



Australian Government
Department of Health and Ageing



Australia and New Zealand Horizon Scanning Network

ANZHSN

AN INITIATIVE OF THE NATIONAL, STATE AND
TERRITORY GOVERNMENTS OF AUSTRALIA
AND THE GOVERNMENT OF NEW ZEALAND

Horizon Scanning Technology Prioritising Summary

Circumferential, endoscopic radiofrequency ablation of Barrett's oesophagus

**November 2008
(Updated November 2009)**



ASERNIP/S

**Australian
Safety
and Efficacy
Register
of New
Interventional
Procedures -
Surgical**



**Royal Australasian
College of Surgeons**

© Commonwealth of Australia 2008

ISBN

Publications Approval Number:

This work is copyright. You may download, display, print and reproduce this material in unaltered form only (retaining this notice) for your personal, non-commercial use or use within your organisation. Apart from any use as permitted under the *Copyright Act 1968*, all other rights are reserved. Requests and inquiries concerning reproduction and rights should be addressed to Commonwealth Copyright Administration, Attorney General's Department, Robert Garran Offices, National Circuit, Canberra ACT 2600 or posted at <http://www.ag.gov.au/cca>

Electronic copies can be obtained from <http://www.horizonscanning.gov.au>

Enquiries about the content of the report should be directed to:

HealthPACT Secretariat
Department of Health and Ageing
MDP 106
GPO Box 9848
Canberra ACT 2606
AUSTRALIA

DISCLAIMER: This report is based on information available at the time of research cannot be expected to cover any developments arising from subsequent improvements health technologies. This report is based on a limited literature search and is not a definitive statement on the safety, effectiveness or cost-effectiveness of the health technology covered.

The Commonwealth does not guarantee the accuracy, currency or completeness of the information in this report. This report is not intended to be used as medical advice and intended to be used to diagnose, treat, cure or prevent any disease, nor should it be used therapeutic purposes or as a substitute for a health professional's advice. The Commonwealth does not accept any liability for any injury, loss or damage incurred by use of or reliance the information.

The production of this Horizon scanning prioritising summary was overseen by the Health Policy Advisory Committee on Technology (HealthPACT), a sub-committee of the Medical Services Advisory Committee (MSAC). HealthPACT comprises representatives from departments in all states and territories, the Australia and New Zealand governments; and ASERNIP-S. The Australian Health Ministers' Advisory Council (AHMAC) supports HealthPACT through funding.

This Horizon scanning prioritising summary was prepared by Mrs Caryn Perera from the Australian Safety and Efficacy Register of New Interventional Procedures – Surgical (ASERNIP-S).

PRIORITISING SUMMARY

REGISTER ID S000089

NAME OF TECHNOLOGY HALO³⁶⁰ CIRCUMFERENTIAL RADIOFREQUENCY ABLATION SYSTEM

PURPOSE AND TARGET GROUP TO ABLATE PRE-MALIGNANT EPITHELIUM IN PATIENTS WITH **BARRETT'S OESOPHAGUS**

STAGE OF DEVELOPMENT (IN AUSTRALIA)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yet to emerge | <input type="checkbox"/> Established |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Experimental | <input type="checkbox"/> Established <i>but</i> changed indication or modification of technique |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Investigational | <input type="checkbox"/> Should be taken out of use |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nearly established | |

AUSTRALIAN THERAPEUTIC GOODS ADMINISTRATION APPROVAL

- | | | |
|---|-------------|---------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | ARTG number | 140684 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable | | |

INTERNATIONAL UTILISATION

COUNTRY	LEVEL OF USE		
	Trials Underway or Completed	Limited Use	Widely Diffused
Brussels	✓		
The Netherlands	✓		
Germany	✓		
United States	✓		

IMPACT SUMMARY

Circumferential endoscopic radiofrequency ablation is a potential alternative to thermal, photochemical or mechanical methods for removing the pre-malignant epithelium in patients with Barrett's oesophagus. This technology is currently in the experimental stage in Australia.

