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Abstract

Background: Over the past decade, several artificial intelligence (AI) systems are developed to assist in endoscopic assessment of (pre)cancerous lesions of the gastrointestinal tract. In this review, we aimed to provide an overview of the possible indications of AI technology in upper gastrointestinal endoscopy, and hypothesize about potential challenges for its use in clinical practice.

Summary: Application of AI in upper gastrointestinal endoscopy has been investigated for several indications: (1) detection, characterization, and delineation of esophageal and gastric cancer and their premalignant conditions, (2) prediction of tumor invasion, and (3) detection of Helicobacter pylori. AI systems show promising results with an accuracy up to 99% for the detection of superficial and advanced upper gastrointestinal cancers. AI outperformed trainee and experienced endoscopists for the detection of esophageal lesions and atrophic gastritis. For gastric cancer, AI outperformed mid-level and trainee, but not expert endoscopists.

Key Messages: Application of AI in upper endoscopy may improve early diagnosis of esophageal and gastric cancer and may enable endoscopists to better identify patients eligible for endoscopic resection. The benefit of AI on the quality of upper endoscopy still needs to be demonstrated, while prospective trials are needed to confirm accuracy and feasibility during real-time daily endoscopy.
Introduction
Accurate endoscopic detection of esophageal and gastric cancers and their premalignant conditions, such as Barrett neoplasia, gastric atrophy, and intestinal metaplasia, is essential for the detection of these cancers at an early stage [1-4]. The challenge of endoscopic procedures lies in the real-time interpretation of endoscopic imagery, which is complex and sensitive to human error. Current endoscopic cancer screening and surveillance strategies encounter several pitfalls, including inter-observer variability in the detection of lesions, time consuming biopsy protocols, and biopsy sampling error [1,5,6]. Especially subtle and early (pre)malignant lesions in the esophagus and stomach can easily be missed by endoscopists (Fig. 1). Artificial intelligence (AI) technology has the potential to overcome these obstacles. AI models have been introduced as a tool to aid in endoscopic detection, characterization and delineation of premalignant and malignant lesions of the upper gastrointestinal (GI) tract [7-11]. Over the past decade, several AI systems have been developed to assist endoscopists in the detection and staging of lesions in the upper GI tract. In this review, we aimed to provide an overview of the possible indications of AI systems in upper GI endoscopy (shown in Fig. 2) and hypothesize about potential challenges for its use in clinical practice.
1. Principles of AI

Artificial intelligence refers to a machine-based intelligence which mimics human cognitive functions, such as learning and decision making. Machine learning (ML) is a form of AI consisting of a teaching algorithm to recognize data patterns and utilize data to predict new data. In order to predict outcomes, a ML algorithm needs to be exposed to different example data sets. Deep learning (DL) is an advanced ML method, which uses layers of artificial neural networks to hierarchically structure data and extract features without human aid. Similar to the human brain, DL methods approach tasks by analyzing the information from different concepts before assigning them to a specific class. Different from conventional ML algorithms that need human intervention to correct errors, DL has the ability to learn from its mistakes. This self-learning ability of DL technology makes it possible to increase its performance as exposure to data increases.

The most widely known DL method in endoscopy is based on convolutional neural network (CNN) and consists of a neural network architecture which is mainly used for image recognition and classification. To achieve sufficient diagnostic accuracy, a DL system needs to be trained and validated with large amounts of labelled data during different steps (shown in Fig. 3). First, the algorithm is subjected to a large dataset of mostly non-endoscopic labelled images. These labelled images are often obtained from open access databases, such as ImageNet [12]. Second, the algorithm needs to be trained and validated with a dataset of labelled endoscopic images. Last, when performance is sufficient, the algorithm needs to be tested. Computer-aided detection (CAD) systems in GI endoscopy are ML methods specifically developed to assist endoscopists to improve accurate detection and staging of pathology, including early stages of disease, and selection of optimal biopsy sites.
2. Esophagus

