Diagnostic and therapeutic recommendations in pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma. Recommendations of the Working Group of the Polish Pancreatic Club

Katarzyna Winter[1], Renata Talar-Wojnarowska[1], Andrzej Dąbrowski[2], Małgorzata Degowska[3], Marek Durlik[4], Anita Gąsiorowska[5], Stanisław Głuszek[6], Grażyna Jurkowska[2], Aleksandra Kaczka[7], Paweł Lampe[8], Tomasz Marek[9], Anna Nasierowska-Guttmejer[10], Ewa Nowakowska-Duława[9], Grażyna Rydzewska[3], Janusz Strzelczyk[11], Zbigniew Śledziński[12], Ewa Małecka-Panas[1]

[1]Department of Digestive Tract Diseases, Medical University of Lodz, Lodz, Poland
[2]Department of Gastroenterology and Internal Medicine, Medical University of Bialystok, Bialystok, Poland
[3]Clinical Department of Internal Medicine and Gastroenterology with Inflammatory Bowel Disease Unit, Central Clinical Hospital of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and Administration, Warsaw, Poland
[4]Department of Gastroenterological Surgery and Transplantation Medicine, Central Clinical Hospital of the Ministry of the Internal Affairs and Administration, Warsaw, Poland
[5]Department of Gastroenterology, Medical University of Lodz, Lodz, Poland
[6]Department of Surgery and Surgical Nursing with the Scientific Research Laboratory, Institute of Medical Sciences, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Jan Kochanowski University, Kielce, Poland
[7]Department of Clinical Nutrition and Gastroenterological Diagnostics, Medical University of Lodz, Lodz, Poland
[8]Department of Gastrointestinal Surgery, School of Medicine, Medical University of Silesia, Katowice, Poland
[9]Department of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Medical University of Silesia, Katowice, Poland
[10]Pathology Department, Jan Kochanowski University, Kielce, Poland
[11]Department of Transplant and General Surgery, Medical University of Lodz, Lodz, Poland
[12]Department of General, Endocrine and Transplant Surgery, Medical University of Gdansk, Gdansk, Poland

Address for correspondence: Ewa Małecka-Panas MD, PhD, AGAF, Department of Digestive Tract Diseases, Medical University of Lodz, 22 Kopcinskiego St, 90-153 Lodz, Poland, phone: +48 602 614 528, +48 42 677 66 64, fax: +48 678 64 80

Abstract

These recommendations refer to the current management in pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma (PDAC), a neoplasia characterised by an aggressive course and extremely poor prognosis. The recommendations regard diagnosis, surgical, adjuvant and palliative treatment, with consideration given to endoscopic and surgical methods. A vast majority of the statements are based on data obtained in clinical studies and experts' recommendations on PDAC management, including the following guidelines: International Association of Pancreatology/European Pancreatic Club (IAP/EPC), American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO), European Society for Medical Oncology (ESMO), National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) and Polish Society of Gastroenterology (PSG) and The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). All recommendations were voted on by members of the Working Group of the Polish Pancreatic Club. Results of the voting and brief comments are provided with each recommendation.

2

K. Winter, R. Talar-Wojnarowska, A. Dąbrowski, M. Degowska, M. Durlik, A. Gąsiorowska, S. Głuszek, G. Jurkowska, A. Kaczka,
P. Lampe, T. Marek, A. Nasierowska-Guttmejer, E. Nowakowska-Duława, G. Rydzewska, J. Strzelczyk, Z. Śledziński, E. Małecka-Panas

Introduction

Diagnostics and treatment of pancreatic cancer represent a great challenge for contemporary medicine. Year by year, the incidence of pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma (PDAC) is increasing. Currently, pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma is the 12th most common malignancy which occurs worldwide [1]. Its incidence is as follows: 8–12.5/100 000 males and 6–7/100 000 females. It mostly affects populations in the developed countries: the Unites States, Europe (mostly Central and Northern), Australia and Argentina [2, 3].

Pancreatic cancer is highly malignant, characterised by rapid local progression and formation of distant metastases. Due to its aggressive course, late diagnosis and resistance to treatment, PDAC represents the cancer with the lowest survivability. Currently, it occupies 4th place with regard to malignancy-related mortality (7% of deaths) [3].

The most common management of early stage PDAC is radical surgery. However, upon making the diagnosis, surgical treatment of the carcinoma can be implemented only in 9.7% of cases [4]. In the event of a tumour involving only the pancreas, the 5-year survival is 32%; for tumours infiltrating nearby structures, the survival is 12% and for PDAC with distant metastases it is only 3% [3]. The overall 5-year survival for pancreatic cancer is up to 8% [3].

If we do not improve the diagnostics of PDAC in its early stage and implement adequate therapy, we can estimate that in 2020, this malignancy will become the 2nd cause of mortality of all neoplasms [5]. Early detection of this disease and implementation of adjuvant therapy are options which may improve the disease management.

Intensive studies on improving the survival of pancreatic cancer patients have been conducted for many years. The studies involve searching for new mechanisms of carcinogenesis as well as specific diagnostic and prognostic markers, improving surgical techniques and implementing new methods of adjuvant therapy. Unfortunately, the results of clinical studies published between the years 1986 and 2016 indicate that the median overall survival for this carcinoma increased by only 3 months [6].

Guideline development methods

This study contains 25 statements regarding diagnostics and therapy as well as palliative management in pancreatic cancer. The vast majority of these statements are based on data obtained in clinical studies and experts' recommendations on management of pancreatic cancer. The level of acceptance of the statements was determined on the basis of results of voting, carried out by the Polish Pancreatic Club Expert Working Group. The acceptance level for each statement was expressed in a five-step scale, presented in Table I. Next, the researchers determined the reliability of the clinical studies on which they based the statements, as presented in Table II.

Recommendations on the diagnostics of pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma (PDAC)

> 1. Patients who demonstrated pancreatic focal lesions, confirmed with imaging techniques, should be referred to reference centres for further diagnostics. Assessment I – 100% full acceptance, data reliability C

Decisions on a diagnosis and tumour resectability should be made in reference centres, offering appropriate diagnostic methods, including e.g. multidetector-row computed tomography and endoscopic ultrasound with fine-needle aspiration biopsy. Details regarding elective treatment should be discussed conjointly by specialists in gastroenterology, radiology, pathology and oncology.

Implementation of imaging examinations according to the pancreatic protocol in a high-volume reference centre improves preoperative evaluation of the disease stage, which allows its management to be modified in the majority of patients with PDAC (56%). Therefore, in high-quality reference centres, repeated CT according to the pancreatic protocol and evaluated by radiologists experienced in pancreatic imaging is recommended [7].

Table I. Five-step scale

Category	Acceptance level
I	Full acceptance
II	Acceptance with minor reservation
III	Acceptance with major reservation
IV	Rejection with minor reservation
V	Full rejection

Table II. Scale of evidence

Category	Data reliability
A	High (based on meta-analyses and randomised clinical trials)
B	Moderate (based on clinical studies and observational studies)
C	Low (mainly based on expert opinions)

Diagnostic and therapeutic recommendations in pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma. Recommendations of the Working Group
of the Polish Pancreatic Club

3

> 2. In the event of clinical suspicion of pancreatic adenocarcinoma, ultrasound of the abdominal cavity is not recommended in diagnostics and evaluation of disease progression. Assessment I – 76.5%, II – 23.5%, moderate acceptance, data reliability C

Ultrasound (US) represents the common preliminary screening examination in abdominal symptoms diagnostics. Its common use is caused by the fact that US is widely accessible, non-invasive and cost-effective. In this examination, performed for other indications, not infrequently focal pancreatic lesions are detected, including relatively early changes, requiring further diagnostics. On the other hand, many such lesions are benign.

Pancreatic adenocarcinoma, in its early stage, is asymptomatic or its symptoms are atypical. Hence, the disease is usually diagnosed in its advanced stage. Due to its limitations, US is not recommended to detect PDAC or to evaluate the disease progression [8–10]. The sensitivity of the examination is highly operator-dependent and ranges between 67% and 90% [11]. The examination poorly visualises the body and tail of the pancreas, particularly in obese patients. It enables, however, one to visualise a hypoechogenic mass, dilatation of the main pancreatic and bile duct, the enlarged pancreatic head and metastases to the liver – changes which require further, more accurate diagnostics [10, 12]. Ultrasound poorly visualises the topography of changes, their localization related to the surrounding organs, and the degree of local progression, and does not show small abnormalities (< 2 cm). Overall, transabdominal US is an acceptable first imaging method, although not reliable for a confident diagnosis or the exclusion of small pancreatic tumours, which are the only ones with a chance for cure.

> 3. For diagnostic purposes and in order to evaluate the degree of progression of PDAC, a contrast-enhanced computed tomography (CT) scan of the abdominal cavity and pelvis according to the pancreatic protocol is recommended, and in unclear cases, magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) is also advisable. Assessment I – 100% strong acceptance, data reliability B

According to the pancreatic protocol, multidetector-row contrast-enhanced CT of the abdominal cavity should be performed in each patient suspected with PDAC in order to evaluate the disease progression [9, 13–16].

Spiral tomography, preferably with the application of a 64-row or above scanner, with slice thickness up to 3 mm, should be performed [9, 15, 17]. Both a neutral oral contrast agent (e.g. water) and an intravenous iodinated contrast agent at a dose of 3–5 ml/s are recommended. The two-phase technique includes the pancreatic parenchymal phase (40 to 50 s after contrast administration) and the portal venous phase (after 65 to 70 s). This pancreatic protocol allows for making an appropriate evaluation of morphological, arterial, venous and extrapancreatic changes, which is crucial to determine the disease progression [17].

The sensitivity of multidetector-row CT in pancreatic cancer detection is high, i.e. 89–97%, but lower for smaller (< 1.5 cm) lesions – 67% [12, 18, 19]. An extensive meta-analysis comparing various imaging techniques in PDAC revealed the sensitivity and specificity of CT of 89% and 90%, respectively, which were equivalent to those of MRI [20].

The PDAC is usually visualised in a CT scan as a lesion poorly demarcated and poorly enhanced after contrast application, and therefore hypodense in scans of the arterial phase. In delayed scans, it can become isodense [15]. Changes which might imply suspicion of PDAC also include (from the lowest to the highest specificity): pancreatic duct dilatation (sensitivity 50% and specificity 78%), hypo-attenuation (sensitivity 75% and specificity 84%), ductal interruption (sensitivity 45% and specificity 82%), distal pancreatic atrophy (sensitivity 45% and specificity 96%), pancreatic contour anomalies (sensitivity 15% and specificity 92%) and common bile duct dilatation (sensitivity 5% and specificity 92%) [21].

The CT is also crucial in evaluation of the disease stage and prediction of tumour unresectability. This examination allows one to accurately determine the size of the tumour, its localization, infiltration of large vessels, involvement of lymph nodes and presence of distant metastases [9, 22]. Recent studies indicate that sensitivity of CT in determining tumour unresectability ranges from 52% to 91%, and specificity from 92% to 100% [22].

The MRI is recommended in patients with strong suspicion of pancreatic neoplasm and uncertain results of a CT scan [23–25]. In most MRI examinations, PDAC is seen as a hypointense lesion, both in T1- and T2-weighted images [25]. Sensitivity and specificity of MRI in detection and evaluation of progression of the disease is comparable to those obtained in CT, i.e. 89% and 89%, respectively [20]. Therefore, MRI is not widely used as the primary imaging modality in most centres due to issues of its high cost and relatively low availability [9].

