medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.16.23294176; this version posted August 29, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Clinical Utility of EsoGuard® as a Triage Test for Endoscopy to Identify Barrett's Esophagus in Fire Fighters

Short Title: EsoGuard® as a Triage Test to Identify Barrett's Esophagus in Fire Fighters

Authors:

1. Rachelle Hamblin, MD, MPH; Department of Medicine, CHRISTUS Health, San Antonio, TX, USA
2. *Victoria T. Lee, MD; PAVmed Inc.; New York, NY, USA
3. Brian J. deGuzman, MD; PAVmed Inc.; New York, NY, USA
4. Suman Verma, MD, PhD; Lucid Diagnostics Inc.; Lake Forest, CA, USA
5. Lishan Aklog, MD; PAVmed Inc.; New York, NY, USA

***Corresponding Author:**

Name: Victoria T. Lee, MD
Fax: N/A
Telephone: (+1) 425-218-6535
Mailing address: 360 Madison Avenue, Floor 25, New York, NY 10017
Email address: vtl@pavmed.com

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.16.23294176; this version posted August 29, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Abstract:

Background:

Firefighters have frequent exposure to smoke and compounds that have been shown to increase the risk of developing esophageal neoplasia. EsoGuard® is a DNA biomarker assay that can be utilized with efficiency and high tolerability as a triage test in the diagnosis of patients with Barrett's Esophagus (BE) and/or esophageal adenocarcinoma (EAC) in this population.

Methods:

This is a retrospective analysis of prospectively collected clinical utility data on use of EsoGuard® DNA testing on samples collected with the nonendoscopic esophageal cell collection device, EsoCheck®, during two large cancer screening events for firefighters in San Antonio, TX, in January 2023.

Results:

A total of 388 firefighters volunteered for screening of Barrett's Esophagus and esophageal adenocarcinoma, of which 385 (>99%) successfully provided cell samples for EsoGuard analysis. There was a 7.27% (28/385) positivity rate, which was similar among males and females (7.26% and 7.41%, respectively). Only 13/385 (3.37%) tests failed analysis due to insufficient DNA sampling. Among those who tested positive with EsoGuard, 100% (28/28) were referred by the ordering physician for gastroenterology and upper endoscopy evaluation. Among those who tested negative, none were referred for upper endoscopy evaluation. This resulted in a 100% concordance between EsoGuard results and physician management decisions.

Conclusions:

This study capturing real-world data on the use of EsoGuard for early detection of BE/EAC in firefighters demonstrates the ability of this diagnostic tool to efficiently screen high-risk populations in a manner that is well tolerated, has high result yield, and effectively drives physician management decisions.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.16.23294176; this version posted August 29, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

1. Introduction

Esophageal adenocarcinoma (EAC) is the most common cancer of the esophagus in the United States (US), with an incidence that has been increasing over the last 40 years, particularly in white males, for whom the incidence has gone up more than 6-fold since the 1970's.[1-3] National statistics estimate there were 20,640 new cases of esophageal cancer, mostly adenocarcinomas, in 2022, with estimated 16,410 deaths.[4] Despite advances in chemotherapy, radiotherapy, and surgical therapy, the prognosis for EAC remains poor, with a 5-year survival rate of only 20%. [4-5] Barrett's Esophagus (BE) is a direct precursor to EAC and has well defined risk factors that characterize a "high-risk" population, with published guidelines and recommendations for screening from the American College of Gastroenterology (ACG) and other Gastroenterological societies. [6-7] This is because, contrary to the lethality of EAC, BE when detected early, can be successfully treated using endoscopic approaches such as radiofrequency or cryotherapy ablation with upwards of 80% success rates.[8-10] However, most individuals, including those at elevated risk for disease, do not undergo recommended screening,[11] likely due to barriers of conventional endoscopy including need for specialist referral and sedation, patient concerns regarding invasiveness of the procedure and complications, etc. Most recently, to bridge this gap, non-endoscopic cell collection devices such as EsoCheck® have been developed, and when paired with a biomarker test such as EsoGuard®, have been endorsed by the updated ACG guidelines and AGA clinical practice updates as a reasonable alternative to conventional upper endoscopy for BE screening.[6-7]

