

# Protocol

## Endoscopic Radiofrequency Ablation or Cryoablation for Barrett Esophagus

(20180)

<b>Medical Benefit</b>		<b>Effective Date:</b> 01/01/16	<b>Next Review Date:</b> 09/19
<b>Preauthorization</b>	No	<b>Review Dates:</b> 05/09, 03/10, 03/11, 03/12, 07/12, 03/13, 03/14, 09/14, 09/15, 09/16, 09/17, 09/18	

### **Preauthorization is not required.**

*The following protocol contains medical necessity criteria that apply for this service. The criteria are also applicable to services provided in the local Medicare Advantage operating area for those members, unless separate Medicare Advantage criteria are indicated. If the criteria are not met, reimbursement will be denied and the patient cannot be billed. Please note that payment for covered services is subject to eligibility and the limitations noted in the patient's contract at the time the services are rendered.*

Populations	Interventions	Comparators	Outcomes
Individuals: • With Barrett esophagus with high-grade dysplasia	Interventions of interest are: • Endoscopic radiofrequency ablation	Comparators of interest are: • Esophagectomy • Endoscopic mucosal resection • Surveillance	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Change in disease status • Morbid events • Treatment-related mortality • Treatment-related morbidity
Individuals: • With Barrett esophagus with low-grade dysplasia	Interventions of interest are: • Endoscopic radiofrequency ablation	Comparators of interest are: • Surveillance	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Change in disease status • Morbid events • Treatment-related mortality • Treatment-related morbidity
Individuals: • With Barrett esophagus without dysplasia	Interventions of interest are: • Endoscopic radiofrequency ablation	Comparators of interest are: • Surveillance	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Change in disease status • Morbid events • Treatment-related mortality • Treatment-related morbidity
Individuals: • With Barrett esophagus with or without dysplasia	Interventions of interest are: • Endoscopic cryoablation	Comparators of interest are: • Esophagectomy • Endoscopic mucosal resection • Surveillance	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Change in disease status • Morbid events • Treatment-related mortality • Treatment-related morbidity

### **DESCRIPTION**

In Barrett esophagus (BE), the normal squamous epithelium is replaced by specialized columnar-type epithelium, known as intestinal metaplasia. Intestinal metaplasia is a precursor to adenocarcinoma and may be treated with mucosal ablation techniques such as radiofrequency ablation (RFA) or cryoablation.

## SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

For individuals who have BE with high-grade dysplasia (HGD) who receive endoscopic RFA, the evidence includes a randomized controlled trial (RCT) comparing radical endoscopic resection with focal endoscopic resection followed by RFA, an RCT comparing RFA with surveillance alone, and a number of observational studies, some of which compared RFA with other endoscopic treatment modalities. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, change in disease status, morbid events, and treatment-related morbidity and mortality. The available evidence has shown that using RFA to treat BE with HGD is at least as effective in eradicating HGD as other ablative techniques, with a lower progression rate to cancer, and may be considered an alternative to esophagectomy. Evidence from at least one RCT has demonstrated higher rates of eradication than surveillance alone. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have BE with low-grade dysplasia (LGD) who receive endoscopic RFA, the evidence includes at least two RCTs comparing RFA with surveillance alone, a number of observational studies, and systematic reviews of these studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, change in disease status, morbid events, and treatment-related morbidity and mortality. For patients with confirmed LGD, evidence from an RCT has suggested that RFA reduces progression to HGD and adenocarcinoma. Challenges exist in differentiating between nondysplastic BE and BE with LGD; making the correct diagnosis has important implications for LGD treatment decisions. One of the available RCTs required that LGD be confirmed by an expert panel, which supports the use of having a gastrointestinal pathologist confirm LGD before treatment of BE with LGD can begin. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have BE without dysplasia who receive endoscopic RFA, the evidence includes single-arm studies reporting outcomes after RFA. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, change in disease status, morbid events, and treatment-related morbidity and mortality. The available studies have suggested that nondysplastic metaplasia can be eradicated by RFA. However, the risk-benefit ratio and the net effect of RFA on health outcomes are unknown. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

For individuals who have BE with or without dysplasia who receive endoscopic cryoablation, the evidence includes noncomparative studies reporting outcomes after cryoablation. Relevant outcomes include overall survival, change in disease status, morbid events, and treatment-related morbidity and mortality. These studies have generally demonstrated high rates of eradication of dysplasia. However, the available evidence does not compare cryoablation with surgical care or RFA. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

## POLICY

Radiofrequency ablation may be considered **medically necessary** for the treatment of Barrett esophagus with high-grade dysplasia (see Policy Guidelines).