K. Winter, R. Talar-Wojnarowska, A. Dąbrowski, M. Degowska, M. Durlik, A. Gąsiorowska, S. Głuszek, G. Jurkowska, A. Kaczka,
P. Lampe, T. Marek, A. Nasierowska-Guttmejer, E. Nowakowska-Duława, G. Rydzewska, J. Strzelczyk, Z. Śledziński, E. Małecka-Panas

> 4. Positron emission tomography (PET) is not applied in PDAC diagnostics as it does not differentiate this disease from chronic pancreatitis. This examination can be used in selected clinical cases in order to detect distant metastases or cancer recurrence. Assessment I – 82.4%, II – 17.6%, moderate acceptance, data reliability C

The PET-CT is an imaging technique which combines functional PET imaging with anatomical images of CT [16]. Fluorodeoxyglucose 18F (18F-FDG), a glucose analogue, is the most commonly applied radiotracer. PDAC is in most cases associated with overexpression of glucose 1, which is demonstrated by increased uptake of 18F-FDG in PET-CT results [26]. This technique sensitivity ranges from 85% to 95% and specificity 61% to 94% in PDAC detection [27]. A great advantage of visualising a patient's anatomy by PET-CT is that it allows one to see the whole body, which is helpful in evaluation of the stage of metastatic disease. A meta-analysis showed that the sensitivity of a 18-FDG PET examination in PDAC diagnostics and evaluation of metastases to lymph nodes and the liver was 91%, 64% and 67% respectively, and specificity 81%, 81% and 96%, respectively [28]. Unlike other imaging techniques, PET allows for monitoring after chemotherapy, and detection of recurrence of malignancies as well as distant neoplastic metastases, particularly to the bones [29, 30].

The main limitation of this technique is the low spatial resolution and possibility of false-positive uptake in healthy structures or mild disturbances, such as inflammatory processes [31]. This examination does not differentiate inflammatory changes from malignant tumours because both conditions manifest with increased accumulation of the tracer. As a diagnostic tool, PET-CT is similar to CT and does not bring any further benefits [32, 33].

Currently, according to the NCCN guidelines, PET-CT is recommended as a complementary examination for CT in patients with borderline resectable disease, with a high CA19-9 level, in large primary tumours or large regional lymph nodes [9].

On the other hand, a combination of PET and MRI reveals higher sensitivity than PET-CT in detection of PDAC due to better resolution in visualization of soft tissues and more accurate visualization of the pancreatic duct [34, 35]. A PET-MRI scan is much more reliable than a PET-CT scan – respectively 96.6% vs. 86.6% [35]. In the event of cystic tumours, PET-MRI enables one to detect also structures located inside lesions, such as mural nodules or intracystic septa.

It can be concluded that currently PET-CT plays no role in standard PDAC diagnostics, but can be applied as a complementary examination in selected cases, e.g. for the purpose of diagnosing distant metastases and recurrence of neoplastic process [9].

> 5. Endoscopic ultrasound (EUS) with fine-needle aspiration biopsy is a recommended diagnostic method in PDAC. Biopsy is not required in patients with resectable PDAC but indicated in candidates for chemo- or chemoradiotherapy, including neoadjuvant therapy. Histopathological samples have to be analysed by an experienced pathologist. Assessment I – 100% strong acceptance, data reliability B

Endoscopic ultrasound is recommended as one of the most accurate methods for the detection of pancreatic focal lesions [36–39]. In the diagnostics of pancreatic tumours, this method is more sensitive than CT, particularly for small lesions of diameter smaller than 2 cm [12, 40–43]. In EUS, PDAC is usually visualised as a poorly outlined, non-homogeneous hypoechogenic mass [12].

Endoscopic ultrasound is indicated in tumour staging, particularly in patients with an unclear result of a CT examination [9]. The EUS is the most reliable examination evaluating local PDAC progression, particularly infiltration of large visceral vessels and lymph node involvement [9, 39, 44]. Sensitivity and specificity for prediction of tumour resectability are 90% and 86%, respectively [39, 44].

Endoscopic ultrasound with fine-needle aspiration biopsy (EUS-FNA) allows for PDAC diagnosis with accuracy of about 96%, sensitivity 85–95% and specificity 95–99% [38, 41, 45–49]. The EUS-FNA is required in patients considered for chemo- or chemoradiotherapy in order to obtain the cytopathological diagnosis [9, 16]. Biopsy is also indicated in tumours of unclear nature, with no malignancy suspicion, i.e. inflammatory or neuroendocrine tumours. In EUS, iodine contrasting agents are not applied, which is an advantage, particularly in patients with renal failure or allergies.

According to the guidelines of the European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ESGE), published in 2017, it is recommended to use 25-gauge or 22-gauge needles for routine collection of biological material from solid tumours and lymph nodes [50]. Use of both needles for cytological (FNA) and histological material (fine needle biopsy – FNB) collection are being recommended [50]. For the purpose of tissue biopsy collection, it is advisable to use the following needles: 19-gauge FNA or FNB or 22-gauge FNB. If it is not possible to conduct the cytological material analysis immediately after EUS-FNA, it is recommended to perform three or four biopsies with FNA needles or two or three biopsies with an FNB needle [50].

Diagnostic and therapeutic recommendations in pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma. Recommendations of the Working Group of the Polish Pancreatic Club

5

It should be pointed out that this procedure is invasive and there is a possibility, however minimal, of complications, such as pain (0.38%), bleeding (0.10%), fever (0.08%), infection (0.02%) and acute pancreatitis (0.44%) [51, 52]. Routine antibiotic prophylaxis before the biopsy of solid lesions and lymph nodes is not required [50].

> **6. Failure to obtain the histological confirmation of malignant neoplasm does not exclude it; therefore in those cases the surgical treatment of potentially resectable lesions should not be delayed. Assessment I – 100% strong acceptance, data reliability A**

Histological confirmation of malignant neoplasm is not required for resectable tumours [9, 10, 16]. Identification of the tumour pathology is necessary in patients with locally advanced and metastatic PDAC – prior to implementation of neoadjuvant therapy or palliative chemo- or chemoradiotherapy [9, 10, 16].

In most cases, a histopathological diagnosis is made based on the post-operative or biopsy specimen evaluation. A histopathological analysis of post-operative material allows for identification of the histopathological type, its local progression and grade. The PDAC grows in a highly dispersed fashion, which makes macroscopic and histopathological identification of the tumour margins difficult. Thus both performing a radical resection and obtaining its histopathological evaluation are difficult [53, 54]. An accurate identification of the margin status of a surgical resection specimen is crucial because it bears a significant prognostic value and allows one to select those patients who will most benefit from the adjuvant therapy [55].

> **7. Percutaneous ultrasound/CT-guided pancreatic biopsy is not recommended in patients with potentially resectable PDAC. In comparison to EUS-guided biopsy, this procedure is less safe and the risk of cancer cells seeding along the needle path is higher. Assessment I – 100% strong acceptance, data reliability B**

Percutaneous ultrasound-guided pancreatic biopsy allows one to detect PDAC with 92–98.7% accuracy; the sensitivity is 94–98.7% and specificity is 97%, whereas the accuracy in a EUS-guided biopsy is about 96%, sensitivity is 85–95% and specificity is 95–100% [38, 41, 45–49, 56–62].

Percutaneous pancreatic biopsy, in comparison to a EUS-guided biopsy, bears a higher risk of complications, equal to 0.8–1.6%, including serious complications, such as pseudoaneurysm and acute pancreatitis [57, 60]. The EUS-guided biopsy, in comparison to the percutaneous technique, carries a low risk of cancer cells seeding, since the potential dissemination site along the needle path is limited to the area of the surgical resection [51, 52, 63, 64].

Percutaneous CT-guided pancreatic biopsy is characterised by low sensitivity, equal to 88.8%, specificity 100% and accuracy 90%. The percentage of complications is high, ranging from 9% to 20% [65, 66]. The procedure entails a lot of technical problems and is rarely performed.

Percutaneous biopsy of PDAC may be performed only for unresectable lesions or if EUS is not available. Percutaneous biopsy of metastatic lesions in the liver is recommended for metastatic PDAC and may be sufficient for revealing the tumour pathology.

> **8. CA19-9 antigen is a recognized PDAC marker. It is not useful for either early diagnostics or screening. Nevertheless, it may be useful as a prognostic and predictive PDAC marker. Assessment I – 88.2%, II – 11.8%, moderate acceptance, data reliability B**

CA19-9 antigen, determined in the blood serum, is the most common marker applied in PDAC diagnostics [67–70]. An increased level of CA19-9 can be observed in 75–85% of PDAC patients. The sensitivity and specificity of CA19-9 in PDAC detection in symptomatic patients is respectively 79–81% and 82–90% [10, 71].

In early stages of PDAC, the marker CA19-9 is usually not elevated. Thus, this marker does not appear to be useful in early diagnostics or PDAC screening [8, 71]. In most cases, an increased serum level of CA19-9 serum indicates advanced malignancy and its increased preoperative level is associated with worse post-operative prognosis [16, 72–74]. The level of serum CA19-9 above 100 U/ml increases the possibility that PDAC is unresectable, highly advanced and metastatic [71]. A cohort study recently published in the United States, conducted in PDAC patients in the years 2004–2012 confirmed that the level of CA19-9 > 800 U/ml before the treatment was associated with advanced PDAC and indicated shorter survival [75].

The marker may be useful in the evaluation of treatment efficacy (predictive value) because a post-operative CA19-9 decrease and normalization after implementation of adjuvant therapy are associated with better prognosis [76–78]. It was shown that a low postoperative level of CA19-9 < 90 U/ml was associated with a better response to gemcitabine adjuvant chemotherapy and higher median survival [79].

According to the ESMO guidelines, in patients with a high preoperative CA19-9 level, after the operation, this marker should be monitored every 3 months for 2 years along with an abdominal CT scan every 6 months. Then, an increased level of the marker will have prognostic value and allow one to identify patients with disease progression [16].

Management of PDAC

> 9. The decision on the management of PDAC should be taken by a multi-specialist team (gastroenterologist, surgeon, radiologist, oncologist and pathologist) in a high-level reference centre. Assessment I – 100% strong acceptance, data reliability C

A decision on the management of PDAC should be taken by a multidisciplinary specialist team, consisting of a gastroenterologist, surgeon, radiologist, pathologist and oncologist [13, 80]. The therapeutic management should be consulted with the patient and accepted by him after he/she has obtained detailed information on the degree of disease progression, types of available therapies, their benefits and complications [8].

The PDAC patients should be operated on in high-level reference centres [8]. Interdisciplinary management of PDAC appeared to have modified therapeutic recommendations for almost every fourth patient [81].

> 10. Radical surgery is the only effective method of PDAC treatment and it should be performed in high-volume centres, by surgeons well experienced in pancreatic surgery. Assessment I – 100% strong acceptance, data reliability C

Primary surgical resection of the primary tumour and regional lymph nodes is recommended for patients with potentially curable pancreatic cancer with no clinical evidence for metastatic disease and a performance status and comorbidity profile appropriate for a major abdominal operation.

Radical resection of a pancreatic malignant tumour is feasible only in 20% of patients [8]. The type of surgery depends on the location of the tumour. In the case of pancreatic head tumour, Kausch-Whipple pancreato-duodenectomy or Traverso-Longmire pylorus-preserving pancreatoduodenectomy with lymphadenectomy is performed [82]. A large literature review was published in 2016, comparing those two operation techniques, considering survival, postoperative mortality, complications and postoperative quality of life, and no significant differences were found [82]. Tumours localized in the pancreatic body or tail require distal pancreatectomy, including the resection of the body and the tail of pancreas and the spleen. In some multi-focal tumours total pancreatectomy is carried out [83].

According to the NCCN guidelines, criteria for tumour resectability include absence of distant metastases, no tumour contact with the superior mesenteric vein and/or portal vein in imaging examinations or ≤ 180° contact without vein contour irregularity and no arterial tumour contact (celiac axis, superior mesenteric

artery or common hepatic artery) (all criteria must be fulfilled). These criteria are presented in Table III [9].

Involvement of lymph nodes in patients with operable PDAC is a significant prognostic factor [84]. Studies confirmed that extended lymphadenectomy, compared to the standard one, is not beneficial in terms of survival, complications number, postoperative mortality or the quality of life [85]. Hence, extended lymphadenectomy is not currently recommended [13].

Reference centres experienced in performing pancreatic resections, achieve the best treatment results [84, 86–88]. High-volume centres have reported decreased complication and postoperative mortality rates, shorter hospital stay, lower cost and longer postoperative stay compared with low-volume institutions [84]. Studies show that the centres performing less than 5 pancreatic procedures per year, in comparison to those performing at least 40 pancreatic procedures per year, have significantly higher mortality rates [89].

In 2016, results of a population study on all patients who underwent surgical treatment of pancreatic cancer in Italy, between 2010 and 2012, were published [88]. The probability of performing palliative surgery in Italian hospitals was much higher in low-level reference centres than in high-level centres [88]. One reason for such a difference might be the poor quality of CT scans obtained in smaller hospitals as well as their evaluation by less experienced radiologists.

Nevertheless, the long-term results of surgical treatment of PDAC are not satisfactory yet. In patients who underwent radical surgery, the median overall survival is 14–17 months, and 5-year survival is observed in only 10–27% [8, 9, 90–93].

> 11. Obtaining R0 resection is crucial for survival. Assessment I – 100% strong acceptance, data reliability A

The aim of surgical therapy is to obtain a radical resection which is microscopically free from disease, i.e. R0 resection. A macroscopically clear resection is defined as R0 if there are no tumour cells within 1 mm of any surface in the pathologic examination. If one or more tumour cells are visible within 1 mm of any surface, we obtain R1 resection [55]. R2 resection is defined as macroscopically incomplete. Obtaining R0 resection is the basic factor affecting the prognosis [8]. In the event of involvement of the portal vein or the superior mesenteric vein, a radical resection with reconstruction of those vessels is feasible. Such a procedure is not associated with higher morbidity or mortality, but then R0 resection is obtained less frequently and the survival is poor, probably due to the tumour's inherent aggressiveness.

Diagnostic and therapeutic recommendations in pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma. Recommendations of the Working Group of the Polish Pancreatic Club

7

Table III. Criteria defining respectability status according to NCCN guidelines [9]

Resectability status	Arterial	Venous
Resectable	No arterial tumour contact (celiac axis (CA), superior mesenteric artery (SMA) or common hepatic artery (CHA))	No tumour contact with the superior mesenteric vein (SMV) or portal vein (PV) or ≤ 180° contact with vein contour irregularity
Borderline resectable	Pancreatic head/uncinate process: • Solid tumour contact with CHA without extension to CA or hepatic artery bifurcation allowing for safe and complete resection and reconstruction • Solid tumour contact with the SMA of < 180° • Solid tumour contact with variant arterial anatomy (e.g. accessory right hepatic artery, replaced right hepatic artery, replaced CHA, and the origin of replaced or accessory artery) and the presence and degree of tumour contact should be noted if present as it may affect surgical planning Pancreatic body/tail: • Solid tumour contact with the CA of < 180° • Solid tumour contact with the CA of > 180° without involvement of the aorta and with intact and uninvolved gastroduodenal artery permitting modified Appleby procedure (some panel members prefer these criteria to be in the unresectable category)	• Solid tumour contact with the SMV or PV > 180°, contact of ≤ 180° with contour irregularity of the vein or thrombosis of the vein but with suitable vessel proximal or distal to the site of involvement allowing for safe and complete resection and vein reconstruction • Solid tumour contact with the inferior vena cava (IVC)
Unresectable	• Distant metastases (including non-regional lymph node metastases) Pancreatic head/uncinate process: • Solid tumour contact with the SMA of > 180° • Solid tumour contact with the CA of > 180° Pancreatic body/tail: • Solid tumour contact of > 180° with the SMA or CA • Solid tumour contact with the CA and aortic involvement	Pancreatic head/uncinate process: • Unreconstructible SMV/PV due to tumour involvement or occlusion (can be due to tumour or bland thrombus) • Contact with the most proximal draining jejunal branch into SMV Pancreatic body/ tail: • Unreconstructible SMV/PV due to tumour involvement or occlusion (can be due to tumour or bland thrombus)

In 561 surgically treated PDAC patients subsequently subjected to adjuvant therapy, longer median survival was obtained in cases with R0 resection compared to others. Moreover, a multifactor analysis confirmed the significant prognostic value of the resection [94].

> **12. Neoadjuvant therapy (induction) is not recommended in resectable tumours but can be implemented in selected cases. Assessment I – 94.1%, II – 5.9%, strong acceptance, data reliability B**

Administration of neoadjuvant therapy in resectable PDAC is controversial due to conflicting data regarding its effectiveness [95].

In recent years, more and more patients have been administered preoperative systemic chemotherapy alone or in combination with radiotherapy. The main aim of the therapy is to extend the survival period in patients, by means of tumour size reduction and obtaining R0 resection [96–98].

Currently, there are no clear recommendations regarding administration of a particular chemotherapeutic drug in neoadjuvant therapy [10]. The majority of patients who undergo neoadjuvant chemotherapy or radiotherapy are administered oral or intravenous drugs for a period of 3–6 months prior to the operations [99].

Neoadjuvant therapy in resectable PDAC should be considered in patients whose condition or concomitant diseases, potentially reversible, do not allow for performing prompt surgery, in large tumours, in cases with high levels of CA19-9 and in patients with extreme pain [8].

In patients with primarily resectable PDAC, the frequency of resections and post-neoadjuvant therapy survival are similar to those after tumour resection and adjuvant therapy [99].

> **13. In borderline resectable PDAC, we should consider combined neoadjuvant (induction) chemotherapy with or without radiotherapy, and next, after exclusion of disease progression based on imaging examinations – surgery. Assessment I – 100% strong acceptance, data reliability B**

K. Winter, R. Talar-Wojnarowska, A. Dąbrowski, M. Degowska, M. Durlik, A. Gąsiorowska, S. Głuszek, G. Jurkowska, A. Kaczka, P. Lampe, T. Marek, A. Nasierowska-Guttmejer, E. Nowakowska-Duława, G. Rydzewska, J. Strzelczyk, Z. Śledziński, E. Małecka-Panas

8

The role of neoadjuvant therapy in patients with borderline resectable PDAC is well documented [9]. This treatment aims at reducing the tumour size, diminishing the disease stage and increasing the chance of obtaining R0 resection. Before implementation of induction treatment, histopathological identification of the neoplasm is required [9]. The definition of borderline resectable PDAC, according to the most recent NCCN guidelines, is presented in Table III [9].

In 2016, the results of a meta-analysis of 18 clinical studies, conducted from 1966 to 2015, regarding implementation of neoadjuvant therapy in patients with borderline resectable PDAC, were published [100]. It was concluded that the overall percentage of resections and R0 resections and the estimated survival period of patients with borderline resectable PDAC after neoadjuvant therapy are similar to those in patients with resectable PDAC. The percentage of patients who were administered induction therapy, and subsequently underwent an operation, ranges from 385 to 80.8% with the percentage of R0 resection up to 75–100% [101–105].

There are numerous retrospective analyses of various options of induction treatment, including chemo- and chemoradiotherapy in borderline resectable PDAC, confirming high efficacy of this kind of treatment and good tolerance [101–106].

According to the ESMO guidelines, a patient with borderline resectable PDAC should be included in chemotherapy clinical trials whenever possible. If those are unavailable, gemcitabine-based chemotherapy or FOLFIRINOX-based chemotherapy, being a combination of 5-fluorouracil (5-FU) and leucovorin (calcium folinate), irinotecan and oxaliplatin, should be administered. Subsequently chemoradiotherapy and then surgery appear to be the best option [16]. The role of radiation therapy, the duration of chemotherapy and the optimal regimen of systemic therapy remain to be elucidated.

Recently, neoadjuvant therapy has been applied also in locally advanced pancreatic adenocarcinoma, followed by surgical treatment. In 2016, a meta-analysis of 325 patients, gathered from 12 studies, with locally advanced PDAC, was conducted. Implementation of the FOLFIRINOX therapy resulted in resections, which were performed in 28% of patients. R0 resection was carried out in 78.4% of the patients who underwent operations [97]. It is estimated that about one third of patients with an initially unresectable neoplasm will develop resectable tumours after neoadjuvant therapy, with a survival period comparable to that in initially resectable tumours. Thus, patients with locally unresectable neoplasm should be included in neoadjuvant protocols and then reassessed for resection [99].

> **14. After R0 and R1 resections of PDAC, in the event of no preoperative treatment (neoadjuvant), adjuvant chemotherapy (complementary) is recommended. Implementation of adjuvant chemoradiotherapy is still controversial. Assessment I – 94.1%, II – 5.9% strong acceptance, data reliability B**

Adjuvant therapy is applied after a radical surgical procedure in order to decrease the risk of local recurrence or to prevent distant metastases, and as a consequence, extend overall survival [8].

Many prospective, randomized studies have revealed that adjuvant therapy, implemented after a radical PDAC resection, extends patients' survival in comparison to the surgery alone [107–111].

According to the ASCO, NCCN and ESMO guidelines, if neoadjuvant therapy has not been implemented in resectable PDAC, adjuvant chemotherapy should be initiated within 8–12 weeks following the operation. Therapeutic options are: 6-month gemcitabine monotherapy or therapy with 5-FU and leucovorin [8–10, 16].

Implementation of adjuvant chemoradiotherapy in resectable PDAC is still controversial [8, 9, 16]. It was previously confirmed that implementation of chemoradiotherapy with chemotherapy does not improve survival and is more toxic than chemotherapy alone [112, 113]. Recently, some studies confirmed that in resectable PDAC, adjuvant chemoradiotherapy is more useful than adjuvant chemotherapy [114–117].

According to the ASCO guidelines, adjuvant chemoradiotherapy can be considered in patients who did not receive neoadjuvant treatment, in the event of positive resection margin (R1), occurrence of metastases to lymph nodes and after administering 4–6-month adjuvant chemotherapy [8]. In the ESMO guidelines it is stated that no chemoradiation should be given to patients after surgery except in clinical trials.

