-diagnostic rate for endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspiration of solid lesions of the pancreas. Cytopathology 2013; 24: 177 – 184

[127] Kopelman Y, Marmor S, Ashkenazi I et al. Value of EUS-FNA cytological preparations compared with cell block sections in the diagnosis of pancreatic solid tumours. Cytopathology 2011; 22: 174 – 178

[128] LeBlanc JK, Emerson RE, Dewitt J et al. A prospective study comparing rapid assessment of smears and ThinPrep for endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspirates. Endoscopy 2010; 42: 389 – 394

[129] Ardengh JC, Lopes CV, de Lima LF et al. Cell block technique and cytological smears for the differential diagnosis of pancreatic neoplasms after endosonography-guided fine-needle aspiration. Acta Gastroenterol Latinoam 2008; 38: 246 – 251

[130] de Luna R, Eloubeidi MA, Sheffield MV et al. Comparison of ThinPrep and conventional preparations in pancreatic fine-needle aspiration biopsy. Diagn Cytopathol 2004; 30: 71 – 76

[131] Kim JH, Lee SJ, Moon SH et al. Incremental value of cell block preparations over conventional smears alone in the evaluation of EUS-FNA for pancreatic masses. Hepatogastroenterology 2014; 61: 2117–2122

[132] Haba S, Yamao K, Bhatia V et al. Diagnostic ability and factors affecting accuracy of endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration for pancreatic solid lesions: Japanese large single center experience. J Gastroenterol 2013; 48: 973–981

[133] Rong L, Kida M, Yamauchi H et al. Factors affecting the diagnostic accuracy of endoscopic ultrasonography-guided fine-needle aspiration (EUS-FNA) for upper gastrointestinal submucosal or extraluminal solid mass lesions. Dig Endosc 2012; 24: 358–363

[134] Moller K, Papanikolaou IS, Toermer T et al. EUS-guided FNA of solid pancreatic masses: high yield of 2 passes with combined histologic-cytologic analysis. Gastrointest Endosc 2009; 70: 60–99

[135] Noda Y, Fujita N, Kobayashi G et al. Diagnostic efficacy of the cell block method in comparison with smear cytology of tissue samples obtained by endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspiration. J Gastroenterol 2010; 45: 868–875

▶ **Appendix e1** Key questions[1]: Technical aspects of endoscopic ultrasound (EUS)-guided sampling in gastroenterology

Patients/Population	Q#	Intervention/comparator	Outcome[2]	Outcome measures[3]
In patients who undergo EUS-guided needle sampling of **solid lesions** a) solid pancreatic masses b) solid lesions other than pancreatic mass[4] c) solid lesions overall[5]	Q1	Should **histologic** or **cytologic** or **both cytologic and histologic**[6] samples be obtained?	▪ To diagnose malignancy ▪ To diagnose a specific condition ▪ To provide information beyond diagnosis	▪ Diagnostic accuracy of malignancy ▪ Diagnostic yield of malignancy ▪ Number of needle passes required to establish the diagnosis ▪ Specimen adequacy for cytologic diagnosis ▪ Cytologic sample quality (cellularity, bloodiness, contamination etc.) ▪ Specimen adequacy for histologic diagnosis ▪ Histologic sample quality ▪ Technical failure rate ▪ Procedural time ▪ Complication rate ▪ Cost ▪ Other
	Q2	What technique should be used when preparing/processing cytologic samples?		
	Q3	What technique should be used when preparing/processing histologic samples?		
	Q4	Should **core biopsy needles**[7] rather than **standard needles** be used?		
	Q5	Should **25G** or **22G** or **19G** needles be used?		
	Q6	Should **ROSE**[8] rather than **no ROSE** be used?		
	Q7	What is the optimal number of needle passes when ROSE is not available?		
	Q8	Should **needle stylet** rather than **no stylet** be used?		
	Q9	Should **no-suction** or **slow stylet pull** method or **standard (5–10 mL) suction** or **high negative pressure** or **wet suction**[9] method be used?		
	Q10	Should **fanning technique** rather than **no-fanning technique** be used?		
	Q11	Should sampling technique be modified depending on characteristics of the target lesion[10]?		
	Q12	Should **contrast harmonic/ elastography guidance** rather than **standard B-mode guidance** be used?		
In patients who undergo EUS-guided sampling of **solid lesions**	Q13	Should **antibiotic prophylaxis** rather than **no antibiotic prophylaxis** be used?	▪ To avoid infectious complications	Complication rate and grade
In patients who undergo EUS-guided sampling of **pancreatic cystic lesions**	Q14	Should **cyst wall/ mural nodules** be sampled in addition to obtaining cyst fluid?	▪ To diagnose mucinous cyst ▪ To diagnose malignant cyst ▪ To obtain cyst fluid for analysis	▪ Diagnostic accuracy ▪ Diagnostic yield ▪ Specimen adequacy for cytologic diagnosis ▪ Cytologic sample quality (cellularity, bloodiness, contamination etc.) ▪ Specimen adequacy for histologic diagnosis ▪ Histologic sample quality ▪ Technical failure rate ▪ Procedural time ▪ Complication rate ▪ Cost ▪ Other

▶ **Appendix e1** (Continuation)

Patients/Population	Q#	Intervention/comparator	Outcome[2]	Outcome measures[3]
	Q15	Should **25G** or **22G** or **19G** needle be used?		
	Q16	Should **cytology brushing** rather than **no cytology brushing** be used?		
	Q17	Should **needle-based forceps biopsy** rather than no **needle-based forceps biopsy** be used?		
In patients who undergo EUS-guided sampling of **cystic lesions** a) pancreatic cystic lesions b) other cystic lesions	Q18	Should **antibiotic prophylaxis** rather than **no antibiotic prophylaxis** be used?	▪ To avoid infectious complications	Complication rate and grade

[1] Questions related to EUS-guided sampling in patients on antiplatelet or anticoagulant agents are not included, because these issues are covered in the recent guideline by the BSG/ESGE: Veitch AM et al. Endoscopy in patients on antiplatelet or anticoagulant therapy, including direct oral anticoagulants: British Society of Gastroenterology (BSG) and European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ESGE) guidelines. Endoscopy 2016; 48: 385 – 402.

[2] The focus of these guidelines should be on diagnosing malignancy. The definition of malignancy may vary from study to study (i. e., for the purpose of a given study neuroendocrine tumor [NET] may be considered as benign or malignant). Issues such as establishing a specific diagnosis (i. e., NET, metastases, autoimmune pancreatitis [AIP], tuberculosis) or providing information beyond diagnosis (i. e. grading of NET, grading of pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma [PDCA], determining gastrointestinal stromal tumor [GIST] prognosis etc.) are interesting, clinically important, and should be included in the review, but most probably there is not enough evidence to make a recommendation.