2.1 Neoplasia in Barrett’s esophagus

The incidence of esophageal adenocarcinoma (EAC) is rapidly increasing in Western society [13,14]. Barrett’s esophagus (BE) is a precancerous condition, which may progress to EAC [15]. Therefore, guidelines recommend endoscopic surveillance of BE in order to diagnose neoplastic progression in early stages. Endoscopic assessment of the esophagus with high-definition (HD) white light endoscopy (WLE) is advised to optimize the detection of dysplastic Barrett mucosa [1,2]. Chromoendoscopy can be utilized to aid in detection of lesions, however, additional value to WLE has not been proven [16]. Given the low progression rate among BE patients, which is estimated at 0.5% per year, the majority of gastroenterologists never encounter dysplasia and therefore may be less familiar with the mucosal changes associated with presence of neoplasia [17]. Visible neoplastic lesions, including early EAC, may remain undetected, especially when endoscopic surveillance is performed by endoscopists with limited experience in the recognition of early neoplastic lesions [18,19]. Low grade dysplasia may present itself with very subtle mucosal changes and is therefore easily missed [6]. To increase the diagnostic yield of dysplasia, guidelines recommend to take four-quadrant biopsies at each 2 cm interval of the Barrett segment, known as the Seattle protocol [20]. Combined with WLE, it is estimated that up to 90% of high grade dysplasia (HGD) and EAC cases are detected [21]. Nevertheless, adherence to this protocol is poor as it is a time-consuming procedure, especially in patients with a long-segment BE [22].

2.1.1. AI in the detection of Barrett neoplasia

Several ML methods were developed to aid in diagnosis of BE neoplasia (Table 1). The majority of papers evaluated diagnostic performance of CNN algorithms in WLE images [7,10,23-27]. Hashimoto et al. (2020) developed an algorithm based on CNN technology to aid in the detection of Barrett neoplasia by image annotation of areas suspect for neoplasia [23]. The pretrained algorithm was trained with 916 images of BE patients with HGD and early EAC. The CNN then analysed 225 images of dysplastic BE and 233 of non-dysplastic Barrett’s esophagus (NDBE) images with 95% accuracy. The ARGOS consortium performed several studies with AI algorithms to aid in the detection, characterization and delineation of BE neoplasia and to improve the selection of biopsy sites [7,24,26,28]. De Groof et al. (2019) developed an AI model based on prospectively collected WLE images for the detection and delineation of BE neoplasia with a sensitivity, specificity and accuracy of 95%, 85% and 92%, respectively [7]. Application of CAD in detection of Barrett neoplasia is also being explored in NBI images and videos [23,27,28]. Struyvenberg et al. (2020) developed a CAD system using 30,021 NBI video frames (average video consisted of 250 fragments obtained during 10 seconds of video) and detected BE neoplasia with accuracy of 83% [28].

Recently, the first prospective studies during live endoscopic procedures were performed by de Groof et al. (2020) [25] and Ebigbo et al. (2020) [10]. De Groof et al. trained their CAD model with 1,704 high-resolution images of 669 patients with histologically confirmed Barrett neoplasia or NDBE [26]. Algorithm performance was externally validated with separate datasets, each containing 80 images which were also scored for the presence of dysplasia by 53 general endoscopists. The CAD system classified images as dysplastic or non-dysplastic with 90% sensitivity, 88% specificity and 89% accuracy. The AI model outperformed the endoscopists in detection of early Barrett neoplasia in another dataset containing 80 images, as the sensitivity, specificity and accuracy of the CAD system and endoscopists was respectively 93% vs 72%, 83% vs 74% and 88% vs 73% [26]. The CAD model was tested during real-time endoscopy with an accuracy of 90% [25]. Ebigbo et al. (2019) developed a CAD-DL system based on 148 HD-WLE and NBI images of 33 early EAC and 41 NDBE areas in one database and 100 HD-WLE images of 17 early EAC and 22 NDBE areas in a second database [27]. Based on the images in these two datasets, the AI model reached a 92-97% sensitivity and 88-100% specificity for WLE images and 94% sensitivity and 80% specificity for NBI images. Afterwards, the developed CNN-CAD algorithm was tested during real-time daily endoscopy in 14 patients with BE neoplasia with an accuracy of 89.9% [10]. The majority of previous mentioned studies showed high accuracy of AI models in the detection of BE neoplasia. Main limitations of these studies were the retrospective design and small sample size.
2.2 Esophageal squamous cell carcinoma

