



## MASSACHUSETTS

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

### Medical Policy

## Adjunctive Techniques for Screening and Surveillance of Barrett Esophagus and Esophageal Dysplasia

### Table of Contents

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

### Policy Number: 841

BCBSA Reference Number: 7.01.167 (For Plan internal use only)

NCD/LCD: N/A

### Related Policies

Endoscopic Radiofrequency Ablation or Cryoablation for Barrett Esophagus [#218](#)

Oncologic Applications of Photodynamic Therapy, Including Barrett Esophagus [#454](#)

### Policy

#### Commercial Members: Managed Care (HMO and POS), PPO, and Indemnity Medicare HMO Blue<sup>SM</sup> and Medicare PPO Blue<sup>SM</sup> Members

Wide-area transepithelial sampling with three-dimensional computer-assisted analysis (WATS3D) is considered [INVESTIGATIONAL](#) for all indications, including but not limited to the screening and surveillance of Barrett esophagus and esophageal 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)	This is <b>not</b> a covered service.
Commercial PPO and Indemnity	This is <b>not</b> a covered service.
Medicare HMO Blue <sup>SM</sup>	This is <b>not</b> a covered service.
Medicare PPO Blue <sup>SM</sup>	This is <b>not</b> a covered service.

### 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.*

## **CPT Codes**

There are not any codes for this procedure

## **Description**

### **Barrett Esophagus**

Barrett esophagus (BE) is a condition in which the squamous epithelium that normally lines the esophagus is replaced by specialized columnar-type epithelium known as intestinal metaplasia in response to irritation and injury caused by gastroesophageal reflux disease (GERD). Barrett esophagus occurs in the distal esophagus. It may involve any length of the esophagus, be focal or circumferential, and is visualized on endoscopy with a different color than background squamous mucosa. Confirmation of BE requires a biopsy of the columnar epithelium and microscopic identification of intestinal metaplasia.<sup>1</sup> The prevalence of BE in the United States is estimated at 5.6%.<sup>2</sup> Risk factors associated with the development of BE include GERD, male gender, central obesity, and age over 50 years. The diagnosis of GERD is associated with a 10% to 15% risk of BE.<sup>3</sup> However, a population-based analysis from Sweden observed that 40% of the study cohort with esophageal cancer reported no prior history of GERD symptoms.<sup>4</sup>

### **Cancer Risk and Management**

Intestinal metaplasia is a precursor to esophageal adenocarcinoma, and patients with BE are at a 40-fold increased risk for developing this disease compared to the general population.<sup>1</sup>

However, there are few data to guide recommendations about management and surveillance, and many issues are controversial. Guidelines from the American College of Gastroenterology (ACG)<sup>3</sup> and a consensus statement from an international group of experts (Benign Barrett's and Cancer Taskforce) on the management of BE are published.<sup>5</sup> The ACG recommendations for surveillance are stratified by the presence and grade of dysplasia.

When no dysplasia is detected, ACG has reported the estimated risk of progression to cancer ranges from 0.2% to 0.5% per year and endoscopic surveillance every 3 to 5 years is recommended. For low-grade dysplasia, the estimated risk of progression is 0.7% per year, and endoscopic therapy is preferred; however, endoscopic surveillance every 12 months is considered an acceptable alternative. It is recommended that both options are discussed with the patient.<sup>3</sup> Precise estimates of cancer risk are not available for individuals with low-grade dysplasia due to large disparities among studies on its natural history. Interobserver variability in the diagnosis of low-grade dysplasia with standard biopsy may be responsible, with expert pathologists commonly downgrading initial diagnoses made by community pathologists.<sup>6</sup>

The Benign Barrett's and Cancer Taskforce consensus group did not endorse routine surveillance for people without dysplasia and was unable to agree on surveillance intervals for low-grade dysplasia.<sup>5</sup>

For high-grade dysplasia, the estimated risk of progression is about 7% per year, and ACG has recommended endoscopic eradication therapy, with the type of procedure dependent on patient age and life expectancy, comorbidities, the extent of dysplasia, local expertise in surgery and endoscopy, and patient preference.<sup>3</sup> Approximately 40% of patients with high-grade dysplasia on biopsy are found to have associated carcinoma in the resection specimen.<sup>7</sup>

For patients who are indefinite for dysplasia, a repeat endoscopy should be performed at 3 to 6 months following optimization of acid suppressive medications. A surveillance interval of 12 months is

recommended if an indefinite for dysplasia reading is confirmed on repeat endoscopy in these individuals.<sup>3</sup> Many patients who are indefinite for dysplasia show regression to nondysplastic BE with subsequent endoscopic evaluation. It is unclear whether some cases of regression are observed due to sampling error.<sup>8</sup>

## Summary

The wide area transepithelial sampling with three-dimensional analysis (WATS3D) is performed during endoscopic examination of the esophagus. The computer-assisted brush biopsy procedure is intended as an adjunct to standard four-quadrant forceps biopsy for screening or surveillance of cancerous or precancerous esophageal lesions and Barrett esophagus (BE).