BACKGROUND

Barrett's oesophagus is a condition where the normal oesophageal cells are replaced with intestinal columnar epithelium, and is commonly diagnosed in patients suffering from

chronic gastroesophageal reflux disease (GERD) (Schuchert and Luketich 2007). A normal oesophagus is lined with flat, thin squamous cells and when the oesophagus is exposed to gastric juices these cells become irritated. When untreated, a constant exposure to reflux conditions can cause metaplasia in the oesophagus resulting in the development of intestinal columnar epithelium. Suggestive endoscopic results (visible columnar epithelium above the oesophagogastric junction) may be confirmed as Barrett's oesophagus when an endoscopic biopsy reveals the presence of intestinal columnar metaplasia (British Society of Gastroenterology 2005; Smith et al 2006).

This metaplasia can continue, increasing through low-grade to high-grade dysplasia and culminating in invasive cancer (British Society of Gastroenterology 2005). Patients with high-grade dysplasia have a 2% to 10% per year risk of developing adenocarcinoma (Ganz et al 2008). Barrett's oesophagus is regarded as a premalignant condition (Schuchert and Luketich 2007) and the objective of treatment is to prevent the development of adenocarcinoma.

Intestinal metaplasia is treated by preventing further oesophageal injury (through managing GERD symptoms) and with continual endoscopic monitoring to detect development of dysplasia (Smith et al 2006). Once low- or high-grade dysplasia is present there is an increased likelihood of developing malignancy. Although management has historically included intensive surveillance endoscopy every 3 months, therapeutic strategies are currently preferred for most patients. When the Barrett's epithelium is injured or removed and GERD is controlled the oesophagus may re-establish the normal squamous epithelium (Roorda et al 2007).

The current endoscopic therapies for removal of the Barrett's epithelium include:

- argon-plasma coagulation
- electro-coagulation
- laser ablation
- radiofrequency ablation
- photodynamic therapy
- endoscopic mucosal resection
- minimally invasive oesophagectomy (Smith et al 2006)

Each of these treatments has accompanying limitations such as technical difficulty and stricture formation, photosensitivity, operative morbidity and mortality (Ganz et al 2008). Thus another technique for complete removal of the epithelium with fewer risks would significantly benefit patients (Smith et al 2006).

A new option for removal of Barrett's epithelium is the HALO³⁶⁰ circumferential radiofrequency ablation system (BarrxTM Medical, Sunnyvale California USA). This system allows the inner diameter of the oesophagus to be ablated quickly during an outpatient procedure, with uniform removal of epithelium to a controlled ablation depth. The patient is placed under conscious sedation and a sizing balloon is used to measure the inner diameter of the oesophagus. An appropriately sized radiofrequency ablation catheter is selected and introduced over a guidewire in a side-by-side manner with an endoscope. The catheter's balloon is then inflated and energy applied (300W and either 10 J/cm² or 12 J/cm²), circumferentially ablating the epithelium to a depth of less than 1 mm. The catheter is then removed and cleaned, and reintroduced if necessary. The

clinician removes the ablated epithelium using irrigation and suction using the endoscope (Barrx Medical Inc).

CLINICAL NEED AND BURDEN OF DISEASE

Barrett's oesophagus is a pre-cancerous condition which left untreated can progress to oesophageal cancer. Between 1993 and 2003 the incidence of oesophageal cancer in Australia increased by 26% (AIHW 2007). Oesophageal cancer is still relatively rare in Australia, but importantly is becoming more common. Annually approximately 1000 Australians are diagnosed with cancer of the oesophagus (Australian cancer study and study of digestive health) and between 1993 and 2003 the average number of new annual cases of oesophageal cancer was 1098 (AIHW 2007). The combined number of deaths caused by GORD and other diseases of the oesophagus was 172 in 2006 (ABS 2008). Barrett's oesophagus affects approximately 1% of the population in the USA, while GORD affects approximately 10–20% of the Western world (Dent et al 2005; Hebbard and Nandurkar 2004).

DIFFUSION

The Barrx™ Medical Halo³⁶⁰ system has been approved by both the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) (K051168) and the Australian Therapeutic Goods Administration (ATGA) (140684). The FDA approved the device in 2005 for the purpose of the coagulation of bleeding and non-bleeding sites in the gastrointestinal tract including but not limited to the oesophagus (FDA).