Radiofrequency ablation may be considered **medically necessary** for the treatment of Barrett esophagus with low-grade dysplasia, when the initial diagnosis of low-grade dysplasia is confirmed by two physicians (see Policy Guidelines).

Radiofrequency ablation is considered **investigational** for the treatment of Barrett esophagus when the above criteria are not met, including but not limited to Barrett esophagus in the absence of dysplasia.

Cryoablation is considered **investigational** for the treatment of Barrett esophagus, with or without dysplasia.

## POLICY GUIDELINES

RFA for Barrett esophagus with HGD may be used in combination with endoscopic mucosal resection of nodular or visible lesions. The diagnosis of HGD should be confirmed by two pathologists before initiating RFA.

There is considerable interobserver variability in the diagnosis of LGD, and the potential exists for overdiagnosis of LGD by nonexpert pathologists (overdiagnosis is due primarily to the difficulty in distinguishing inflammatory changes from LGD). There is literature evidence that expert gastrointestinal (GI) pathologists will downgrade a substantial portion of biopsies that are initially read as LGD by nonexperts (Curvers et al, 2010; Kerkhof et al, 2007). As a result, it is ideal that two experts in GI pathology agree on the diagnosis to confirm LGD; this may result in greater than 75% of initial diagnoses of LGD being downgraded to nondysplasia (Curvers et al, 2010). A review by a single expert GI pathologist will also result in a large number of LGD diagnoses being downgraded, although probably not as many as achieved using two expert pathologists (Kerkhof et al, 2007).

## BACKGROUND

### BARRETT ESOPHAGUS AND RISK OF ESOPHAGEAL CARCINOMA

The esophagus is normally lined by squamous epithelium. Barrett esophagus (BE) is a condition in which the normal squamous epithelium is replaced by specialized columnar-type epithelium, known as intestinal metaplasia, in response to irritation and injury caused by gastroesophageal reflux disease. Occurring in the distal esophagus, BE may be of any length; it may be focal or circumferential and can be seen on endoscopy as being a different color than the background squamous mucosa. Confirmation of BE requires biopsy of the columnar epithelium and microscopic identification of intestinal metaplasia.

Intestinal metaplasia is a precursor to esophageal adenocarcinoma, which is thought to result from a stepwise accumulation of genetic abnormalities in the specialized epithelium, resulting in the phenotypic expression of histologic features from LGD, to HGD, to carcinoma. Two large epidemiologic studies published in 2011 reported the risk of progression to cancer in patients with BE. One reported the rate of progression to cancer in more than 8000 patients with a mean duration of follow-up of seven years (range, one to 20 years).<sup>1</sup> The de novo progression to cancer from BE at one year was 0.13%. The risk of progression was reported as 1.4% per year in patients with LGD and 0.17% per year in patients without dysplasia. This incidence translates into a risk of 10 to 11 times that of the general population. The other study identified more than 11,000 patients with BE and after a median follow-up of 5.2 years; it reported that the annual risk of esophageal adenocarcinoma was 0.12%.<sup>2</sup> Detection of LGD on index endoscopy was associated with an incidence rate for adenocarcinoma of 5.1 cases per 1000 person-years, and the incidence rate among patients without dysplasia was 1.0 case per 1000 person-years. Risk estimates for patients with HGD were slightly higher.

The reported risk of progression to cancer in BE in older studies was much higher, with an annual incidence of risk of 0.4% to 0.5% per year, with risk estimated at 30 to 40 times that of the general population. Current surveillance recommendations have been based on these higher risk estimates.

### Management

The management of BE includes treatment of gastroesophageal reflux disease and surveillance endoscopy to detect progression to HGD or adenocarcinoma. The finding of HGD or early-stage adenocarcinoma warrants mucosal ablation or resection (either endoscopic mucosal resection [EMR] or esophagectomy).

