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Objectives

• Discuss the epidemiology and screening strategies for Barrett’s Esophagus and dysplasia
• Focus on the Barrett’s patient with dysplasia
• Discuss treatment and follow-up in the patient with dysplasia
• Review endoscopic ablative therapies in the high risk patient who has dysplasia or early cancer

Disclosures

None pertinent to this topic

Barrett’s Esophagus

A condition in which the lining of the esophagus is replaced by tissue similar to that of the intestine
(Intestinal Metaplasia or IM)

Dr Norman Barrett
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WHY ?
Diagnosis

- Endoscopy:
  - Long segment > 3 cm
  - Short segment < 3 cm

- Histology:
  - Intestinal metaplasia with goblet cells (USA)
  - Mucous-secreting columnar cells without GCs (UK)

Prevalence of Barrett’s Esophagus

Autopsy studies: 0.4% (LSBE)

EGD for any indication: 1–2%
EGD for GERD: 5–15%

Cameron AJ et al. Gastroenterology 1990;99:918-22

Risk Factors for Barrett’s Esophagus

- Older age
- White race (non-Hispanic)
- Male sex
- GERD (10-15% will have BE)
- Age < 30 at onset of GERD symptoms
- Hiatal hernia
- Central obesity with intra-abdominal fat distribution
- Metabolic syndrome
- Tobacco use
- Family history of GERD, BE, or esophageal adenocarcinoma
- Obstructive sleep apnea
- Low birth weight for gestational age
- Consumption of red meat and processed meat

Protective Factors for Barrett’s Esophagus

- Use of NSAIDS
- Use of statins
- Helicobacter pylori infection
- Diet high in fruits and vegetables
- Tall height


Screening for Barrett’s Esophagus

- Observational studies: patients with BE associated cancers diagnosed by surveillance endoscopy have earlier stage tumors and higher survival rates than those who present with symptoms
- 40% of cancer patients report no GERD symptoms
- < 10% of patients with Ca have a prior diagnosis of BE
- Recent case-control study challenged the efficacy of surveillance for cancer prevention among patients with BE

Coley DA et al. Gastroenterology 2013;145:312-9
Screening for Barrett’s Esophagus

- **Advanced Endoscopic Imaging Techniques for Screening**
  - Dye-based chromoendoscopy
  - Optical and digital chromoendoscopy
  - Autofluorescence endoscopy
  - Confocal laser endomicroscopy
  - Optical coherence tomography
  - Narrow band imaging

- **Biopsies:**
  - abnormalities in p53 expression
  - cellular DNA content (flow cytometry)
  - cytogenetic abnormalities (FISH)

Minimally Invasive Screening Techniques

- Video capsule endoscopy - currently not cost-effective
- Transnasal endoscopy
- Esophageal Capsule Cytology (Cytosponge)

Risk of Cancer in Barrett’s Esophagus

- True incidence of cancer in BE: 0.1 – 0.3%/year

- Life time risk for a patient with non-dysplastic BE is in the range of 5 – 8 %

Desai TK et al. GUT 2012;61:970-6
Hvid-Jensen F et al. NEJM 2011;365:1375-83
Dysplasia

• Epithelial cells have acquired genetic alterations that predispose them to the development of malignancy
• Often not identified endoscopically
• Patchy
• Seattle Protocol: 4 quadrant biopsies q 1-2 cm + any focal abnormalities; jumbo forceps
• Inter-observer variability

Levine et al. Am J Gastro 2000

Dysplasia

Rates of progression:
- LGD to EAC: 0.5 – 3 % per year
- HGD to EAC: 2.3 – 10.3 % per year (5%)

How Benign is Low-Grade Dysplasia? Overdiagnosed but Underestimated

• 147 patients with diagnosis of LGD made in a community practice in Holland
• Path reviewed by 2 expert pathologists (disagreement resolved by consensus)
• 85 % of cases were down-graded
• In the 15 % who were not, the incidence rate of HGD or EAC was 13.4 % per patient per year (mean f/u: 51 months)


Algorithm for Screening and Surveillance

Chronic GERD symptoms and > 1 risk factor for esophageal adenocarcinoma: age > 50, male, caucasian, hiatal hernia, elevated BMI, intra-abdominal body-fat distribution or tobacco use

No further screening
No Barrett’s Consider screening endoscopy for Barrett’s esophagus

