The American Society for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ASGE) Technology Committee provides reviews of existing, new, or emerging endoscopic technologies that have an impact on the practice of GI endoscopy. Evidence-based methodology is used, with a MEDLINE literature search to identify pertinent clinical studies on the topic and a MAUDE (U.S. Food and Drug Administration Center for Devices and Radiological Health) database search to identify the reported complications of a given technology. Both are supplemented by accessing the “related articles” feature of PubMed and by scrutinizing pertinent references cited by the identified studies. Controlled clinical trials are emphasized, but, in many cases, data from randomized, controlled trials are lacking. In such cases, large case series, preliminary clinical studies, and expert opinions are used. Technical data are gathered from traditional and Web-based publications, proprietary publications, and informal communications with pertinent vendors.

Technology Status Evaluation Reports are drafted by 1 or 2 members of the ASGE Technology Committee, reviewed and edited by the Committee as a whole, and approved by the Governing Board of the ASGE. When financial guidance is indicated, the most recent coding data and list prices at the time of publication are provided. For this review, the MEDLINE database was searched through October 2013 for articles related to endoscopy by using the keywords “high resolution,” “high definition,” “high magnification,” and “magnifying endoscopy.”

Technology Status Evaluation Reports are scientific reviews provided solely for educational and informational purposes. Technology Status Evaluation Reports 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 or payment for such treatment.

BACKGROUND

Video endoscopy permits the endoscopist to examine GI mucosa and identify abnormal tissue. The quality of endoscopic visualization is a function of both resolution and magnification. Video resolution is defined as the ability to optically distinguish 2 closely approximated objects or points and is a function of pixel density (the number of pixels wide × the number of pixels or lines of height). High-resolution imaging improves the ability to discriminate detail, whereas magnification enlarges the image. This report reviews advances in white-light high-resolution-definition and high-magnification endoscopic imaging systems.

TECHNOLOGY UNDER REVIEW

Standard definition (SD) signals offer images in a 4:3 (width:height) aspect ratio, with image resolutions of 640 to 700 horizontal pixels (width) × 480 to 525 vertical pixels (height) or “lines” (~367,000 pixels). SD (640 × 480) displays, such as cathode-ray TVs, have approximately 300,000 pixels. SD endoscopes are equipped with charge-coupled device (CCD) chips that produce an image signal of 100,000 to 400,000 pixels, which are displayed in the SD format. Advances in CCD and, more recently, in complementary metal-oxide semiconductor (CMOS) technology have resulted in smaller chips with an increased number of pixels and increased resolution. The chips used in current high-resolution or high-definition (HD) endoscopes produce signal images with resolutions that range from 850,000 pixels to more than 1 million pixels (Table 1).

The general consensus definition of a HD image or display and the definition of high definition for the purposes of this review are one with more than 650 to 720 lines of resolution. Details of HD displays have previously been discussed in another technology committee document. Briefly, HD image displays can refresh on a line-by-line scan, which may be progressive (p) or interlaced (i). Progressive scanning provides twice the temporal resolution (60 frames/s) of interlaced scanning (30 frames/s) and is better for video display of fast-moving objects.

HD video imaging can be displayed in either TV or computer monitor formats. Broadcast HD TV is available in 3 standard formats, 720p, 1080i, and 1080p, all in a 16:9 aspect ratio. The 16:9 aspect ratio is not useful for display of images originating from round endoscopic lenses. Historically, SD endoscopic images have been displayed in a 4:3 aspect ratio to match the standard aspect ratios of SD TV. This ratio provides the highest pixel density and resolution possible, given the endoscope lens shape. HD endoscopic video chips display images in either 4:3 or 5:4 aspect ratios.

To provide true HD image resolution, each component of the system (eg, the endoscope video chip, the
processor, the monitor, and transmission cables) must be HD compatible. When the number of pixels and aspect ratio of the video source match those of the display, the highest possible image resolution or native resolution is displayed. HD processors and monitors can up-convert input image signals, such as from SD endoscopes, through pixel interpolation that may limit image quality.

Three different HD endoscope systems are currently available in the United States (Table 1). Olympus America Inc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1. High-resolution and high-magnification endoscopes available in the United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GastroScope</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympus America Inc (Center Valley, Pa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model no.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optical system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field of view, deg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of field, mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insertion section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working length, mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angulation, deg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right/left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument channel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water jet function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD format, pixels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price, US$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processor, price, US$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light source, price, US$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deg, degrees; TELE, long version; I, intermediate version; CE, contrast enhancement; NBI, narrow-band imaging; FICE, Fujinon image contrast enhancement; HD, high-definition; D, digital; O, optical.