One population of particular interest for BE/EAC screening are firefighters, who by nature of their occupation have ongoing exposure to multiple suspected and known carcinogenic agents, such as (but not limited to) formaldehyde, benzene, asbestos, and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons. In July of 2022, firefighting was designated a Group 1 carcinogen by the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC).[12] Additionally, a recent pilot study from France suggests a link between specific occupational exposures (including those common to firefighters, such as asbestos, hydrocarbons, etc.) and esophageal cancer.[13] Published literature has also shown relationships between firefighters and increased cancer mortality with firefighters having a 9% greater risk of getting cancer and a 14% greater risk of dying from cancer than the general population.[14] Excess incidence of cancers of the digestive tract are observed within this population, namely esophageal and colorectal malignancies.[14-15] As such, firefighters have the potential to significantly benefit from an easily accessible, minimally invasive, non-endoscopic screening test for BE/EAC. Early disease detection can guide physician decision-making, including determination of which patients warrant further evaluation and disease staging with upper endoscopy (UE).

This study evaluates clinical utility data captured from San Antonio firefighters who underwent clinically directed EsoGuard testing as part of two large cancer screening events in January 2023. To our knowledge, this was the first incidence of any large-scale screening for BE/EAC in U.S firefighters to date.

2. Materials Methods

2.1 Population

Two large cancer screening events for firefighters were organized by over 40 community volunteers, including community physicians and other health care professionals, and the San Antonio Fire Department in January of 2023. The screening events occurred over the course of two weekends (January 14-15, and January 28-29). Resources and support were also provided by Mollie's Fund (Mollie Biggane Melanoma Foundation; for skin cancer screening), and Lucid Diagnostics Inc. (Barrett's Esophagus and esophageal adenocarcinoma screening). Firefighters willingly underwent clinically directed EsoGuard testing on esophageal cell samples collected using the EsoCheck device (EC/EG). The decision to test

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.16.23294176; this version posted August 29, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

each individual was based on the presence of at least 3 risk factors for BE/EAC, including but not limited to: known occupational risk, history of gastroesophageal reflux disease, chronic heartburn symptoms, tobacco smoking, obesity, male sex, white race, age 50 years or older, and family history of BE/EAC.

2.2 Ethical Considerations

The study was conducted according to the guidelines of the Declaration of Helsinki and approved by the WCG Institutional Review Board (study number 1350589, approved on 03-March-23). Given the retrospective nature of the analysis, and satisfactory plan for protecting patient identifiers from improper use and disclosure, patient informed consent was waived.

2.3 EsoCheck® and EsoGuard®

EsoCheck® (EC) is an FDA cleared, non-endoscopic cell collection device (**Figure 1**) designed to circumferentially sample cells from a targeted region of the esophagus (**Figure 2**); EsoGuard® (EG) is a laboratory developed test (LDT) performed in a Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendment (CLIA) certified and College of American Pathologists (CAP) accredited lab that utilizes set of genetic assays and algorithms which examines the presence of cytosine methylation at 31 different genomic locations on the vimentin (VIM) and Cyclin-A1 (CCNA1) genes. EsoGuard has been clinically validated in a developmental study published in 2018 and shown to have a >90% sensitivity and >90% specificity in non-endoscopic detection of Barrett's Esophagus (BE) or esophageal adenocarcinoma (EAC).[16]

Figure 1.

EsoCheck administration is a simple, non-invasive, non-endoscopic, office-based procedure that can be performed by a variety of healthcare providers including physicians, nurse practitioners, physician assistants, nurses, or other trained personnel usually in less than 5 minutes and without sedation or significant pre-procedure preparation.