Squamous cell carcinoma remains the predominant histologic type of esophageal cancer (EC), which accounts for 80% of the cases worldwide [29,30]. The incidence rates of esophageal squamous cell carcinoma (ESCC) vary strongly among geographic regions, with highest rates in Eastern Asia [29]. Most ESCC are detected in advanced stages and therefore associated with a poor five-year survival rate of merely 20% [31]. The prognosis of early ESCC is considerably better, since the risk of lymph node and distant metastasis is associated with tumor invasion depth [32]. Additional lugol’s iodine staining or WLE and NBI can be used to increase the detection of subtle esophageal lesions [33,34]. The combination of magnification and NBI during endoscopy (ME-NBI) allows visualization of the microvasculature of the esophageal epithelium, which can be classified according to the intrapapillary capillary loop (IPCL) classification [35]. This classification can help to differentiate dysplasia from non-dysplasia in daily clinical practice [36].

2.2.1. AI in the detection of ESCC

Most studies that investigated AI for the early detection of ESCC derive from Asian countries [29,37-43]. AI models based on CNN during WLE are mostly investigated to detect squamous dysplasia and early ESCC (shown in Table 2) [37-41]. Horie et al. (2019) developed a CNN-CAD system for the detection of EC (both ESCC and EAC; 8,428 images for system development and 1,118 images for validation) [9]. This study showed that CNN-CAD can correctly detect EC cases, including both superficial and advanced cancers with a sensitivity of 98%. Furthermore, the CNN-CAD system was accurately able to detect small cancerous lesions <10mm that can be easily missed, even by experienced endoscopists. Shimamoto et al. (2020) compared the use of DL during WLE and during NBI for the accurate detection of the invasion depth in ESCC. The accuracy was higher in WLE than in ME-NBI (98.7% vs 89.2%) [41]. Ohmori et al. (2019) showed that their AI system had a high sensitivity for the detection of ESCC using non-ME NBI and high accuracy for the differentiation of ESCC from non-cancerous lesions [37].

Endoscopic screening and detection of ESCC remains challenging, partly because it is liable to the inter-observer variability between endoscopists [35]. Early stage ESCC are difficult to detect, especially for trainee endoscopists (sensitivity of NBI for ESCC detection in trainee versus expert endoscopists: 53% vs 100%) [44]. Several studies compared diagnostic parameters of developed AI models to endoscopists [37-42,45]. Cai et al. (2019) developed a DNN-CAD system based on WLE (2,428 images from 746 patients for training, 187 images from 52 patients for validation) which was compared to three groups of endoscopists (seniors with >15 years of experience, mid-levels with 5-15 years of experience and juniors with <5 years of experience) [38]. Sensitivity of AI for detection of ESCC appeared to be higher, even for the experienced endoscopists. AI system versus senior, mid-level and junior endoscopists was 97.8% vs 86.3%, 78.6% and 61.9%, respectively. Zhao et al. (2019) developed a CAD model based on ME-NBI to investigate automated classification of ICPLs [42]. The mean diagnostic accuracy of the CAD system was higher than that of mid-level and junior endoscopists for the detection of malignant esophageal lesions (p<0.001). Fukuda and colleagues (2020) divided the diagnostic process into two parts: detection (identify suspicious lesions) and characterization (differentiate cancer from no cancer). The developed CNN-DL system had a better diagnostic performance than the expert endoscopists [45]. Major limitations of these studies included the small sample size of images used for both training [38,42] and validation [37,38,42,45]. Furthermore, the samples of participating endoscopists with different levels of endoscopic experience were relatively small, ranging from four to 15 endoscopists per sub-group.

2.2.2. AI in prediction of invasion depth of ESCC

The tumor invasion depth is an important prognostic factor in ESCC [46]. Accurate endoscopic detection of the invasion depth is essential for decision making between endoscopic resection or proceed to esophagectomy with lymphadectomy [47]. To optimize endoscopic prediction of invasion depth, the role of AI was studied [39-41]. Shimamoto et al. (2020) developed an AI system on WLE and NBI images from endoscopic videos to estimate the invasion depth, which was compared to experienced endoscopists (7 to 25 years of experience) [41]. The AI model outperformed the endoscopists in both non-ME and ME-NBI with a sensitivity, specificity and accuracy of AI versus endoscopists using ME-NBI of 71%, 95% and 89% versus 42%, 97% and 84%, respectively. Tokai and colleagues (2020) developed an AI model to predict the ESCC invasion depth on 1,751 images, which was validated on 291 images. The diagnostic accuracy of the AI model outperformed 12 out of 13 endoscopists [40].
3. Stomach