[3] The most important outcome measure from the clinical point of view is the diagnostic accuracy; however, many available studies did not evaluate accuracy but used various other, less clinically important outcome measures instead (column 5).

[4] Solid lesions other than pancreatic masses include submucosal masses or LNs or liver lesions, etc. There are only a few randomized controlled trials (RCTs) that compared needles or sampling techniques in homogeneous groups of patients with these pathologies. Data can be extracted from studies that included patients with various pathology and reported results broken down by target lesion type.

[5] Solid lesions overall – data from studies that included patients with various target lesions and did not report separate results for specific types of target lesion.

[6] It is realized that it may be difficult to draw a clear distinction line between histologic and cytologic samples and that there is substantial variability among centers/studies in this respect. The task force should define cytologic and histologic samples for the purpose of this Guideline.

[7] This question relates to studies that compared needles especially designed to procure histologic samples (cores, tissue fragments) with standard, end-hole aspiration needles.

[8] ROSE: rapid on-site cytologic evaluation.

[9] Wet suction: pre-flushing the needle with saline to replace the column of air with liquid followed by aspiration.

[10] Vascularity, size, location of the lesion; multiple lesions, suspicion of a specific diagnosis (pancreatic NET, pancreatic metastases, lymphoma, a rare tumor, benign pathology including AIP and focal chronic pancreatitis).

▶ **Appendix e2** Task forces and key question assignment

Task force	Main topics	Key questions*	Task force panel (leader in bold)
TF1	Solid lesions: • cytologic/histologic sample preparation/processing • cytology or histology or both • core needle vs. standard needle	Q1 – Q4	Aithal, G. Carrara, S. Kaye, P. Larghi, A. Fornelli, A. **Polkowski, M.**
TF2	Solid lesions: • needle size, • ROSE • number of needle passes when ROSE not available	Q5 – Q7	Arcidiacono, P. Barthet, M. **Iglesias-Garcia, J.** Jenssen, C.
TF3	Solid lesions: • stylet • suction • fanning • antibiotic prophylaxis	Q8 – Q13	Bastos, Pedro **Dumonceau, J.-M.** Eisendrath, Pierre Seicean, Andrada
TF4	Pancreatic cyst: • cyst wall/mural nodules puncture • needle size • cytology brushing, through-the-needle forceps biopsy • antibiotic prophylaxis	Q14 – Q18	Deprez, P. **Gines, A.** Hassan, C. Fernandez-Esparrach, G. Napoleon, B.

ROSE, rapid on-site evaluation.
* Key questions are listed in Appendix e1.

Supplementary material

Table S1 Reverse bevel vs. fine needle aspiration (FNA) needles for endoscopic ultrasound (EUS)-guided sampling: randomized controlled trials (RCTs).

First author, year	Design, Number of patients	Target lesion	Compared needles (and specimen type)		Outcome measures*		
					Diagnostic accuracy	Adverse event rate	Sample adequacy and quality
Othman, 2017 [9]	Parallel-group RCT, 109 patients	Solid masses, LNs (pancreas 81%)	ProCore 22G (on-site cytology, final cytology/ cell block)	FNA 22G (on-site cytology, final cytology/ cell block)	Not evaluated	NSD in adverse event rate (2.8% vs. 2.7%)	NSD in cellularity score (!), sample bloodiness and contamination, mean number of passes to obtain an adequate specimen, and rate of obtaining on-site diagnosis, both overall and for subgroup of patients with pancreatic masses.
Lee, 2017 [10]	Parallel-group RCT, 58 patients	Solid masses, LNs (pancreas 28%)	ProCore 22G (histology)	FNA 22G (histology)	NSD in accuracy for malignancy (79% vs. 76%)	No adverse events	**ProCore requires fewer needle passes to obtain a core specimen (*P* < 0.001).** NSD in the rate of histologic core specimens and surface area of histologic core.
Han, 2016 [11]	Crossover† RCT, 22 patients	Gastric subepithelial masses ≥15 mm	ProCore 22/25G (on-site and final cytology, histology)	FNA 22/25G (on-site and final cytology, histology)	Not evaluated	No adverse events	**ProCore requires fewer needle passes to obtain sample of adequate cellularity (*P* = 0.008). Higher rate of samples of adequate cellularity from the first needle pass for ProCore vs. FNA (68% vs. 32%; *P* = 0.034).** NSD in the rate of samples of adequate cellularity and in the rate of diagnostic samples.
Sterlacci, 2016 [12]	Crossover RCT, 56 patients	Solid masses, LNs (pancreas 68%)	ProCore 22G (cytology, histology)	FNA 22G (cytology, histology)	NSD in (!) accuracy for malignancy (94% vs. 89%)	No adverse events	NSD in the number of needle passes to obtain macroscopically optimal sample, cytologic and histologic sample quality, and the rate of samples adequate for diagnosis (both overall and in pancreatic masses).
Aadam, 2016 [13]	Parallel-group RCT, 140 patients	Solid masses, LNs (pancreas 52%)	ProCore 25/22/19G (on-site and final cytology, histology)	FNA 22/25G (on-site cytology, final cytology/cell block)	Not evaluated	No adverse events	**ProCore vs. FNA increases the (!) rate of diagnostic samples overall** (90% vs. 67%; *P* = 0.002) **and in nonpancreatic lesions** (88% vs. 55%; *P* = 0.006). NSD in the rate of diagnostic samples in pancreatic masses. **ProCore increases the rate of adequate samples on on-site evaluation overall** (83% vs. 60%; *P* = 0.006) **and for nonpancreatic masses** (82% vs. 52%; *P* = 0.019**).** NSD in the rate of adequate samples in pancreatic masses.

Kamata, 2016 [14]	Parallel-group RCT, 214 patients	Solid pancreatic masses (97%), pancreatic cyst (3%)	ProCore 25G (histology)	FNA 25G (histology)	NSD in single-pass sensitivity (76% vs. 69%) and (!) accuracy for malignancy (79% vs. 76%)	No adverse events	**ProCore increases the rate of samples adequate for histologic diagnosis** (81% vs. 69%; *P* = 0.048) **and provides samples of higher cellularity.**
Alatawi, 2015 [15]	Parallel-group RCT, 100 patients	Solid pancreatic masses >2 cm	ProCore 22G (histology)	FNA 22G (histology)	NSD in sensitivity (98% vs. 88%) and specificity for malignancy	No adverse events	**ProCore requires (!) fewer needle passes to obtain a 90% rate of samples adequate for diagnosis and provides samples of higher histologic quality.** NSD in digestive contamination.
Mavrogenis, 2015 [16]	Crossover RCT, 27 patients (28 lesions)	Solid pancreatic masses (68%), LNs (32%)	ProCore 25G (cytology/ cell block)	FNA 22G (cytology/ cell block)	NSD in single-pass sensitivity for malignancy both for pancreatic masses (90% vs. 90%) and LNs (66% vs. 66%)	No adverse events	NSD in amount of blood contamination, macroscopic quantity of the material, quality of the cytology, and adequacy and accuracy of the cell block material.
Vanbiervliet, 2014 [17]	Crossover RCT, 80 patients	Solid pancreatic masses	ProCore 22G, single-pass (cytology/ cell block)	FNA 22G, two passes (cytology/ cell block)	NSD in (!) accuracy for malignancy (90% vs. 93%)	7.5%	**FNA needle provides sample of higher histologic quality than ProCore needle.** NSD in cytologic sample quality.
Lee, 2014 [18]	Parallel-group RCT, 116 patients	Solid pancreatic masses	ProCore 22/25G (on-site and final cytology, histology).	FNA 22/25G (on-site and final cytology, histology)	NSD in (!) accuracy for malignancy (98% vs. 95%). **ProCore offers higher on-site accuracy for malignancy** (93% vs. 72%; *P* = 0.003)	NSD in adverse event rate (5.2% vs. 1.7%)	**ProCore requires fewer needle passes to establish the diagnosis than FNA needle** (median of 1.0 [IQR 1.0–2.0] vs. 2.0 [IQR 1.0–3.0]; *P* < 0.001).
Kim, 2014 [19]	Parallel-group RCT, 22 patients	Subepithelial masses ≥2 cm	ProCore 22G (histology or cytology)	FNA 22G (histology or cytology)	Not evaluated	NSD in adverse event rate (0% vs. 10%)	**ProCore vs. FNA requires fewer (!) needle passes to obtain core tissue specimen than FNA needle** (median of 2 vs. 4; *P* = 0.025) **ProCore increases the rate of samples adequate for histologic diagnosis** (75% vs. 20%; *P* = 0.01)
Hucl, 2013 [20]	Crossover RCT, 144 patients (145 lesions)	Solid pancreatic masses (48%), LNs (52%)	ProCore 22G (histology)	FNA 22G (histology)	NSD in overall accuracy for malignancy (79% vs. 81%). **ProCore offers higher accuracy in pancreatic mass** (87% vs. 75%; *P* = 0.046). **FNA offers higher accuracy in LNs (**72% vs. 86%; *P* = 0.02).	No adverse events	**ProCore vs. FNA requires fewer needle passes to obtain adequate histologic sample** (mean of 1.23±0.47 vs. 2.47±0.93; p<0.001). NSD in (!) sample adequacy rate and sample quality (histology).
Bang, 2012 [21]	Parallel-group RCT,	Solid pancreatic masses	ProCore 22G (on-site cytology	FNA 22G (on-site cytology	Not evaluated	NSD in adverse event	NSD in (!) number of passes to establish the diagnosis and rates of diagnostic sufficiency, procurement of the

| | 58 patients | | and final cytology/cell block) | and final cytology/ cell block) | | rate (3.6% vs. 3.6%) | histologic core or the presence of diagnostic histologic specimens. |

FNB, fine needle biopsy; IQR, interquartile range; LNs, lymph nodes; NSD, no significant difference.

* Primary outcome measure marked by (!).

† In crossover RCTs both compared needles were used in the same patients in a randomized order.

Technical details on EUS-guided sampling technique:
FNA needles compared with ProCore needles: Echotip/Cook Medical [10–20]; Expect/Boston Scientific [9,13,21]; EZShot2/Olympus [9].
Stylet used: yes [9–12,14–20]; various approaches depending on biopsy technique/endosonographer preference [13,21].
Suction used: yes [9,11,12,15,17,18,20]; stylet slow-pull [14,16]; various approaches depending on biopsy technique/endosonographer preference [10,13,19,21].
On-site cytologic evaluation: yes [9,11,13,17,18,21]; no [10,12,14–16,19,20].
Pathologist blinded to the type of needle used: yes [9–12,14–19,21]; no [13,20].

Table S2 Reverse bevel vs. fine needle aspiration (FNA) needles for endoscopic ultrasound (EUS)-guided sampling: meta-analyses.

First author, year	Analyzed studies and patients	Target lesion	Compared needles		Outcome measures		
					Diagnostic accuracy	Adverse event rate	Sample adequacy and quality Technical performance of the needle
Bang, 2016 [50]	4 RCTs, 3 prospective and 2 retrospective studies (576 patients)	Pancreatic mass (5 studies), various solid masses and LNs (2 studies), subepithelial masses (1 study)	ProCore 22G (25G)	FNA 22G (25G)	NSD in diagnostic accuracy both overall (pooled accuracy, 86% vs. 86%) and for pancreatic masses (pooled accuracy, 87% vs. 85%).	NSD	**ProCore vs. FNA requires fewer needle passes for diagnosis** (SMD –1.18; 95%CI –1.79 to –0.58). NSD in rate of samples adequate for pathologic evaluation, procurement of histologic core tissue, both overall and for pancreatic masses.
Oh, 2016 [51]	5 RCTs, 2 prospective and 4 retrospective studies (896 patients)	Pancreatic mass (8 studies), various solid masses and LNs (3 studies)	ProCore 22G (25G)	FNA 22G (25G)	NSD in diagnostic accuracy both overall (pooled sensitivity, 88% vs. 84%; pooled specificity, 99% vs. 100%) and for pancreatic masses (pooled sensitivity, 91% vs. 91%; pooled specificity, 97% vs. 100%).	NSD	**ProCore vs. FNA requires fewer needle passes for diagnosis** (SMD –0.72; 95%CI –1.02 to –0.41). **Probability of procurement of histologic core higher for ProCore vs FNA** (RR 0.81; 95% CI 0.72 to 0.92). NSD in procurement of optimal histologic core, sample adequacy, and technical failure rate.

CI, confidence interval; FNB, fine needle biopsy; LNs, lymph nodes; NSD, no significant difference; RCT, randomized controlled trial; RR, risk ratio, SMD, standardized mean difference.