Figure 2.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.16.23294176; this version posted August 29, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



Non endoscopic cell-collection devices paired with a biomarker test (e.g., EsoCheck/EsoGuard) are deemed an acceptable alternative to UE to screen for BE, according to the 2022 ACG guidelines and AGA clinical practice updates for screening in Barrett's Esophagus. [6-7]

2.4 BE/EAC Screening at the San Antonio Cancer Screening Events

Over the course of the two weekend screening events, all patients who were evaluated by a physician and deemed appropriate for EC/EG screening were educated about BE/EAC, risk factors, and the EsoCheck cell collection device and the EsoGuard assay. They were given the option to undergo EC/EG testing. Patients identified to have "red flag" symptoms such as dysphagia, or escalation of pre-existing symptoms were automatically referred for specialist evaluation (Gastroenterology) and diagnostic upper endoscopy and are not included in the scope of this study. At-risk patients who elected to undergo BE screening with EC/EG were then passed to trained nurse practitioners for EsoCheck esophageal cell collection. Cell collection was performed according to the device IFU, and samples sent to the central lab for analysis (LucidDx Labs, Inc, Lake Forest, California).

2.5 Follow-up

EsoGuard results were available within two weeks of cell collection. All EsoGuard results were reviewed by the ordering physician, and the decision then made on whether gastroenterology and UE referral would be provided. All negative results were conveyed by a follow-up letter, with explanation of the results and recommendations for ongoing care (including a proposed monitoring plan for individuals deemed to be particularly high risk, based on a number of risk factors). All positive results were communicated by the ordering physician directly to the patient, with an explanation of the results and further recommendations for care. Further care coordination included referral to either an experienced gastroenterologist, general surgeon, or bariatric surgeon who could then perform the necessary confirmatory upper endoscopy (with biopsies as clinically indicated), counseling, and develop a treatment or surveillance plan for positive results. Hard copies of positive EsoGuard results were also given securely to patients as well as providers to ensure continuity of care.

2.6 Data Collection and Statistical Analysis

This is a retrospective analysis of prospectively collected data on the clinical utility of EC/EG for screening of BE and EAC in the above population. The study was designed to collect real-world data on the use of EsoGuard DNA testing on samples collected with EsoCheck (EC/EG) in the setting of two large cancer screening events for firefighters in San Antonio, TX, which occurred in January of 2023.

A retrospective chart review was performed, and a limited data set collected, consisting of patient demographic information, BE/EAC risk factors, EsoGuard test results, and physician decision on referral

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.16.23294176; this version posted August 29, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

of the patient for UE. The risk factors that were solely obtained by patient self-reporting/patient questionnaire and therefore unvalidated at the time of testing (specifically family history, tobacco smoking, and obesity) are not included within the scope of this analysis.

All data was compiled in an Excel file. As this is not a hypothesis-driven study, no statistical software was utilized for data analysis, and calculations were performed with Excel. The results for continuous variables are shown as medians with interquartile range (IQR). Data from patient test results and outcomes are presented as numbers and percentages. No comparative tests were performed.

3. Results

3.1 Patient Characteristics

A total of 388 San Antonio firefighters were identified for EsoGuard testing over the two weekend screening events, due to risk factors for BE/EAC. Of these 385 (99.22%) successfully swallowed the EsoCheck device to provide cell samples. The remaining three were unable to tolerate the cell collection and could not provide DNA for EsoGuard testing and were thus excluded from study analysis.

Overview of screening numbers and patient characteristics (namely age and sex) are provided in **Table 1**. Males accounted for 92.99% (358/385) of the tested population, and females accounted for the remaining 7.10% (27/385). The median age was 41.49 years old [IQR 14.45]. Of the tested firefighters, most (76.62%; 295/385) were <50 years old. Only 23.38% (90/385) were age 50 or older. The median age for the males and females were similar (41.49 years old [IQR 14.45] and 42.25 years old [IQR 12.65], respectively). Just under 10% (9.61%; 37/385) of the tested cohort were less than 30 years old.