### Summary of Evidence

For individuals with a history of BE who receive standard surveillance with adjunctive WATS3D, the evidence includes studies of diagnostic yield, a physician impact study, a decision analytic model, and a retrospective analysis of the manufacturer database. Relevant outcomes are test validity, overall survival, disease-specific survival, change in disease status, and quality of life. Relative diagnostic yields for BE and various categories of dysplasia have ranged from 18.8% to 73% and 42.1% to 428.6%, respectively. These studies are limited by heterogeneity in classification and reporting of test results and selection bias stemming from the enrichment of patients with a prior history of dysplasia. It is also unclear to what extent results obtained from academic centers are generalizable to community-based settings, where adherence to endoscopic biopsy guidelines is poor. In discordant cases where BE or dysplasia were identified only by WATS3D, significant physician management changes included initiation of invasive treatments. Health outcomes stemming from management changes were not reported, and risks associated with overdiagnosis and overtreatment require elucidation. Follow-up data on disease progression in these patients are limited. A retrospective analysis of the manufacturer database found a disease progression rate of 5.79% per patient-year (95% confidence interval [CI], 1.02% to 10.55%) for baseline low-grade dysplasia diagnoses via WATS3D sampling; however, study interpretation is limited as only 16 cases (0.33%) of progression defined as high-grade dysplasia or esophageal adenocarcinoma on follow-up forceps biopsy were identified. No direct evidence of clinical utility was identified. Because combined use of WATS3D with standard surveillance is intended to replace the current standard of care for guiding patient management decisions regarding initiation of treatment or surveillance, direct evidence of clinical utility is required. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals at increased risk of BE who undergo standard screening with adjunctive WATS3D, the evidence includes studies of diagnostic yield, a physician impact study, a decision analytic model, and a retrospective analysis of the manufacturer database. Relevant outcomes are test validity, overall survival, disease-specific survival, change in disease status, and quality of life. Relative diagnostic yields for BE and dysplasia have ranged from 75% to 213% and 88.5% to 274%, respectively. However, available studies have incomplete descriptions of selection criteria, and it is unclear whether study patients are at increased risk as defined by guideline recommendations for screening. In fact, 2 studies were enriched with women in whom screening is generally not recommended by society guidelines. These studies also noted that detected cases of BE in short-segment patients may actually reflect intestinal metaplasia of the cardia, which is thought to carry a significantly lower risk of cancer development compared to traditional BE. In discordant cases where BE or dysplasia were identified only by WATS3D, significant physician management changes included initiation of invasive treatments. Health outcomes from management changes were not reported, and risks associated with overdiagnosis and overtreatment require elucidation. Follow-up data on disease progression in these patients are limited. A retrospective analysis of the manufacturer database found a disease progression rate of 5.79% per patient-year (95% CI, 1.02% to 10.55%) for baseline low-grade dysplasia diagnoses via WATS3D sampling; however, study interpretation is limited as only 16 cases (0.33%) of progression defined as high-grade dysplasia or esophageal adenocarcinoma on follow-up forceps biopsy were identified. No direct evidence of clinical utility was identified. Because combined use of WATS3D with standard screening is intended to replace the current standard of care for guiding patient management decisions regarding initiation of treatment or surveillance, direct evidence of clinical utility is required. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

## Policy History

Date	Action
10/2022	Annual policy review. Description, summary and references updated. Policy statements unchanged.
1/2022	New medical policy describing investigational indications. Effective 1/1/2022.