> **15. In the event of diagnosing local recurrence, chemotherapy, chemoradiotherapy, or a combination of both are indicated. In the event of generalized recurrence, following PDAC resection, chemotherapy is indicated. Assessment I – 100% strong acceptance, data reliability B**

In the event of PDAC recurrence after a radical surgical procedure, management of the disease depends on the time elapsed since the systemic therapy, conducted within adjuvant or neoadjuvant therapy. If the disease recurred not later than 6 months following the chemotherapy treatment, the patient is administered different drugs than before (the second-line chemotherapy). If the disease recurred later than 6 months following the

Diagnostic and therapeutic recommendations in pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma. Recommendations of the Working Group of the Polish Pancreatic Club

9

systemic treatment, the same therapy can be repeated or the patient can be administered alternative chemotherapy. If local recurrence or distant metastases are detected, a biopsy may be required in order to confirm the recurrence. In a local recurrence without distant metastases, chemoradiotherapy can be implemented, provided it has not been administered before or systemic chemotherapy. In the event of occurrence of distant metastases with or without local recurrence, the patient receives maintenance therapy [9].

> **16. Routine preoperative insertion of biliary stents in patients with PDAC is not recommended since it does not improve the complication or post-resection mortality rate. Assessment I – 100% strong acceptance, data reliability B**

Routine pre-operative stenting of the biliary tract in patients with potentially resectable PDAC is not indicated because it increases the percentage of complications, including inflammation of the biliary tract, serious intra-abdominal infections and post-operative pancreatic fistula [10, 118–120]. On the other hand, stenting should be considered in active inflammation of the biliary tract, extensive hepatic damage, severe skin itchiness or when the surgery has to be delayed over 2 weeks [16]. Metal stents applied in the procedure of pre-operative stenting of the biliary tract are more effective than plastic stents due to the lower number of repeated endoscopic interventions [121, 122]. In addition, the incidence of post-operative pancreatic fistula is lower for metal than plastic stents [121, 122]. Studies which reveal no significant differences between these two procedures were also published [123].

The procedure of endoscopic stenting of the biliary tract significantly outperforms the percutaneous method in terms of patient tolerability and effectiveness of the therapy [10].

Palliative treatment

> **17. Chemotherapy is a treatment of choice for locally advanced PDAC. Application of chemoradiotherapy is currently recommended by some groups of experts. Assessment I – 100% strong acceptance, data reliability C**

Chemotherapy is a treatment of choice for locally advanced PDAC [9, 16, 124]. Definition of unresectable PDAC, according to the most recent NCCN guidelines, is presented in Table III [9].

The type of administered chemotherapeutic drug is still controversial [10, 124]. According to the ESMO guidelines, 6-month gemcitabine therapy is recommended [16], whereas, according to the NCCN guidelines, patients in good general condition should be administered the FOLFIRINOX programme or gemcitabine monotherapy or in combination with other cytostatics, e.g. with albumin-bound paclitaxel, erlotinib, capecitabine or cisplatin (only for known BRCA1/2 mutations) [9]. Patients in poor general condition should be administered gemcitabine or capecitabine or 5-FU monotherapy or maintenance treatment alone [9]. Gemcitabine chemotherapy (if fluoropyrimidine was previously applied) or fluoropyrimidine chemotherapy (if gemcitabine was previously applied) is recommended as the second-line therapy.

According to the ESMO guidelines, chemoradiotherapy in locally advanced PDAC is only rarely advisable and it may be used in combination with capecitabine. According to the NCCN and ASCO guidelines, it can be considered in the event of local progression after induction chemotherapy, and if there are no distant metastases [9, 124]. Also, chemoradiotherapy can be applied in patients who responded to preliminary 6-month chemotherapy or have stable disease or have developed unacceptable chemotherapy-related toxicities [124].

> **18. In disseminated PDAC, chemotherapy apart from symptomatic treatment is a treatment of choice. Assessment I – 100% strong acceptance, data reliability A**

Chemotherapy, apart from maintenance treatment, is a treatment of choice in disseminated PDAC. For decades, gemcitabine was a standard of care for first line treatment of unresectable and metastatic PDAC. In 2007 erlotinib with gemcitabine was approved, but more recently FOLFIRINOX and gemcitabine with nab-paclitaxel have become the two upfront standards of the care regimen [9, 125]. The patient's condition is a factor determining the choice of therapy. The treatment basically aims at extending the patient's life and relieving symptoms of the advanced neoplastic disease. Patients in good general condition most benefit from systemic therapy. Such patients are administered more aggressive treatment strategies which contribute to longer overall survival. Patients in poor general condition, demonstrating intense symptoms of neoplastic disease, require less aggressive treatment, which should focus more on relieving bothersome symptoms of the disease [125].

In patients in good general condition, more aggressive treatment, consisting of the FOLFIRINOX programme or gemcitabine in combination with nab-paclitaxel (albumin-bound paclitaxel), should be used. This formulation of paclitaxel increases the drug concentration in pancreatic cancer cells by 30%.

Application of FOLFIRINOX extends the median overall survival, free from progression, despite an increase in toxicity. However, this treatment is associated with considerable toxicity [9, 10, 16, 125]. In the first-line treatment, patients in good general condition can also be administered gemcitabine in combination with other cytostatics or targeted drugs (erlotinib, capecitabine, cisplatin) and gemcitabine, capecitabine or 5-FU monotherapy.

Patients who are in poor general condition are administered gemcitabine monotherapy or maintenance treatment alone. In the second-line treatment, patients are administered either 5-FU or capecitabine-related programmes if they were previously treated with gemcitabine or programmes based on gemcitabine if the patients previously received 5-FU, capecitabine or maintenance therapy. Very recently combination of nanoliposomal encapsulation of irinotecan, and 5-FU, folinic acid can be offered to the patients with first line treatment with gemcytabine plus NAB-paclitaxel [9, 16]. No data regarding the third-line therapy are available in professional literature [9, 10, 16, 97, 125].

A programme set forth by the Ministry of Health in Poland is available. The programme concerns the therapy of disseminated PDAC with albumin-bound nab-paclitaxel in combination with gemcitabine. Patients who cannot be treated with FOLFIRINOX and fulfil other criteria, i.e. normal hepatic and renal function, low bilirubin and creatinine levels and haemoglobin level equal or higher than 10 g/dl, may be qualified for this programme [126].

> **19. Mechanical jaundice in patients with inoperable PDAC is an indication for the procedure of stenting the biliary tract during endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP), EUS-guided choledochoduodenostomy or percutaneous drainage of the biliary tract when endoscopic treatment is not possible. Assessment I – 100% strong acceptance, data reliability B**

Patients with inoperable pancreatic cancer and biliary tract obstruction undergo ERCP with insertion of stents into the biliary tract. Coated metal self-expanding stents are recommended because they contain a special coating to prevent stent occlusion [9, 13, 127, 128]. Commonly used plastic stents have a narrower lumen than metal ones and require frequent replacement, every 3–4 months, due to their occlusion. However, unlike metal stents, they have hooks at their ends to prevent their migration [128].

If the ERCP procedure is not feasible, EUS-guided endoscopic drainage or percutaneous drainage of the biliary tract should be considered. It is possible to perform endoscopic drainage of the extrahepatic and intrahepatic biliary ducts, through the stomach or duodenum. The method should be adjusted to the particular patient, depending on anatomical conditions. It should be pointed out that endoscopic drainage of the biliary tract requires considerable experience from an endoscopist and is associated with a high risk of complications: 3.4–38.6% [129]. On the other hand, the incidence of complications of percutaneous drainage of the biliary tract may be higher than that of EUS-guided technique [130].

Patients with mechanical jaundice, in whom the tumour was intraoperatively unresectable, may also undergo the procedure of common bile duct (choledochojejunostomy) or common hepatic duct (hepaticojejunostomy) bypassing anastomosis with the intestine [13, 118]. An alternative method is gall bladder and jejunum anastomosis (cholecystojejunostomy), easier from the technical point of view and possible to perform laparoscopically [118]. Nevertheless, ERCP with insertion of stents into the biliary tract, in comparison with surgical procedures, is associated with a smaller number of complications, shorter hospitalization period, better quality of life of the patients and lower costs [131].

> **20. Duodenal occlusion in patients with inoperable PDAC is an indication for a surgical bypassing anastomosis or endoscopic implantation of a metal self-expandable prosthesis. Assessment I – 100% strong acceptance, data reliability C**

Duodenal occlusion occurs in about 10–25% of pancreatic cancer patients and is caused by an infiltration of the coeliac plexus and impaired motoric activity of the stomach and duodenum, tumour pressure or direct duodenum infiltration [101, 132–134].

According to the ESMO guidelines, a procedure of endoscopic insertion of a metal self-expandable stent prosthesis in the stenosis is a preferred management method in duodenal stenosis [16, 134]. Endoscopic procedures are characterized by high therapeutic effectiveness, a low morbidity rate and low costs in comparison to surgical methods [134]. Biliary tract occlusion, requiring percutaneous or endoscopic drainage in 40% of patients, is a common problem, occurring during the procedure of duodenal stenting [132, 135]. One way of avoiding this complication is placing a stent in the main biliary duct before duodenal stenting [136]. Insertion of the prosthesis to the duodenum is associated with a risk of complications, including intestinal perforation, bleeding, inappropriate stent position and/or migration or fistula formation [132, 136].

However, according to the NCCN guidelines, in occlusion in patients with life expectancy over 3–6 months, laparoscopic or open gastrointestinal anastomosis should be performed. Similarly, patients with

Diagnostic and therapeutic recommendations in pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma. Recommendations of the Working Group of the Polish Pancreatic Club

11

inoperable tumour, confirmed at laparotomy, without current occlusion but with at a higher risk of occlusion, can be offered the prophylactic bypassing anastomosis [9, 133]. In the most recent NICE guidelines, the proposed management is similar [13]. A surgical procedure is still effective and represents the best therapeutic tool in properly selected patients. Patients not qualified for a surgical procedure may undergo endoscopic techniques [133].

> **21. Pain is observed in most patients with advanced PDAC and analgesic treatment should be conducted according to the analgesic ladder. Assessment I – 100% strong acceptance, data reliability B**

Upon PDAC diagnosis, over 50% of patients experience pain [137, 138]. The pain is mostly localized in the epigastrium, umbilical and frequently in the lumbar area. It is a cachexia-producing symptom which negatively affects the quality of life of patients. Pain in pancreatic cancer has three components: coeliac, somatic and neuropathic [138].

In most cases PDAC-related pain is controlled by oral pharmacological treatment. Pharmacological treatment of pain is conducted according to the analgesic ladder based on the World Health Organization (WHO) guidelines. In the first stage, the patient is administered non-steroid anti-inflammatory drugs. If they appear to be ineffective, the patient receives drugs of the second level of the analgesic ladder, including weak opioids (codeine, dihydrocodeine, tramadol). If the weak opioids, applied in maximum doses, are ineffective, they are replaced with strong opioids, which include morphine, oxycodone, fentanyl and buprenorphine (stage III) [139, 140]. Morphine is commonly applied to control chronic neoplasm-related pain, particularly in moderate and severe pain [138, 139]. It should be emphasized that opioid use is associated with severe side effects, such as sedation, respiratory depression, pruritus, nausea and constipation [138].

