



MASSACHUSETTS

Blue Cross Blue Shield of Massachusetts is an Independent Licensee of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association

Medical Policy

Endoscopic Radiofrequency Ablation or Cryoablation for Barrett Esophagus

Table of Contents

- [Policy: Commercial](#)
- [Coding Information](#)
- [Information Pertaining to All Policies](#)
- [Policy: Medicare](#)
- [Description](#)
- [References](#)
- [Authorization Information](#)
- [Policy History](#)

Policy Number: 218

BCBSA Reference Number: 2.01.80 (For Plans internal use only)

NCD/LCD: NA

Related Policies

- Oncologic Applications of Photodynamic Therapy, Including Barrett Esophagus, [#454](#)
- Confocal Laser Endomicroscopy, [#618](#)

Policy

Commercial Members: Managed Care (HMO and POS), PPO, and Indemnity Medicare HMO BlueSM and Medicare PPO BlueSM Members

Radiofrequency ablation may be considered [MEDICALLY NECESSARY](#) for treatment of Barrett esophagus with high-grade dysplasia.

Radiofrequency ablation may be considered [MEDICALLY NECESSARY](#) for treatment of Barrett esophagus with low-grade dysplasia, when the initial diagnosis of low-grade dysplasia is confirmed by two pathologists.

Radiofrequency ablation is considered [INVESTIGATIONAL](#) for 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 Barrett esophagus, with or without dysplasia.

Prior Authorization Information

Inpatient

- For services described in this policy, precertification/preauthorization **IS REQUIRED** for all products if the procedure is performed **inpatient**.

Outpatient

- For services described in this policy, see below for products where prior authorization **might be required** if the procedure is performed **outpatient**.

	Outpatient
Commercial Managed Care (HMO and POS)	Prior authorization is not required .
Commercial PPO and Indemnity	Prior authorization is not required .
Medicare HMO BlueSM	Prior authorization is not required .
Medicare PPO BlueSM	Prior authorization is not required .

CPT Codes / HCPCS Codes / ICD Codes

Inclusion or exclusion of a code does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage as it applies to an individual member.

Providers should report all services using the most up-to-date industry-standard procedure, revenue, and diagnosis codes, including modifiers where applicable.

The following codes are included below for informational purposes only; this is not an all-inclusive list.

The above medical necessity criteria MUST be met for the following codes to be covered for Commercial Members: Managed Care (HMO and POS), PPO, Indemnity, Medicare HMO Blue and Medicare PPO Blue:

CPT Codes

CPT codes:	Code Description
43229	Esophagoscopy, flexible, transoral; with ablation of tumor(s), polyp(s), or other lesion(s) (includes pre- and post-dilation and guide wire passage, when performed)

ICD-10 Diagnosis Codes

ICD-10-CM Diagnosis codes:	Code Description
D13.0	Benign neoplasm of esophagus
K22.710	Barrett's esophagus with low grade dysplasia
K22.711	Barrett's esophagus with high grade dysplasia
K22.719	Barrett's esophagus with dysplasia, unspecified

Description

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 a 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 low grade dysplasia (LGD), to high-grade dysplasia (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 7 years (range, 1 to 20 years).¹ The de novo progression to cancer from BE at 1 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%.²

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.

There are challenges in diagnostically differentiating between nondysplastic BE and BE with LGD; they are important when considering treatment for LGD.^{3,4} Both sampling bias and interobserver variability have been shown to be problematic. Therefore, analysis of progression to carcinoma in BE with intestinal metaplasia versus LGD is difficult. Initial diagnosis of BE can also be a challenge with respect to histologic grading because inflammation and LGD can share similar histologic characteristics.⁵

One approach to risk-stratify patients with an initial diagnosis of LGD has been to use multiple pathologists, including experts in gastrointestinal histopathology, to confirm the initial diagnosis of LGD. There is a high degree of interobserver variability among the pathology readings of LGD versus inflammatory changes, and the resultant variability in pathology diagnosis may contribute to the variable rates of progression of LGD reported in the literature.⁶ Kerkhof et al (2007) reported that, in patients with an initial pathologic diagnosis of LGD, review by an expert pathologist would result in the initial diagnosis being downgraded to nondysplasia in up to 50% of cases.⁷ Curvers et al (2010) tested this hypothesis in 147 patients with BE who were given an initial diagnosis of LGD.⁸ All pathology slides were read by 2 expert gastrointestinal pathologists with extensive experience in BE; disagreements among experts in the readings were resolved by consensus. Once this process was completed, 85% of initial diagnoses of LGD were downgraded to nondysplasia, leaving 22 (15%) of 147 patients with a confirmed diagnosis of LGD. All patients were followed for a mean of 5.1 years for progression to HGD or cancer. For patients with confirmed LGD, the rate of progression was 13.4%, compared with 0.5% for patients who had been downgraded to nondysplasia.