3.1. Gastric precancerous lesions and early gastric cancer

*Helicobacter pylori* (HP) infection can cause chronic atrophic gastritis (CAG) and gastric intestinal metaplasia (GIM), which are both precancerous conditions associated with increased risk of gastric cancer (GC) development [3,48]. GC is often diagnosed in an advanced stage with an estimated 5-year survival rate of 20% [30]. Endoscopic surveillance is offered to patients with CAG and GIM to detect GC in an early stage, as detection of early gastric cancer (EGC) improves survival [3]. Current surveillance strategies consist of adequate inspection of the gastric mucosa and standardized random biopsy sampling according to the Sydney protocol for topographic mapping [3]. Guidelines recommend use of HD-chromoendoscopy in gastric cancer surveillance, as it improves optical diagnosis of precancerous lesions and EGC [3,49-51]. Treatment strategy is determined by invasion depth, which is an important prognostic factor in EGC [3,30]. In early cases, diagnosis of EGC can be difficult as features can be subtle and EGC is easily missed in presence of other pathology such as gastritis. AI models may improve diagnostic accuracy by locating areas suspect for cancer and aid the endoscopist in detection and staging of gastric pathology.

3.1.1 Al in the detection of EGC

The application of AI for the detection of EGC has been investigated in WLE images [52-57] and optic chromoendoscopy images (Table 3) [8,58-63]. Li et al. (2020) developed a CNN model on 386 images of benign lesions, 1,702 images of EGC for model development, 171 images of non-cancerous lesions and 170 EGC images to test the models’ performance [8]. The AI model had a diagnostic accuracy of 91% versus 87% when used by experts and 70 to 74% for non-expert endoscopists. Horiuchi et al. tested a CAD system to detect EGC using 174 NBI videos that contained 87 cancerous lesions [58]. The CAD system was trained with 2,570 images containing cancerous and non-cancerous gastric lesions. The performance of the CAD system was benchmarked against 11 endoscopists with experience in NBI and showed varying results. Only two endoscopists were outperformed by the CAD system. Similar results were found in the study of Ikenoyama et al. (2021), that assessed the application of AI in detecting gastric cancer with both WLE and NBI [55].

3.1.2. Al in prediction of invasion depth of EGC

Few research groups have developed CAD systems to assess the invasion depth of EGC [52,56,61]. Nagao et al. (2020) developed a CNN-CAD system by using 16,557 images of 1,084 GC cases that underwent endoscopic resection or radical surgery, to study if invasion depth of EGC can be determined [61]. Prediction of invasion depth was analyzed in both WLE and NBI modality. The CAD system predicted invasion depth with sensitivity of 84% and 75%, specificity of 99% and 100% and accuracy of 94% and 94% during WLE and NBI images, respectively. Yoon et al. (2019) analyzed 11,539 images of both GC (T1a and T1b) and non-EGC and predicted invasion depth with an AUC of 0.85 [52]. However, in case of undifferentiated histology, the accuracy of the AI model was significantly lower. Despite the high performance of the CAD systems, only images were used to train and calculate performance of the algorithm, video analysis has yet to be tested.

3.1.3. Al in detection of gastric precancerous lesions and HP infection

Recent AI systems to enhance endoscopic detection of gastric precancerous lesions and HP are shown in Table 4 [11,64-71]. In two studies, AI models were compared to endoscopists with different levels of experience in detection of CAG [11,64]. Zhang et al. (2020) designed a CNN model to detect CAG by using 5,470 antrum images of 1,699 patients [64]. Images were classified as mild, moderate and severe CAG. CAG was histologically confirmed in 3,042 images. The performance of the CNN model was compared to three expert endoscopists. The model outperformed the endoscopists with a sensitivity, specificity and accuracy of respectively 95%, 94% and 94%. Highest detection rate was seen in severe CAG, with an accuracy of 99%. Guimarães et al. (2020) showed similar results and reported a 93% accuracy for the detection of CAG in WLE images of the proximal stomach [11]. Yan and colleagues (2020) developed a CNN-CAD model for the detection of GIM with ME-NBI [71]. The AI model reported a diagnostic accuracy of 89% with an accuracy of 84% for expert endoscopists with 10 years of endoscopic experience ($p=0.42$).