*HD format assumes pairing with EPK-i7000 processor.

†Requires MAJ–570, which is an additional cost.
HD endoscopes were designed based on commercial availability of TVs and recorders for output onto HDTVs. The output from the endoscope is enhanced to 1080i, with an option to output in 1080p; however, the endoscopic image itself is displayed within a 1280 × 1024-pixel frame. The actual video chip specifications are proprietary. PENTAX Medical Co (Montvale, NJ) and Fujinon Inc (Wayne, NJ) HD endoscopes were designed for output.

### TABLE 1. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gastroscope</th>
<th>Colonoscope</th>
<th>Gastroscope</th>
<th>Colonoscope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PENTAX Medical Co (Montvale, NJ)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fujinon Inc (Wayne, NJ)</strong></td>
<td><strong>PENTAX Medical Co (Montvale, NJ)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fujinon Inc (Wayne, NJ)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG 2990i</td>
<td>EC 3890Li</td>
<td>EG 590 WR</td>
<td>EC 590 ZW/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG 2790i</td>
<td>EC 3490Li</td>
<td>EG 590ZW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4–100</td>
<td>4–100</td>
<td>4–100</td>
<td>3–100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1050</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210/120</td>
<td>180/180</td>
<td>210/90</td>
<td>180/180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120/120</td>
<td>160/160</td>
<td>100/100</td>
<td>160/160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-Scan</td>
<td>i-Scan</td>
<td>FICE</td>
<td>FICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920 × 1080i</td>
<td>1920 × 1080i</td>
<td>1280 × 1080i</td>
<td>1280 × 1080i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D, ×2</td>
<td>D, ×2</td>
<td>D, ×2</td>
<td>D, ×2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>43,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **EPK-i5010** | **EPK-i7000** | **EPK-i5010** | **EPK-i7000** | **EPX 4440HD** | **EPX 4440HD** | **EPX 4440HD** |
| EPK-i5010 | EPK-i7000 | EPK-i5010 | EPK-i7000 | EPX-4440HD | EPX-4440HD | EPX-4440HD |

(Center Valley, Pa) HD endoscopes were designed based on commercial availability of TVs and recorders for output onto HDTVs. The output from the endoscope is enhanced to 1080i, with an option to output in 1080p; however, the endoscopic image itself is displayed within a 1280 × 1024-pixel frame. The actual video chip specifications are proprietary. PENTAX Medical Co (Montvale, NJ) and Fujinon Inc (Wayne, NJ) HD endoscopes were designed for output.
onto monitors for computer display. The first Fujinon CCD chips were 1077\times C2.788 pixels (\approx 850,000 pixels), and their output was equivalent to extended graphics array monitors (1024 \times 728 pixels),\(^1\) but current endoscopes have an output of 1280 \times 960 pixels. The actual resolution of the video chip is proprietary. The newer processors enhance the image to 1080i. The PENTAX video chip is 1920 \times C2.1080 pixels (\approx 2 million pixels) and displays at native resolution.

HD video chips have lower light sensitivities because of the smaller size of their pixels compared with SD video chips. Hence, for optimal illumination, the standard light source for HD endoscopy is a 300-W xenon lamp. The digital output from the processors requires HD serial digital interface cables for HDTV displays or digital video interface cables for computer monitors.

High-magnification endoscopes are defined by the capacity to perform optical zoom by using a movable lens in the tip of the endoscope. A translucent cap on the tip of the endoscope may be used to stabilize the focal length between the lens and the target tissue to improve image quality.\(^4\) Optical zoom obtains a magnified image of the target while maintaining image display quality. This is distinguished from electronic or digital magnification, which simply enlarges the image on the display, with a consequent decreased pixel density and decreased image quality. With the proper processor, conventional endoscopes permit a digital magnification of 1.5x to 2x. Although standard endoscopes magnify images 30 to 35 times, zoom endoscopes can optically magnify images up to 150 times, depending on the size of the monitor (Tables 1 and 2). All 3 companies have zoom endoscopes available in the United States, with combined optical and digital zoom (Table 1). Newer Olympus endoscopes have a feature called near-focus imaging (using a variable focus lens system) that allows the endoscope to be moved closer (within 2-6 mm) to the area of interest while maintaining the image in focus. Other Olympus zoom endoscopes reported in the literature are not commercially available in the United States (Table 2).