EMR, either focal or circumferential, provides a histologic specimen for examination and staging (unlike ablative techniques). One 2007 study provided long-term results for EMR in 100 consecutive patients with early Barrett-associated adenocarcinoma (limited to the mucosa).<sup>3</sup> The five-year overall survival was 98% and, after a mean of 36.7 months, metachronous lesions were observed in 11% of patients. In a review by Pech and Eli (2009), the

authors stated that circumferential EMR of the entire segment of BE leads to a stricture rate of 50%, and recurrences occur at a rate of up to 11%.<sup>4</sup>

#### Ablative Techniques

Available mucosal ablation techniques that include several thermal (multipolar electrocoagulation [MPEC], argon plasma coagulation [APC], heater probe, Nd:YAG laser, KTP-YAG laser, diode laser, argon laser, cryoablation) or nonthermal (5-aminolevulinic acid, photodynamic therapy [PDT]) techniques. In a 2005 randomized phase 3 trial, PDT was shown to decrease significantly the risk of adenocarcinoma in BE.<sup>5</sup> (PDT for BE is discussed in the Oncologic Applications of Photodynamic Therapy, Including Barrett Esophagus Protocol.)

The CryoSpray Ablation system uses a low-pressure spray for spraying liquid nitrogen through an upper endoscope. Cryotherapy allows for treatment of uneven surfaces; however, a disadvantage of the treatment is the uneven application inherent in spraying the cryogen.

The HALO system uses radiofrequency energy and consists of two components: an energy generator and an ablation catheter. The generator provides rapid (i.e., less than one second) delivery of a predetermined amount of RF energy to the catheter. The HALO90 or the HALO360 is inserted into the esophagus with an endoscope, using standard endoscopic techniques. The HALO90 catheter is plate-based and used for focal ablation of areas of BE up to three cm. The HALO360 uses a balloon catheter that is sized to fit the individual's esophagus and is inflated to allow for circumferential ablation.

Ablation with RF affects only the most superficial layer of the esophagus (i.e., the mucosa), leaving the underlying tissues unharmed. Measures of efficacy for the procedure are eradication of intestinal metaplasia and post-ablation regrowth of the normal squamous epithelium. (Note: The eradication of intestinal metaplasia does not leave behind microscopic [or "buried"] foci). Reports of the efficacy of the HALO system in ablating BE have been as high as 70% (comparable with alternative methods of ablation [e.g., APC, MPEC]), and even higher in some reports. The incidence of leaving behind buried foci of intestinal metaplasia has been reported to be between 20% and 44% with APC and 7% with MPEC; studies using the HALO system have reported 0%.<sup>6</sup> Another potential advantage to the HALO system is that because it is an automated process, it eliminates operator-dependent error that may be seen with APC or MPEC.

The risk of treating HGD or mucosal cancer solely with ablative techniques is undertreatment for approximately 10% of patients with undetected submucosal cancer, in whom esophagectomy would have been required.<sup>4</sup>

#### REGULATORY STATUS

In 2005, the HALO360 (now Barrx™ 360 RFA Balloon Catheter; Barrx Medical, Sunnyvale, CA; acquired by Covidien in 2012) was cleared for marketing by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) through the 510(k) process and, in 2006, the HALO90 (now Barrx™ 90 RFA Focal Catheter) received clearance. FDA-labeled indications are for use in coagulation of bleeding and nonbleeding sites in the gastrointestinal tract, and include the treatment of BE.<sup>7</sup> FDA product code: GEI.

In December 2007, the CryoSpray Ablation™ System (formerly the SprayGenix Cryo Ablation system; CSA Medical, Lutherville, MD) was cleared for marketing by FDA through the 510(k) process for use as a "cryosurgical tool for destruction of unwanted tissue in the field of general surgery, specifically for endoscopic applications."<sup>8</sup> FDA product code: GEH.

