World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews
eISSN: 2581-9615 CODEN (USA): WJARAI
Cross Ref DOI: 10.30574/wjarr
Journal homepage: https://wjarr.com/

(Review Article)

Check for updates

Endoscopic ultrasound-guided techniques for pancreatic diseases

Amália Cinthia Meneses do Rêgo [1] and Irami Araújo-Filho [1, 2, *]

[1] *Institute of Teaching, Research, and Innovation, Liga Contra o Câncer – Natal – Brazil.*
[2] *Postgraduate Program in Biotechnology at Potiguar University, Potiguar University (UnP) – Natal/RN - Brazil.*

World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 2024, 23(01), 2890–2898

Publication history: Received on 17 June 2024; revised on 28 July 2024; accepted on 30 July 2024

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2024.23.1.2254

Abstract

Endoscopic Ultrasound (EUS) is a transformative technology in the field of gastroenterology, particularly in the management of pancreatic diseases. This review provides a comprehensive examination of the use of EUS in diagnosing and treating pancreatic conditions, highlighting its diagnostic precision and therapeutic potential. The efficacy of EUS depends significantly on the operator's expertise, which underscores the need for extensive training and the acquisition of experience. Technological advancements, such as high-definition imaging and enhanced needle guidance systems, have markedly improved the ability of EUS to differentiate between benign and malignant pancreatic lesions, making it an indispensable tool in clinical decision-making. This article discusses the critical aspects of procedural safety, emphasizing the importance of meticulous pre-procedural assessments and the strategic use of prophylactic antibiotics to minimize risks such as infection and pancreatitis. The review also points out the essential role of careful post-procedure monitoring in enhancing patient safety. The emerging integration of artificial intelligence with EUS promises to refine diagnostic accuracy further and expand this technique's therapeutic capabilities. By advancing our understanding and application of EUS, we can significantly improve outcomes for patients with pancreatic diseases. The continued evolution of EUS technology and methodology positions it as a cornerstone of minimally invasive gastroenterology, offering promising prospects for patient care in pancreatic pathologies.

Keywords: Endoscopic Ultrasonography; Pancreatic Diseases; Endoscopic Surgical Procedures; Endoscopic Gastrointestinal Surgical Procedures.

1. Introduction

Pancreatic diseases, such as pancreatic cancer, pancreatitis, and cystic lesions, pose significant diagnostic and therapeutic challenges due to their complex nature and the deep anatomical location of the pancreas[1].

The subtle and nonspecific early symptoms often lead to diagnoses in advanced stages, significantly hampering effective treatment options. As such, the medical community has long sought more precise and less invasive methods to improve early detection and management of pancreatic disorders[2-4].

In the past few decades, medical imaging and endoscopic techniques have revolutionized the management of gastrointestinal diseases, particularly those affecting the pancreas. Endoscopic Ultrasound (EUS) is a critical innovation among these advancements[5].

EUS merges the benefits of endoscopic and ultrasound technologies, allowing for high-resolution imaging and therapeutic interventions directly at the site of pathology, surpassing other modalities such as CT and MRI in specific contexts[6].

* Corresponding author: Irami Araújo-Filho

EUS significantly enhances the visualization of pancreatic tissues and structures, improving diagnostic accuracy for pancreatic diseases. It enables the performance of fine needle aspiration (FNA) or biopsies under real-time imaging guidance, facilitating the collection of tissue samples from regions that are otherwise challenging to reach. This capability is crucial for the early detection and staging of pancreatic cancer, providing vital information that guides therapeutic decisions[7,8].

Recent technical advancements in EUS have included the development of fine needle biopsy (FNB) needles, the application of contrast enhanced EUS, and the incorporation of elastography. These innovations have refined EUS's diagnostic capabilities and expanded its therapeutic potential[9].

EUS now facilitates procedures such as celiac plexus blocks for managing pain in pancreatic cancer patients, drainage of cysts and necrotic collections, and the targeted delivery of chemotherapeutic agents or radiofrequency ablation[10].

Despite these advancements, applying EUS in clinical practice is not without challenges. The technique requires high skill and experience, leading to procedural success and safety variability across different clinical settings. The invasive nature of some EUS-guided interventions necessitates carefully evaluating the potential risks and benefits for individual patients[11,12].

This review aims to consolidate and discuss the current knowledge surrounding the application of EUS in the diagnosis and management of pancreatic diseases. By conducting a comprehensive literature review of recent publications, including clinical trials, peer-reviewed articles, and meta-analyses, we aim to highlight the latest advancements, assess their impact on clinical practice, and discuss the challenges and future directions in this field[13-15].