The strategy of having LGD confirmed by expert pathologists is supported by the results of a randomized controlled trial by Phoa et al (2014), which required confirmation of LGD by a central expert panel following initial diagnosis by a local pathologist.⁹ Of 511 patients with an initial diagnosis of LGD, 264 (52%) were excluded because the central expert panel reassigned the classification of LGD, most often from LGD to indefinite or nondysplasia. These findings were further confirmed in a retrospective cohort study by Duits et al (2015) who reported on 293 BE cases with LGD diagnosed over an 11-year period and submitted for expert panel review.¹⁰ In this sample, 73% of subjects were downstaged.

Management of Barrett Esophagus

The management of BE includes the 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).¹¹ The 5-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 Ell (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%.¹²

Ablative Techniques

Available mucosal ablation techniques include several thermal (multipolar electrocoagulation [MPEC], argon plasma coagulation [APC], heater probe, neodymium-doped yttrium aluminum garnet [Nd:YAG] laser, potassium titanyl phosphate [KTP]-YAG laser, diode laser, argon laser, cryoablation) or nonthermal (5-aminolevulinic acid, photodynamic therapy) techniques. In a randomized phase 3 trial reported by

Overholt et al (2005), photodynamic therapy was shown to decrease significantly the risk of adenocarcinoma in BE.¹³ (Photodynamic therapy for BE is discussed in policy #454.)

Radiofrequency ablation affects only the most superficial layer of the esophagus (ie, the mucosa), leaving the underlying tissues unharmed. Measures of efficacy for the procedure are the eradication of intestinal metaplasia and the postablation regrowth of the normal squamous epithelium. (Note: The eradication of intestinal metaplasia does not leave behind microscopic foci). The HALO system uses radiofrequency energy and consists of 2 components: an energy generator and an ablation catheter. Reports of the efficacy of the HALO system in ablating BE have been as high as 70% (comparable with alternative methods of ablation [eg, APC, MPEC]), and even higher in some reports. The incidence of leaving behind microscopic 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%.¹⁴ Another potential advantage of the HALO system is that it is an automated process that eliminates operator-dependent error, which may be seen with APC or MPEC. Cryotherapy allows for the treatment of uneven surfaces and can be administered as either a spray therapy or a balloon catheter..

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.¹²

Summary

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.

For individuals who have Barrett esophagus (BE) with high-grade dysplasia (HGD) who receive endoscopic radiofrequency ablation (RFA), the evidence includes a randomized controlled trial (RCT) comparing radical endoscopic resection with focal endoscopic resection followed by RFA, 1 RCT comparing RFA with surveillance alone, and a systematic review evaluating RCTs and a number of observational studies, some of which compared RFA with other endoscopic treatment modalities. Relevant outcomes are 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 techniques, with a lower progression rate to cancer, and may be considered an alternative to esophagectomy. Evidence from at least 1 RCT has demonstrated higher rates of eradication than surveillance alone. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in an 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 3 RCTs comparing RFA with surveillance alone, a number of observational studies, and systematic reviews of these studies. Relevant outcomes are change in disease status, morbid events, and treatment-related morbidity and mortality. For patients with confirmed LGD, evidence suggests that RFA reduces progression to HGD and adenocarcinoma. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in an 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 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 that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have BE with or without dysplasia who receive endoscopic cryoablation, the evidence includes nonrandomized studies and systematic reviews of those studies reporting outcomes after cryoablation. Relevant outcomes include change in disease status, morbid events, and treatment-related morbidity and mortality. These studies have generally demonstrated high rates of eradication of dysplasia. Recent observational studies comparing RFA with cryoablation show similar outcomes.