In July 2002, the Polar Wand® device (Chek-Med Systems, Willington, CT), a cryosurgical device that uses compressed carbon dioxide, was cleared for marketing by FDA through the 510(k) process. Indications for use are

“ablation of unwanted tissue in the fields of dermatology, gynecology, general surgery, urology, and gastroenterology.”<sup>9</sup>

## RELATED PROTOCOLS

Confocal Laser Endomicroscopy

Oncologic Applications of Photodynamic Therapy, Including Barrett Esophagus

---

Services that are the subject of a clinical trial do not meet our Technology Assessment Protocol criteria and are considered investigational. *For explanation of experimental and investigational, please refer to the Technology Assessment Protocol.*

It is expected that only appropriate and medically necessary services will be rendered. We reserve the right to conduct prepayment and postpayment reviews to assess the medical appropriateness of the above-referenced procedures. **Some of this protocol may not pertain to the patients you provide care to, as it may relate to products that are not available in your geographic area.**

## REFERENCES

We are not responsible for the continuing viability of web site addresses that may be listed in any references below.

1. Bhat S, Coleman HG, Yousef F, et al. Risk of malignant progression in Barrett’s esophagus patients: results from a large population-based study. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* Jul 6 2011;103(13):1049-1057. PMID 21680910
2. Hvid-Jensen F, Pedersen L, Drewes AM, et al. Incidence of adenocarcinoma among patients with Barrett’s esophagus. *N Engl J Med.* Oct 13 2011;365(15):1375-1383. PMID 21995385
3. Ell C, May A, Pech O, et al. Curative endoscopic resection of early esophageal adenocarcinomas (Barrett’s cancer). *Gastrointest Endosc.* Jan 2007;65(1):3-10. PMID 17185072
4. Pech O, Ell C. Endoscopic therapy of Barrett’s esophagus. *Curr Opin Gastroenterol.* Sep 2009;25(5):405-411. PMID 19474724
5. Overholt BF, Lightdale CJ, Wang KK, et al. Photodynamic therapy with porfimer sodium for ablation of high-grade dysplasia in Barrett’s esophagus: international, partially blinded, randomized phase III trial. *Gastrointest Endosc.* Oct 2005;62(4):488-498. PMID 16185958
6. Ganz RA, Overholt BF, Sharma VK, et al. Circumferential ablation of Barrett’s esophagus that contains high-grade dysplasia: a U.S. Multicenter Registry. *Gastrointest Endosc.* Jul 2008;68(1):35-40. PMID 18355819
7. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. 510(k) Premarket Notification Database: BARRX MODELS HALO360 AND HALO360+ COAGULATION CAT. No. K080557. 2008; [http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfpmn/pmn\\_template.cfm?id=k080557](http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfpmn/pmn_template.cfm?id=k080557). Accessed October 25, 2017.
8. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. 510(k) Safety Summary: CryoSpray Ablation System. No. K072651. 2007; [http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh\\_docs/pdf7/K072651.pdf](http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf7/K072651.pdf). Accessed October 25, 2017.
9. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. 510(k) Premarket Notification to Check-Med Systems, Inc. 2002; [https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh\\_docs/pdf2/k021387.pdf](https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf2/k021387.pdf). Accessed November 16, 2017.
10. Hernandez JC, Reicher S, Chung D, et al. Pilot series of radiofrequency ablation of Barrett’s esophagus with or without neoplasia. *Endoscopy.* May 2008;40(5):388-392. PMID 18459075