### EFFICACY AND COMPARATIVE STUDIES

The review that follows focuses on HD/magnification systems. However, most studies evaluating image-enhanced endoscopy in GI lesion detection and classification have combined HD magnification endoscopy with dye-based or electronic chromoendoscopy. It is therefore difficult to establish the independent effect of HD/magnification endoscopy in the observed results. Dye-based and electronic chromoendoscopy are reviewed in other Technology Committee documents.\(^5,6\)

### TABLE 2. High-resolution and high-magnification endoscopes not available in the United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model no.</th>
<th><strong>Gastroscope</strong></th>
<th><strong>Colonoscope</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insertion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tube outer</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diameter, mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>length, mm</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>1030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel inner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diameter, mm</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional CE</td>
<td>NBI</td>
<td>NBI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnification</td>
<td>(\times 80)</td>
<td>(\times 85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD format, pixels</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>HD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(L\), Long version; \(I\), intermediate version; \(CE\), contrast enhancement; \(NBI\), narrow-band imaging; \(FICE\), Fujinon image contrast enhancement; \(HD\), high-definition; \(D\), digital; \(O\), optical; \(SD\), standard definition.
Esophagus

There have been multiple attempts with magnification endoscopy and mucosal enhancement to identify mucosal patterns that accurately predict the presence of Barrett’s esophagus, with or without dysplasia. There are 3 commonly used magnification HD narrow-band imaging (NBI) classification systems; Kansas, Nottingham, and Amsterdam, which have similar degrees of accuracy and interobserver agreement. An initial study using indigo carmine staining reported 4 different mucosal surface patterns associated with Barrett’s esophagus as opposed to small round and straight pits, which were associated with gastric epithelium. An additional report described 4 different mucosal surface patterns enhanced by SD magnification endoscopy and acetic acid (type I, round; type II, reticular; type III, villous without pits; and type IV, ridged). Type III and IV patterns were associated with Barrett’s epithelium. Another report of the use of indigo carmine staining along with magnification endoscopy described 3 distinct patterns: ridged and/or villous, circular, and irregular and/or distorted. Barrett’s epithelium was most commonly identified in patients with the ridged-villous pattern, whereas high-grade dysplasia was found entirely within mucosa with the irregular-distorted pattern. A study with magnification endoscopy and acetic acid identified 3 mucosal patterns (type 1, normal; type 2, slit reticular; and type 3, gyrus-villous), with Barrett’s epithelium correlating with type 3. However, all of the existing classifications require a learning process for the endoscopist. A significant limitation of these classification systems is their inter- and intraobserver variability. Three studies that used NBI and SD magnification endoscopy reported success in identifying intestinal metaplasia based on different types of capillary and fine mucosal patterns.

A randomized, crossover trial compared SD magnification endoscopy and acetic acid–guided biopsies with SD conventional endoscopy and random 4-quadrant biopsies. Diagnostic yield in the detection of Barrett’s esophagus increased 1.4-fold to 1.6-fold when using magnifying endoscopy with acetic acid. However, it is difficult to determine the independent contribution of magnification endoscopy in this improved detection. Furthermore, magnification endoscopy has not uniformly been shown to be better than conventional endoscopy at detecting intestinal metaplasia.

A randomized, blinded, tandem trial by Wolfsen et al comparing HD-NBI targeted biopsy with SD-WLE targeted plus random biopsy demonstrated higher per-patient yield for dysplasia (57% vs 43%), higher grades of dysplasia (18% upstaged by HD-NBI, P < .001), and fewer biopsies (4.7 vs

| TABLE 2. Continued |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PENTAX Medical Co (Montvale, NJ)</th>
<th>Fujinon Inc (Wayne, NJ)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gastroscope</strong></td>
<td><strong>Colonoscope</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG 29-110</td>
<td>EG 27-110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG 600WR</td>
<td>EC 590WM2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1050</td>
<td>1050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-Scan</td>
<td>i-Scan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D, ×2</td>
<td>D, ×2; O, ×136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920 × 1080</td>
<td>1920 × 1080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPK-i5010</td>
<td>EPK-i5010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG 17000</td>
<td>EPK-i7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICE</td>
<td>FICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD/1080p</td>
<td>HD/HDTV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPX</td>
<td>EPX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4440HD</td>
<td>4440HD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
higher proportion of areas with dysplasia (30% vs 21%, biopsies per patient (3.6 vs 7.6, tecting intestinal metaplasia as HD-WLE. NBI allowed fewer suggest that NBI with targeted biopsies is as effective in de-
col with targeted biopsies by using NBI alone. The results
blinded study investigated the difference between HD
white-light endoscopy and biopsies per the Seattle proto-
8.5, \( P < .001 \)) required with HD-NBI. A recent randomized, blinded study investigated the difference between HD
endoscopy and biopsies per the Seattle protocol with targeted biopsies by using NBI alone. The results
suggest that NBI with targeted biopsies is as effective in
detecting intestinal metaplasia as HD-WLE. NBI allowed fewer
biopsies per patient (3.6 vs 7.6, tecting intestinal metaplasia as HD-WLE. NBI allowed fewer
biopsies per patient (3.6 vs 7.6,