Antidepressants (amitriptyline, sertraline) as well as antiepileptic drugs (gabapentin, pregabalin, carbamazepine, valproic acid) are auxiliary agents in treating neuropathic pain [140–142]. For coeliac pain, steroids proved to be particularly useful. They inhibit synthesis of prostaglandins, a precursor of the inflammatory state cascade, and decrease vascular permeability, thus decreasing the tissue oedema [143].

One method of relieving pain and improving the quality of life is the implantation of a prosthesis in the pancreatic duct, improving its patency, which completely eases the pain in 60% of patients or at least partly alleviates it in 25% [144, 145].

> **22. EUS-guided celiac plexus neurolysis is moderately effective in alleviating pancreatic pain. Nevertheless, it should be considered in patients with poor opioid tolerance or limited response to pharmacotherapy. Assessment I – 100% strong acceptance, data reliability C**

In persistent pain unresponsive to pharmacological treatment or in patients with poor opioid tolerance, celiac plexus neurolysis may be considered [146–149]. Decreased visceral plexus conduction may be obtained by blocking it with EUS-guided local injection of alcohol, phenol, bupivacaine or steroid in the coeliac plexus region [9, 13, 150].

Studies reveal that the effectiveness of EUS-guided neurolysis in reducing PDAC pain is 70–80% which endures for a limited time [150, 151]. Surgery-related complications include transient pain exacerbations, hypotension, diarrhoea and inebriation. Most of the complications are not severe, but at times serious adverse effects are observed, such as bleeding in the extraperitoneal space, abscess and ischaemic complications [151].

Such management most often decreases pain but does not eliminate it completely. Hence, most of the patients still require analgesics [10].

> **23. Supplementation with pancreatic enzymes is not recommended in PDAC, unless exocrine pancreatic insufficiency has been diagnosed. Assessment I – 94.1%, II – 5.9%, strong acceptance, data reliability C**

Exocrine pancreatic insufficiency occurs in 68% to 92% of PDAC patients before and in 80% of PDAC patients after surgery [152]. In the event of symptoms of exocrine pancreatic insufficiency, the therapy involves supplementation with pancreatic enzymes [9, 152]. The aim of the pancreatic enzyme therapy is to restore normal fat absorption by providing a sufficient amount of active lipase in the duodenum and the proximal jejunum simultaneously with the release of nutrients from the stomach [153].

Exocrine insufficiency leads to malabsorption syndrome, which causes fatty stools, weight loss and undernutrition. It is associated with a deficit of fat-soluble vitamins (vitamins A, D, E and K), magnesium, calcium and essential fats and amino acids [152].

According to the NCCN guidelines, supplementation should be administered only in the event of symptoms of pancreatic insufficiency [9], whereas according to the most recent NICE guidelines, supplementation should be applied prior to and after PDAC resection [13]. However, fatty diarrhoea is a late symptom of exocrine pancreatic insufficiency and many patients demonstrate serious malabsorption, weight loss and undernutrition

12

K. Winter, R. Talar-Wojnarowska, A. Dąbrowski, M. Degowska, M. Durlik, A. Gąsiorowska, S. Głuszek, G. Jurkowska, A. Kaczka,
P. Lampe, T. Marek, A. Nasierowska-Guttmejer, E. Nowakowska-Duława, G. Rydzewska, J. Strzelczyk, Z. Śledziński, E. Małecka-Panas

not accompanied with any abdominal symptoms [154]. Evaluation of the symptoms alone does not allow one to exclude pancreatic insufficiency. Hence, only a combined evaluation of the symptoms, nutrition state and appropriate tests may provide a reliable assessment of the exocrine function of the pancreas [154]. Determination of faecal elastase concentration is widely used for exocrine pancreatic insufficiency estimation [155].

In clinical practice, administration of replacement therapy with pancreatic enzymes is difficult because their optimal dose is highly variable, depending on the remaining active pancreatic parenchyma, postoperative anatomy and fat content in the diet. Patients after pancreatic resection are routinely recommended to take pancreatic enzymes at initial doses of 75,000 lipase units with main meals and between 25,000 and 50,000 units with snacks [154]. Patients who have undergone extensive pancreatic resection should be individually evaluated for exocrine pancreatic insufficiency in the postoperative period. Patients who will not respond to supplementation with pancreatic enzymes should be referred to a dietician, informed of the requirement to adjust doses and undergo examinations in order to exclude other gastrointestinal pathologies, including small intestinal bacterial overgrowth (SIBO) and bile acid malabsorption [154].

Screening examinations

24. Patients who are in high risk groups of PDAC – with hereditary pancreatitis, congenital syndrome with high risk of pancreatic cancer (HNPCC, Peutz-Jeghers syndrome, FAMMM, congenital breast and ovarian cancer) and family history of pancreatic cancer (occurrence of the cancer in at least two family members) – require monitoring in reference centres. Annual EUS scan and serum CA19-9, starting at the age of 35, are recommended. Assessment I – 100% strong acceptance, data reliability C

Genetic disorders characterised by an increased risk of PDAC include Lynch syndrome (HNPCC), familial adenomatous polyposis (FAP), Peutz-Jeghers syndrome, familial atypical multiple mole melanoma (FAMMM), hereditary breast and ovarian cancer (HBOC), Fanconi anaemia, Hippel-Lindau disease, Li-Fraumeni syndrome and ataxia telangiectasia [156–159]. Patients from high risk groups of PDAC require monitoring in reference centres and a multidisciplinary approach.

Presence of a mutated PRSS1 gene in a patient with chronic pancreatitis (CP) is identified with an occurrence of hereditary pancreatitis. If the mutation respon-

sible for hereditary pancreatitis has not been confirmed, recurrent acute pancreatitis (AP) or CP of unknown etiology observed in two first-degree relatives or in three second-degree relatives, in at least two generations, is a proof of hereditary pancreatitis [160]. It was revealed that patients with hereditary pancreatitis are at increased risk of pancreatic cancer. In children and young adults, the risk of developing PDAC is almost zero; it rapidly increases about the age of 50 and at 80 years its percentage reaches 40% [161].

Patients who do not meet the above criteria but more than one relative of the same generation is affected by CP are diagnosed with familial pancreatitis [161]. This type of pancreatitis occurs in about 3–10% of patients affected by pancreatitis [162, 163]. Familial occurrence of pancreatitis refers to families where at least two first-degree relatives were diagnosed with pancreatitis with no genetic syndrome occurring [164].

All patients with a positive history of hereditary pancreatitis should undergo genetic tests. According to the guidelines of the American College of Gastroenterology, genetic tests conducted in patients with suspicion of familial pancreatitis should include the following mutations: BRCA1 and BRCA 2, CDKN2A, PALB2 and ATM [156].

According to the most recent guidelines on chronic pancreatitis of the Working Group of the National Consultant for Gastroenterology and the Polish Pancreatic Club, patients with hereditary pancreatitis family history of pancreatitis should each year undergo an EUS examination, and have serous CA19-9 marker determined, starting at the age of 35 [165].

According to the guidelines of the American College of Gastroenterology, screening for PDAC in patients with confirmed mutations characteristic for genetic syndromes should involve conducting EUS or MRI of the pancreas each year, starting at age 50 or 10 years prior to the earliest occurrence of pancreatitis in the family [166]. Patients with Peutz-Jeghers syndrome should start screening at age 35. According to the same guidelines, due to a lower risk of PDAC in family members with the confirmed mutations BRCA1, BRCA2, PALB2, ATM and LS, the screening should be limited to mutation carriers and to first- or second-degree relatives of PDAC patients [156].

According to the NICE guidelines, screening for PDAC is recommended in patients with hereditary pancreatitis and PRSS1, BRCA1, BRCA2, PALB2 or CDKN2A (p16) mutations as well as in patients with Peutz-Jeghers syndrome who have at least one relative with PDAC [13]. It should also be considered in subjects who have two or more first-degree relatives with PDAC, in Lynch syndrome (mutations: MLH1, MSH2, MSH6 or PMS2) and other first-degree relatives of a pancreatic cancer

Diagnostic and therapeutic recommendations in pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma. Recommendations of the Working Group
of the Polish Pancreatic Club

13

patient. In such a group of patients, the NICE guidelines recommend performing MRI/MRCP (magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography) or EUS of the pancreas. In patients with hereditary pancreatitis and PRSS1 mutation, it is recommended to conduct contrast-enhanced abdominal CT according to the pancreatic protocol [13].

> **25. Non-genetically related chronic pancreatitis (PC) is not an indication for routine examinations for potential detection of PDAC. Assessment I – 82.4%, II – 17.6%, moderate acceptance, data reliability C**

Long-term chronic pancreatitis (CP) is a significant factor of PDAC development [167–169]. In patients with CP, the risk of PDAC increases 14-fold [168]. It increases with the disease duration and reaches about 2% after 10 years after its onset and about 4% after 20 years. The incidence of PDAC as a consequence of chronic pancreatitis is 5% [168]. The percentage is higher (40–55%) in patients affected by hereditary pancreatitis [161, 170, 171]. According to the most recent guidelines of the Working Group of the National Consultant for Gastroenterology and the Polish Pancreatic Club on chronic pancreatitis, long-lasting, non-genetically related chronic pancreatitis is not an indication for routine examinations for potential detection of PDAC. However, in the event of occurrence of new worrying symptoms in patients with CP, it is crucial to conduct an adequate diagnostics [165].

Conclusions

Improving survival in PDAC is strongly needed but still not achieved. Recent scientific advantages targeting the stroma, immune system and blocking different signalling pathways provided some optimism in this area. Wide use of new biomarkers, a personalized approach and surrogate endpoints may also help in improving the therapeutic efficacy. Nevertheless, survival in PDAC remains poor and extensive patient enrolment in clinical trials is encouraged with the hope of improved outcomes from novel therapeutic regimens.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Ferlay J, Soerjomataram I, Ervik M, et al. Cancer incidence and mortality worldwide: sources, methods and major patterns in GLOBOCAN 2012. Int J Cancer 2015; 136: 359-86.
2. Didkowska J, Wojciechowska U, Olasek P. Cancer in Poland in 2015. Krajowy Rejestr Nowotworów. Warsaw 2017.
3. American Cancer Society. 2018 [cited May 26, 2018]. In: Cancer Statistics Center [Internet]. Available at: https://cancer-statisticscenter.cancer.org.
4. National Cancer Institute. 2018 [cited May 26, 2018]. In: Pancreatic Cancer Cancer Stat Facts [Internet]. Available at: https://seer.cancer.gov.
5. Pancreatic Cancer Action Network. The alarming rise of pancreatic cancer deaths in The United States: Why we need to stem the tide today, 2012. Available at http://www.pancan.org.
6. Hall BR, Cannon A, Atri P, et al. Advanced pancreatic cancer: a meta-analysis of clinical trials over thirty years. Oncotarget 2018; 9: 19396-405.
7. Walters DM, Lapar DJ, de Lange EE, et al. Pancreas-protocol imaging at a high-volume center leads to improved preoperative staging of pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma. Ann Surg Oncol 2011; 18: 2764-71.
8. Khorana AA, Mangu PB, Berlin J, et al. Potentially curable pancreatic cancer: American Society of Clinical Oncology Clinical Practice Guideline. J Clin Oncol 2017; 35: 2324-8.
9. National Comprehensive Cancer Network. NCCN Guidelines Version 2.2018 Pancreatic Adenocarcinoma. Available at: http://www.nccn.org.
10. Takaori K, Bassi C, Biankin A, et al. International Association of Pancreatology (IAP)/European Pancreatic Club (EPC) consensus review of guidelines for the treatment of pancreatic cancer. Pancreatology 2016; 16: 14-27.
11. Săftoiu A, Vilmann P. Role of endoscopic ultrasound in the diagnosis and staging of pancreatic cancer. J Clin Ultrasound 2009; 37: 1-17.
12. Pietryga JA, Morgan DE. Imaging preoperatively for pancreatic adenocarcinoma. J Gastrointest Oncol 2015; 6: 343-57.
13. O'Reilly D, Fou L, Hasler E, et al. Diagnosis and management of pancreatic cancer in adults: a summary of guidelines from the UK National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Pancreatology 2018; 18: 962-70.
14. Zhang L, Sanagapalli S, Stoita A. Challenges in diagnosis of pancreatic cancer. World J Gastroenterol 2018; 24: 2047-60.
15. Al-Hawary MM, Francis IR, Chari ST, et al. Pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma radiology reporting template: consensus statement of the Society of Abdominal Radiology and the American Pancreatic Association. Radiology 2014; 270: 248-60.
16. Ducreux M, Cuhna AS, Caramella C, et al.; the ESMO Guidelines Committee. Cancer of the pancreas: ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines for diagnosis, treatment and follow-up. Ann Oncol 2015; 26 (Suppl. 5): v56-68.
17. Horvat N, Ryan DE, LaGratta MD, et al. Imaging for pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma. Chin Clin Oncol 2017; 6: 62.
18. Wong JC, Lu DS. Staging of pancreatic adenocarcinoma by imaging studies. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol 2008, 6: 1301-8.
19. Legmann P, Vignaux O, Dousset B, et al. Pancreatic tumors: comparison of dual-phase helical CT and endoscopic sonography. AJR Am J Roentgenol 1998; 170: 1315-22.
20. Treadwell JR, Zafar HM, Mitchell MD, et al. Imaging tests for the diagnosis and staging of pancreatic adenocarcinoma: a meta-analysis. Pancreas 2016; 45: 789-95.
21. Ahn SS, Kim MJ, Choi JY, et al. Indicative findings of pancreatic cancer in prediagnostic CT. Eur Radiol 2009; 19: 2448-55.

22. Tamm EP, Balachandran A, Bhosale PR, et al. Imaging of pancreatic adenocarcinoma: update on staging/resectability. Radiol Clin North Am 2012; 50: 407-28.

23. Park HS, Lee JM, Choi HK, et al. Preoperative evaluation of pancreatic cancer: comparison of gadolinium-enhanced dynamic MRI with MR cholangiopancreatography versus MDCT. J Magn Reson Imaging 2009; 30: 586-95.

24. Schima W, Függer R. Evaluation of focal pancreatic masses: comparison of mangafodipir-enhanced MR imaging and contrast-enhanced helical CT. Eur Radiol 2002; 12: 2998-3008.

25. Wang Y, Miller FH, Chen ZE, et al. Diffusion-weighted MR imaging of solid and cystic lesions of the pancreas. Radiographics 2011; 31: 47-64.

26. Reske SN, Grillenberger KG, Glatting G, et al. Overexpression of glucose transporter 1 and increased FDG uptake in pancreatic carcinoma. J Nucl Med 1997; 38: 1344-8.

27. Wang XY, Yang F, Jin C, et al. Utility of PET/CT in diagnosis, staging, assessment of resectability and metabolic response of pancreatic cancer. World J Gastroenterol 2014; 20: 15580-9.

28. Wang Z, Chen JQ, Liu JL, et al. FDG-PET in diagnosis, staging and prognosis of pancreatic carcinoma: a meta-analysis. World J Gastroenterol 2013; 19: 4808-17.

29. Okano K, Kakinoki K, Akamoto S, et al. 18F-fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography in the diagnosis of small pancreatic cancer. World J Gastroenterol 2011; 17: 231-5.

30. Ruf J, Lopez Hanninen E, Oettle H, et al. Detection of recurrent pancreatic cancer: comparison of FDG-PET with CT/MRI. Pancreatology 2005; 5: 266-72.

31. Diederichs CG, Staib L, Vogel J, et al. Values and limitations of 18F-fluorodeoxyglucose-positron-emission tomography with preoperative evaluation of patients with pancreatic masses. Pancreas 2000; 20: 109-16.

32. Jha P, Bijan B, Melendres G, et al. Hybrid imaging for pancreatic malignancy: clinical applications, merits, limitations, and pitfalls. Clin Nucl Med 2015; 40: 206-13.

33. Rijkers AP, Valkema R, Duivenvoorden HJ, et al. Usefulness of F-18-fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography to confirm suspected pancreatic cancer: a meta-analysis. Eur J Surg Oncol 2014; 40: 794-804.

34. Mergo PJ, Helmberger TK, Buetow PC, et al. Pancreatic neoplasms: MR imaging and pathologic correlation. Radiographics 1997; 17: 281-301.

35. Nagamachi S, Nishii R, Wakamatsu H, et al. The usefulness of (18)F-FDG PET/MRI fusion image in diagnosing pancreatic tumor: comparison with (18)F-FDG PET/CT. Ann Nucl Med 2013; 27: 554-63.

36. Mitchell RA, Stanger D, Shuster C, et al. Repeat endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspiration in patients with suspected pancreatic cancer: diagnostic yield and associated change in access to appropriate care. Can J Gastroenterol Hepatol 2016; 2016: 7678403.

37. Tsutsumi H, Hara K, Mizuno N, et al. Clinical impact of preoperative endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspiration for pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma. Endosc Ultrasound 2016; 5: 94-100.

38. Yamabe A, Irisawa A, Bhutani MS, et al. Efforts to improve the diagnostic accuracy of endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspiration for pancreatic tumors. Endosc Ultrasound 2016; 5: 225-32.

39. Nawaz H, Fan CY, Kloke J, et al. Performance characteristics of endoscopic ultrasound in the staging of pancreatic cancer: a meta-analysis. JOP 2013; 14: 484-97.

40. Brand B, Pfaff T, Binmoeller KF, et al. Endoscopic ultrasound for differential diagnosis of focal pancreatic lesions, confirmed by surgery. Scand J Gastroenterol 2000; 35: 1221-8.

41. Hewitt MJ, McPhail MJW, Possamai L, et al. EUS-guided FNA for diagnosis of solid pancreatic neoplasms: a meta-analysis. Gastrointest Endosc 2012; 75: 319-31.

42. Agarwal B, Krishna NB, Labundy JL, et al. EUS and/or EUS-guided FNA in patients with CT and/or magnetic resonance imaging findings of enlarged pancreatic head or dilated pancreatic duct with or without a dilated common bile duct. Gastrointest Endosc 2008; 68: 237-42.

43. Wang W, Shpaner A, Krishna SG, et al. Use of EUS-FNA in diagnosing pancreatic neoplasm without a definitive mass on CT. Gastrointest Endosc 2013; 78: 73-80.

44. Gress FG, Hawes RH, Savides TJ, et al. Role of EUS in the preoperative staging of pancreatic cancer: a large single-center experience. Gastrointest Endosc 1999; 50: 786-91.

45. Puli SR, Bechtold ML, Buxbaum JL, et al. How good is endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspiration in diagnosing the correct etiology for a solid pancreatic mass? A meta-analysis and systematic review. Pancreas 2013; 42: 20-6.

46. Zhang F, Kumbhari V, Tieu AH. Endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration of suspected pancreatic adenocarcinoma: yield of the first and repeat procedure. JOP 2016; 17: 48-52.

47. Uehara H, Ikezawa K, Kawada N, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration for suspected pancreatic malignancy in relation to the size of lesions. J Gastroenterol Hepatol 2011; 26: 1256-61.

48. Williams DB, Sahai AV, Aabakken L, et al. Endoscopic ultrasound guided fine needle aspiration biopsy: a large single centre experience. Gut 1999; 44: 720-6.

49. Hébert-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: 159-71.

50. Polkowski M, Jenssen C, Kaye P, et al. Technical aspects of endoscopic ultrasound (EUS)-guided sampling in gastroenterology: European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ESGE) Technical Guideline – March 2017. Endoscopy 2017; 49: 989-1006.

51. 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: 283-90.

52. Matsumoto K, Takeda Y, Onoyama T, et al. Role of the preoperative usefulness of the pathological diagnosis of pancreatic diseases. World J Gastrointest Oncol 2016; 8: 656-62.

53. Verbeke CS. Resection margins in pancreatic cancer: are we entering a new era? HPB (Oxford) 2014; 16: 1-2.

54. Verbeke CS, Menon KV. Redefining resection margin status in pancreatic cancer HPB (Oxford) 2009; 11: 282-9.

55. Kim KS, Kwon J, Kim K, et al. Impact of resection margin distance on survival of pancreatic cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Cancer Res Treat 2017; 49: 824-33.

56. Crinò SF, Conti Bellocchi MC, Bernardoni L, et al. Diagnostic yield of EUS-FNA of small (≤15 mm) solid pancreatic lesions

Diagnostic and therapeutic recommendations in pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma. Recommendations of the Working Group
of the Polish Pancreatic Club

15

using a 25-gauge needle. Hepatobiliary Pancreat Dis Int 2018; 17: 70-4.

57. D'Onofrio M, De Robertis R, Barbi E, et al. Ultrasound-guided percutaneous fine-needle aspiration of solid pancreatic neoplasms: 10-year experience with more than 2,000 cases and a review of the literature. Eur Radiol 2016; 26: 1801-7.

58. 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: 973-81.

59. Yan L, Ikemura K, Park JW. Utility of core biopsy with concurrent ROSE FNA in the diagnosis of pancreatic tumor-does the biopsy add any diagnostic benefit? Diagn Cytopathol 2018; 46: 154-9.

60. Kahriman G, Ozcan N, Dogan S, et al. Percutaneous ultrasound-guided core needle biopsy of solid pancreatic masses: results in 250 patients. J Clin Ultrasound 2016; 44: 470-3.

61. Yang RY, Ng D, Jaskolka JD, et al. Evaluation of percutaneous ultrasound-guided biopsies of solid mass lesions of the pancreas: a center's 10-year experience. Clin Imaging 2015; 39: 62-5.

62. Matsubayashi H, Matsui T, Yabuuchi Y, et al. Endoscopic ultrasonography guided-fine needle aspiration for the diagnosis of solid pancreaticobiliary lesions: clinical aspects to improve the diagnosis. World J Gastroenterol 2016; 22: 628-40.

63. Ikezawa K, Uehara H, Sakai A, et al. Risk of peritoneal carcinomatosis by endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration for pancreatic cancer. J Gastroenterol 2013; 48: 966-72.

64. Micames C, Jowell PS, White R, et al. Lower frequency of peritoneal carcinomatosis in patients with pancreatic cancer diagnosed by EUS-guided FNA vs. percutaneous FNA. Gastrointest Endosc 2003; 58: 690-5.

65. Hsu MY, Pan KT, Chen CM, et al. CT-guided percutaneous core-needle biopsy of pancreatic masses: comparison of the standard mesenteric/retroperitoneal versus the trans-organ approaches. Clin Radiol 2016; 71: 507-12.

66. Tyng CJ, Almeida MF, Barbosa PN, et al. Computed tomography-guided percutaneous core needle biopsy in pancreatic tumor diagnosis. World J Gastroenterol 2015; 21: 3579-86.