11. Pouw RE, Gondrie JJ, Sondermeijer CM, et al. Eradication of Barrett esophagus with early neoplasia by radiofrequency ablation, with or without endoscopic resection. *J Gastrointest Surg.* Oct 2008;12(10):1627-1636; discussion 1636-1627. PMID 18704598
12. Roorda AK, Marcus SN, Triadafilopoulos G. Early experience with radiofrequency energy ablation therapy for Barrett's esophagus with and without dysplasia. *Dis Esophagus.* 2007;20(6):516-522. PMID 17958728
13. Sharma VK, Wang KK, Overholt BF, et al. Balloon-based, circumferential, endoscopic radiofrequency ablation of Barrett's esophagus: 1-year follow-up of 100 patients. *Gastrointest Endosc.* Feb 2007;65(2):185-195. PMID 17258973
14. Chadwick G, Groene O, Markar SR, et al. Systematic review comparing radiofrequency ablation and complete endoscopic resection in treating dysplastic Barrett's esophagus: a critical assessment of histologic outcomes and adverse events. *Gastrointest Endosc.* May 2014;79(5):718-731 e713. PMID 24462170
15. van Vilsteren FG, Pouw RE, Seewald S, et al. Stepwise radical endoscopic resection versus radiofrequency ablation for Barrett's oesophagus with high-grade dysplasia or early cancer: a multicentre randomised trial. *Gut.* Jun 2011;60(6):765-773. PMID 21209124
16. Shaheen NJ, Sharma P, Overholt BF, et al. Radiofrequency ablation in Barrett's esophagus with dysplasia. *N Engl J Med.* May 28 2009;360(22):2277-2288. PMID 19474425
17. Shaheen NJ, Overholt BF, Sampliner RE, et al. Durability of radiofrequency ablation in Barrett's esophagus with dysplasia. *Gastroenterology.* Aug 2011;141(2):460-468. PMID 21679712
18. Orman ES, Li N, Shaheen NJ. Efficacy and durability of radiofrequency ablation for Barrett's Esophagus: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol.* Oct 2013;11(10):1245-1255. PMID 23644385
19. Semlitsch T, Jeitler K, Schoefl R, et al. A systematic review of the evidence for radiofrequency ablation for Barrett's esophagus. *Surg Endosc.* Dec 2010;24(12):2935-2943. PMID 20464420
20. Phoa KN, Pouw RE, Bisschops R, et al. Multimodality endoscopic eradication for neoplastic Barrett oesophagus: results of an European multicentre study (EURO-II). *Gut.* Apr 2016;65(4):555-562. PMID 25731874
21. Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). Radiofrequency ablation of nondysplastic or low-grade dysplastic Barrett's esophagus. *TEC Assessments.* 2010;Volume 25:Tab 5. PMID
22. Eloubeidi MA, Wallace MB, Hoffman BJ, et al. Predictors of survival for esophageal cancer patients with and without celiac axis lymphadenopathy: impact of staging endosonography. *Ann Thoracic Surg.* Jul 2001;72(1):212-219; discussion 219-220. PMID 11465182
23. Barret M, Belghazi K, Weusten BL, et al. Single-session endoscopic resection and focal radiofrequency ablation for short-segment Barrett's esophagus with early neoplasia. *Gastrointest Endosc.* Jul 2016;84(1):29-36. PMID 26769410
24. Almond LM, Hodson J, Barr H. Meta-analysis of endoscopic therapy for low-grade dysplasia in Barrett's oesophagus. *Br J Surg.* Sep 2014;101(10):1187-1195. PMID 24965075
25. Phoa KN, van Vilsteren FG, Weusten BL, et al. Radiofrequency ablation vs. endoscopic surveillance for patients with Barrett esophagus and low-grade dysplasia: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA.* Mar 26 2014;311(12):1209-1217. PMID 24668102
26. Downs-Kelly E, Mendelin JE, Bennett AE, et al. Poor interobserver agreement in the distinction of high-grade dysplasia and adenocarcinoma in pretreatment Barrett's esophagus biopsies. *Am J Gastroenterol.* Sep 2008;103(9):2333-2340; quiz 2341. PMID 18671819
27. Yerian L. Histology of metaplasia and dysplasia in Barrett's esophagus. *Surg Oncol Clin N Am.* Jul 2009;18(3):411-422. PMID 19500733
28. Wang KK, Sampliner RE. Updated guidelines 2008 for the diagnosis, surveillance and therapy of Barrett's esophagus. *Am J Gastroenterol.* Mar 2008;103(3):788-797. PMID 18341497
29. Kerkhof M, van Dekken H, Steyerberg EW, et al. Grading of dysplasia in Barrett's oesophagus: substantial interobserver variation between general and gastrointestinal pathologists. *Histopathology.* Jun 2007;50(7):920-927. PMID 17543082



