To cite: Yan X. Li X. Chen Y. et al

. Health economics evaluation of

diagnostic strategies for gastro-

with reflux symptoms in China:

2025:15:e093108. doi:10.1136/

a modelling study. BMJ Open

bmjopen-2024-093108

Prepublication history

and additional supplemental

available online. To view these

online (https://doi.org/10.1136/

XY and XL contributed equally.

Check for updates

C Author(s) (or their

employer(s)) 2025. Re-use

permitted under CC BY-NC. No

commercial re-use. See rights

and permissions. Published by

For numbered affiliations see

material for this paper are

files, please visit the journal

bmjopen-2024-093108).

Received 31 August 2024

Accepted 14 April 2025

oesophageal reflux disease

BMJ Open Health economics evaluation of diagnostic strategies for gastrooesophageal reflux disease with reflux symptoms in China: a modelling study

Xiaxiao Yan ⁽¹⁾, ¹ Xiaoqing Li, ¹ Yang Chen, ¹ Meiduo Ouzhu, ² Ziqi Guo, ³ Chengzhen Lyu ⁽¹⁾, ¹ Daiyu Yang, ³ Hongda Chen, ⁴ Feng Xie ⁽¹⁾, ⁵ Dong Wu^{1,2}

ABSTRACT

Objectives American College of Gastroenterology (ACG) and Chinese expert consensus recommended different algorithmic approaches for the diagnosis of gastrooesophageal reflux disease (GERD) are not yet defined. We compared the two recommended diagnostic processes using a Chinese population-based health economics analysis.

Methods Our analysis considered a hypothetical cohort of patients with typical reflux symptoms. We constructed a decision tree model to compare the two recommended diagnostic processes described in ACG clinical guidelines (stratified endoscopy strategy) and Chinese expert consensus (endoscopy-first strategy). The first strategy begins with hazard stratification based on alarm symptoms. Patients with alarm symptoms directly undergo endoscopic examination, while patients without alarm symptoms receive proton pump inhibitors as diagnostic treatment. In the second strategy, all patients with reflux symptoms complete an endoscopic examination. Sensitivity analysis was performed to evaluate a range of cost and probability estimates on costs and health outcomes over a 1-year time horizon from the healthcare system perspective.

Results The total expected costs were US\$122.51 for the stratified endoscopy strategy and US\$150.12 for the endoscopy-first strategy. The incremental costeffectiveness ratio (ICER) comparing the endoscopy-first strategy with the stratified endoscopy strategy was US\$440.39 per additional correct case of GERD. The rates of detecting upper gastrointestinal carcinoma of the two strategies were 0.0088 and 0.0120, and the ICER was US\$8561.34.

Conclusions The use of endoscopy for all patients with reflux symptoms was more effective but with an increased cost compared with the strategy recommended in international guidelines.

INTRODUCTION

Gastro-oesophageal reflux disease (GERD) is a condition in which reflux of gastric contents causes troublesome symptoms and complications. Although heartburn and regurgitation are considered typical symptoms associated with GERD, a broad spectrum of

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

- \Rightarrow Nationally representative data sources based on a particular population were used.
- \Rightarrow Sensitivity analysis was done to determine the uncertainty in the estimates.
- \Rightarrow Costs and outcomes related to treatment, survival and disability were not measured.
- \Rightarrow Regional differences among the Chinese population were not considered.

other symptoms includes dysphagia, chest pain, painful swallowing and extraoesophageal symptoms (eg, chronic cough, hoarseness, larvngitis, pharvngitis and pulmonary fibrosis).¹ The estimated global prevalence of GERD is 13% and varies considerably by region and population. In mainland Ξ China, the overall pooled prevalence of GERD was 8.7% and showed an increasing G trend.^{2 3} