

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/aoe-22-12>

Reviewer A

---

Comment 1:

The manuscript brings interesting data; however, it needs to teach readers outside the UK otherwise it will have a local interest only. As such, I suggest a better discussion on the differences between dedicated and general units not focusing on local reality. This will require extensive revision of the whole text.

Reply 1: Thank you for the comment and we have clarified a definition of dedicated services in the introduction alongside examples from the literature, table 1 shows this information as a comparison with standard care too, we have amended the discussion extensively, referenced the most recent European and US guidelines for Barrett's to broaden the readership appeal.

Changes in the text: Introduction pages 4-5 starting from line 15 page 4, table 1 and to page 5 line 17 multiple changes. Discussion pages 10-12 extensive revision of the text.

Comment 2: "et al." not "et al"

Reply 2: Many thanks for this correction, we have amended this throughout the manuscript

Changes in the text: "." Added page 4 line 23 and page 5 line 5.

---

Comment 3: 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph on the discussion (on cytosponge) is biased and not related to the topic. The paragraph should be deleted.

Reply 3: Thank you we have removed the section about cytosponge.

Changes in the text: Discussion extensively revised with segments about Cytosponge removed pages 10-12.

Reviewer B

---

Comment 1: Page 6 row 14 missing values rates were treated as 0/no and line 16/17 partial completions defined as not all items completed but items were included in the analysis if BE surveillance was performed in their unit.

This would benefit from clarification. To me it reads that partially completed surveys were used if Q2 was answered as YES, with those missing Q6 answered as NO. I do not understand why that was necessary. Can they be accepted as missing? Then the comparison is with no/missing. It may just need a clarity rewrite if I have not understood correctly.

Reply 1: thank you for the comment – we have clarified the statements around missing values.

Changes in the text: Statistical analysis page 7 line 11- 16

---

Comment 2: Page 7 line 15-20 Association with the use of advanced imaging techniques and chromoendoscopy

Survey question 5 is “Does your unit have LOCAL access to the following?” rather than use. Where have you got the information for this section? Note this issue occurs throughout the paper.

Reply 2: Many thanks for this comment – agree with the wording change and have made it clearer that the association is with local availability rather than use as far as our data can show.

Changes in the text: Changed on page 8 line 16-17, clarified on page 8 line 21, page 9 lines 1-7. Clarified on page 9 line 15-17. Clarified page 11 line 17. 3. Clarified on page 12 line 22-23. Page 13 lines 9-11.

---

Comment 3: SURGE/Quality assessment criteria for survey research reports reporting checklist was not completed.

Reply 3: The SURGE checklist was completed and submitted alongside the manuscript - we have resubmitted this alongside the tracked manuscript.

Changes in the text: n/a

---

Comment 4: Abstract line 9 and page 5 line 9 and appendix 1

The survey has 6 questions according to the appendix but 9 according to the text

Reply 4: Thank you for the comment, the survey has 9 questions, it may be an issue with the reproduction of the survey questions during manuscript submission, we will include it in the resubmission so all the questions are visible.

Changes in the text: Survey questions included as a supplementary appendix file.

---

Comment 5: Page 5 line 16 Joint Advisory Committee (JAG)

Is this the correct acronym? (ie Committee abbreviated as G) In the acknowledgement it is referred to as the Joint Advisory Group.

Reply 5: Many thanks – acknowledged and corrected this in the manuscript.

Changes in the text: Page 6 line 16 corrected in the text.

---

Comment 6: Page 6 row 14-15 Response rates were calculated as a percentage, non-responder characteristics and item completion rates calculated

Sentence unclear and would benefit from a re-write.

Reply 6: Many thanks – we have rewritten the sentences for clarity.  
Changes in the text: Page 7 line 14-16.

---

Comment 7: Page 8 Line 1 clinic/follow up care

Question 3 in the survey was about a dedicated service, here that is translated as a specific clinic/follow-up care. If you wish to use different terms throughout, would it be worth clarifying in the methods the different terms you will use and why its ok to change terms.

Reply 7: Thank you for the query, I could not see the area in question in line 1 page 8, if the query is in regard to section entitled “follow up care” on page 8 commencing line 19, this section pertains to question 7 on the survey which looking at comment 4 it would appear perhaps wasn’t visible when you reviewed the manuscript. Many apologies for this and as mentioned above we have resubmitted the appendices to help improve this issue. Question 7 states “7) Does your unit/hospital run a dedicated clinic service for Barrett’s oesophagus patients?” hence the section in the results and discussion specifically about clinic and follow up care. For clarity we have added in where we are meaning endoscopy in some of the earlier results.

Changes in the text: Supplementary file appendix 1 amended to avoid problems when resubmitting. Results pages 9-10

---

Comment 8: Page 12 line 1-4 In conclusion, this is the largest survey of UK endoscopy services about BE care provision at the time of publication and has wider generalisability to other health care systems given the clinical services explored e.g. RFA, HRWLE and Acetic acid, are available in other economically developed countries, and the model of dedicated care for Barrett’s could potentially replicated  
This is a long sentence and might usefully be split into two sentences. The last part of the sentence is missing a verb.

Reply 8: Many thanks – acknowledged and the sentences rewritten for clarity.  
Changes in the text: Page 13 line 1-5

---

Comment 9: Figure 2

I am not sure that “intersection size” is the clearest labelling for the vertical axis. Would “number of units” be clearer?

Reply 9 : Many thanks for this comment, for an UpSet plot this is the correct term as it corresponds to not just the number of units but how these intersect with the other outcomes.

Changes in the text: No changes