Trials of circumferential radiofrequency ablation are currently being conducted in Brussels, The Netherlands, Germany and the United States. Australia appears to be in the experimental stage with this technology, with the Royal Melbourne and St Vincent's Hospitals to begin using the Halo³⁶⁰ and Halo⁹⁰ for dysplastic Barrett's oesophagus in 2008-2009 (Victorian Government Health Information 2008).

COMPARATORS

Due to the high rate of progression to oesophageal adenocarcinoma the standard of care for high grade dysplasia is oesophagectomy (Smith et al 2006). Oesophagectomy allows the complete removal of all Barrett's epithelium and oesophageal adenocarcinoma, yet has significant morbidity and mortality risks for the patient. When performed to treat oesophageal adenocarcinoma, oesophagectomy may have a mortality rate of 4-6% and this rate may be lower when performed to treat high grade dysplasia (Smith et al 2006).

SAFETY AND EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES

Two level II studies and one level IV study were eligible for inclusion in this summary. Each study assessed the effectiveness of the HALO³⁶⁰ circumferential radiofrequency ablation system for the treatment of patients with Barrett's oesophagus of varying severity. The identified RCTs were dosage studies and did not compare circumferential radiofrequency ablation to another type of Barrett's epithelium removal, including oesophagectomy.

In the randomised controlled trial (RCT) conducted by Dunkin et al (2006) 13 male patients aged 49-85 years with adenocarcinoma at or near the gastroesophageal junction were enrolled. The patients all underwent ablation prior to oesophagectomy, and were randomised to one of three energy density groups: 8, 10 or 12 J/cm². There were no details as to how patients were randomised. After using the 8 J/cm² setting in one patient, the authors determined that the ablation effect at that setting was negligible and all remaining patients were randomised to either 10 or 12 J/cm². Patients who had received any previous ablative or resective oesophageal procedure, or who had an oesophageal stricture preventing passage of the endoscope or catheter were excluded.

All ablations were performed under general anaesthesia. Two separate circumferential ablation zones were planned for each patient, each 3 cm in length. Zone one received one radiofrequency application (1x), whereas zone 2 received two radiofrequency applications (2x) with 1 or 2 minutes between applications. Following ablation, visual assessments of the ablation areas were made and oesophagectomy was performed. Each oesophagectomy specimen was opened longitudinally and photographed and fixed in formalin. One pathologist reviewed all histopathology, and was blinded to treatment group and zone of treatment. The outcomes measured were complete epithelial ablation; the maximum depth of ablation; and the thickness of residual ablation effect.

In the RCT conducted by Smith et al (2006) eight men aged 45-71 years with histopathologically diagnosed high-grade dysplasia were enrolled. The patients all underwent ablation prior to oesophagectomy and were randomised to receive 10, 12 or 14 J/cm² of energy density and 2, 3 or 4 applications. There were no details as to how the patients were randomised. Patients who had oesophageal stricture preventing passage of an endoscope or catheter or previous ablative therapy to the oesophagus were excluded. All ablations were performed under general anaesthesia before the planned oesophagectomy procedure. In patients with adequate endoscopic length of Barrett's oesophagus, a second separate ablation zone was also created. A total of ten ablation zones were created in the eight patients. Following ablation oesophagectomy was performed. At removal each specimen was opened longitudinally and photographed and fixed in formalin. A single blinded pathologist reviewed all histopathology slides. The outcomes measured were maximum ablation depth and complete ablation of all intestinal metaplasia and high grade dysplasia.