There are limited data regarding magnification endoscopy
in small-bowel disease, although there are some promising reports suggesting advantages in targeting
biopsies in patients with celiac sprue or malabsorption.\(^{37-40}\) One study of 34 patients with either celiac or tropical
sprue found that SD magnification chromoendoscopy identified villous atrophy better than did standard endos-
copy and therefore helped to target biopsies.\(^{37}\) A study
of 191 patients showed that HD magnification endoscopy
had a 95% sensitivity, 99% specificity, 95% positive predic-
tive value, and 99% negative predictive value to detect the
presence of any villous abnormality.\(^{40}\) A recent article re-
ported on the utility of magnification endoscopy combined
with indigo carmine chromoendoscopy in celiac disease. It
showed increased accuracy of diagnosis in a subgroup of
patients with difficult-to-diagnose disease as long as they
were treatment naive.\(^{41}\)

**Colon**

HD and high-magnification endoscopy have been exam-
ined as tools to enhance detection and classification of
colonic neoplasia, including flat or depressed lesions. Chro-
moendoscopy has been used as an adjunct in this
effort. Kudo et al\(^{42,43}\) proposed 5 major pit patterns to
differentiate non-neoplastic, neoplastic, and malignant
polyps. This classification system yielded a high level of in-
ter- and intra-observer agreement.\(^{44,45}\)

There are large cases series that report the utility of using
magnification colonoscopy and pit-pattern analysis to
differentiate neoplastic and non-neoplastic lesions,\(^{46,47}\)
including flat or depressed lesions.\(^{48,49}\) Three studies
found that SD magnification chromocolonoscopy is more
accurate than nonmagnification chromocolonoscopy in
differentiating adenomas from hyperplastic polyps. A pro-
spective trial randomized 660 patients to magnification
chromocolonoscopy (indigo carmine) or conventional
chromocolonoscopy.\(^{49}\) The accuracy of magnification
chromocolonoscopy when using the Kudo pit pattern sys-
tem to distinguish neoplastic from non-neoplastic lesions
was significantly higher than for nonmagnification chro-
moendoscopy (92% vs 68%). The higher accuracy of
magnification chromocolonoscopy over conventional chro-
moendoscopy was validated in a further 500-patient study.\(^{50}\)
Another study compared the diagnostic accuracy of
differentiating neoplastic from non-neoplastic lesions
by conventional colonoscopy, chromocolonoscopy with
indigo carmine, and SD magnification chromocolonoscopy.
All lesions were sequentially evaluated by all 3 methods.\(^{51}\)
M magnification chromocolonoscopy was found to have
a significantly higher accuracy compared with either chro-
moendoscopy (95.6 % vs 89.4%, \( P = .015 \)) or conve-
tional colonoscopy without indigo carmine (95.6% vs
84%, \( P = .0001 \)). Prospective studies demonstrated that
high magnification NBI was more accurate than conven-
tional colonoscopy and was equivalent to magnification
chroendoscopy in differentiating between neoplastic
and non-neoplastic colonic lesions.\(^{52,53}\) The Kudo system,
which was originally developed for chroendoscopy,
was recently modified for NBI.\(^{54-56}\)

**Stomach**

The use of chromoendoscopy or NBI with magnification
doscopy has primarily been used for the evaluation of
eye gastric cancers before endoscopic resection, but sur-
ronding gastritis can compromise specificity.\(^{27-30}\) Early ad-
enocarcinomas were noted to have irregular, tortuous
capillaries compared with adenomatous, hyperplastic, or
ormal mucosa. There were differences noted between
rounded- and depressed-type lesions.\(^{27}\) A feasibility study
examined the effect of magnification endoscopy and i-Scan electronic chromoendoscopy (PENTAX Medical) in
gastric neoplasia and found improvement in image quality
without clear diagnostic benefit.\(^{51}\) The importance of de-
tecting early lesions and establishing depth of invasion
based on mucosal patterns would help to stratify between
surgical or endoscopic resection.\(^{29,32}\) Mucosal pit patterns
may also be useful for identifying *Helicobacter pylori–*
duced gastritis,\(^{30,33,34}\) intestinal metaplasia,\(^{35,36}\) and
gastric atrophy,\(^{33,36}\) with good inter- and intraobserver
agreement.\(^{35,36}\) These data are primarily from Asian or Por-
tuguese studies, and the generalizability to lower preva-
ience regions is unclear.