Table S3 19G reverse bevel vs. 19G trucut needle for endoscopic ultrasound (EUS)-guided sampling: randomized controlled trial (RCT).

First author, year	Design, Number of patients	Target lesion	Compared needles (specimen type)		Outcome measures*		
					Diagnostic accuracy	Adverse event rate	Sample adequacy and quality Technical performance of the needle
DeWitt, 2015 [22]	Parallel-group RCT, 78 patients	Various solid masses, LNs and parenchymal liver disease (pancreas, 27%)	ProCore 19G (histology)	Quick-Core 19G (histology)	**Accuracy (!) higher for the ProCore vs. Quick-Core needle** (88% vs. 62%; $P = 0.02$)	NSD	ProCore vs. Quick-Core needle: **higher rate of samples adequate for histologic diagnosis** (85% vs. 57 %; $P = 0.006$); **higher technical success rate of the first pass** (95% vs. 78%; $P = 0.041$); and **lower rate of crossover to the other needle** (2% vs. 65%; $P < 0.001$).

LNs, lymph nodes; NSD, no significant difference.

* Primary outcome measure marked by (!).

Technical details on EUS-guided sampling technique:

Suction used: only for sampling with the ProCore needle.
Stylet used: only for the first pass with the ProCore needle.
On-site cytologic evaluation: no.
Pathologist blinded to the type of needle used: yes.

Table S4 Needles with and without side port for endoscopic ultrasound (EUS)-guided sampling: randomized controlled trial (RCT).

First author, year	Design, Number of patients	Target lesion	Compared needles (specimen type)		Outcome measures*		
					Diagnostic accuracy	Adverse event rate	Sample adequacy and quality Technical performance of the needle
Ang, 2015 [23]	Crossover† RCT, 30 patients	Solid pancreatic masses	FNA 22G with side port (cytology/ cell block)	FNA 22G without side port (cytology/ cell block)	NSD in (!) accuracy for malignancy both after the first pass (77% vs. 73%) and after two passes (87% vs. 87%)	No adverse event	NSD in the rates of samples of adequate cellularity and diagnostic samples

NSD, no significant difference.

* Primary outcome measure marked by (!).

† Both compared needles were used in the same patients in a randomized order.

Technical details on EUS-guided sampling technique:
Needles evaluated: EZ-Shot 2/Olympus.
Suction used: yes.
Stylet used: yes.
On-site cytologic evaluation: yes.
Pathologist blinded to the type of needle used: yes.

Table S5 25G vs. 22G fine needle aspiration (FNA) needles for endoscopic ultrasound (EUS)-guided sampling: randomized controlled trials (RCTs).

First author, year	Design, Number of patients	Target lesion	Compared needles		Outcome measures*			
					Diagnostic accuracy	Adverse event rate	Sample adequacy and quality	Needle technical performance
Carrara, 2016 [24]	Parallel-group RCT, 144 patients	Solid masses, LNs (pancreas 71%)	FNA 25G	FNA 22G	**Higher (!) accuracy for neoplasia for the 25G needle** (79% vs. 64%; *P* = 0.04)	No major adverse events	NSD in rates of (!) adequate samples, crossover to the other needle, mean number of passes to obtain an adequate sample	NSD in rates of difficult puncture
Gimeno-García, 2014 [25]	Crossover† RCT, 120 patients (126 lesions)	Solid masses, LNs (pancreas, 65%)	FNA 25G	FNA 22G	NSD in sensitivity for malignancy (!) (89% vs. 83%) and other test performance characteristics, both overall and for pancreatic masses	No adverse events	NSD in sample cellularity and bloodiness and in the mean number of needle passes to obtain an adequate sample	NSD in scores for needle visibility and ease of puncture
Lee, 2013 [26]	Parallel-group RCT, 188 patients	Solid pancreatic masses (74%), pancreatic cysts (26%)	FNA 25G	FNA 22G	NSD in (!) accuracy for malignancy (88% vs. 89%)	**Lower adverse event rate for the 25G needle** (3.2% vs. 10.6%; *P* = 0.004)	NSD in sample cellularity and bloodiness	**Higher manipulability scores for the 25G needle**
Vilmann, 2013 [27]	Parallel-group RCT, 135 patients	Solid masses, LNs, (pancreas, 44%), pancreatic cysts, (3.7%)	FNA 25G	FNA 22G	NSD in sensitivity for malignancy (82% vs. 68%) and other test performance characteristics	No major adverse events	NSD in rate of conclusive cytology, number of needle passes to obtain an adequate sample, amount of blood, and cell preservation	**Lower rates of suboptimal needle visualization and performance for the 22G needle**
Camellini, 2011 [28]	Parallel-group RCT, 115 patients (127 lesions)	Solid masses, LNs, (pancreas, 66%)	FNA 25G	FNA 22G	NSD in sensitivity (89% vs. 87%) and specificity for malignancy, both overall and for pancreatic masses	No major adverse events	NSD in rates of adequate samples, crossover to the other needle, and (!) mean number of passes to obtain a diagnostic sample	
Fabbri, 2011 [29]	Crossover RCT, 50 patients	Solid pancreatic masses	FNA 25G	FNA 22G	NSD in accuracy for malignancy (94% vs. 86%) and other test performance characteristics	No adverse events	NSD in scores of overall cellularity, quantity of blood, presence of cellular debris and amorphous material, presence of inflammatory cells, and neoplastic cellularity	
Siddiqui, 2009 [30]	Parallel-group RCT, 131 patients	Solid pancreatic masses	FNA 25G	FNA 22G	NSD in sensitivity for malignancy (!) (96% vs. 88%)	No adverse events	NSD in (!) diagnostic rate of malignancy, number of passes to obtain a definitive diagnosis,	NSD in ease of needle passage into the mass, and the rate of needle malfunctions

| Lee, 2009 [31] | Crossover RCT, 12 patients | Solid pancreatic masses | FNA 25G | FNA 22G | NSD in accuracy (100% vs. 100%) and other test performance characteristics | No adverse events | NSD in cellularity, discohesion of cells, amount of necrosis and degree of nuclear atypia | |

LNs, lymph nodes; NSD, no significant difference.

* Primary outcome measure marked by (!).

† In crossover RCTs both compared needles were used in the same patients in a randomized order.