In the study conducted by Ganz et al (2008) 142 consecutive patients (median age 67 years) with high grade dysplasia Barrett's oesophagus were enrolled at 16 academic and community centres. The patients underwent a median of 1 ablation session. Ablations were performed as an outpatient procedure and most patients received conscious sedation. Some patients received propofol or general anaesthesia due to issues with upper endoscopies, physician preference, or comorbidity. All patients received ablation at the 12 J/cm² density. Following ablation patients received endoscopies at approximately 3 month intervals and if persistent Barrett's oesophagus was evident another ablation was performed. All treated patients were included in the safety analysis, whereas only those with post ablation endoscopy with biopsies were included in the effectiveness analysis. Curiously, if specimens obtained within 3 months of ablation revealed adenocarcinoma, the case was deemed a prevalent cancer and the patient was included in the safety

analysis and excluded from the effectiveness analysis, thus introducing experimental bias. Effectiveness outcomes included 1) all biopsy specimen fragments were negative for high grade dysplasia; 2) all biopsy specimens were negative for any dysplasia; 3) all biopsy specimens were negative for intestinal metaplasia.

SAFETY

In the RCT by Dunkin et al (2006) one patient had a superficial, 1-cm long mucosal injury that occurred during sizing and may have been due to previous radiotherapy. There were no device malfunctions and no other complications relating to the ablation procedure were reported. After oesophagectomy there were no cases of pleural effusion, perforation, or transmural thermal injury, although there was a small amount of perioesophageal oedema in two patients, including the patient who had received previous radiotherapy.

In the RCT by Smith et al (2006) there were no device-related adverse events. The authors reported that ablation using the highest treatment setting of 14 J/cm² was accompanied by mild oedema in the superficial layer of the submucosa. Upon oesophagectomy the authors reported that there was no transmural thermal or mechanical injury, perioesophageal fluid, or other adverse events in the mediastinum or abdomen at the gastroesophageal junction.

In the study by Ganz et al (2008) there were no serious adverse events reported. There was one stricture noted at follow-up endoscopy (0.4%) and the patient was asymptomatic and required no dilation.

EFFECTIVENESS

In the RCT by Dunkin et al (2006) 12 of the original 13 patients received circumferential radiofrequency ablation. One patient was excluded from analysis as the endoscope and catheter could not be simultaneously introduced into the oesophagus. The histological sections from a patient who received ablations at 8 J/cm² showed that the ablation depth was mid epithelium even at 2x. As the epithelium was either unchanged or ablated to mid epithelium depth with viable cells near the basement membrane, all subsequent ablations were performed at either 10 or 12 J/cm². Complete epithelial ablation was consistently achieved at 10 J/cm² (2x) and 12 J/cm² (1x or 2x). Visual assessments were made of the immediate post ablation endoscopy images. The zones treated with 10 J/cm² (2x) and 12 J/cm² (1x or 2x) had uniform, circumferential ablations while the zones treated with 8 J/cm² (1x or 2x) and 10 J/cm² (1x) had less visible ablative effects and/or less uniformity of ablation. The maximum ablation depth was directly related to energy density and, for the 10 J/cm² sections, to the number of ablative treatments (1x vs 2x). The maximum ablation depth for all zones treated at 10 J/cm² (2x) and 12 J/cm² (1x or 2x) was lamina propria or muscularis propria. The maximum ablative depth for zones treated with 8 J/cm² (1x or 2x) was mid epithelium, and for zones treated with 10 J/cm² (1x) was either mid epithelium or lamina propria.

In the RCT by Smith et al (2006) the maximum ablation depth increased as the energy density and number of applications increased. No specimen showed histologic evidence of ablation to the submucosa, and the deepest ablation level was achieved at 14 J/cm² (4x) with evidence of mild oedema in the superficial layer of the submucosa. In all 2x ablation zones, ablation was limited to the lamina propria whereas in all 4x zones the ablation reached to, but not through, the muscularis mucosae. Complete removal of all intestinal metaplasia and high grade dysplasia was achieved in 9 of the 10 ablation zones. At 12 J/cm² (2x) 99.9% of intestinal metaplasia and high grade dysplasia was completely ablated, although a single focus of high grade dysplasia within the lamina propria was detected at the ablation margin. The authors suggested that this may have been due to incomplete overlap of the second application. In the 9 remaining ablation zones the histologic sections showed either complete removal of all intestinal metaplasia and high grade dysplasia, or residual intestinal metaplasia or high grade dysplasia with irreversible ablative changes. The residual intestinal metaplasia or high grade dysplasia were likely not viable because of the significant thermal injury.¹