Zheng et al. (2019) developed a CAD system to determine HP infection status, based on endoscopic images, 15,484 gastric images of 1,959 patients of which 1,157 with a HP infection [66].
This study aimed to investigate whether the AI model could accurately diagnose HP infection during endoscopy without the need for biopsies. The CNN system showed a high performance with an accuracy of 92%. Nakashima et al. (2018) used a DL model to diagnose HP infection with the use of WLE and blue light imaging (BLI) [68]. The research group conducted a single-center prospective study with 222 participants of which 105 had a confirmed HP infection. The DL model had an AUC of 0.96 with BLI. However, with WLE images the AUC of the AI model decreased to 0.66.
Conclusion and potential challenges of implementing AI upper endoscopy into clinical practice

In this review, we have shown that AI systems have been applied in upper GI endoscopy for several indications: (1) detection, characterization, and delineation of esophageal and gastric cancer and their premalignant conditions, (2) prediction of tumor invasion, and (3) diagnosis of a Helicobacter pylori infection. The current status of AI models for each indication in upper GI endoscopy is shown in table 5. So far, all AI studies in upper GI endoscopy have shown promising results with high performance for accurate detection and staging of (pre)malignant lesions in both esophagus and stomach. The benefit, especially on the quality of endoscopy by the use of AI in upper GI, however, still needs to be demonstrated, and may differ between endoscopists based on their skills and experience.

Use of AI in upper GI endoscopy may be of additional value for clinical practice for different reasons. AI have the potential to provide real-time assistance by red flagging cancers that remained undetected by endoscopists and may improve the yield of biopsies by indicating the optimal biopsy sites during live endoscopic procedures. More accurate prediction of tumor invasion of early-stage cancers may improve the selection of patients eligible for endoscopic resection and may prevent unnecessary invasive surgery. And more accurate endoscopic diagnosis of HP infection and gastric precancerous lesions by AI models may replace gastric biopsies.

To date, most AI models in upper GI endoscopy are developed in an ideal setting with high-quality imagery. This setting does not always reflect real-life, where a good visualisation of the mucosa is dependent on the experience and skills of the endoscopists, which is essential for optimal performance of AI. Although several studies compared AI models to endoscopists, studies reporting on the diagnostic performance of AI models for each experience level of endoscopists are scarce. Outcome of these studies will better illuminate for which indication AI may be of additional value in relation to endoscopist’s own experience and skills. For example, in gastric cancer AI outperformed mid-level and trainee, but not expert endoscopists. Besides studies linking the performance of AI models to endoscopists with different levels of experience, studies that investigate AI during real-time upper GI endoscopy are still very scarce. To date, no AI systems have been validated in large groups of patients during live endoscopic procedures. Large prospective trials are awaited for to validate the additional value and confirm the clinical significance of AI models during real-life endoscopy.

In conclusion, AI models in upper GI endoscopy showed high diagnostic performance for the detection, characterization and delineation of upper GI lesions. In addition, AI shows promising results in the prediction of the tumor invasion depth and diagnosis of HP. The benefit of AI correlated to endoscopist skills and experience need to be further addressed, while prospective studies are needed to confirm its accuracy and feasibility during real-time daily endoscopy.
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Figure legends

Fig 1. Endoscopic images of subtle early esophageal and gastric (pre)malignant lesions of which detection rates can be increased with assistance of AI. The (pre)malignant lesions are marked with a red rectangle. A) Early BE neoplasia with white light imaging (WLE). B) The same lesion as A) with magnified endoscopy and narrow band imaging (ME-NBI). C) and D) ESCC with WLE and ME-NBI. E) and F) EGC with WLE and ME-NBI. G) and H) GIM located at the angulus in the stomach with WLE and NBI.

Abbreviations: AI = artificial intelligence, BE = Barrett’s esophagus; EGC = early gastric cancer; ESCC = esophageal squamous cell carcinoma; GI = gastrointestinal; GIM = gastric intestinal metaplasia; ME = magnified endoscopy; NBI = narrow band imaging; WLE = white light endoscopy.

Fig 2. Application of AI in upper GI endoscopy - topics that are addressed in this review.