Barrett’s Esophagus

No Dysplasia LGD HGD or intra-mucosal Ca
Endoscopy q 3-5 yrs
Endoscopy q 6-12 mo or endoscopic eradication
Endoscopic eradication therapy
Guidelines for LGD

- Review biopsies with expert pathologists to confirm diagnosis
- Repeat endoscopy in 6 months
- EGD annually if LGD persists or in 3 years if there is no LGD on 2 consecutive endoscopies

Wang et al. AJG 2008

Risk of Watchful Waiting

Esophagectomy for HGD/early Adenocarcinoma

- Operative mortality: 2 - 10 %
- Early morbidity: 15 - 32 %
- Long-term morbidity: 75 %
- Recurrent intestinal metaplasia
- Average LOS: 20 days

Birkmeyer NEJM 2002
Viklund Eur J Cancer 2006

Acid Suppression in Barrett’s Esophagus

- No long-term prospective clinical trials
- Refluxed acid can cause inflammation, ds DNA breaks, and increased cell proliferation
- PPIs relieve symptoms, heal inflammation and reduce proliferation, but may increase gastrin levels
- Observational studies suggest beneficial response

Kastelein F. Clin Gastro Hepatol 2013;11:362-8

Acid Suppression in Barrett’s Esophagus

- Multicenter prospective cohort study
- 540 patients with Barrett’s
- Median follow-up of 5.2 years
- 7 % developed HGD or EAC
- PPIs reduced risk of neoplastic progression by 75 %
Anti-Reflux Surgery

- Bile acids can also cause ds DNA breaks and might contribute to carcinogenesis
- Anti-reflux surgery can prevent reflux of all gastric contents
- Surgery is not more effective than PPI therapy in preventing cancer

Spechler SJ. Dig Dis 2014;32:156-63

Barrett’s Esophagus: Endoscopic Therapy

Endoscopic ablation of Barrett’s epithelium

+ Suppression of acid reflux

= Partial or complete healing with squamous mucosa

Risk Modifiers for Potential Metastasis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Increased Metastatic Potential</th>
<th>Decreased Metastatic Potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tumor Appearance</td>
<td>Ulcerated</td>
<td>Flat or Polypoid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumor Size</td>
<td>&gt; 2 cm</td>
<td>&lt; 2 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of Invasion</td>
<td>Into Submucosa, &gt; 500 um</td>
<td>Intramucosal, &lt; 500 um</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>Poorly Differentiated</td>
<td>Well Differentiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angiolymphatic Invasion</td>
<td>Presence Increases</td>
<td>Absence Decreases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EMR

Endoscopic Eradication of Dysplasia
Endomucosal Resection

- Therapy and most accurate means to delineate depth of invasion
**EMR**

- Recurrence of intra-mucosal CA or HGD is unacceptably high if EMR is the only therapy leaving intestinal metaplasia behind

  Pech et al. GUT 2008;57:1200-6

**Limitations/Risks:**
- Lesion should be small, <2cm
- Lesion must be liftable/polypoid
- Must be short segment Barrett’s if complete removal is planned
- Increased incidence of strictures

**Long-term Efficacy and Safety of Endoscopic Resection for Patients with Mucosal Adenocarcinoma of the Esophagus**

- 1000 consecutive patients
- 481 SSBE; 519 LSBE
- All treated by EMR
- Excluded any submucosal extensions
- Follow-up period: 56.6 +/- 33.4 months


**RESULTS**
- 963 (96.3%) complete remission
  - 12 (3.7%) surgery for failed endo therapy
  - Tumor-related deaths 2 (0.2%)
- Recurrence of neoplasia: 140 patients (14.5%) – endo reTx successful in 115
- Long-term complete Remission rate: 93.8%
- Major complications in 15 pts. All treated endoscopically


**Radiofrequency Ablation**

- Bipolar electrode array and a generator that delivers a fixed amount of thermal radiofrequency energy that results in uniform tissue dissipation to a depth of 0.5 mm.
- Devices: HALO 360; HALO 90; HALO Ultra 90
- Identify landmarks and length (Prague Classification)
- Sizing the balloon
- First ablation
- Cleaning the device and debride tissue (clear cap)
- Second ablation
- Post-procedure instructions
- Follow-up 2-3 months
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Radiofrequency Ablation
• Bipolar electrode array and a generator that delivers a fixed amount of thermal radiofrequency energy that results in uniform tissue dissipation to a depth of 0.5 mm.
• Devices: HALO 360, HALO 90, HALO Ultra 90
• Identify landmarks and length (Prague Classification)
• Sizing the balloon
• First ablation
• Cleaning the device and debride tissue (clear cap)
• Second ablation
• Post-procedure instructions
• Follow-up 2-3 months