In the study by Ganz et al (2008) only 92 of the 142 patients had at least one follow-up biopsy session, making them eligible for the efficacy cohort. The efficacy cohort was not significantly different from the safety cohort as a whole in terms of baseline demographics and Barrett's oesophagus length. The median follow-up from primary ablation to the last available endoscopic biopsy was 12 months. Biopsy specimen fragments were negative for high-grade dysplasia in 90.2% of patients and negative for dysplasia in 80.4% of patients (9 patients without high grade dysplasia had persistent low grade dysplasia at last follow up). Biopsy specimen fragments were negative for intestinal metaplasia in 54.3% of patients, which appears to be quite low for an outcome that is the primary purpose of this device. At follow up no patients from the effectiveness cohort had been referred for an oesophagectomy. A subgroup analysis was conducted to assess the histologic response rates between patients who had a baseline oesophageal mucosal resection (EMR) (n=24) versus those with no baseline EMR (n=68). All biopsy specimen fragments were negative for high grade dysplasia in 87.5% (EMR) versus 90.8% (no EMR); negative for dysplasia in 81.3% (EMR) versus 80.3% (no EMR); and negative for intestinal metaplasia in 62.5% (EMR) versus 52.6% (no EMR). All 5 patients with baseline mucosal adenocarcinoma resected with an EMR before ablation showed a negative result for intestinal metaplasia after the last biopsy.

COST IMPACT

No information regarding cost effectiveness was identified from the retrieved material. One RCT reported that the successful removal of low-grade dysplasia would reduce the need for endoscopy from every 6 months to every 2 or 3 years, and in patients with nondysplastic Barrett's oesophagus successful ablation would eliminate the need for surveillance, thus reducing attendant health care costs (Dunkin et al 2005). The risk of progression to adenocarcinoma could also be reduced.

¹ These "ghost cells" were cells with severe loss of cytoarchitectural features, loss of nuclei, and/or presence of coagulative changes.

ETHICAL, CULTURAL OR RELIGIOUS CONSIDERATIONS

No issues were identified from the retrieved material.

OTHER ISSUES

No issues were identified from the retrieved material.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

From the included studies it is unclear whether circumferential radiofrequency ablation is a suitable alternative to more invasive surgical interventions as none of the studies compared treatment to the current gold standard of oesophagectomy. The patient numbers were very low for all studies. The two RCTs lacked compelling evidence of effectiveness. One RCT (Dunkin et al 2006) did not report if all dysplasia and metaplasia were eliminated and the other RCT (Smith et al 2006) had only ten sites for assessment. Both RCTs were basically dose-response experiments and did not compare circumferential radiofrequency ablation to other types of ablation.

Overall, the two RCTs reported that effective ablation was achieved in 27 of 32 ablation zones. The maximum ablation depth was the muscularis mucosae. One level IV study found that ablation removed high-grade dysplasia in 90.2% of patients, dysplasia in 80.4% of patients and intestinal metaplasia in 54.3% of patients. The best energy density to use appeared to be either 10 or 12 J/cm² with either one or two applications, as 8 J/cm² appeared to be too low and ineffective, while 14 J/cm² appeared to be too high and was accompanied by mucosal oedema.

There were few adverse events reported including superficial mucosal injury during sizing, mild oedema in the superficial layer of the submucosa and one stricture. Future studies should assess circumferential radiofrequency ablation compared to other types of ablation or oesophagectomy, and should ascertain the maximum energy densities that are safe and effective to use, as 14 J/cm² causes mild oedema.

HEALTHPACT ACTION

Based on the lack of RCTs which compared circumferential radiofrequency ablation to other therapies for Barrett's oesophagus, the potential of this technology as an alternative remains unclear. As studies with longer follow up are required, it is recommended that this technique is monitored for 12 months for future developments.

NUMBER OF STUDIES INCLUDED

Total number of studies	3
Level II evidence	2
Level IV evidence	1

REFERENCES

AIHW Cancer in Australia: an overview, 2006.