Technical details on EUS-FNA technique:
Needles evaluated: Echotip/Cook Medical [25,28,29,31]; Beacon BNX/Medtronic [24]; Sonotip II/Mediglobe [27]; Endocoil 22G vs. Echotip 25G/Cook Medical [26,30].
Stylet used: yes [24,26,28–31]; no [25]; no data [27].
Suction used: yes [26–31]; no [25,28]; stylet slow-pull [24].
On-site cytologic evaluation: yes [24,25,28–30]; no [26,27]; no data [31].
Pathologist blinded to the type of needle: yes [24,25,27–31]; no data [26].

Table S6 25G vs. 22G fine needle aspiration (FNA) needles for endoscopic ultrasound (EUS)-guided sampling: meta-analyses.

First author, year	Analyzed studies	Target lesion	Compared needles (number of patients)		Outcome measures	
					Diagnostic accuracy	Other outcomes
Xu, 2017 [53]	7 RCTs and 4 prospective studies published in years 2009–2016	Solid pancreatic mass	25G FNA (425)	22G FNA (412)	**Higher pooled sensitivity for malignancy for the 25G needle vs. 22G needle** (92% [95%CI 89%–95%] vs. 88% [95%CI 84%–91%], *P* = 0.046). NSD in pooled specificity (100% [95%CI 94%–100%] vs. 100% [95%CI 95%–100%]). The area under the summary ROC curve was 0.96 for the 25G needle and 0.97 for the 25G needle.	Not evaluated
Facciorusso, 2016 [52]	7 RCTs published in years 2009–2016	Solid pancreatic mass	25G FNA (309)	22G FNA (295)	NSD in pooled sensitivity: 25G needle, 93% (95%CI 91–95%) vs. 22G needle, 89% (95%CI 85%–94%); *P* = 0.13. NSD in pooled specificity: 100% (95%CI 98%–100%) for both needles; *P* = 0.85. The area under the ROC curve was 0.99 for the 25G needle and 0.98 for the 22G needle	NSD in sample adequacy, small number of adverse event precluded analysis
Madhoun, 2013 [54]	3 RCTs, 2 prospective and 3 retrospective studies published in years 2009–2011	Solid pancreatic mass	25G FNA (565)*	22G FNA (799)*	**Higher pooled sensitivity for malignancy for the 25G needle vs. 22G needle** (93% [95%CI 91%–96%] vs. 85% [95%CI 82%–88%]; *P* < 0.001). NSD in pooled specificity (97% [95%CI 93%–99%] vs.100% [95%CI 98%–100%]; *P* = 0.97) The difference in sensitivity was nonsignificant when only prospective studies were analyzed (94% [95%CI 89%–97%] vs. 87% [95%CI 78%–93%])	NSD in needle malfunction, small number of adverse event precluded analysis
Affolter, 2013 [55]	5 RCTs, 3 prospective and 3 retrospective studies published in years 2005–2011	Solid pancreatic mass (7 studies), various solid masses (2 studies)	25G FNA (no data)*	22G FNA (no data)*	NSD in accuracy: *P* = 0.97. Pooled sensitivity: 25G needle, 91% (95%CI 87%–94%) vs. 22G needle, 78% (95%CI 74%–81%). NSD in pooled specificity: 100% (95%CI 97%–100%) vs. 100% (95%CI 98%–100%).	A trend toward higher sample adequacy for the 25G needle (risk difference 0.035 [95%CI –0.01 to 0.079]).

CI, confidence interval; NSD, no significant difference; RCT, randomized controlled trial; ROC, receiver operating characteristic.

* More than half of the evaluated patients were contributed by the retrospective study by Yosuf et al. with 842 patients (302 and 540 in the 25G and 22G groups, respectively).

Table S7 25G vs. 22G reverse bevel needle for endoscopic ultrasound (EUS)-guided sampling: randomized controlled trial (RCT).

First author, year	Design, Number of patients	Target lesion	Compared needles (specimen type)		Outcome measures*		
					Diagnostic accuracy	Adverse event rate	Sample adequacy and quality Technical performance of the needle
Park, 2016 [32]	Crossover† RCT 56 patients	Solid pancreatic masses	ProCore 22G (cytology, histology)	ProCore 25G (cytology, histology)	NSD in accuracy, sensitivity both based on cytology and histology	No adverse events	NSD in (!) rates of core procurement, length and width of the core. No technical failures.

NSD, no significant difference.

* Primary outcome measure marked by (!).

† In crossover RCTs both compared needles were used in the same patients in a randomized order.

Technical details on EUS-guided sampling technique:
Suction used: yes.
Stylet used: yes.
On-site cytologic evaluation: no data.
Pathologist blinded to the type of needle used: yes.

Table S8 19G vs. 22G fine needle aspiration (FNA) needles for endoscopic ultrasound (EUS)-guided sampling: randomized controlled trial (RCT).

First author, year	Design, Number of patients	Target lesion	Compared needles		Outcome measures*			
					Diagnostic accuracy	Adverse event rate	Sample adequacy and quality	Needle technical performance
Song, 2010 [33]	Parallel-group RCT, 117 patients	Solid pancreatic/ parapancreatic masses (pancreas 97%)	FNA 19G	FNA 22G	NSD in (!) accuracy for malignancy (87% vs. 79%) in intention-to-treat analysis. **Higher accuracy for malignancy in technically successful cases for 19G needle** (95% vs. 79%; P = 0.015)	NSD	NSD in sample quality assessed by Mair score. **Lower mean number of passes in the 19G vs. 22G group** (2.35 ± 0.88 vs. 2.78 ± 0.88; P = 0.013)	NSD in technical success rate overall and in body/tail masses. **Higher technical success rate in head masses for 22G needle** (100% vs. 81%; P = 0.019). NSD in crossover rate to the other needle type.

NSD, no significant difference.

* Primary outcome measure marked by (!).

Technical details on EUS-guided sampling technique:
Needles evaluated: Echotip/Cook Medical.
Suction used: yes.
Stylet used: yes.
On-site cytologic evaluation: no.
Pathologist blinded to the type of needle used: yes.

Table S9 The effects of using negative pressure (suction) during endoscopic ultrasound (EUS)-guided fine needle aspiration (FNA): randomized controlled trials (RCTs).