67. Duffy MJ, Sturgeon C, Lamerz R, et al. Tumor markers in pancreatic cancer: a European Group on Tumor Markers (EGTM) status report. Ann Oncol 2010; 21: 441-7.

68. Bhat K, Wang F, Ma Q, et al. Advances in biomarker research for pancreatic cancer. Curr Pharm Des 2012; 18: 2439-51.

69. Goonetilleke KS, Siriwardena AK. Systematic review of carbohydrate antigen (CA 19-9) as a biochemical marker in the diagnosis of pancreatic cancer. Eur J Surg Oncol 2007; 33: 266-70.

70. Zhang Y, Yang J, Li H, et al. Tumor markers CA19-9, CA242 and CEA in the diagnosis of pancreatic cancer: a meta-analysis. Int J Clin Exp Med 2015; 8: 11683-91.

71. Ballehaninna UK, Chamberlain RS. The clinical utility of serum CA 19-9 in the diagnosis, prognosis and management of pancreatic adenocarcinoma: an evidence based appraisal. J Gastrointest Oncol 2012; 3: 105-19.

72. Hartwig W, Strobel O, Hinz U, et al. CA19-9 in potentially resectable pancreatic cancer: perspective to adjust surgical and perioperative therapy. Ann Surg Oncol 2013; 20: 2188-96.

73. Kim YC, Kim HJ, Park JH, et al. Can preoperative CA19-9 and CEA levels predict the resectability of patients with pancreatic adenocarcinoma? J Gastroenterol Hepatol 2009; 24: 1869-75.

74. Ferrone CR, Finkelstein DM, Thayer SP, et al. Perioperative CA19-9 levels can predict stage and survival in patients with resectable pancreatic adenocarcinoma. J Clin Oncol 2006; 24: 2897-902.

75. Mirkin KA, Hollenbeak CS, Wong J. Prognostic impact of carbohydrate antigen 19-9 level at diagnosis in resected stage I-III pancreatic adenocarcinoma: a U.S. population study. J Gastrointest Oncol 2017; 8: 778-88.

76. Gu YL, Lan C, Pei H, et al. Applicative value of serum CA19-9, CEA, CA125 and CA242 in diagnosis and prognosis for patients with pancreatic cancer treated by concurrent chemoradiotherapy. Asian Pac J Cancer Prev 2015; 16: 6569-73.

77. Kondo N, Murakami Y, Uemura K, et al. Prognostic impact of perioperative serum CA 19-9 levels in patients with resectable pancreatic cancer. Ann Surg Oncol 2010; 17: 2321-9.

78. Berger AC, Garcia M, Hoffman JP, et al. Postresection CA 19-9 predicts overall survival in patients with pancreatic cancer treated with adjuvant chemoradiation: a prospective validation by RTOG 9704. J Clin Oncol 2008; 26: 5918-22.

79. Humphris JL, Chang DK, Johns AL, et al. The prognostic and predictive value of serum CA19.9 in pancreatic cancer. Ann Oncol 2012; 23: 1713-22.

80. Kumar R, Herman JM, Wolfgang CL, et al. Multidisciplinary management of pancreatic cancer. Surg Oncol Clin N Am 2013; 22: 265-87.

81. Pawlik TM, Laheru D, Hruban RH, et al. Evaluating the impact of a single-day multidisciplinary clinic on the management of pancreatic cancer. Ann Surg Oncol 2008; 15: 2081-8.

82. Hüttner FJ, Fitzmaurice C, Schwarzer G, et al. Pylorus-preserving pancreaticoduodenectomy (pp Whipple) versus pancreaticoduodenectomy (classic Whipple) for surgical treatment of periampullary and pancreatic carcinoma (Review). Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2016; 2: CD006053.

83. Hackert T, Büchler MW, Werner J. Current state of surgical management of pancreatic cancer. Cancers 2011; 3: 1253-73.

84. Masiak-Segit W, Rawicz-Pruszyński K, Skórzewska M, et al. Surgical treatment of pancreatic cancer. Pol Przegl Chir 2018; 90: 45-53.

85. Nimura Y, Nagino M, Takao S. Standard versus extended lymphadenectomy in radical pancreatoduodenectomy for ductal adenocarcinoma of the head of the pancreas. J Hepatobiliary Pancreat Sci 2012; 19: 230-41.

86. Bilimoria KY, Bentrem DJ, Feinglass JM, et al. Directing surgical quality improvement initiatives: comparison of perioperative mortality and long-term survival for cancer surgery. J Clin Oncol 2008; 26: 4626-33.

87. Gooiker GA, Lemmens VE, Besselink MG, et al. Impact of centralization of pancreatic cancer surgery on resection rates and survival. Br J Surg 2014; 101: 1000-5.

88. Balzano G, Capretti G, Callea G, et al. Overuse of surgery in patients with pancreatic cancer. A nationwide analysis in Italy. HPB (Oxford) 2016; 18: 470-8.

89. Swanson RS, Pezzi CM, Mallin K, et al. The 90 day mortality after pancreatectomy for cancer is double the 30-day mor-

16

K. Winter, R. Talar-Wojnarowska, A. Dąbrowski, M. Degowska, M. Durlik, A. Gąsiorowska, S. Głuszek, G. Jurkowska, A. Kaczka, P. Lampe, T. Marek, A. Nasierowska-Guttmejer, E. Nowakowska-Duława, G. Rydzewska, J. Strzelczyk, Z. Śledziński, E. Małecka-Panas

tality: more than 20,000 resections from the national cancer data base. Ann Surg Oncol 2014; 21: 4059-67.

90. Cress RD, Yin D, Clarke L, et al. Survival among patients with adenocarcinoma of the pancreas: a population-based study (United States). Cancer Causes Control 2006; 17: 403-9.

91. Hariharan D, Saied A, Kocher HM. Analysis of mortality rates for pancreatic cancer across the world. HPB (Oxford) 2008; 10: 58-62.

92. Han SS, Jang JY, Kim SW, et al. Analysis of long-term survivors after surgical resection for pancreatic cancer. Pancreas 2006; 32: 271-5.

93. Katz MH, Wang H, Fleming JB. Long-term survival after multidisciplinary management of resected pancreatic adenocarcinoma. Ann Surg Oncol 2009; 16: 836-47.

94. Strobel O, Hank T, Hinz U, et al. Pancreatic cancer surgery: the new r-status counts. Ann Surg 2017; 265: 565-73.

95. Rahman SH, Urquhart R, Molinari M. Neoadjuvant therapy for resectable pancreatic cancer. World J Gastrointest Oncol 2017; 9: 457-65.

96. Sutton JM, Abbott DE. Neoadjuvant therapy for pancreas cancer: past lessons and future therapies. World J Gastroenterol 2014; 20: 15564-79.

97. Suker M, Beumer BR, Sadot E, et al. FOLFIRINOX for locally advanced pancreatic cancer: a systematic review and patient-level meta-analysis. Lancet Oncol 2016; 17: 801-10.

98. Dhir M, Malhotra GK, Sohal DPS, et al. Neoadjuvant treatment of pancreatic adenocarcinoma: a systematic review and meta-analysis of 5520 patients. World J Surg Oncol 2017; 15: 183.

99. Gillen S, Schuster T, Meyer Zum Büschenfelde C, et al. Preoperative/neoadjuvant therapy in pancreatic cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis of response and resection percentages. PLoS Med 2010; 7: e1000267.

100. Tang K, Lu W, Qin W, et al. Neoadjuvant therapy for patients with borderline resectable pancreatic cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis of response and resection percentages. Pancreatology 2016; 16: 28-37.

101. Katz MH, Pisters PW, Evans DB, et al. Borderline resectable pancreatic cancer: the importance of this emerging stage of disease. J Am Coll Surg 2008; 206: 833-46.

102. Stokes JB, Nolan NJ, Stelow EB, et al. Preoperative capecitabine and concurrent radiation for borderline resectable pancreatic cancer. Ann Surg Oncol 2011; 18: 619-27.

103. Chuong MD, Springett GM, Freilich JM, et al. Stereotactic body radiation therapy for locally advanced and borderline resectable pancreatic cancer is effective and well tolerated. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2013; 86: 516-22.

104. Kharofa J, Tsai S, Kelly T, et al. Neoadjuvant chemoradiation with IMRT in resectable and borderline resectable pancreatic cancer. Radiother Oncol 2014; 113: 41-6.

105. Paniccia A, Edil BH, Schulick RD, et al. Neoadjuvant FOLFIRINOX application in borderline resectable pancreatic adenocarcinoma: a retrospective cohort study. Medicine (Baltimore) 2014; 93: 198.

106. Lopez NE, Prendergast C, Lowy AM. Borderline resectable pancreatic cancer: definitions and management. World J Gastroenterol 2014; 20: 10740-51.

107. Raigani S, Ammori J, Kim J, et al. Trends in the treatment of resectable pancreatic adenocarcinoma. J Gastrointest Surg 2014; 18: 113-23.

108. Klinkenbijl JH, Jeekel J, Sahmoud T, et al. Adjuvant radiotherapy and 5-fluorouracil after curative resection of cancer of the pancreas and periampullary region: phase III trial of the EORTC gastrointestinal tract cancer cooperative group. Ann Surg 1999; 230: 776-84.

109. Yeo CJ, Abrams RA, Grochow LB, et al. Pancreaticoduodenectomy for pancreatic adeno-carcinoma: postoperative adjuvant chemoradiation improves survival. A prospective, single-institution experience. Ann Surg 1997; 225: 621-36.

110. Neoptolemos JP, Dunn JA, Stocken DD, et al.; European Study Group for Pancreatic Cancer. Adjuvant chemoradiotherapy and chemotherapy in resectable pancreatic cancer: a randomised controlled trial. Lancet 2001; 358: 1576-85.

111. Oettle H, Post S, Neuhaus P, et al. Adjuvant chemotherapy with gemcitabine vs observation in patients undergoing curative-intent resection of pancreatic cancer: a randomized controlled trial. JAMA 2007; 297: 267-77.

112. Lio WC, Chien KL, Wu MS, et al. Adjuvant treatments for resected pancreatic adenocarcinoma: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. Lancet Oncol 2013; 14: 1095-103.

113. Neoptolemos JP, Stocken DD, Friess H, et al.; European Study Group for Pancreatic Cancer. A randomized trial of chemoradiotherapy and chemotherapy after resection of pancreatic cancer. N Engl J Med 2004; 350: 1200-10.

114. Rutter CE, Park HS, Corso CD, et al. Addition of radiotherapy to adjuvant chemotherapy is associated with improved overall survival in resected pancreatic adenocarcinoma: an analysis of the National Cancer Data Base. Cancer 2015; 121: 4141-9.

115. Mellon EA, Springett GM, Hoffe SE, et al. Adjuvant radiotherapy and lymph node dissection in pancreatic cancer treated with surgery and chemotherapy. Cancer 2014; 120: 1171-7.

116. Hsieh MC, Chang WW, Yu HH, et al. Adjuvant radiotherapy and chemotherapy improve survival in patients with pancreatic adenocarcinoma receiving surgery: adjuvant chemotherapy alone is insufficient in the era of intensity modulation radiation therapy. Cancer Med 2018; 7: 2328-38.