<http://www.aihw.gov.au/publications/index.cfm/title/10476>

Accessed 29th September 2008.

Australian Bureau of Statistics 3303.0 - Causes of Death, Australia, 2006.

<http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/0/2093DA6935DB138FCA2568A9001393C9>

Accessed 29th September 2008.

Australian cancer study and study of digestive health.

<http://www.acs.qimr.edu.au/menu/oes/index.html>

Accessed 8 October 2008.

Barrx Medical Inc Advanced Ablation Technology <http://www.barrx.com/>

Accessed 29th September 2008

British Society of Gastroenterology 2005 Guidelines for the diagnosis and management of Barrett's columnar-lined oesophagus. A report of the working party of the British Society of Gastroenterology. http://www.bsg.org.uk/pdf_word_docs/Barretts_Oes.pdf

Accessed 8 October 2008.

Dent J, El-Serag HB, Wallander MA et al. Epidemiology of gastro-oesophageal reflux disease: a systematic review. *Gut* 2005 **54**: 710-7.

Dunkin BJ, Martinez J, Bejarano PA et al. Thin-layer ablation of human esophageal epithelium using a bipolar radiofrequency balloon device. *Surgical Endoscopy* 2006 **20**: 125-130.

Ganz RA, Overholt BF, Sharma VK et al. Circumferential ablation of Barrett's esophagus that contains high-grade dysplasia: a U.S. multicenter registry. *Gastrointestinal Endoscopy* 2008 **68**: 35-40.

Hebbard GS and Nandurkar S. Managing Barrett's oesophagus. *Medical Journal of Australia* 2004 **180**: 375-376

Roberts S. Stomach and oesophageal cancer 2008

http://www.cancervic.org.au/about-cancer/cancer_types/stomach_and_oesophageal_cancer

Accessed 29th September 2008.

Roorda AK, Marcus SN, Triadafilopoulos G. Early experience with radiofrequency energy ablation therapy for Barrett's esophagus with and without dysplasia. *Diseases of the Esophagus* 2007 **20**: 516-522.

Schuchert MJ, Luketich JD. Management of Barrett's esophagus. *Oncology* 2007 **21**:1382-9, 1392; discussion 1392, 1394, 1396.

Smith CD, Bejarano PA, Melvin WS et al. Endoscopic ablation of intestinal metaplasia containing high-grade dysplasia in esophagectomy patients using a balloon-based ablation system. *Surgical Endoscopy* 2007 **21**: 560-569.

Victorian Government Health Information. New technology/clinical practice program. Information for health services/hospitals. 2008 <http://www.health.vic.gov.au/newtech/>
Accessed 30 September 2008.

SOURCES OF FURTHER INFORMATION

Buttar NS, Wang KK, Sebo TJ et al. Extent of high-grade dysplasia in Barrett's esophagus correlates with risk of adenocarcinoma. *Gastroenterology* 2001 **120**: 1630-1639.

Das D, Ishaq S, Harrison R et al. Management of Barrett's esophagus in the UK: overtreated and underbiopsied but improved by the introduction of a national randomized trial. *American Journal of Gastroenterology* 2008 **103**: 1079-1089

DeMeester SR. New options for the therapy of Barrett's high-grade dysplasia and intramucosal adenocarcinoma: endoscopic mucosal resection and ablation versus vagal-sparing esophagectomy. *Annals of Thoracic Surgery* 2008 **85**: S747-50

Fisichella PM 2008 <http://www.emedicine.com/med/topic741.htm>
Accessed 9th October 2008.

Ganz RA, Utler DS, Stern RA et al. Complete ablation of esophageal epithelium with a balloon-based bipolar electrode: a phased evaluation in the porcine and in the human esophagus. *Gastrointestinal Endoscopy* 2004 **60**: 1002-1010.

The Gut Foundation. GI tract <http://www.gut.nsw.edu.au/gitract1.html>
Accessed 29th September 2008.

Li YM, Li L, Yu CH et al. A systematic review and meta-analysis of the treatment for Barrett's esophagus. *Digestive Diseases and Sciences* 2008 Apr 22 [Epub ahead of print].