First author, year	Design, Number of patients	Target lesion	Compared techniques (specimen type)		Outcome measures*		
					Diagnostic accuracy	Adverse event rate	Sample adequacy and quality
Tarantino, 2014 [34]	Crossover RCT, 88 patients	Solid pancreatic masses	FNA 22G, 20-mL or 10-mL suction (cytology, histology)	22G FNA without suction (cytology, histology)	**Suction increases sensitivity** (84% vs. 64% vs. 41%; *P* < 0.001) and **accuracy** (86% vs. 69% vs. 49%; *P* < 0.001) for 20-mL suction, 10-mL suction, and no suction, respectively. NSD in specificity.	3.4%	**Suction increases the rate of adequate samples** (20-mL vs. 10-mL, 88% vs. 76%, *P* = 0.051; 20-mL vs. no suction, 88% vs. 45%, *P* < 0.001; 10-mL vs. no suction, 76% vs. 45%; *P* < 0.001).
Lee, 2013 [35]	Crossover RCT†, 81 patients	Solid pancreatic masses	FNA 22/25G, 10-mL suction (cytology)	FNA 22/25G without suction (cytology)	**Suction increases sensitivity** (82% vs. 72%; *P* = 0.005) and **accuracy** (85% vs. 76%; *P* = 0.004) for malignancy.	2.5%	**Suction increases the rate of diagnostic samples** (73% vs. 59%; *P* = 0 .001), sample **cellularity** (OR 2.12; 95%CI 1.37–3.30; *P* = 0.001), and **bloodiness** (OR 1.46; 95%CI 1.28–1.68; *P* = 0.001).
Puri, 2009 [36]	Parallel-group RCT, 52 patients	Various solid masses and LNs (pancreas 15%)	FNA 22G, 10-mL suction (cytology)	FNA 22G without suction (cytology)	**Suction increases sensitivity for malignancy** (86% vs. 67%, *P* = 0.05). NSD in accuracy and specificity.	No adverse events	**Suction increases the number of cytology slides** (mean number 17.8 ± 7.1 vs. 10.2 ± 5.5; *P* < 0.001). NSD in sample bloodiness, cellularity and contamination.
Wallace, 2001 [37]	Crossover RCT, 43 patients with 46 LNS	LNs	FNA 22G, suction (cytology/ cell block).	FNA 22G without suction (cytology/ cell block)	NSD in the likelihood of obtaining a correct diagnosis; OR 1.52, 95%CI 0.81–2.85.	No data	**Suction increases sample cellularity and bloodiness.**
Kudo, 2014 [38]	Crossover RCT, 90 patients	Solid pancreatic masses	25G FNA, high (50-mL) negative pressure (cytology, histology)	25G FNA, standard (10-mL) suction (cytology, histology)	NSD in accuracy (82% vs. 73%; *P* = 0.06), sensitivity, and specificity, for malignancy.	1%	**High negative pressure increases (!) the rate of samples adequate for histologic diagnosis** (90% vs. 72%; *P* < 0.001) and **sample bloodiness** (*P* = 0.004). NSD in sample contamination by gastrointestinal tract cells.
Attam, 2015 [39]	Crossover RCT, 95 patients with 117 lesions	Various solid masses and LNs (pancreas 54%)	FNA 22G, wet suction technique (cytology/ cell block)	22G FNA, standard 10-mL suction (cytology/ cell block)	Not evaluated.	No adverse events	**Wet suction increases (!) the rate of adequate samples** (86% vs. 75%; *P* = 0.035), **mean cellularity scores** (1.82 vs. 1.45; *P* < 0.001) and **rate of samples with moderate-to-high cellularity** (68% vs. 44%; *P* < 0.001). NSD in blood contamination.
Aadam, 2016 [40]	Crossover RCT, 60 patients	Solid pancreatic masses	FNA 22G, 10-mL suction + eliminating	FNA 22G, 10-mL suction	**Eliminating the residual negative pressure increases sensitivity** for malignancy (93%	No adverse events	**Eliminating the residual negative pressure decreases (!) the rate of sample contamination by gastrointestinal tract cells**

			the residual negative pressure (cytology)	(cytology)	vs. 76%, $P = 0.02$).		(7% vs. 17%, p = 0.03). NSD in sample cellularity.

CI, confidence interval; LNs, lymph nodes; NSD, no significant difference; OR, odds ratio.

* Primary outcome measure marked by (!).

† In crossover RCTs both compared techniques were used in the same patients in a randomized order.

Technical details on EUS-guided sampling technique:
FNA needles used: Echotip/Cook Medical [35,37–40]; Expect/Boston Scientific [34]; Sonotip II/Mediglobe [36].
Stylet used: yes [34–38,40]; depending on the technique (no in wet suction, yes in standard suction technique) [39].
On-site cytologic evaluation: yes [34,37–40]; no [35,36].
Pathologist blinded to the type of needle: yes [34–40].

Table S10 The effects of using needle stylet during endoscopic ultrasound (EUS)-guided fine needle aspiration (FNA): randomized controlled trials (RCTs).

First author, year	Design, Number of patients	Target lesion	Compared techniques (specimen type)		Outcome measures*		
					Diagnostic accuracy	Adverse event rate	Sample adequacy and quality
Abe, 2015 [41]	Crossover RCT†, 107 patients with 110 lesions	Various solid masses and LNs (pancreas 60%)	FNA 22G with stylet (cytology, histology)	FNA 22G without stylet (cytology, histology)	Not evaluated	1.8%	NSD in (!) the rate of samples adequate for histologic evaluation, sample cellularity, bloodiness and contamination by gastrointestinal tract cells.
Nijhawan, 2014 [42]	Parallel-group RCT, 115 patients with 128 lesions	Various solid masses and LNs (pancreas 34%, LNs 52%)	FNA 22G with stylet (cytology)	FNA 22G without stylet (cytology)	Not evaluated	No data	NSD in the rate of adequate samples and sample bloodiness.
Wani, 2012 [43]	Crossover RCT, 100 patients with 100 lesions	Various solid masses and LNs (pancreas 58%)	FNA 22/25G with stylet (cytology)	FNA 22/25G without stylet (cytology)	Not evaluated	No adverse events	NSD in (!) the diagnostic yield for malignancy, the rate of adequate samples, sample cellularity, bloodiness and contamination
Rastogi, 2011 [44]	Crossover RCT, 101 patients with 111 lesions	Various solid masses and LNs (pancreas 52%)	FNA 22G with stylet (cytology)	FNA 22G without stylet (cytology)	Not evaluated	No data	NSD in (!) the diagnostic yield for malignancy, the rate of adequate samples, sample cellularity, bloodiness and contamination
Lee, 2013 [35]	Crossover RCT, 81 patients	Solid pancreatic masses	FNA 22/25G, specimen expressed by reinserting the stylet (cytology)	FNA 22/25G, specimen expressed by air flushing (cytology)	NSD in sensitivity (76% vs. 79%), specificity (100% vs. 96%) and accuracy (80% vs. 82%) for malignancy between reinserting the stylet vs. air flushing techniques.	2.5%	**Expressing the specimen by reinserting the stylet vs. air flushing increases sample bloodiness.** NSD in the rate of diagnostic samples and sample cellularity.