Abbreviations: AI = artificial intelligence; BE = Barrett’s esophagus; CAG = chronic atrophic gastritis; EGC = early gastric cancer; ESCC = esophageal squamous cell carcinoma; GI = gastrointestinal; GIM = gastric intestinal metaplasia; HP = Helicobacter Pylori.

Fig 3. Visual steps in the development of an AI model: pretraining, training, validation and testing.

Abbreviations: AI = Artificial Intelligence.
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Purpose: to learn the model discriminative basic features
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Purpose: fine-tuning of the model
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Purpose: to evaluate performance of the model

Preferably in a different dataset
| Authors (year) | Country       | Study design | Aim                                                                 | Modality   | AI model   | Endoscopists                      | Sens % | Spec % | Accuracy % | Experience (in years) | Sens % | Spec % | Accuracy % |
|---------------|---------------|--------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------------------------------|--------|--------|------------|------------------------|--------|--------|------------|
| Ebigbo et al. (2020) [10] | Germany   | Pro          | Detection of BE neoplasia during live endoscopy                     | WLE        |            |                                    | 84     | 100    | 90         | x                      | x      | x      | x          |
| de Groof et al. (2020) [26] | Netherlands | Retro        | Detection of BE neoplasia                                          | WLE        |            | Seniors >5; Juniors <3; Fellows; Novices | 77     | 79     | 73         | 77; 76; 76; 73          | 75     | 78     | 66         |
| de Groof et al. (2020) [25] | Netherlands | Pro          | Detection and delineation of BE neoplasia and selection of optimal biopsy site during live endoscopy | WLE        |            |                                    | 91     | 89     | 90         | x                      | x      | x      | x          |
| Hashimoto et al. (2020) [23] | USA        | Retro        | Detection and image annotation of BE neoplasia                     | WLE/ME-NBI |            |                                    | 96     | 94     | 95         | x                      | x      | x      | x          |
| Ebigbo et al. (2019) [27] | Germany   | Retro        | Detection of BE neoplasia                                          | WLE NBI    |            |                                    | 94-97  | 88-100 | 80         | x                      | x      | x      | x          |
| de Groof et al. (2019) [7] | Netherlands | Pro data collection | Detection and delineation of BE neoplasia                         | WLE        |            |                                    | 95     | 85     | 92         | x                      | x      | x      | x          |
| van der Sommen et al. (2016) [24] | Netherlands | Retro        | Detection and delineation of BE neoplasia                         | WLE        |            | Experts*                          | 95-100 | 73-93 | x           | x                      | 95     | 99     | x          |

**Abbreviations:** AI = Artificial Intelligence; BE = Barrett’s esophagus; ME = magnified endoscopy; NBI = narrow band imaging; NDBE = non-dysplastic Barrett’s esophagus; Pro = prospective; Retro = retrospective; Sens = sensitivity; Spec = specificity; USA = United States of America; WLE = white light endoscopy

*Years of experience (of subgroups) of endoscopists unknown

x = not reported
Table 2: Application of AI in the detection of ESCC and prediction of invasion depth.

| Authors (year) | Country | Study design | Aim | Modality | AI model | Endoscopists | Experience (in years) | Sens % | Spec % | Accuracy % |
|----------------|---------|--------------|-----|----------|----------|--------------|-----------------------|--------|--------|------------|
| Guo et al. (2020) [43] | India | Retro | Detection of ESCC | NBI images videos | ME-NBI/BLI | x | x | x | x |
| Ohmori et al. (2020) [37] | Japan | Retro | Detection of ESCC and Differentiation ESCC vs no cancer | WLE | ME-NBI/BLI | 90 | 98 | 76 | 81 | 8-24 | 87 | 67 | 75 |
| Fukuda et al. (2020) [45] | Japan | Retro | Detection of ESCC and differentiation ESCC vs no cancer | NBI/BLI | | 91 | 51 | 63 | 8 | 4 | 79 | 70 | 76 |
| Tokai et al. (2020) [40] | Japan | Retro | Detection of ESCC and prediction of invasion depth | WLE | | 84 | 73 | 81 | Unknown | 79 | 62 | 74 |
| Shimamoto et al. (2020) [41] | Japan | Retro | Prediction of invasion depth of ESCC | WLE | ME-NBI/BLI | 87 | 71 | 50 | 99 | 89 | 7-25 | 45 | 97 | 85 |
| Cai et al. (2019) [38] | China | Retro | Detection of ESCC | WLE | | 98 | 85 | 91 | >15 | 86 | 91 | 89 | 84 | 82 |
| Zhao et al. (2019) [42] | China | Retro | Feasibility of automated IPCLs classification | ME-NBI | | 87 | 84 | 89 | >15 | 91 | 79 | 84 | 71 | 76 |
| Nakagawa et al. (2019) [39] | Japan | Retro | Prediction of invasion depth of ESCC | WLE | | 90 | 96 | 90 | 9-23 | 89 | 88 | 90 |