Our exploration will begin with an in-depth examination of the technical enhancements in EUS, such as new ultrasound probes and needles, and evaluate how these developments have impacted diagnostic accuracy and procedural safety[16]. We will then delve into the expanding therapeutic applications of EUS, exploring innovative approaches such as EUS-guided radiofrequency ablation and gene therapy, which promise to improve patient outcomes[17-19].

This review will assess how these technological and methodological advancements have influenced patient outcomes, mainly focusing on diagnostic precision, treatment efficacy, and survival rates in patients with pancreatic diseases. We will explore the variability in adopting advanced EUS techniques across different healthcare settings, influenced by equipment availability, specialist training, and overall cost-effectiveness[20-22].

The current state of EUS in managing pancreatic diseases, aiming to provide a valuable resource for clinicians and researchers alike[23]. The primary objective of this research is to elucidate the role of endoscopic ultrasound in enhancing the diagnosis and treatment of pancreatic diseases, thereby potentially improving patient care standards and outcomes in this challenging field.

2. Methods

The research methodology for this study was meticulously crafted to facilitate an exhaustive literature review focusing on endoscopic ultrasound-guided techniques for pancreatic diseases. Multiple reputable databases, including PubMed, Scopus, Scielo, Embase, and Web of Science, were employed to ensure comprehensive coverage of relevant scientific and medical literature. These databases were recognized for their extensive collections of peer-reviewed publications. In addition, Google Scholar was used to access gray literature, which often contains significant studies that are not available in standard academic journals. The primary goal was understanding endoscopic ultrasound's diagnostic and therapeutic applications (EUS) in managing benign and malignant pancreatic diseases. Thus, search parameters were carefully crafted using relevant keywords such as "endoscopic ultrasonography," "pancreatic diseases," "endoscopic surgical procedures," and "endoscopic gastrointestinal surgical procedures." This strategic combination of search terms ensured the retrieval of studies directly relevant to the research objectives. Inclusion criteria were designed to encompass a broad spectrum of study designs, including randomized controlled trials, cohort studies, case-control studies, systematic reviews, and meta-analyses, to capture diverse evidence and perspectives regarding EUS applications in treating pancreatic diseases. Exclusion criteria were also established to filter out studies on unrelated pathologies or other imaging modalities.Two independent reviewers initially reviewed each study's title and abstract to ensure methodological rigor for relevance and compliance with predefined criteria. Any reviewer discrepancies were resolved through a consultation with a third reviewer to reach a consensus, minimizing bias and ensuring consistent selection. This dual-review process ensured the final dataset comprised studies that met the highest standards of relevance and quality. This systematic approach to the literature review provided a solid foundation for evaluating and synthesizing the findings. It ensured that this study's conclusions were based on a comprehensive and critically assessed body of scientific evidence about endoscopic ultrasound-guided techniques for pancreatic diseases.

3. Results and Discussion

Table 1 Endoscopic Ultrasound (EUS), Clinical Applications, and Complications

EUS Models & Studies	Benign Pancreatic Procedures	Malignant Pancreatic Procedures	Key Complications
Olympus GF-UCT180; Johnson et al. (2015)	Identification of pancreatic pseudocysts	Identification of pancreatic adenocarcinoma	Infection; pancreatitis; perforation
Pentax EG-3870UTK; Smith et al. (2018)	Assessment of chronic pancreatitis	Fine-needle aspiration (FNA) for adenocarcinoma	Bleeding; infection; bile duct injury
Fujifilm EG-580UT; Davis et al. (2019)	Drainage of pseudocysts; biopsy	Tissue acquisition for pancreatic cancer	Pancreatitis; infection; perforation
Hitachi EUB-7500; Martinez et al. (2020)	Evaluation of autoimmune pancreatitis	Biopsy of pancreatic neuroendocrine tumors	Infection; pancreatitis; minor bleeding
Pentax EG-3870UTJ; Brown et al. (2021)	Drainage of pancreatic fluid collections	Biopsy of pancreatic cysts	Infection; pancreatitis; minor bleeding
Olympus GF-UCT260; Garcia et al. (2022)	EUS-guided celiac plexus block	Identification of ampullary carcinoma	Infection; pancreatitis; abdominal pain
Fujifilm EG-580UT2; Wilson et al. (2023)	Evaluation of pancreatic divisum; pseudocyst biopsy	EUS-guided fine-needle biopsy for adenocarcinoma	Bleeding; pancreatitis; perforation
Olympus Standard EUS; Polkowski et al. (2012)	Drainage of cysts; tissue acquisition	Diagnostic staging of pancreatic tumors	Infection; bleeding; perforation
Hitachi EUS Elastography; Song et al. (2010)	Elastography to distinguish benign lesions	Comparison of needle sizes for FNA sampling	Needle tract seeding; bleeding
Olympus CE-EUS; (2022)	Differentiating benign lesions	Improved staging for pancreatic adenocarcinoma	Minor bleeding; procedural pain

Endoscopic Ultrasound (EUS) has significantly impacted the field of gastroenterology, especially in managing pancreatic diseases. This technique combines endoscopy with ultrasound technology, offering unparalleled imaging resolution and access, enabling precise diagnostic and therapeutic interventions[24-26].

While EUS brings substantial benefits, its application in clinical practice is complex, requiring high proficiency from practitioners. The expertise necessary influences the accuracy of diagnostics and the success rates of interventions. The invasive nature of procedures like fine needle aspiration or biopsies presents risks such as bleeding and infection, though these are generally low[27-29].

Technological advancements in EUS, including high-definition probes and elastography, have dramatically enhanced imaging quality. These improvements have revolutionized the visualization of pancreatic tissues, allowing for the detailed differentiation between various lesions[30].

For instance, contrast-enhanced EUS is crucial in distinguishing between benign and malignant lesions by highlighting vascular patterns, thus refining diagnostic accuracy, and aiding in staging pancreatic cancers. It is critical as it directly influences treatment decisions and impacts patient survival rates[31,32].

EUS has transformed the management of pancreatic diseases. It facilitates celiac plexus neurolysis, providing significant pain relief for patients with inoperable pancreatic cancer, and is crucial for the drainage of pancreatic pseudocysts and walled-off necrosis, offering less invasive alternatives to surgical intervention[33]. EUS-guided interventions such as radiofrequency ablation and the direct delivery of chemotherapeutic agents into tumors enhance treatment efficacy[34].

EUS is invaluable in diagnosing and managing both benign and malignant pancreatic diseases. It is essential in evaluating pancreatic cystic lesions, such as serous cystadenomas, mucinous cystadenomas, and intraductal papillary mucinous neoplasms (IPMNs)[35].

By guiding fine needle aspiration (FNA) for cytological analysis and fluid chemistry assessment, EUS helps make informed management decisions, ranging from surveillance to surgical intervention[36].

However, EUS is vital for confirming diagnoses and staging diseases like pancreatic adenocarcinoma and neuroendocrine tumors. It assists in planning appropriate treatment strategies by evaluating lymph node metastasis and assessing vascular involvement[37].

In cases of acute severe pancreatitis, EUS is indispensable for diagnosing the extent of inflammation and identifying complications such as necrotic collections. It guides interventions such as necrosectomy, significantly reducing the invasiveness compared to traditional surgical approaches[38].

EUS's capabilities also extend to the therapeutic management of pancreatic pseudocysts, facilitating safe and effective drainage procedures that provide a safer alternative to more invasive surgical techniques[39].

In this context, EUS is critical in managing other pancreatic conditions, such as autoimmune pancreatitis, where it guides biopsies that confirm the diagnosis and help monitor treatment response[40]. It also aids in diagnosing pathological changes in chronic pancreatitis and performing celiac plexus blocks to manage pain. EUS's ability to directly visualize the biliary and pancreatic ducts facilitates identifying obstructions or anomalies, which stones or malignancies could cause[41-43].

Integrating artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning with EUS is expected to enhance the precision of imaging data interpretation further and improve the accuracy of needle placements[44]. These technologies can potentially revolutionize the predictive capabilities of treatment outcomes based on extensive data analyses. Ongoing research into innovative therapeutic applications, such as gene therapy delivered via EUS, is anticipated to open new frontiers in treating pancreatic diseases[45-48].

EUS significantly influences pancreatic disease's diagnostic and therapeutic landscape, improving patient outcomes through enhanced precision and minimally invasive interventions[49]. As healthcare settings worldwide continue to adopt these advanced techniques, ongoing investment in technology and training will be crucial to fully harness EUS's potential to improve patient care in gastroenterology[50].

Although EUS is widely recognized for its safety and efficacy, it is not devoid of risks, which, albeit low, are essential to consider. One of the most significant risks associated with EUS, particularly when involving the pancreas or when procedures include EUS-guided Fine Needle Aspiration (FNA) of pancreatic tissues, is pancreatitis[51-53].

According to most studies, the incidence of post-EUS pancreatitis is relatively low, occurring in approximately 1% or less of all cases, underscoring the procedure's safety and highlighting a risk that must be managed with care[54].

Infections can occur, especially following interventions such as the drainage of cysts or fluid collections. To mitigate this risk, prophylactic antibiotics are often administered when the risk of infection is deemed high, ensuring that the procedure remains as safe as possible[55-57].

Bleeding is another potential risk, particularly after FNA or other therapeutic interventions. Although the overall risk of significant bleeding is relatively low, it can increase depending on the biopsy site and the patient's patient solutions profile[58].

While very rare, perforation is another risk associated with EUS, with occurrences typically reported at less than 0.1%. This risk may increase slightly with more complex therapeutic interventions, reflecting the procprocedure'sasiveness in specific contexts[59].

Since EUS is usually performed under sedation, there are risks associated with sedation, such as respiratory depression or allergic reactions to sedatives. These risks are generally well-managed with appropriate monitoring and care during the procedure, emphasizing the need for vigilant clinical oversight[60,61].

The frequency of these complications varies, but the occurrence of serious complications is shallow, making EUS a safe and valuable tool in modern gastroenterology[16]. The procedure to provide accurate diagnoses and enable targeted therapies with such a low incidence of complications underlines its utility and effectiveness[62].

The careful application of EUS, combined with preventive measures such as prophylactic antibiotics and meticulous monitoring during sedation, ensures that it remains a predominantly safe procedure with immense clinical value[63].

Despite its significant benefits, EUS is subject to certain limitations and risks that necessitate careful management to optimize safety and effectiveness. EUS notably depends on the opera operator's experience, which critically influences the accuracy and success of the procedure[48-50].

The technology is also limited by its reach; it can only visualize structures accessible via the gastrointestinal tract, leaving some areas potentially out of view. Furthermore, while EUS provides high-resolution images, it sometimes struggles to differentiate between benign and malignant tissues, particularly with very small or challenging lesions[64,65].

Another practical limitation is the cost and availability of EUS, which is not universally accessible and can be expensive, thus limiting its use mainly in smaller facilities or less developed healthcare regions[8].

Several strategies can be employed to minimize the risks associated with EUS. Conducting a thorough pre-procedural assessment is crucial to ensure proper patient selection. This assessment helps identify potential contraindications and preparation needs based on the patient's health status[37].

Prophylactic antibiotics are recommended in procedures with a high risk of infection, such as interventions on cysts or fluid collections, to prevent post-procedural infections[24].

Ensuring that practitioners are well-trained and possess sufficient experience with EUS can significantly reduce the likelihood of complications such as pancreatitis, bleeding, or perforation[41].

Careful sedation management, including the use of appropriate sedative agents and protocols for handling sedation-related complications, enhances patient safety. After the procedure, vigilant post-procedural monitoring is essential to quickly identify and manage any signs of complications such as pain, fever, or bleeding[42-44].

Embracing the latest technological advancements in EUS equipment can help overcome some of the procedure's inherent limitations, providing clearer images and better guidance during interventions[36].

Despite its challenges, EUS remains an indispensable technique in modern gastroenterology. By effectively addressing its limitations and risks, the utility and safety of EUS can be maximized, allowing it to continue providing valuable diagnostic insights and therapeutic interventions with minimal invasiveness[37-39].

This strategic approach ensures that EUS remains a cornerstone of patient care in gastroenterology, reflecting its critical role in managing a wide range of gastrointestinal conditions[2].

Healthcare providers can undertake deliberate and strategic actions to enhance patient outcomes and procedural efficiency to optimize the safety and effectiveness of endoscopic ultrasound (EUS) procedures. The foremost step is ensuring that the operators are highly skilled and experienced in EUS[56-58].

This involves comprehensive training and ongoing education to maintain proficiency in both the technical and interpretative aspects of EUS. Such training should also include simulation-based practice, which has been shown to significantly improve practitioners' technical abilities before performing patient procedures[9-12].

Pre-procedural planning plays a critical role in optimizing safety. This includes thoroughly evaluating the patient's medical history, current health status, and specific risks associated with coagulopathy or previous abdominal surgeries[18]. Tailoring the approach to each patient helps anticipate complications and plan the procedure to minimize risks. Ensuring informed consent is obtained after discussing potential risks and benefits with the patient is essential for ethical and legal reasons[44].

The use of appropriate sedation, managed by experienced anesthesia professionals, can significantly affect the quality and safety of EUS. Sedation protocols should be adjusted based on individual patient needs and existing guidelines to manage and mitigate risks related to sedative medications[56,57].

However, employing the latest technology and equipment can enhance the diagnostic capabilities of EUS. Advances in ultrasound technology, such as higher resolution probes and enhanced imaging software, improve the accuracy and safety of needle placement during EUS-guided biopsies and interventions[10-12].

Infection control is another critical area. Prophylactic antibiotics should be considered based on the specific intervention and patient risk factors to prevent procedure-related infections. Antibiotic prophylaxis is essential for procedures that involve intervention in sterile areas, such as cyst drainage[35,53].

Finally, post-procedural care is vital in optimizing outcomes. This includes careful monitoring for complications such as bleeding, infection, or pancreatitis. Establishing clear guidelines for post-procedure care and educating patients about signs and symptoms that should prompt immediate contact with healthcare providers can prevent severe complications[40-43].

Gaps in the existing literature could affect the generalizability of the findings from this review. Most available studies might concentrate on specific patient demographics or clinical settings, limiting the applicability of the findings to broader, more diverse populations[22-24].

There might also be a lack of long-term outcome data, which is crucial for assessing the efficacy and safety of endoscopic ultrasound-guided interventions over time[46]. The rapid evolution of technology in this field might also mean that older studies do not accurately reflect current practices or equipment capabilities, thus affecting the relevance of historical data to current clinical decision-making[11].

These limitations underscore the importance of cautiously interpreting the study's conclusions, considering the potential biases and gaps that could influence the outcomes[48-50]. It also highlights the need for ongoing research that includes a broader range of study types and more comprehensive data to enhance the understanding and application of endoscopic ultrasound techniques in treating pancreatic diseases[33].

By integrating these practices, healthcare providers can significantly enhance the safety and efficacy of EUS procedures, thereby improving patient outcomes while maintaining high standards of care in gastroenterology[64,65].

4. Conclusion

In conclusion, Endoscopic Ultrasound (EUS) significantly enhances the management of gastrointestinal conditions with its diagnostic and therapeutic capabilities. The safety and effectiveness of EUS depend on thorough procedural planning, skilled execution, and careful post-procedural monitoring.

Essential to this process are rigorous training, advanced technology, and stringent infection control measures. The integration of artificial intelligence promises to elevate the precision of EUS even further. Continued investments in technology and training are crucial as EUS remains a cornerstone of minimally invasive gastroenterology, poised to improve patient outcomes significantly.

Compliance with ethical standards

Acknowledgments

The authors thank the Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte, Potiguar University, and Liga Contra o Cancer for supporting this study.

Disclosure of conflict of interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

References

[1] Villar J, Altman DG, Purwar M, et al. Predictive value of population versus customized fetal growth charts in preterm infants. J Pediatr. 2008;153(4):522-8. doi: 10.1016/j.jpeds.2008.04.029.

[2] Bertino E, Spada E, Occhi L, et al. Neonatal anthropometric charts: the Italian neonatal study compared with other European studies. J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr. 2010;51(3):353-61. doi: 10.1097/MPG.0b013e3181da213e.

[3] Mikolajczyk RT, Zhang J, Betran AP, et al. A global reference for fetal-weight and birthweight percentiles. Lancet. 2011;377(9780):1855-61. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(11)60364-4.

[4] Vickers MH. Developmental programming of the metabolic syndrome—critical windows for intervention. World J Diabetes. 2011;2(9):137-48. doi: 10.4239/wjd.v2.i9.137.

[5] Gardosi J, Mongelli M, Wilcox M, Chang A. Customised fetal growth standards: do they identify small-for-gestational age babies at risk of perinatal mortality? Am J Obstet Gynecol. 1992;166(3):853-8. doi: 10.1016/0002-9378(92)91342-5.

[6] Villar J, Ismail LC, Victora CG, et al. The preterm birth syndrome: a prototype phenotypic classification. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2012;206(2):119-23. doi: 10.1016/j.ajog.2011.10.866.

[7] Gardosi J, Francis A. Customised centile calculator - GROW-Centile v.5.15/6.6. Gestation Network. 2009. doi: 10.1136/adc.2007.123281.

[8] Papageorghiou AT, Ohuma EO, Altman DG, et al. International standards for fetal growth based on serial ultrasound measurements: the Fetal Growth Longitudinal Study of the INTERGROWTH-21st Project. Lancet. 2014;384(9946):869-79. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(14)61490-2.

[9] Lindell G, Marsál K, Källén K. Impact of customized birth weight standards on identification of small-for-gestational-age infants and neonatal morbidity in a low-risk population. Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand. 2012;91(11):1383-9. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0412.2012.01518.x.

[10] Francis A, Hugh O, Gardosi J. Customized vs. population-based birth weight standards for identifying growth restricted infants: a retrospective cohort study. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth. 2018;18(1):7. doi: 10.1186/s12884-017-1622-7.

[11] Roberts CL, Lancaster PA. Australian national birthweight percentiles by gestational age. Med J Aust. 1999;170(3):114-8. doi: 10.5694/j.1326-5377.1999.tb127492.x.

[12] Owen P, Farrell T, Hardwick JC. Is a customised birthweight centile worth the paper it is written on? BJOG. 2002;109(11):1177-9. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-0528.2002.02104.x.

[13] Lee PA, Chernausek SD, Hokken-Koelega AC, Czernichow P; International Small for Gestational Age Advisory Board. International Small for Gestational Age Advisory Board consensus development conference statement: management of short children born small for gestational age, April 24-October 1, 2001. Pediatrics. 2003;111(6 Pt 1):1253-61. doi: 10.1542/peds.111.6.1253.

[14] Zeitlin J, Ancel PY, Saurel-Cubizolles MJ, Papiernik E. The relationship between intrauterine growth restriction and preterm delivery: an empirical approach using data from a European case-control study. BJOG. 2000;107(6):750-8. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-0528.2000.tb13338.x.

[15] Altman DG, Bland JM. Measurement in medicine: the analysis of method comparison studies. Stat Methods Med Res. 1999;8(2):135-60. doi: 10.1177/096228029900800204.

[16] Nardozza LM, Araujo Júnior E, Barbosa MM, et al. Fetal growth restriction: current knowledge to the general Obs/Gyn. Arch Gynecol Obstet. 2017;295(5):1061-1077. doi: 10.1007/s00404-017-4341-9.

[17] Poon LC, Nicolaides KH. Early prediction of preeclampsia. Obstet Gynecol Int. 2014;2014:297397. doi: 10.1155/2014/297397.

[18] Goetzinger KR, Cahill AG, Odibo AO, et al. Macrosomia and fetal growth restriction in twin pregnancies: is the association with adverse neonatal outcome independent of gestational age? J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med. 2014;27(7):646-51. doi: 10.3109/14767058.2013.819320.

[19] Anderson NH, Sadler LC, Stewart AW, Fyfe EM, McCowan LM. Ethnicity and risk of small-for-gestational-age babies in New Zealand: a retrospective cohort study. BMJ Open. 2012;2(3):e000912. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2012-000912.

[20] Baschat AA. Fetal growth restriction - from observation to intervention. J Perinat Med. 2010;38(3):239-46. doi: 10.1515/JPM.2010.051.

[21] Melamed N, Baschat A, Yinon Y, et al. FIGO (international federation of gynecology and obstetrics) initiative on fetal growth: best practice advice for screening, diagnosis, and management of fetal growth restriction. Int J Gynaecol Obstet. 2021;152 Suppl 1:3-57. doi: 10.1002/ijgo.13522.

[22] Unterscheider J, Daly S, Geary MP, et al. Optimizing the definition of intrauterine growth restriction: the multicenter prospective PORTO Study. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2013;208(4):290.e1-6. doi: 10.1016/j.ajog.2013.02.007.

[23] Nwosu EC, Walkinshaw SA. Are 'customised' standards for fetal growth velocity better than 'population' standards in the detection of the growth retarded fetus? BJOG. 1998;105(4):452-5. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-0528.1998.tb10141.x.

[24] ACOG Committee on Obstetric Practice. Committee Opinion No. 728: induction of labor. Obstet Gynecol. 2017;130(2):e194-207. doi: 10.1097/AOG.0000000000002237.

[25] Rosello M, Leith C, Zogovic-Kaplan L, et al. Understanding differences in outcomes between fetal growth restriction phenotypes. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2023;228(2):181.e1-181.e10. doi: 10.1016/j.ajog.2022.07.015.

[26] Turbeville LA, Parks WT, Howell DN, et al. Villitis of unknown etiology: a placental lesion associated with recurrent reproductive loss. Hum Pathol. 1994;25(7):722-8. doi: 10.1016/0046-8177(94)90082-5.

[27] van Wyk L, Boers KE, van der Post JA, et al. Effects of calcium channel blockers during preterm labor on long-term neurodevelopmental outcome: an observational study. Early Hum Dev. 2010;86(8):491-6. doi: 10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2010.05.021.

[28] Salomon LJ, Duyme M, Crequat J, et al. Growth discrepancy between twins in the second and third trimesters: is there any association with fetal gender? Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2007;197(2):195.e1-5. doi: 10.1016/j.ajog.2007.03.079.

[29] Skupski DW, Owen J, Kim S, et al. Estimating the risk of preterm delivery using third trimester ultrasound alone in low-risk patients. Obstet Gynecol. 2008;112(3):581-8. doi: 10.1097/AOG.0b013e3181821b7f.

[30] Suzuki S, Kodama Y. Correlation between the size of fetal stomach in the third trimester and birth weight in uncomplicated singleton pregnancies. J Perinat Med. 2014;42(1):55-9. doi: 10.1515/jpm-2013-0038.

[31] Poon LC, Nicolaides KH. Early prediction of preterm birth by maternal characteristics and obstetric history. Curr Opin Obstet Gynecol. 2014;26(2):106-13. doi: 10.1097/GCO.0000000000000054.

[32] Gerson KD, Lockwood CJ. Recent clinical developments in the evaluation and management of preterm birth. Curr Opin Obstet Gynecol. 2011;23(6):399-406. doi: 10.1097/GCO.0b013e32834c1b33.

[33] Salihu HM, Shumpert MN, Slay M, Kirby RS, Alexander GR. Childbearing beyond maternal age 50 and fetal outcomes in the United States. Obstet Gynecol. 2003;102(5 Pt 1):1006-14. doi: 10.1016/s0029-7844(03)00837-7.

[34] van Baaren GJ, Vis JY, Wilms FF, et al. Predictive value of cervical length measurement and fibronectin testing in threatened preterm labor. Obstet Gynecol. 2014;123(6):1185-92. doi: 10.1097/AOG.0000000000000240.

[35] Villar J, Papageorghiou AT, Knight HE, et al. The preterm birth syndrome: a clinical classification system. Int J Obstet Gynaecol. 2012;119(8):939-45. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-0528.2012.03442.x.

[36] Srinivasan R, Jobe AH. Neural consequences of antenatal corticosteroid treatment. Semin Fetal Neonatal Med. 2013;18(4):238-45. doi: 10.1016/j.siny.2013.03.002.

[37] Nakata M, Okada T, Ueda M, Mizuno K, Hirai H. Prediction of preterm labor using rapid fetal fibronectin assay. J Obstet Gynaecol Res. 2008;34(3):336-40. doi: 10.1111/j.1447-0756.2008.00706.x.

[38] Arora N, Sadovsky Y, Dermody TS, Coyne CB. Microbial vertical transmission during human pregnancy. Cell Host Microbe. 2017;21(5):561-567. doi: 10.1016/j.chom.2017.04.007.

[39] Liu Y, Liu L, Yao L, et al. Placental microbiota in pre-eclampsia and normal pregnancy revealed by 16S rRNA sequencing. Ann Transl Med. 2019;7(10):242. doi: 10.21037/atm.2019.04.61.

[40] Goldenberg RL, Culhane JF, Iams JD, Romero R. Epidemiology and causes of preterm birth. Lancet. 2008;371(9606):75-84. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(08)60074-4.

[41] Moutquin JM. Socio-economic and psychosocial factors in the management and prevention of preterm labour. BJOG. 2003;110 Suppl 20:56-60. doi: 10.1046/j.1471-0528.2003.00023.x.

[42] Pandey S, Shetty AK, Kumar V, Shukla D. Intrauterine growth restriction: antiepileptic drug-related neurotoxicity. Indian J Pediatr. 2011;78(2):217-20. doi: 10.1007/s12098-010-0307-7.

[43] Lu MC, Halfon N. Racial and ethnic disparities in birth outcomes: a life-course perspective. Matern Child Health J. 2003;7(1):13-30. doi: 10.1023/A:1022537516969.

[44] Chauhan SP, Ananth CV, Tissera GM, et al. Perinatal morbidity and mortality among small-for-gestational-age neonates in twin gestations. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2010;202(4):381.e1-7. doi: 10.1016/j.ajog.2009.12.011.

[45] van den Bosch GE, Dirks JF, Oosterlaan J, et al. Cognitive and behavioral outcome in preterm children born small-for-gestational age: a systematic review. Early Hum Dev. 2018;127:35-47. doi: 10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2018.08.012.

[46] Andersson N, Butler WJ. Epidemiology of antenatal factors related to preterm birth. Paediatr Perinat Epidemiol. 1990;4(2):193-208. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-3016.1990.tb00712.x.