However, there are no RCTs comparing cryoablation with surgical care or RFA. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

Policy History

Date	Action
1/2025	Annual policy review. Description, summary, and references updated. Policy statements unchanged.
1/2024	Annual policy review. Description, summary, and references updated. Policy statements unchanged.
1/2023	Annual policy review. Description, summary, and references updated. Policy statements unchanged.
1/2022	Annual policy review. Description, summary, and references updated. Policy statements unchanged.
1/2021	Annual policy review. Description, summary, and references updated. Policy statements unchanged.
1/2020	Annual policy review. Description, summary, and references updated. Policy statements unchanged.
1/2019	Annual policy review. Description, summary, and references updated. Policy statements unchanged.
1/2018	Annual policy review. New references added
12/2016	Annual policy review. New references added
1/2016	Annual policy review. New references added
6/2015	Annual policy review. Investigational indications clarified. Added coding language. Effective 6/1/2015.
7/2014	Annual policy review. New references added.
5/2014	Updated Coding section with ICD10 procedure and diagnosis codes. Effective 10/2015.
1/2014	Updated to add new CPT code 43229 and remove deleted code 43228
9/2012	Added coverage for RFA for treatment of Barrett's esophagus with low-grade dysplasia. Effective 9/1/2012.
11/2011-4/2012	Medical policy ICD 10 remediation: Formatting, editing and coding updates. No changes to policy statements.
10/2011	Reviewed - Medical Policy Group – GI, Nutrition and Organ Transplantation. No changes to policy statements.
3/2011	Reviewed - Medical Policy Group – Allergy/Asthma/Immunology and ENT/Otolaryngology. No changes to policy statements.
8/1/2010	Medical Policy #218 effective 8/1/2010 describing covered and non-covered indications.

Information Pertaining to All Blue Cross Blue Shield Medical Policies

Click on any of the following terms to access the relevant information:

[Medical Policy Terms of Use](#)

[Managed Care Guidelines](#)

[Indemnity/PPO Guidelines](#)

[Clinical Exception Process](#)

[Medical Technology Assessment Guidelines](#)

References

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 06 2011; 103(13): 1049-57. 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): 1375-83. PMID 21995385
3. 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): 2333-40; quiz 2341. PMID 18671819

4. Yerian L. Histology of metaplasia and dysplasia in Barrett's esophagus. *Surg Oncol Clin N Am*. Jul 2009; 18(3): 411-22. PMID 19500733
5. Wang KK, Sampliner RE. Updated guidelines 2008 for the diagnosis, surveillance and therapy of Barrett's esophagus. *Am J Gastroenterol*. Mar 2008; 103(3): 788-97. PMID 18341497
6. Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association Technology Evaluation Center (TEC). Radiofrequency ablation of nondysplastic or low-grade dysplastic Barretts esophagus. *TEC Assessments*. 2010;Volume 25:Tab 5.
7. 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): 920-7. PMID 17543082
8. 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): 1523-30. PMID 20461069
9. 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): 1209-17. PMID 24668102
10. 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): 700-6. PMID 25034523
11. 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
12. Pech O, Ell C. Endoscopic therapy of Barrett's esophagus. *Curr Opin Gastroenterol*. Sep 2009; 25(5): 405-11. PMID 19474724
13. 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): 488-98. PMID 16185958
14. 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
15. Food and Drug Administration. 510(k) Summary: BARRX Channel RFA Endoscopic Catheter. No. K130623. 2013; https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf13/K130623.pdf. Accessed September 21, 2024.
16. Food and Drug Administration. 510(k) Safety Summary: CryoSpray Ablation System. No. K072651. 2007; https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf7/K072651.pdf. Accessed September 20, 2024.
17. Food and Drug Administration. 510(k) Summary: C2 Cryoballoon Ablation System. No. K163684. 2018; https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf16/K163684.pdf. Accessed September 23, 2024.
18. PR Newswire. Pentax Medical Introduces Next-Generation C2 Cryoballoon Ablation System for Treatment of Barrett's Esophagus. 2018. <https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/pentax-medical-introduces-next-generation-c2-cryoballoon-ablation-system-for-treatment-of-barretts-esophagus-300658152.html>. Accessed September 23, 2024.
19. 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. Accessed September 23, 2024.
20. 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 Thorac Surg*. Jul 2001; 72(1): 212-9; discussion 219-20. PMID 11465182
21. National Cancer Institute. Esophageal Cancer. <https://www.cancer.gov/pediatric-adult-rare-tumor/rare-tumors/rare-digestive-system-tumors/esophageal>. Accessed September 23, 2024.
22. 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.e3. PMID 24462170
23. 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): 765-73. PMID 21209124
24. 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): 2277-88. PMID 19474425