**Small intestine**

There are limited data regarding magnification endosco-
py in small-bowel disease, although there are some
promising reports suggesting advantages in targeting
Application of magnification endoscopy for adenoma detection

In an older randomized trial, HD (850,000 pixels) chromocolonoscopy (with indigo carmine) was compared with conventional colonoscopy in the detection of adenomas in high-risk patients. The number of lesions detected was the same between the HD colonoscope without tissue staining and the standard colonoscope. More hyperplastic polyps and flat adenomas were detected by using tissue staining and HD colonoscopes than when using standard colonoscopes alone, but the total number of adenomas (the primary endpoint) was the same between the 2 groups. The investigators concluded that HD chromocolonoscopy was not required for routine care.

In a more recent study comparing HD colonoscopy alone with HD chromocolonoscopy, a moderate increase in the detection of flat and small adenomas was seen. HD chromocolonoscopy detected significantly more flat adenomas, adenomas smaller than 5 mm per patient, and non-neoplastic polyps per patient compared with HD colonoscopy alone. Another prospective, cohort study showed similar adenoma detection rates between HD colonoscopy alone and HD colonoscopy with i-Scan–based electronic chromocolonoscopy. HD colonoscopy was also found to increase the detection rate of right-sided, flat, and all adenomas compared with SD colonoscopy in a randomized, controlled trial. A meta-analysis indicated that HD colonoscopy resulted in a 3.5% increase in the detection of adenomas with the number needed to treat for identifying an additional patient with an adenoma of 28.

Magnification chromoendoscopy has been reported to be useful in predicting histology and invasive depth of cancer, although the sensitivity may be low. Magnification colonoscopy with NBI has also shown promise in predicting histology and depth of invasion. Ultimately, magnification colonoscopy with tissue stains or NBI may help to direct endoscopic therapy (eg, EMR) and to assess the completeness of the resection.

HD magnification colonoscopy has also been studied in ulcerative colitis, typically with chromocolonoscopy. A recent trial demonstrated a threefold increase in dysplasia detection on targeted biopsies when comparing HD colonoscopy with SD white-light examination in patients with chronic colonic inflammatory bowel disease. A randomized, controlled trial demonstrated that SD magnification colonoscopy with methylene blue was better than magnification colonoscopy alone for identifying intraepithelial neoplasia. HD magnification with NBI may be useful in detecting dysplasia in patients with ulcerative colitis. However, one study noted that active mucosal inflammation may interfere with the accuracy of magnification chromocolonoscopy in the detection of neoplasia. In small studies, magnification chromocolonoscopy was also used to assess disease severity and may even predict relapse, but these findings require confirmation.

SAFETY

There have been no reports of adverse events from the HD or magnification features of endoscopes.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

The costs of equipment available in the United States are included in Table 1. The financial burden of converting to HD imaging systems requires updating the entire endoscopy unit, including monitors, processors, and endoscopes, and, if desired, peripherals (eg, recorders or printers). There are at present no Current Procedural Terminology codes (American Medical Association, Chicago, Ill) for HD or magnification endoscopy. There has been no formal cost-effective analysis of using HD magnification chromoendoscopy. The impact on endoscopy-unit efficiency has not been examined.

AREAS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Further refinement of current classification systems for GI mucosal abnormalities found on HD and magnification endoscopy is needed. The new standards need to be simple enough for clinical use and reliable interobserver interpretation. Data on the accuracy of HD magnification endoscopes available in the United States for GI mucosal lesion detection and classification are needed. Further studies that examine the value of HD magnification endoscopes compared with tissue biopsy are required, with reference to the ASGE Preservation and Incorporation of Valuable endoscopic Innovation (PIVI) thresholds.

SUMMARY

HD and high-magnification endoscopy, with or without mucosal enhancement techniques, enable detailed visualization of GI mucosa. These new endoscopic systems help to improve detection and classification of GI mucosal lesions and also help minimize biopsies by allowing better targeting. These new endoscopes have played a role in the evolution of targeted endoscopic therapy for early GI neoplastic lesions.
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