117. Kooby DA, Gillespie TW, Liu Y, et al. Impact of adjuvant radiotherapy on survival after pancreatic cancer resection: an appraisal of data from the national cancer data base. Ann Surg Oncol 2013; 20: 3634-42.

118. van der Gaag NA, Rauws EA, van Eijck CH, et al. Preoperative biliary drainage for cancer of the head of the pancreas. N Engl J Med 2010; 362: 129-37.

119. Fujii T, Yamada S, Suenaga M, et al. Preoperative internal biliary drainage increases the risk of bile juice infection and pancreatic fistula after pancreatoduodenectomy: a prospective observational study. Pancreas 2015; 44: 465-70.

120. Zhang GQ, Li Y, Ren YP, et al. Outcomes of preoperative endoscopic nasobiliary drainage and endoscopic retrograde biliary drainage for malignant distal biliary obstruction prior to pancreaticoduodenectomy. World J Gastroenterol 2017; 23: 5386-94.

121. Crippa S, Cirocchi R, Partelli S, et al. Systematic review and meta-analysis of metal versus plastic stents for preoperative biliary drainage in resectable periampullary or pancreatic head tumors. Eur J Surg Oncol 2016; 42: 1278-85.

122. Tol JA, van Hooft JE, Timmer R, et al. Metal or plastic stents for preoperative biliary drainage in resectable pancreatic cancer. Gut 2016; 65: 1981-7.

Diagnostic and therapeutic recommendations in pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma. Recommendations of the Working Group
of the Polish Pancreatic Club

17

123. Song TJ, Lee JH, Lee SS, et al. Metal versus plastic stents for drainage of malignant biliary obstruction before primary surgical resection. Gastrointest Endosc 2016; 84: 814-21.

124. Balaban EP, Mangu PB, Khorana AA, et al. Locally advanced, unresectable pancreatic cancer: American Society of Clinical Oncology clinical practice guideline. J Clin Oncol 2016; 34: 2654-68.

125. Sohal DP, Mangu BP, Khorana AA, et al. Metastatic pancreatic cancer: American Society of Clinical Oncology clinical practice guideline. J Clin Oncol 2016; 34: 2784-96.

126. http://onkologia-online.pl/info/show/4711,mz:_programy_lekowe_-_1_styczen_2018.

127. Maire F, Sauvanet A. Palliation of biliary and duodenal obstruction in patients with unresectable pancreatic cancer: endoscopy or surgery? J Visc Surg 2013; 150 (3 Suppl): 27-31.

128. Andtbacka RH, Evans DB, Pisters PW. Surgical and endoscopic palliation for pancreatic cancer. Minerva Chir 2004; 59: 123-36.

129. Baars JE. Kaffes AJ, Saxena P. EUS-guided biliary drainage: a comprehensive review of the literature. Endosc Ultrasound 2018; 7: 4-9.

130. Sharaiha RZ, Khan MA, Kamal F, et al. Efficacy and safety of EUS-guided biliary drainage in comparison with percutaneous biliary drainage when ERCP fails: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Gastrointest Endosc 2017; 85: 904-14.

131. Smith AC, Dowsett JF, Russell RC, et al. Randomised trial of endoscopic stenting versus surgical bypass in malignant low bile duct obstruction. Lancet 1994; 344: 1655-60.

132. Bakhru M, Tekola B, Kahaleh M. Endoscopic palliation for pancreatic cancer. Cancers (Basel) 2011; 3: 1947-56.

133. Maire F, Hammel P, Ponsot P, et al. Long-term outcome of biliary and duodenal stents in palliative treatment of patients with unresectable adenocarcinoma of the head of pancreas. Am J Gastroenterol 2006; 101: 735-42.

134. Stark A, Hines OJ. Endoscopic and operative palliation strategies for pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma. Semin Oncol 2015; 42: 163-76.

135. Mosler P, Mergener KD, Brandabur JJ, et al. Palliation of gastric outlet obstruction and proximal small bowel obstruction with self-expandable metal stents: a single center series. J Clin Gastroenterol 2005; 39: 124-8.

136. Sanders M, Papachristou GI, McGrath KM, et al. Endoscopic palliation of pancreatic cancer. Gastroenterol Clin North Am 2007; 36: 455-76.

137. D'Haese JG, Hartel M, Demir IE, et al. Pain sensation in pancreatic diseases is not uniform: the different facets of pancreatic pain. World J Gastroenterol 2014; 20: 9154-61.

138. Lahoud MJ, Kourie HR, Antoun J, et al. Road map for pain management in pancreatic cancer: a review. World J Gastrointest Oncol 2016; 8: 599-606.

139. Hanks GW, Conno F, Cherny N, et al. Morphine and alternative opioids in cancer pain: the EAPC recommendations. Br J Cancer 2001; 84: 587-93.

140. Pergolizzi J, Böger RH, Budd K, et al. Opioids and the management of chronic severe pain in the elderly: consensus statement of an International Expert Panel with focus on the six clinically most often used World Health Organization Step III opioids (buprenorphine, fentanyl, hydromorphone, methadone, morphine, oxycodone). Pain Pract 2008; 8: 287-313.

141. Esin E, Yalcin S. Neuropathic cancer pain: what we are dealing with? How to manage it? Onco Targets Ther 2014; 7: 599-618.

142. Caraceni A, Zecca E, Martini C, et al. Gabapentin as an adjuvant to opioid analgesia for neuropathic cancer pain. J Pain Symptom Manage 1999; 17: 441-5.

143. Vyvey M. Steroids as pain relief adjuvants. Can Fam Physician 2010; 56: 1295-7, e415.

144. Tham TC, Lichtenstein DR, Vandervoort J, et al. Pancreatic duct stents for "obstructive type" pain in pancreatic malignancy. Am J Gastroenterol 2000; 95: 956-60.

145. Costamagna G, Mutignani M. Pancreatic stenting for malignant ductal obstruction. Dig Liver Dis 2004; 36: 635-8.

146. Staats PS, Hekmat H, Sauter P, et al. The effects of alcohol celiac plexus block, pain, and mood on longevity in patients with unresectable pancreatic cancer: a double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled study. Pain Med 2001; 2: 28-34.

147. Wong GY, Schroeder DR, Carns PE, et al. Effect of neurolytic celiac plexus block on pain relief, quality of life, and survival in patients with unresectable pancreatic cancer: a randomized controlled trial. JAMA 2004; 291: 1092-9.

148. Zhang CL, Zhang TJ, Guo YN, et al. Effect of neurolytic celiac plexus block guided by computerized tomography on pancreatic cancer pain. Dig Dis Sci 2008; 53: 856-60.

149. Yan BM, Myers RP. Neurolytic celiac plexus block for pain control in unresectable pancreatic cancer. Am J Gastroenterol 2007; 102: 430-8.

150. Kaufman M, Singh G, Das S, et al. Efficacy of endoscopic ultrasound-guided celiac plexus block and celiac plexus neurolysis for managing abdominal pain associated with chronic pancreatitis and pancreatic cancer. J Clin Gastroenterol 2010; 44: 127-34.

151. Yasuda I, Wang HP. Endoscopic ultrasound-guided celiac plexus block and neurolysis. Dig Endosc 2017; 29: 455-62.

152. Sikkens EC, Cahen DL, van Eijck C, et al. The daily practice of pancreatic enzyme replacement therapy after pancreatic surgery: a northern European survey: enzyme replacement after surgery. J Gastrointest Surg 2012; 16: 1487-92.

153. Domínguez-Muñoz JE. Chronic pancreatitis and persistent steatorrhea: what is the correct dose of enzymes? Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol 2011; 9: 541-6.

154. Phillips ME. Pancreatic exocrine insufficiency following pancreatic resection. Pancreatology 2015; 15: 449-55.

155. Forsmark CE. Diagnosis and management of exocrine pancreatic insufficiency. Curr Treat Options Gastroenterol 2018; 16: 306-15.

156. Syngal S, Brand RE, Church JM, et al.; American College of Gastroenterology. ACG clinical guideline: genetic testing and management of hereditary gastrointestinal cancer syndromes. Am J Gastroenterol 2015; 110: 223-62.

157. Yeo TP. Demographics, epidemiology, and inheritance of pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma. Semin Oncol 2015; 42: 8-18.

158. Petersen GM, de Andrade M, Goggins M, et al. Pancreatic cancer genetic epidemiology consortium. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 2006; 15: 704-10.

159. Solomon S, Das S, Brand R, et al. Inherited pancreatic cancer syndromes. Cancer J 2012; 18: 485-91.

K. Winter, R. Talar-Wojnarowska, A. Dąbrowski, M. Degowska, M. Durlik, A. Gąsiorowska, S. Głuszek, G. Jurkowska, A. Kaczka,
P. Lampe, T. Marek, A. Nasierowska-Guttmejer, E. Nowakowska-Dułlawa, G. Rydzewska, J. Strzelczyk, Z. Śledziński, E. Małecka-Panas

160. Wejnarska K, Kołodziejczyk E, Kierkuś J, et al. Dziedziczne za-palenie trzustki. Postep Nauk Med 2014; 27: 192-6.

161. Howes N, Lerch M, Greenhalf W, et al.; European Registry of Hereditary Pancreatitis and Pancreatic Cancer (EUROPAC). Clinical and genetic characteristics of hereditary pancreatitis in Europe. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol 2004; 2: 252-61.

162. Matsubayashi H. Familial pancreatic cancer and hereditary syndromes: screening strategy for high-risk individuals. J Gastroenterol 2011; 46: 1249-59.

163. Shi C, Hruban RH, Klein AP. Familial pancreatic cancer. Arch Pathol Lab Med 2009; 133: 365-74.

164. Lynch HT, Lanspa SJ, Fitzgibbons RJ Jr, et al. Familial pancre-atic cancer (part 1): genetic pathology review. Nebr Med J 1989; 74: 109-12.

165. Kadaj-Lipka R, Lipiński M, Adrych K, et al. Diagnostic and therapeutic recommendations for chronic pancreatitis. Rec-ommendations of the Working Group of the Polish Society of Gastroenterology and the Polish Pancreas Club. Gastroenter-ology Rev 2018; 13: 167-81.

166. Tenner S, Baillie J, Dewitt J, et al. American College of Gastro-enterology guideline: management of acute pancreatitis. Am J Gastroenterol 2013; 108: 1400-16.

167. Raimondi S, Lowenfels AB, Morselli-Labate AM, et al. Pancre-atic cancer in chronic pancreatitis; aetiology, incidence, and early detection. Best Practice Res Clin Gastroenterol 2010; 24: 349-58.

168. Lowenfels AB, Maisonneuve P, Cavallini G. Pancreatitis and the risk of pancreatic cancer. N Engl J Med 1993; 328: 1433-7.

169. Pinho AV, Chantrill L, Rooman I. Chronic pancreatitis: a path to pancreatic cancer. Cancer Letters 2014; 345: 203-9.

170. Rebours V, Boutron-Ruault MC, Schnee M, et al. Risk of pan-creatic carcinoma in patients with hereditary pancreatitis: a national exhaustive series. Am J Gastroenterol 2008; 103: 111-9.

171. Lowenfels AB, Maisonneuve P, DiMagno EP, et al. Hereditary pancreatitis and the risk of pancreatic cancer. International Hereditary Pancreatitis Study Group. J Natl Cancer Inst 1997; 89: 442-6.