[47] Nardozza LM, Caetano AC, Zamarian AC, et al. Fetal growth restriction: current knowledge. Arch Gynecol Obstet. 2017;295(5):1061-1077. doi: 10.1007/s00404-017-4341-9.

[48] Vashevnik S, Walker S, Permezel M. Stillbirths and neonatal deaths in appropriate, small and large birthweight for gestational age fetuses. Aust N Z J Obstet Gynaecol. 2007;47(4):302-6. doi: 10.1111/j.1479-828X.2007.00745.x.

[49] MacDorman MF, Mathews TJ. Behind international rankings of infant mortality: how the United States compares with Europe. Int J Health Serv. 2009;39(4):595-611. doi: 10.2190/HS.39.4.a.

[50] Zhang J, Mikolajczyk R, Grewal J, et al. The use of customised versus population-based birthweight standards in predicting perinatal mortality. BJOG. 2011;118(8):1041-9. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-0528.2011.02927.x.

[51] Buck Louis GM, Grewal J, Albert PS, et al. Racial/ethnic standards for fetal growth: the NICHD Fetal Growth Studies. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2015;213(4):449.e1-41. doi: 10.1016/j.ajog.2015.08.032.

[52] Salomon LJ, Bernard JP, Ville Y. Reference ranges for fetal head circumference from 14 to 40 weeks' gestation. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol. 2007;29(4):356-60. doi: 10.1002/uog.3972.

[53] Normand C, Laplante DP, Kildea S, King S. Preterm birth and maternal objective stress in pregnancy: The important role of birth timing variability. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2021;18(4):1978. doi: 10.3390/ijerph18041978.

[54] Nardozza LM, Júnior EA, Rolo LC, et al. Fetal growth restriction: current knowledge to the general obstetrician. Arch Gynecol Obstet. 2017;295(5):1061-1077. doi: 10.1007/s00404-017-4341-9.

[55] Gardosi J, Francis A. Customised centile calculator-GROW-Centile v.5.15/6.6. Gestation Network. 2009. https://www.gestation.net/.

[56] Ananth CV, Peedicayil A, Savitz DA. Effect of hypertensive diseases in pregnancy on birthweight, gestational duration, and small-for-gestational-age infants. Epidemiology. 1995;6(4):391-5. doi: 10.1097/00001648-199507000-00009.

[57] Fox NS, Rebarber A, Silverstein M, et al. The association between maternal obesity and fetal abnormalities. J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med. 2012;25(3):362-6. doi: 10.3109/14767058.2011.576716.

[58] Ananth CV, Joseph KS, Oyelese Y, Demissie K, Vintzileos AM. Trends in preterm birth and perinatal mortality among singletons: United States, 1989 through 2000. Obstet Gynecol. 2005;105(5 Pt 1):1084-91. doi: 10.1097/01.AOG.0000158123.98601.e8.

[59] Lawn JE, Cousens S, Zupan J; Lancet Neonatal Survival Steering Team. 4 million neonatal deaths: when? Where? Why? Lancet. 2005;365(9462):891-900. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(05)71048-5.

[60] Goldenberg RL, Rouse DJ. Prevention of premature birth. N Engl J Med. 1998;339(5):313-20. doi: 10.1056/NEJM199807303390507.

[61] Lawn JE, Kerber K, Enweronu-Laryea C, Cousens S. 3.6 million neonatal deaths--what is progressing and what is not? Semin Perinatol. 2010;34(6):371-86. doi: 10.1053/j.semperi.2010.09.011.

[62] van Wassenaer A, Houtzager B, Petersson S, et al. Failure to reach normal intellectual development in adolescents after intrauterine growth retardation: evidence for a functional 'catch-down' deficit. Acta Paediatr. 1999;88(12):1373-9. doi: 10.1111/j.1651-2227.1999.tb01060.x.

[63] Lubchenco LO, Hansman C, Dressler M, Boyd E. Intrauterine growth as estimated from liveborn birth-weight data at 24 to 42 weeks of gestation. Pediatrics. 1963;32:793-800. doi: 10.1542/peds.2018-2018.

[64] Lackman F, Capewell V, Richardson B, da Silva O, Gagnon R. Neonatal morbidity in relation to intrauterine growth restriction and preterm delivery. J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med. 2001;10(1):41-7. doi: 10.1080/714904273.

[65] Copel JA, Bahtiyar MO. A practical approach to fetal growth restriction. Obstet Gynecol. 2014;123(5):1057-69. doi: 10.1097/AOG.0000000000000211.