## 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. 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): 1084-91. PMID 21376940
2. Hirota WK, Loughney TM, Lazas DJ, et al. Specialized intestinal metaplasia, dysplasia, and cancer of the esophagus and esophagogastric junction: prevalence and clinical data. *Gastroenterology*. Feb 1999; 116(2): 277-85. PMID 9922307
3. 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
4. Lagergren J, Bergstrom R, Lindgren A, et al. Symptomatic gastroesophageal reflux as a risk factor for esophageal adenocarcinoma. *N Engl J Med*. Mar 18 1999; 340(11): 825-31. PMID 10080844
5. Bennett C, Moayyedi P, Corley DA, et al. BOB CAT: A Large-Scale Review and Delphi Consensus for Management of Barrett's Esophagus With No Dysplasia, Indefinite for, or Low-Grade Dysplasia. *Am J Gastroenterol*. May 2015; 110(5): 662-82; quiz 683. PMID 25869390
6. 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
7. Fayer D, Corbett M, Heirs M, et al. A systematic review of photodynamic therapy in the treatment of pre-cancerous skin conditions, Barrett's oesophagus and cancers of the biliary tract, brain, head and neck, lung, oesophagus and skin. *Health Technol Assess*. Jul 2010; 14(37): 1-288. PMID 20663420
8. Sinh P, Anaparthi R, Young PE, et al. Clinical outcomes in patients with a diagnosis of "indefinite for dysplasia" in Barrett's esophagus: a multicenter cohort study. *Endoscopy*. Aug 2015; 47(8): 669-74. PMID 25910065
9. Yantiss RK. Diagnostic challenges in the pathologic evaluation of Barrett esophagus. *Arch Pathol Lab Med*. Nov 2010; 134(11): 1589-600. PMID 21043812
10. CDx Diagnostics. WATS3D. 2021; <https://www.cdxdiagnostics.com/wats3d>. Accessed July 8, 2022.
11. Qumseya B, Sultan S, Bain P, et al. ASGE guideline on screening and surveillance of Barrett's esophagus. *Gastrointest Endosc*. Sep 2019; 90(3): 335-359.e2. PMID 31439127
12. DeMeester S, Smith C, Severson P, et al. Multicenter randomized controlled trial comparing forceps biopsy sampling with wide-area transepithelial sampling brush for detecting intestinal metaplasia and dysplasia during routine upper endoscopy. *Gastrointest Endosc*. Jun 2022; 95(6): 1101-1110.e2. PMID 34902373
13. Gross SA, Smith MS, Kaul V. Increased detection of Barrett's esophagus and esophageal dysplasia with adjunctive use of wide-area transepithelial sample with three-dimensional computer-assisted analysis (WATS). *United European Gastroenterol J*. May 2018; 6(4): 529-535. PMID 29881608
14. Smith MS, Ikononi E, Bhuta R, et al. Wide-area transepithelial sampling with computer-assisted 3-dimensional analysis (WATS) markedly improves detection of esophageal dysplasia and Barrett's esophagus: analysis from a prospective multicenter community-based study. *Dis Esophagus*. Mar 01 2019; 32(3). PMID 30541019
15. Anandasabapathy S, Sontag S, Graham DY, et al. Computer-assisted brush-biopsy analysis for the detection of dysplasia in a high-risk Barrett's esophagus surveillance population. *Dig Dis Sci*. Mar 2011; 56(3): 761-6. PMID 20978843

16. Vennalaganti PR, Kaul V, Wang KK, et al. Increased detection of Barrett's esophagus-associated neoplasia using wide-area trans-epithelial sampling: a multicenter, prospective, randomized trial. *Gastrointest Endosc.* Feb 2018; 87(2): 348-355. PMID 28757316
17. Vennalaganti PR, Naag Kanakadandi V, Gross SA, et al. Inter-Observer Agreement among Pathologists Using Wide-Area Transepithelial Sampling With Computer-Assisted Analysis in Patients With Barrett's Esophagus. *Am J Gastroenterol.* Sep 2015; 110(9): 1257-60. PMID 25916227
18. Johanson JF, Frakes J, Eisen D, et al. Computer-assisted analysis of abrasive transepithelial brush biopsies increases the effectiveness of esophageal screening: a multicenter prospective clinical trial by the EndoCDx Collaborative Group. *Dig Dis Sci.* Mar 2011; 56(3): 767-72. PMID 21132367
19. Agha YH, Srinivasan S, Hyder J, et al. WATS 3D versus forceps biopsy in screening for Barrett's esophagus: experience in community endoscopy centers. *Ann Gastroenterol.* 2021; 34(2): 164-168. PMID 33654354
20. Shaheen NJ, Smith MS, Odze RD. Progression of Barrett's esophagus, crypt dysplasia, and low-grade dysplasia diagnosed by wide-area transepithelial sampling with 3-dimensional computer-assisted analysis: a retrospective analysis. *Gastrointest Endosc.* Mar 2022; 95(3): 410-418.e1. PMID 34537193
21. Singer ME, Smith MS. Wide Area Transepithelial Sampling with Computer-Assisted Analysis (WATS 3D ) Is Cost-Effective in Barrett's Esophagus Screening. *Dig Dis Sci.* May 2021; 66(5): 1572-1579. PMID 32578042
22. Kaul V, Gross S, Corbett FS, et al. Clinical utility of wide-area transepithelial sampling with three-dimensional computer-assisted analysis (WATS3D) in identifying Barrett's esophagus and associated neoplasia. *Dis Esophagus.* Dec 07 2020; 33(12). PMID 32607543
23. 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
24. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Esophageal and Esophagogastric Junction Cancers (v.2.2022). February 11, 2022; [https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician\\_gls/pdf/esophageal.pdf](https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/esophageal.pdf). Accessed July 8, 2022.
25. Docimo S, Al-Mansour M, Tsuda S. SAGES TAVAC safety and efficacy analysis WATS 3D (CDx Diagnostics, Suffern, NY). *Surg Endosc.* Sep 2020; 34(9): 3743-3747. PMID 32162125