25. Shaheen NJ, Overholt BF, Sampliner RE, et al. Durability of radiofrequency ablation in Barrett's esophagus with dysplasia. *Gastroenterology*. Aug 2011; 141(2): 460-8. PMID 21679712
26. 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): 555-62. PMID 25731874
27. Wang Y, Ma B, Yang S, et al. Efficacy and Safety of Radiofrequency Ablation vs. Endoscopic Surveillance for Barrett's Esophagus With Low-Grade Dysplasia: Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *Front Oncol*. 2022; 12: 801940. PMID 35296005
28. Klair JS, Zafar Y, Nagra N, et al. Outcomes of Radiofrequency Ablation versus Endoscopic Surveillance for Barrett's Esophagus with Low-Grade Dysplasia: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Dig Dis*. 2021; 39(6): 561-568. PMID 33503615
29. Pandey G, Mulla M, Lewis WG, et al. Systematic review and meta-analysis of the effectiveness of radiofrequency ablation in low grade dysplastic Barrett's esophagus. *Endoscopy*. Oct 2018; 50(10): 953-960. PMID 29689573
30. 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): 867-76. PMID 18561930
31. 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): 781-9. PMID 20857372
32. Papaefthymiou A, Norton B, Telese A, et al. Efficacy and Safety of Cryoablation in Barrett's Esophagus and Comparison with Radiofrequency Ablation: A Meta-Analysis. *Cancers (Basel)*. Aug 23 2024; 16(17). PMID 39272792
33. Tariq R, Enslin S, Hayat M, et al. Efficacy of Cryotherapy as a Primary Endoscopic Ablation Modality for Dysplastic Barrett's Esophagus and Early Esophageal Neoplasia: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Cancer Control*. 2020; 27(1): 1073274820976668. PMID 33297725
34. Westerveld DR, Nguyen K, Banerjee D, et al. Safety and effectiveness of balloon cryoablation for treatment of Barrett's associated neoplasia: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Endosc Int Open*. Feb 2020; 8(2): E172-E178. PMID 32010750
35. Hamade N, Desai M, Thoguluva Chandrasekar V, et al. Efficacy of cryotherapy as first line therapy in patients with Barrett's neoplasia: a systematic review and pooled analysis. *Dis Esophagus*. Dec 30 2019; 32(11). PMID 31076753
36. Agarwal S, Alshelleh M, Scott J, et al. Comparative outcomes of radiofrequency ablation and cryoballoon ablation in dysplastic Barrett's esophagus: a propensity score-matched cohort study. *Gastrointest Endosc*. Mar 2022; 95(3): 422-431.e2. PMID 34624303
37. Fasullo M, Shah T, Patel M, et al. Outcomes of Radiofrequency Ablation Compared to Liquid Nitrogen Spray Cryotherapy for the Eradication of Dysplasia in Barrett's Esophagus. *Dig Dis Sci*. Jun 2022; 67(6): 2320-2326. PMID 33954846
38. 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): 443-8. PMID 25887715
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): 680-5. PMID 20363409
40. Dumot JA, Vargo JJ, 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): 635-44. PMID 19559428
41. Shaheen NJ, Falk GW, Iyer PG, et al. Diagnosis and Management of Barrett's Esophagus: An Updated ACG Guideline. *Am J Gastroenterol*. Apr 01 2022; 117(4): 559-587. PMID 35354777
42. Rubenstein JH, Sawas T, Wani S, et al. AGA Clinical Practice Guideline on Endoscopic Eradication Therapy of Barrett's Esophagus and Related Neoplasia. *Gastroenterology*. Jun 2024; 166(6): 1020-1055. PMID 38763697
43. Wani S, Qumseya B, Sultan S, et al. Endoscopic eradication therapy for patients with Barrett's esophagus-associated dysplasia and intramucosal cancer. *Gastrointest Endosc*. Apr 2018; 87(4): 907-931.e9. PMID 29397943

44. National Comprehensive Cancer Network. NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Esophageal and Esophagogastric Junction Cancers. Version 4.2024. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/PDF/esophageal.pdf. Accessed September 23, 2024.