Table 1. Screening Numbers and Patient Characteristics

	n		%
Firefighters participating in EsoCheck/EsoGuard BE/EAC screening	388		100
Firefighters unable to swallow EsoCheck (i.e., unable to provide cell samples for EsoGuard)	3		0.07
Firefighters who successfully swallowed EsoCheck	385		99.22
Full Analysis Cohort	**385**		
Median age (years)	**41.49**	**IQR: 14.45**	**Min, max: 21.60, 77.50**
Male	358		92.99
Median age (years)	41.49	IQR: 14.45	Min, max: 21.60, 77.50
Female	27		7.1
Median age (years)	42.25	IQR: 12.65	Min, max: 29.6, 63.9

The ICD-10 codes were reviewed to assess the primary clinical indication for patient testing, with most patients indicated as having GERD, or heartburn symptoms (57.66% and 22.85%, respectively). Patients without any history of GERD or heartburn symptoms accounted for <20% of the tested

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.16.23294176; this version posted August 29, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

population, and were screened due to other risk factors, namely their environmental/occupational exposure to smoke, radiation, and toxic agents (**Table 2**).

Table 2. Testing Indication, according to ICD-10 code

ICD-10 codes		N	%
K21.9	GERD w/o esophagitis	222	57.66
R12	Heartburn	88	22.85
Z57.1	Occupational exposure to radiation	67	17.4
Z57.5	Occupational exposure to toxic agents	7	1.81
Other/Missing		1	0.02
	Total	**385**	**100**

3.2 EsoGuard Results

There were 372 patients who received binary test results (96.62% successful analysis rate) and 13 with DNA quantity not sufficient (QNS, 3.37%). A total of 28 patients tested positive (7.27%), and 344 patients tested negative (89.35%). See **Table 3** for details.

Table 3. EsoGuard® Results

Result	n	%
Total	**385**	
Positive	**28**	**7.27**
Male	26	92.86
Female	2	7.14
Negative	**344**	**89.35**
Male	319	92.73
Female	25	7.27
DNA Quantity Not Sufficient (QNS)	**13**	**3.37**
Male	13	100
Female	0	0

Among the EsoGuard (+) patients, two (7.14%) were female and the remainder were male (26/28; 92.86%). All QNS test results were from male patients. When the EsoGuard (+) results are analyzed based on characteristics of patient sex and age (**Table 4**), it was noted that the EsoGuard (+) rate was similar among females and males, at 7.41% and 7.26%, respectively. EsoGuard positivity rate increased in the older age-groups, namely in patients age ≥50. Although 50% of the patients aged ≥70 years ended up testing EsoGuard (+), the sample size was too small to make inferences.

Table 4. EsoGuard® Positive Results by Age and Sex

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.16.23294176; this version posted August 29, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Characteristic	n EsoGuard (+)	Total n	Positive rate (%)
Male sex	26	358	**7.26**
Female sex	2	27	**7.41**
Age <30 years	0	37	**0.00**
Age <50 years	15	295	**5.08**
Age 50 years or greater	13	90	**14.40**
Age 70 years of greater	3	6	**50.00**

The average age of the EG(+) patients was 44.56 years old, with the youngest being 30.9 and the oldest being 77.5 years old. Among the EG(+) patients, 85.71% (24/28) had either GERD or heartburn, and only 14.29% (4/28) were being screened due to other risk factors.

Table 5. Patient Experience Variables: EsoCheck® vs. Screening Upper Endoscopy

		EsoCheck®: nonendoscopic esophageal cell collection	Screening Upper Endoscopy
Patient experience variable	Pre-procedure NPO requirement	**2hrs**	**6-8hrs**
	Requires a specialist physician to perform?	**No**	**Yes**
	Requires a specialized test location (e.g., endoscopy suite or procedure room)?	**No**	**Yes**
	Anesthesia or sedation required?	**No**	**Yes**
	Education/consent time	**15min**	**15min**
	Test time	**Average 3min**	**Approximately 30min**[23] (dependent on findings and number of biopsies performed)
	Post-procedure time on-site	**5min**	**Up to 2hrs**[23] (post-sedation monitoring)
	Total patient time commitment	**<30min**	**>2hrs**
	Firefighters able to return to shift after the procedure?	**Yes**	**No**