LNs, lymph nodes; NSD, no significant difference.

* Primary outcome measure marked by (!).

† In crossover RCTs both compared techniques were used in the same patients in a randomized order.

Technical details on EUS-guided sampling technique:
FNA needles used: Echotip/Cook Medical [35,42–44], Expect/Boston Scientific [41].
Suction used: yes [41–44]; yes 50%/no 50% of needle passes [35].
On-site cytologic evaluation: yes [41,43,44]; no [35,42].
Pathologist blinded to the type of needle used: yes [35,41–44].

Table S11 Targeting specific parts of the lesion during endoscopic ultrasound (EUS)-guided fine needle aspiration (FNA): randomized controlled trials (RCTs).

First author, year	Design, Number of patients	Target lesion	Compared techniques (specimen type)		Outcome measures*		
					Diagnostic accuracy	Adverse event rate	Sample adequacy and quality
Sugimoto, 2015 [45]	Parallel-group RCT, 40 patients	Solid pancreatic masses	FNA 22G guided by contrast harmonic EUS (cytology)	FNA 22/25G using standard technique (cytology)	NSD in sensitivity (90% vs. 85%) and accuracy (90% vs. 85%) for malignancy	No adverse events	NSD in the rate of diagnostic samples. **Higher adequacy rate for the first needle pass in the contrast-guided** group (60% vs. 25%; $P = 0.027$).
Bang, 2013 [46]	Parallel-group RCT, 54 patients	Solid pancreatic masses	FNA 22/25G using fanning technique (cytology/ cell block)	FNA 22/25G using standard technique (cytology/ cell block)	NSD in accuracy for malignancy (fanning 96% vs. standard 77%; $P = 0.05$)	No adverse events	**Fanning decreases the (!) number of passes required to establish the diagnosis** (median 1 [IQR 1–3] vs. 1 [IQR 1–1]; $P = 0.02$), and **increases the proportion of patients in whom an on-site diagnosis was achieved on the first pass** (86% vs. 58%; $P = 0.02$).
Wallace, 2001 [37]	Crossover RCT†, 43 patients with 46 LNs	LNs	FNA 22G from the edge of the LN (cytology/ cell block)	FNA 22G from the center of the LN (cytology/ cell block)	NSD in the likelihood of obtaining a correct diagnosis; OR 1.16, 95%CI 0.42–3.21.	No data	Not evaluated.

CI, confidence interval; IQR, interquartile range; LNs, lymph nodes; NSD, no significant difference; OR, odds ratio.

* Primary outcome measure marked by (!).

† In crossover RCTs both compared techniques were used in the same patients in a randomized order.

Technical details on EUS-guided sampling technique:
FNA needles used: Echotip/Cook Medical [37,45], Expect/Boston Scientific [45,46], EZ shot2/Olympus Medical [45].
Suction used: yes [45]; no [46]; yes 50%/no 50% of needle passes [37].
Stylet used: yes [37,45]; only for the 1st pass [46].
On-site cytologic evaluation: yes [37,45,46].
Pathologist blinded to the type of needle used: yes [37,46]; no data [45].

Table S12 The effects of on-site cytologic evaluation during endoscopic ultrasound (EUS)-guided fine needle aspiration (FNA): randomized controlled trials (RCTs).

First author, year	Design, Number of patients	Target lesion	Compared techniques		Outcome measures*		
					Diagnostic accuracy	Adverse event rate	Sample adequacy and quality
Wani, 2015 [47]	Parallel-group RCT, 241 patients	Solid pancreatic masses	22G FNA with on-site cytologic evaluation	22G FNA with 7 needle passes	NSD in sensitivity (87% vs. 87%) and accuracy (89% vs. 89%) for malignancy.	NSD	NSD in (!) diagnostic yield of malignancy (= proportion of patients with positive cytologic diagnosis of malignancy), (!) rate of inadequate specimens, overall procedure time, number of repeat procedures, sample cellularity, bloodiness, contamination. **On-site evaluation decreases the number of needle passes (median 4 vs. 7; *P* < 0.001) and the mean time to review slides as reported by the cytopathologist (15 vs. 27 min.; *P* < 0.001).**
Lee, 2015 [48]	Parallel-group non-inferiority RCT, 142 patients	Solid pancreatic masses	22/25G FNA with on-site cytologic evaluation	22/25G FNA with 7 needle passes	NSD in (!) accuracy for malignancy (78% vs. 78%)	NSD	NSD in procedure time and need for repeat FNA. **On-site evaluation decreases the number of needle passes (median 5 vs. 7; *P* < 0.001).**

NSD, no significant difference.

* The primary outcome measure marked by (!).

Technical details on EUS-guided sampling technique:
FNA needles used: Echotip/Cook Medical [47], Beacon BNX/Medtronic [48].
Suction used: yes [47,48].
Stylet used: yes [48]; at the discretion of the endosonographer [47].
Pathologist blinded to the type of needle used: yes [47,48].

Table S13 Number of needle passes and the outcomes of endoscopic ultrasound (EUS)-guided sampling: per-pass analysis.

First author, year	Number of patients	Target lesion	Needle type and gauge	Outcome	Cumulative value after subsequent passes				
					1st	2nd	3rd	4th	≥5th
Mohamadnejad, 2016 [104]	239	Solid pancreatic masses	22G FNA	Sensitivity for malignancy – overall – masses >2 cm in size – masses ≤2 cm in size	59% 62% 41%	77% 81% 50%	83% 85% 64%	92% 93% 77%	94%–96% 96%–97% 77%–82%
Alatawi, 2015 [15]	70	Solid pancreatic masses >2 cm	22G FNA	Rate of diagnostic samples	74%	86%	90%	90%	90%
Lee, 2014 [18]	56	Solid pancreatic masses	22G FNA	Sensitivity for malignancy	38%	54%	88%	95%*	
Bang, 2013 [46]	54†	Solid pancreatic mass	25/22G FNA	Rate of diagnostic samples – fanning technique – no fanning technique	86% 58%	93% 73%	96% 77%	– –	– –
Bang, 2012 [21]	28	Solid pancreatic mass	22G FNA	Rate of diagnostic samples	64%	75%	100%	–	–
Alatawi, 2015 [15]	70	Solid pancreatic masses >2 cm	22G ProCore	Rate of diagnostic samples	94%	98%	100%	100%	100%
Lee, 2014 [18]	55	Solid pancreatic masses	22G ProCore	Sensitivity for malignancy	73%	84%	96%	98%*	
Iwashita, 2013 [88]	50	Solid pancreatic masses	25G ProCore	Sensitivity for malignancy	83%	91%	96%	96%	–
Bang, 2012 [21]	28	Solid pancreatic masses	22G ProCore	Rate of diagnostic samples	68%	86%	89%	–	–

FNA, fine-needle aspiration.