30. Curvers WL, ten Kate FJ, Krishnadath KK, et al. Low-grade dysplasia in Barrett's esophagus: overdiagnosed and underestimated. *Am J Gastroenterol*. Jul 2010;105(7):1523-1530. PMID 20461069
31. Duits LC, Phoa KN, Curvers WL, et al. Barrett's oesophagus patients with low-grade dysplasia can be accurately risk-stratified after histological review by an expert pathology panel. *Gut*. May 2015;64(5):700-706. PMID 25034523
32. Fleischer DE, Overholt BF, Sharma VK, et al. Endoscopic ablation of Barrett's esophagus: a multicenter study with 2.5-year follow-up. *Gastrointest Endosc*. Nov 2008;68(5):867-876. PMID 18561930
33. Fleischer DE, Overholt BF, Sharma VK, et al. Endoscopic radiofrequency ablation for Barrett's esophagus: 5-year outcomes from a prospective multicenter trial. *Endoscopy*. Oct 2010;42(10):781-789. PMID 20857372
34. Ertan A, Zaheer I, Correa AM, et al. Photodynamic therapy vs. radiofrequency ablation for Barrett's dysplasia: efficacy, safety and cost-comparison. *World J Gastroenterol*. Nov 7 2013;19(41):7106-7113. PMID 24222954
35. David WJ, Qumseya BJ, Qumsiyeh Y, et al. Comparison of endoscopic treatment modalities for Barrett's neoplasia. *Gastrointest Endosc*. Nov 2015;82(5):793-803 e793. PMID 26071064
36. Johnston MH, Eastone JA, Horwhat JD, et al. Cryoablation of Barrett's esophagus: a pilot study. *Gastrointest Endosc*. Dec 2005;62(6):842-848. PMID 16301023
37. Dumot JA, Vargo JJ, 2nd, Falk GW, et al. An open-label, prospective trial of cryospray ablation for Barrett's esophagus high-grade dysplasia and early esophageal cancer in high-risk patients. *Gastrointest Endosc*. Oct 2009;70(4):635-644. PMID 19559428
38. Greenwald BD, Dumot JA, Horwhat JD, et al. Safety, tolerability, and efficacy of endoscopic low-pressure liquid nitrogen spray cryotherapy in the esophagus. *Dis Esophagus*. Jan 2010;23(1):13-19. PMID 19515183
39. Shaheen NJ, Greenwald BD, Peery AF, et al. Safety and efficacy of endoscopic spray cryotherapy for Barrett's esophagus with high-grade dysplasia. *Gastrointest Endosc*. Apr 2010;71(4):680-685. PMID 20363409
40. Canto MI, Shin EJ, Khashab MA, et al. Safety and efficacy of carbon dioxide cryotherapy for treatment of neoplastic Barrett's esophagus. *Endoscopy*. Jul 2015;47(7):582-591. PMID 25826275
41. Sengupta N, Ketwaroo GA, Bak DM, et al. Salvage cryotherapy after failed radiofrequency ablation for Barrett's esophagus-related dysplasia is safe and effective. *Gastrointest Endosc*. Sep 2015;82(3):443-448. PMID 25887715
42. Shaheen NJ, Falk GW, Iyer PG, et al. ACG Clinical Guideline: diagnosis and management of Barrett's esophagus. *Am J Gastroenterol*. Jan 2016;111(1):30-50; quiz 51. PMID 26526079
43. Fitzgerald RC, di Pietro M, Ragnath K, et al. British Society of Gastroenterology guidelines on the diagnosis and management of Barrett's oesophagus. *Gut*. Jan 2014;63(1):7-42. PMID 24165758
44. ASGE Standards of Practice Committee, Evans JA, Early DS, et al. The role of endoscopy in Barrett's esophagus and other premalignant conditions of the esophagus. *Gastrointest Endosc*. Dec 2012;76(6):1087-1094. PMID 23164510
45. Sharma P, Katzka DA, Gupta N, et al. Quality indicators for the management of Barrett's esophagus, dysplasia, and esophageal adenocarcinoma: International Consensus Recommendations from the American Gastroenterological Association Symposium. *Gastroenterology*. Nov 2015;149(6):1599-1606. PMID 26296479
46. Spechler SJ, Sharma P, Souza RF, et al. American Gastroenterological Association medical position statement on the management of Barrett's esophagus. *Gastroenterology*. Mar 2011;140(3):1084-1091. PMID 21376940
47. Stefanidis D, Hope WW, Kohn GP, et al. Guidelines for surgical treatment of gastroesophageal reflux disease. *Surg Endosc*. Nov 2010;24(11):2647-2669. PMID 20725747
48. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Esophageal and Esophagogastric Junction Cancers. Version 2.2017. [http://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician\\_gls/PDF/esophageal.pdf](http://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/PDF/esophageal.pdf). Accessed September 15, 2017.