Rajan E, Burgart LJ, Gostout CJ. Endoscopic and histologic diagnosis of Barrett oesophagus. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings* 2001 **76**: 217-225.

Seewald S, Ang TL, Soehendra N. Endoscopic mucosal resection of Barrett's oesophagus containing dysplasia or intramucosal cancer. *Postgraduate Medical Journal* 2007 **83**: 367-372

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 (with video). *Gastrointestinal Endoscopy* 2007 **65**: 185-195.

Yousef F, Cardwell C, Cantwell MM et al. The incidence of esophageal cancer and high-grade dysplasia in Barrett's esophagus: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *American Journal of Epidemiology* 2008 **168**: 237-249

SEARCH CRITERIA TO BE USED

Halo 360

circumferential ablation

Barrett's esophagus

PRIORITISING SUMMARY (2009 UPDATE)

NAME OF TECHNOLOGY: HALO³⁶⁰ CIRCUMFERENTIAL RADIOFREQUENCY ABLATION SYSTEM

PURPOSE AND TARGET GROUP: TO ABLATE PRE-MALIGNANT EPITHELIUM IN PATIENTS WITH BARRETT'S OESOPHAGUS

2009 SAFETY AND EFFECTIVENESS ISSUES

Three new case series studies on circumferential radiofrequency ablation for Barrett's oesophagus were identified from the literature (Sharma et al 2008, Fleischer et al 2008, Beaumont et al 2009). Of these, two were selected for inclusion in this update based on study quality and size of patient cohort (Sharma et al 2008, Fleischer et al 2008).

The prospective, multicentre case series study by Fleisher et al (2008) is an extension of the Ablation for Intestinal Metaplasia (AIM) trial conducted at 8 United States centres between September 2003 and September 2005. Of the 70 patients from the original trial, a total of 62 agreed to participate in this study extension ([mean \pm standard deviation] mean age: 55.5 ± 11.3 years, mean Barrett's oesophagus length: 3.1 ± 1.3 cm). All patients previously underwent circumferential ablation with the HALO³⁶⁰ system (BARRX Medical Inc, California, United States). In addition, all patients also underwent focal ablation with the HALO⁹⁰ ablation system (BARRX Medical Inc, California, United States) during this extended study. Circumferential ablation was performed with an energy density of $10\text{J}/\text{cm}^2$ while focal ablation was performed using $12\text{J}/\text{cm}^2$. All ablations were performed with high-power density ($40\text{W}/\text{cm}^2$). Patients underwent endoscopy and biopsy at each follow up time point (1, 3, 6, 12 and 30 months) (Fleisher et al 2008).

The second study was a prospective case series study of 63 (low grade dysplasia: 39, high grade dysplasia: 24) patients who underwent circumferential ablation for Barrett's oesophagus (Sharma et al 2008). Median age was 71 years (range: 43-83) and median Barrett's oesophagus length was 5cm (range: 1-13 cm). As with other studies, circumferential ablation was performed with the HALO³⁶⁰ system and focal ablation with the HALO⁹⁰ ablation system. After primary circumferential ablation, patients underwent follow up endoscopy at 3 month intervals. Overall median follow up duration was 24 months (Sharma et al 2008).

Safety

Fleisher et al (2008) reported 24 minor adverse events in 16 patients out of 106 circumferential ablation procedures (15.1%). These events include: fever (2), chest/throat pain (9), superficial linear mucosal injury (1), mild bleeding (1), mucosal scarring at 1 month (1), sedation related airway obstruction (1), sedation related hypotension (1) and nausea (8). All minor events were transient and resolved completely. In addition to these,

a total of 4 minor adverse events were reported in 3 patients after 115 focal ablation procedures (2.6%). These include: chest pain (1), nausea or vomiting (2) and sedation related hypotension (1). All were transient and resolved completely as well. No strictures were noted during follow up and no buried glandular mucosa was detected at 12 or 30 months with standardised biopsy protocols (Fleisher et al 2008).