* 4th and 5th pass combined.

† Parallel-group randomized controlled trial comparing fanning and standard sampling technique in 28 and 26 patients, respectively.

Technical details on EUS-guided sampling technique:
FNA needles used: Echotip/ Cook Medical [15,18,104], Expect/Boston Scientific [21,46].

Table S14 Processing of specimens obtained by endoscopic ultrasound (EUS)-guided sampling: studies comparing diagnostic accuracy of various techniques.

First author, year	Design	Number of patients and target lesion	Compared techniques	Diagnostic accuracy
Qin, 2014 [125]	Prospective comparison of samples from different needle passes from the same lesion	72 patients with solid pancreatic masses	Direct smears vs. LBC vs. Cell block	**Higher sensitivity (90%), NPV (67%) and accuracy (92%) for malignancy of cell block vs. direct smears (70%, 32%, and 75%, respectively) and vs. LBC (73%, 30%, and 78%, respectively) ($P < 0.05$ for all comparisons).** NSD in specificity and PPV. Combination (smears+cell block or LBC+cell block) not superior to cell block alone.
Kim, 2014 [131]	Retrospective split sample comparison	61 patients with solid pancreatic masses	Direct smears vs. Direct smears plus cell block	**Higher sensitivity (90% vs. 79%; $P = 0.03$) and accuracy (91% vs. 81%; $P = 0.03$) for malignancy of combination of direct smears plus cell block vs. direct smears alone.**
Weynand, 2013 [126]	Retrospective comparison of results from two different periods	169 patients with solid pancreatic masses	Direct smears (plus cell block in 78% of cases) vs. LBC (plus cell block in 56% of cases)	NSD in sensitivity and accuracy for malignancy.
Rong, 2012 [133]	Retrospective split sample comparison	158 patients with solid pancreatic masses, subepithelial masses and LNs	Cytospin smears vs. Histology (formalin-fixed) vs. Combination	**Higher accuracy for malignancy of combined cytologic–histologic analysis (87%) vs. either cytologic (73%; $P < 0.01$) or histologic analysis alone (57%; $P < 0.001$).**
Haba, 2012 [132]	Retrospective split sample comparison	936 patients with solid pancreatic masses	Direct smears vs. Cell block vs. Combination	**Higher sensitivity (92% vs. 88%; $P < 0.01$) and specificity (98% vs. 95%; $P < 0.01$) for malignancy of combination of direct smears and cell block vs. direct smears alone.** NSD in PPV and NPV.
Kopelman, 2011 [127]	Prospective(?) split sample comparison	99 patients with solid pancreatic masses	Direct smears vs. Cell block	NSD in sensitivity and accuracy for malignancy.
Lee, 2011 [49]	Crossover RCT comparing samples from different needle passes from the same lesion	58 patients with solid and cystic pancreatic masses	Direct smears vs. LBC	**Higher sensitivity (93% vs. 75%; $P = 0.021$), accuracy (95% vs. 81%; $P = 0.039$), and NPV (82% vs. 56%; $P = 0.049$) for direct smears vs. LBC.** NSD in specificity and PPV. Combination (smears+LBC) not superior to smears alone.
LeBlanc, 2010 [128]	Prospective comparison of samples from different needle passes from the same lesion	130 patients with 139 lesions (50 pancreas, 89 LNs)	Direct smears (on-site and final diagnoses) vs. LBC	**Higher accuracy for malignancy of direct smears vs. LBC, both overall (96% vs. 76%), for pancreatic masses (98% vs. 64%), and for LNs (94% vs. 82%).** **Higher sensitivity for malignancy of direct smears vs. LBC, both overall (95% vs. 64%), for pancreatic masses (98% vs. 62%), and for LNs (92% vs. 67%).** NSD in specificity for malignancy.

Noda, 2010 [135]	Prospective split sample comparison	33 patients with solid pancreatic mass (58%), LNs (36%), or other abdominal masses;	Direct smear vs. Cell block	**Higher sensitivity (92% vs. 60%; *P* = 0.02), accuracy (94% vs. 61%; *P* = 0.003), and NPV (89% vs. 36%; *P* = 0.03) for malignancy for direct smears vs. LBC**. NSD in specificity and PPV.
Moller, 2009 [134]	Retrospective split sample comparison	192 patients with solid pancreatic masses	Cytospin smears vs. Histology (formalin-fixed) vs. Combination	**Higher sensitivity for malignancy of combined cytologic–histologic analysis (83%) vs. either cytologic (68%; *P* < 0.02) or histologic analysis alone (60%; *P* < 0.001).** NSD in sensitivity, PPV, NPV and accuracy.
Ardengh, 2008 [129]	Retrospective comparison of results from two different periods	356 patients with solid or cystic pancreatic masses	Direct smears vs. Cell block	**Higher sensitivity (85% vs. 61%; *P* < 0.001), accuracy (87% vs. 68%; *P* < 0.001), and NPV (55% vs. 36%; *P* = 0.046) for malignancy for cell block vs. direct smears.** NSD in specificity and PPV.
De Luna, 2004 [130]	Retrospective split sample comparison FNA needle	67 patients with pancreatic masses	Direct cytology smears (on-site and final diagnoses) vs. LBC	**Higher sensitivity (77% v58%; *P* = 0012) for malignancy for direct smears vs. LBC.** NSD in specificity and accuracy.
Wallace, 2001 [37]	Prospective split sample comparison	43 patients with enlarged LNs	Direct cytology smears (on-site and final diagnoses) vs. Cell block	The examination of the cell block preparations did not contribute any additional diagnoses of malignancy beyond those obtained by the direct smears

FNA, fine needle aspiration; LBC, liquid-based cytology; LNs, lymph nodes; NPV, negative predictive value; NSD, no significant difference; PPV, positive predictive value; RCT, randomized controlled trial.

Technical details on EUS-guided sampling and specimen processing techniques:
LBC system used: ThinPrep [49,125,128,130], PapSpin [126].