4. Discussion

One of the earliest suggestions of an association between firefighters and esophageal malignancy arose from a registry-based case-control study published in 2007. Based on records of 3,659 California

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.16.23294176; this version posted August 29, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

firefighters, there was evidence that firefighting could be a risk factor for development of esophageal cancer, with an odds ratio of 1.48 (95% CI 1.14– 1.91). [17]

In a pooled cohort of U.S firefighters from San Francisco, Chicago, and Philadelphia, evaluating mortality and cancer incidence from 1950 to 2009 (later with updated mortality data through 2016), the standardized mortality ratio (ratio of observed to expected number of deaths) was 1.31-1.39 for esophageal cancer; the standardized incidence ratio (ratio of observed malignancies to the expected number of cases estimated using U.S incidence rates) was 1.62.[14-15] Similar results were found by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) in their study of California firefighters from 1988-2007 with an odds ratio of 1.6 for esophageal cancer. [18] In Western countries, the most common type of esophageal cancer is EAC, which is known to arise from the pre-malignant condition of BE. [19] Chronic GERD has long been associated with the development of BE and EAC, with additional demographic and lifestyle characteristics such as male sex, older age (≥50 years), white race, tobacco smoking history, obesity, and family history being well-described and quantified as risk factors. [20] As such, high-risk patients with multiple risk factors are recommended for BE screening, followed by recommendations for long-term surveillance or treatment of those diagnosed with disease.

This study is the first to evaluate clinical utility of a nonendoscopic cell collection device (EsoCheck) paired with a biomarker test (EsoGuard) for screening of BE/EAC in the high-risk firefighter's population. EsoGuard, when used to analyze samples collected using EsoCheck, is intended to serve as a screening tool and triage test for UE in patients determined to be at risk for BE/EAC. Given EsoGuard's >90% sensitivity and specificity for detection of intestinal metaplasia, a positive result indicates the evaluated patient has a high pre-test (i.e., pre-endoscopy) probability for presence of disease along the BE to EAC spectrum. [16] In contrast, a negative EsoGuard result indicates a low pre-test (i.e., pre-endoscopy) probability for disease, and serves as a better-tolerated alternative to screening endoscopy for ruling out disease. It is important to note that EsoGuard is not intended as a replacement for UE to investigate patients with alarm symptoms or to diagnose other esophageal pathologies. Indeed, the results of this study support the clinical use of EsoGuard in this manner, with a 100% correlation between the EsoGuard results and subsequent endoscopy referral pattern. All 28 EsoGuard positive patients were referred to a GI specialist for confirmatory evaluation and disease staging with UE. All EsoGuard negative patients without "red flag" symptoms were deemed effectively screened and were not referred by their physician for any additional endoscopy workup.

The EsoGuard positivity rate within the tested population (7.27%) is consistent with expected BE prevalence rates from the literature (5-15%).[21] The presence of GERD and/or heartburn symptoms in >80% of tested individuals, and higher EsoGuard positivity rate among those aged 50 and older is consistent with established risk factors. Taken together, this study provides a real-world example of how EsoGuard used with EsoCheck (EC/EG) can improve endoscopy resource utilization while still ensuring appropriate screening of an at-risk population for early disease detection. Indeed, EC/EG may significantly improve patient capture and disease detection, as it does not suffer from the same limitations as endoscopy when used as a screening test. Prior to development of nonendoscopic testing approaches (and even now), the overall BE screening rates were low, even in high-risk patients; less than 10% of patients with EAC were ever diagnosed with BE prior to discovering their malignancy. [22] Unlike endoscopy, EC/EG does not require a specialists' expertise or specialized procedural setting, does not require patient sedation, and can be done with little to no patient preparation in any office setting. As seen in this firefighter screening experience, EsoCheck can be administered across large numbers of patients in an efficient and well-tolerated fashion with circumferential cell sampling and high DNA yield. **Table 5** provides a summary of the EsoCheck characteristics (compared with upper endoscopy) and patient

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.16.23294176; this version posted August 29, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

experience variables which the authors believe contributed to successful screening of nearly 400 firefighters over only four days.