**Abbreviations:** AI = Artificial Intelligence; BLI = blue light imaging; NBI = narrow band imaging; ESCC = esophageal squamous cell carcinoma; IPCL = intrapapillary capillary loop; Retro = retrospective; ME = magnified endoscopy; Sens = sensitivity; Spec = specificity; WLE = white light endoscopy

x = not reported
Table 3. Application of AI in the detection of EGC and prediction of invasion depth.

| Authors (year) | Country | Study design | Aim | Modality | AI model | Sens % | Spec % | Accuracy % | Experience (in years/number of EGDs) | Endoscopists | Sens % | Spec % | Accuracy % |
|----------------|---------|--------------|-----|----------|----------|--------|--------|------------|---------------------------------|-------------|--------|--------|------------|
| Ikenoyama et al. (2021) [55] | Japan | Retro | Detection of EGC | WLE/NBI | 58 | 87 | x | Mean 18.6 Mean 8.2 | 37 27 97 97 | x |
| Ueyama et al. (2020) [60] | Japan | Retro | Detection of EGC | ME-NBI | 98 | 100 | 99 | x x x x | |
| Horiuchi et al. (2020) [58] | Japan | Retro | Detection of EGC | ME-NBI | 87 95 | 83 71 | 85 85 | >10 5-10 | 54-94 68-85 62-95 89-99 58-92 78-88 | x x x x x |
| Nagao et al. (2020) [61] | Japan | Retro | Prediction of invasion depth of EGC | WLE NBI | 84 75 | 99 100 | 94 94 | x x x x | |
| Li et al. (2020) [8] | China | Retro | Detection of EGC | ME-NBI | 91 | 91 | 91 | >10 3 | 78-81 74-78 62-73 87 70-74 | |
| Cho et al. (2019) [54] | China | Retro | Detection of EGC | WLE | 28 50 | 88 91 | 75 76 | Mean 6.7 | 69-93 87-100 82-98 | |
| Wu et al. (2019) [53] | Japan | Retro | Detection of EGC | WLE | 94 | 91 | 93 | Expert* Senior Trainee | 94 90 87 89 90 87 | 81 |
| Yoon et al. (2019) [52] | Korea | Retro | Detection of EGC | WLE | 91 79 | 98 78 | AUC 0.98 AUC 0.85 | x x x x | |
| Zhu et al. (2019) [56] | USA | Retro | Prediction of invasion depth of EGC | WLE | 76 96 | 89 | >5000 EGDs 2000-5000 EGDs | 87 63 70 62 77 66 | |
| Hirasawa et al. (2018) [57] | Japan | Retro | Detection of EGC | WLE | 92 | x | 92 | x x x x | |
| Kanesaka et al. (2018) [59] | Taiwan | Retro | Detection and delineation of EGC | ME-NBI | 97 | 95 | 96 | x x x x | |
| Miyaki et al. (2013, 2015) [62,63] | Japan | Retro | Detection of EGC | FICE | 85 | 87 | 86 | x x x x | |

**Abbreviations:** AI = Artificial Intelligence; AUC = area under the curve; BLI = blue light imaging; EC = esophageal cancer; EGC = early gastric cancer; FICE = flexible spectral imaging color enhancement; ME = magnified endoscopy; NBI = narrow band imaging; USA= United States of America; Retro = retrospective; Sens = sensitivity; Spec = specificity; WLE = white light endoscopy

*Years of experience of subgroups of endoscopists unknown
x = not reported
Table 4. Application of AI in the detection of gastric precancerous lesions and HP.