For the low grade dysplasia group, Sharma et al (2008) reported that one patient on aspirin developed a self-limiting episode of mint bleed after primary circumferential ablation. No endoscopic intervention or blood transfusion was necessary. Meanwhile, a second patient with a history of severe peptic stricture developed mild symptomatic stricture after primary circumferential ablation. This was successfully treated with balloon dilation. No complications were reported for the high grade dysplasia group (Sharma et al 2008).

Effectiveness

During the effectiveness phase of the study by Fleisher et al (2008), a total of 3007 biopsy fragments (n=69, mean of 1.5 circumferential ablations) were collected at 12 months. At 12 months, 70% of patients had complete remission of intestinal metaplasia (CR-IM). During the extension period (n=61, mean of 1.9 focal ablations), a total of 923 biopsy specimens were collected at 30 months follow up and demonstrated that 98% had CR-IM.

For the low grade dysplasia cohort in Sharma et al (2008), 38/39 patients were available for follow up (median: 24 months, range: 4-64 months). Patients underwent a median of one circumferential ablation (range: 1-4) and one (range: 0-2) focal ablation sessions (20 received combination of circumferential and focal ablation, 19 had circumferential ablation alone). Follow up date indicated that 87% (33/38) had endoscopic evidence of complete restoration of normal squamous epithelium in the oesophagus (CR-IM). Of these, 31% (10/32) achieved CR-IM after one session of circumferential ablation. Of the 5 patients who did not respond to treatment, 3 have IM without dysplasia and 2 have IM indefinite for dysplasia. Overall, this corresponds to 87% CR-IM, 95% CR-D (complete remission dysplasia) and 100% CR-LGD (complete remission low grade dysplasia). A 5mm nodule was resected with endoscopic mucosal resection during an interim endoscopy at 12 months showing intramucosal cancer. This was resected in a single piece with negative margins. No further ablation was necessary, CR-IM and CR-D was achieved at 24 months.

For the high grade dysplasia cohort, Sharma et al (2008) stated that all 24 patients were available for follow up (median: 23 months, range: 6-38 months). Patients underwent a median of one circumferential ablation (range: 0-4) and one focal ablation (range: 0-3) session. At last follow up, 67% (16/24) of patients had endoscopically normal squamous mucosa confirmed on biopsy, 13% (3/24) had IM without dysplasia and IM indefinite for dysplasia and 8% (2/24) low grade dysplasia. This corresponds to 67% CR-IM, 79% CR-D and 100% CR-HGD. No buried glands were observed in >1000 biopsies (Sharma et al 2008).

2009 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The evidence suggests that stepwise circumferential and focal ablation of Barrett's oesophagus is a safe and effective procedure. One study indicates that the use of focal ablation when there is histological evidence of IM during follow up resulted in complete eradication of IM in 98% of patients at 2.5 years follow up.

COST IMPACT

The cost of each generator for the 360° and 90 ° coils are approximately \$60,000 with each single-use coil costing approximately \$2,500 to \$2,500.

2009 HEALTHPACT RECOMMENDATION

The studies retrieved suggest that circumferential ablation for Barrett's oesophagus is a feasible, safe and effective procedure. However, long-term data (2.5 years) is only available from one case series study to date. It is probably premature to advocate the use of this procedure for the treatment of patients with nondysplastic IM outside of a clinical trial setting. Further long-term studies on this procedure would be useful, however further assessment by HealthPACT is not necessary.

2009 INCLUDED STUDIES

Total number of studies	2
Level IV intervention evidence	2

2009 REFERENCES

Fleischer DE, Overholt BF, Sharma VK, Reymunde A, Kimmey MB, Chuttani R, Chang KJ, Lightdale CJ, Santiago N, Pleskow DK, Dean PJ, Wang KK. Endoscopic ablation of Barrett's esophagus: a multicenter study with 2.5-year follow-up. *Gastrointestinal Endoscopy* 2008; 68(5): 867-876.

Sharma VK, Jae Kim H, Das A, Wells CD, Nguyen CC, Fleischer DE. Circumferential and focal ablation of Barrett's esophagus containing dysplasia. *American Journal of Gastroenterology* 2009; 104(2): 310-317.