EsoCheck was successfully swallowed in >99% of patients, and there were no complications reported. Additionally, recent literature suggests that use of endoscopy with punch biopsy as an initial screening test results in a high rate of missed diagnoses, possibly due to poor compliance with structured biopsy protocols, and inability to sample large areas of the esophageal mucosa.[24] As such, methods of BE detection with high sensitivity and broader cell sampling are needed for more effective screening. Firefighters in particular stand to strongly benefit from testing that is effective, efficient, easily tolerated, and allows for minimal to no "out of service time," allowing them to respond to calls if needed.

We recognize certain limitations to our study, including the observational nature and single-provider experience. Of note, during the first screening weekend, occupational exposure was not included in ICD-10 coding, as the provider was not aware of this option. Thus, the ICD-10 data presented within this manuscript does not accurately reflect the prevalence of that specific risk factor among the screened individuals. It is expected that as firefighters, all participants would have some degree of occupational exposure and associated risk for disease. Additionally, given that most lifestyle risk factors and obesity were patient-reported, these were excluded from current analysis, as they require additional provider validation.

This study was also not intended to validate the EsoGuard assay performance, but rather to evaluate the clinical utility as a screening tool and triage test for a large, high-risk group of individuals. Future directions for study would include evaluation of an even larger and geographically diverse population of firefighters, more comprehensive collection of individual risk factors, and longitudinal follow-up which could be powered for subgroup analysis. While the current study only tested active-duty firefighters, future studies may benefit from testing of retirees who have the longest duration of occupational exposure and would be at highest risk. However, despite the above limitations, we present the largest experience to date of BE/EAC screening in firefighters utilizing nonendoscopic strategies. This enabled effective and efficient management of nearly 400 firefighters who might otherwise not have been screened.

Conclusion

This study capturing real-world data on the use of EsoGuard for early detection of BE/EAC in firefighters demonstrates the ability of nonendoscopic strategies to efficiently screen high-risk populations in a manner that is well tolerated, has high result yield, and effectively drives physician management decisions.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.16.23294176; this version posted August 29, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

References:

1. Pohl H, Welch HG. The role of overdiagnosis and reclassification in the marked increase of esophageal adenocarcinoma incidence. J Natl Cancer Inst. 2005;97:142-6.
2. Devesa SS, Blot WJ, Fraumeni JF, Jr. Changing patterns in the incidence of esophageal and gastric carcinoma in the United States. Cancer. 1998;83:2049-53.
3. Pera M, Cameron AJ, Trastek VF, et al., Increasing incidence of adenocarcinoma of the esophagus and esophagogastric junction. Gastroenterol. 1993;104:510-3.
4. https://seer.cancer.gov/statfacts/html/esoph.html
5. Siegel RL, Miller KD, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2015. CA Cancer J Clin. 2015;65:5-29.
6. Shaheen NJ, Falk GW, Iyer PG, Souza RF, Yadlapati RH, Sauer BG, Wani S. Diagnosis and Management of Barrett's Esophagus: An Updated ACG Guideline. Am J Gastroenterol. 2022 Apr 1;117(4):559-587.
7. Muthusamy VR, Wani S, Gyawali CP, Komanduri S; CGIT Barrett's Esophagus Consensus Conference Participants. AGA Clinical Practice Update on New Technology and Innovation for Surveillance and Screening in Barrett's Esophagus: Expert Review. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2022 Dec;20(12):2696-2706.e1.
8. Stawinski PM, Dziadkowiec KN, Kuo LA, Echavarria J, Saligram S. Barrett's Esophagus: An Updated Review. Diagnostics (Basel). 2023 Jan 16;13(2):321.
9. Rastogi A, Puli S, El-Serag HB, Bansal A, Wani S, Sharma P. Incidence of esophageal adenocarcinoma in patients with Barrett's esophagus and high-grade dysplasia: a meta-analysis. Gastrointest Endosc. 2008 Mar;67(3):394-8.
10. Phoa KN, van Vilsteren FG, Weusten BL, Bisschops R, Schoon EJ, Ragunath K, Fullarton G, Di Pietro M, Ravi N, Visser M, Offerhaus GJ, Seldenrijk CA, Meijer SL, ten Kate FJ, Tijssen JG, Bergman JJ. Radiofrequency ablation vs endoscopic surveillance for patients with Barrett esophagus and low-grade dysplasia: a randomized clinical trial. JAMA. 2014 Mar 26;311(12):1209-17
11. Vaughan TL, Fitzgerald RC. Precision prevention of oesophageal adenocarcinoma. Nat Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2015;12:243–8
12. Demers, Paul A., et al. "Carcinogenicity of occupational exposure as a firefighter." *The Lancet Oncology* 23.8 (2022): 985-986.
13. Gressier A, Gourier G, Metges JP, Dewitte JD, Loddé B, Lucas D. Occupational Exposures and Esophageal Cancer: Prog Study. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2022 Aug 9;19(16):9782.
14. Daniels RD, Kubale TL, Yiin JH, Dahm MM, Hales TR, Baris D, Zahm SH, Beaumont JJ, Waters KM, Pinkerton LE. Mortality and cancer incidence in a pooled cohort of US firefighters from San Francisco, Chicago and Philadelphia (1950-2009). Occup Environ Med. 2014 Jun;71(6):388-97.
15. Pinkerton L, Bertke SJ, Yiin J, Dahm M, Kubale T, Hales T, Purdue M, Beaumont JJ, Daniels R. Mortality in a cohort of US firefighters from San Francisco, Chicago and Philadelphia: an update. Occup Environ Med. 2020 Feb;77(2):84-93.
16. Moinova HR, LaFramboise T, Lutterbaugh JD, et al. Identifying DNA methylation biomarkers for non-endoscopic detection of Barrett's esophagus. Sci Transl Med. 2018;10(424):eaao5848.
17. Bates MN. Registry-based case-control study of cancer in California firefighters. Am J Ind Med. 2007 May;50(5):339-44.
18. Tsai, Rebecca J., et al. "Risk of cancer among firefighters in California, 1988–2007." *American journal of industrial medicine* 58.7 (2015): 715-729.
19. Delforge M, Plomteux O, Delfosse V, Fontaine F, Louis E; Société Liégeoise de Gastro-Entérologie. Oesophage de Barrett: mise au point [Barrett's esophagus: overview]. Rev Med Liege. 2002 Aug;57(8):535-45.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.16.23294176; this version posted August 29, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

20. Qumseya BJ, Bukannan A, Gendy S, Ahemd Y, Sultan S, Bain P, Gross SA, Iyer P, Wani S. Systematic review and meta-analysis of prevalence and risk factors for Barrett's esophagus. Gastrointest Endosc. 2019 Nov;90(5):707-717.e1.
21. Runge TM, Abrams JA, Shaheen NJ. Epidemiology of Barrett's Esophagus and Esophageal Adenocarcinoma. Gastroenterol Clin North Am. 2015 Jun;44(2):203-31.
22. Bhat SK, McManus DT, Coleman HG, Johnston BT, Cardwell CR, McMenamin U, Bannon F, Hicks B, Kennedy G, Gavin AT, Murray LJ. Oesophageal adenocarcinoma and prior diagnosis of Barrett's oesophagus: a population-based study. Gut. 2015 Jan;64(1):20-5.
23. https://www.cancer.net/navigating-cancer-care/diagnosing-cancer/tests-and-procedures/upper-endoscopy
24. Singer ME, Odze RD. High rate of missed Barrett's esophagus when screening with forceps biopsies. Esophagus. 2023 Jan;20(1):143-149.