Systematic Review Comparing RFA and Complete EMR in the Treatment of Barrett’s
• 22 studies; 1087 patients; 532 cEMR, 555 RFA
• Dysplasia was effectively eradicated at the end of treatment in 95 % after complete EMR and 92 % after RFA
• Over a median follow-up of 23 months it was maintained in 95 % after EMR and 94 % after RFA
• Adverse events:
  - 12 % in complete EMR (38% strictures)
  - 2.5 % in RFA (4% strictures)

Chadwick B et al. Gastrointest Endoscopy 2014;79;718-31

Long-term Outcomes Halo RF Ablation

RECURRENCE IN PATIENTS WITH CE-IM AFTER SUCCESSFUL RFA FOR DYSPLASTIC BE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of Patients under surveillance</th>
<th>Median length of FU (months)</th>
<th>Recurrence Rate %/year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pouw</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gondrie</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gondrie</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pouw</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herrero</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Vlijmen</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaccaro</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaheen</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Orman ES et al. Am J Gastro 2013 186-95
Durability and Predictors of Successful Radiofrequency Ablation for Barrett’s

- US RFA registry: 5521 patients; 3728 had Bxs > 12 months
- 1634 (30 %) met inclusion criteria with FU of 2.4 years after CEIM

Results:
- 85 % achieved complete remission
- IM recurred in 334 (20 %)
- 287/334 were non-dysplastic or indefinite for dysplasia
- Patients with recurrence were more likely to be older, have LSBE, non-Caucasians, have dysplastic BE before Tx and needed more Tx sessions

Recurrence of Barrett’s mucosa after EMR and RFA

Kaplan-Meier curve depicting the durability of CRIM over 3 years. All subjects with CRIM were analyzed from time 0 and followed forward until recurrence developed or until the end of the study. At 1 year 20 % of patients with CRIM had developed recurrence; and at 2 years 33 % had developed recurrence


Moncton Hospital Experience with RFA (HALO)

- 1st patient treated November 2009
- # of patients treated so far: 60
- Mean Age 63.8 years (Range: 43 – 82)
- 50 Males; 10 Females

Pathology # of Patients
Adenocarcinoma in situ 17
High Grade Dysplasia 36
Low Grade Dysplasia 7
Submucosal invasion 4
SSBE 21
LSBE 39
Prior EMR 36

Moncton Hospital Experience with RFA (HALO)

- # of patients “eradicated” 36
- Treatment not yet completed 19
- Drop-outs 4
- Recurrence: Barrett 4
  LGD 3
  Indef. for dysplasia 1
- Esophageal Carcinoma 0

RFA for non-dysplastic Barrett’s metaplasia

- Efficacy has not been established
- The problem with subsquamous intestinal metaplasia
Other Ablative Modalities

- **ESD**

Cryoablation

- Cycles of rapid freezing and thawing resulting in tissue destruction, fracturing of cell membranes and denaturation of proteins
- Non-contact
- Liquid nitrogen or CO2 sprayed onto mucosa
- Cryospray Ablation System: liquid nitrogen (-196°C)
- Includes a 16 F orogastric decompression tube
- 20 sec cycle of deep freeze followed by thawing for 60 secs
- Typically 3 – 4 sessions
- Strictures 3%; Chest pain 2%

Cryo-ablation using liquid Nitrogen spray
Temp – 196°C

Summary

- Barrett’s esophagus is not rare and is a pre-malignant lesion for which we should screen
- Endoscopic surveillance seems reasonable once identified
- Patients with LGD need expert assessment and careful follow-up
- Ablation is effective and low risk for patients with HGD and LGD
- RFA is safe and effective but recurrence of disease mandates careful endoscopic follow-up
- RFA often needs to be combined with EMR
- The role for RFA in LGD remains controversial
Epidemiology

- Untreated patients with long-segment BE typically have severe GERD with erosive esophagitis
- Short segment BE is not associated with GERD symptoms or endoscopic esophagitis
- Patients with GERD symptoms: 7 x increased risk of EAC
- Patients with severe and longstanding GERD symptoms: 43 x increased risk of EAC

Lagergren J et al. NEJM 1999;340:825-31