| Authors (year)       | Country | Study design | Aim                        | Modality | AI model | Sens % | Spec % | Accuracy % | Experience (in years/number of EGDs) | Endoscopists                  | Sens % | Spec % | Accuracy % |
|----------------------|---------|--------------|----------------------------|----------|----------|--------|--------|------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------|--------|------------|
| Zhang et al. (2020)  | China   | Retro        | Detection of CAG           | WLE      | 95       | 94     | 94     |            | Experts*                        | 88-92 60-62                   | 90-91  | 58-60  | 89-92 59-61 |
| Guimaraes et al. (2020) | Germany | Retro        | Detection of CAG           | WLE      | 100      | 88     | 93     |            | >1500 EGDs 64 96 <1500 EGDs 79 | 81                            |
| Yan et al. (2020)    | China   | Retro        | Detection of GIM           | (ME-)NBI | 92       | 86     | 89     |            | 10 87                         | 84                            |
| Yasuda et al. (2020) | Japan   | Retro        | Detection of HP infection  | NBI      | 90       | 86     | 88     |            | Expert* Endoscopist 93 90 91 90 | 91                            |
| Zheng et al. (2019)  | China   | Retro        | Detection of HP infection  | WLE      | 92       | 99     | 94     |            | Senior resident 93 90 83 87 | 87                            |
| Shichijo et al. (2019) | Japan   | Retro        | Detection of HP infection  | WLE      | x        | x      | 80     |            | x x x x                         | x x x x x                      |
| Nakashima et al. (2018) | Japan   | Pro data collection | Detection of HP infection | WLE NBI  | 67       | 60 83-87 | AUC 0.66 | x x x x x         | x x x x x                     |
| Itoh et al. (2018)   | Japan   | Retro        | Detection of HP infection  | WLE      | 87       | 87     | AUC 0.96 | x x x x x         | Experts* Trainee x x x x x x | 74-81 65-73 |
| Huang et al. (2004)  | Taiwan  | Retro        | Detection gastric precancerous lesions and HP infection | WLE | 85 | 91 | 85 | Experts* Trainee x x | 74-81 65-73 |

Abbreviations: AI = Artificial Intelligence; AUC = area under the curve; CAG = chronic atrophic gastritis; EGD = esophagogastroduodenoscopy; GIM = gastric intestinal metaplasia; HGD = high-grade dysplasia; HP = Helicobacter Pylori; LGD = low-grade dysplasia; NBI = narrow band imaging; Pro = prospective; Retro = retrospective; Sens = sensitivity; Spec = specificity; WLE = white light endoscopy. *Years of experience of subgroups of endoscopists unknown x = not reported
Table 5. Current status of (development of) AI system per upper GI indication.

| Indications for AI in upper GI endoscopy | Current status of AI systems |
|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| **BE neoplasia**                        | - Algorithms are trained and validated with a dataset of labelled endoscopic images  
- Prospective studies during live endoscopic procedures have been performed in small groups of patients  
Next step: Validation of AI algorithms in large groups of patients during live endoscopic procedures. Assess AI performance when used by endoscopists with different levels of experience |
| Detection, characterization and delineation of BE neoplasia  
Selection of biopsy site  
ESCC  
Detection of early ESCC  
Prediction of invasion depth  
EGC  
Detection of EGC  
Prediction of invasion depth  
Gastric precancerous lesions  
GIM and HP infection  
CAG |
| **ESCC**                                | - Algorithms are trained and validated with a dataset of labelled endoscopic images  
- Retrospective studies with high quality images or videos have been performed  
Next step: prospective data collection of images and videos |
| Detection of early ESCC  
Prediction of invasion depth |
| **EGC**                                 | - Algorithms are trained and validated with a dataset of labelled endoscopic images  
- Retrospective studies with high quality images or videos  
Next step: Prospective data collection of images and videos |
| Detection of EGC  
Prediction of invasion depth |
| **Gastric precancerous lesions**        | - Algorithms are trained and validated with a dataset of labelled endoscopic images  
- Prospective data collection with high quality images  
Next step: Prospective studies during live endoscopic procedures |
| GIM and HP infection  
CAG |

**Abbreviations**: AI = artificial intelligence; BE = Barrett’s esophagus; CAG = chronic atrophic gastritis; EGC = early gastric cancer; ESCC = esophageal squamous cell carcinoma; GI = gastrointestinal; GIM = gastric intestinal metaplasia; HP = Helicobacter pylori.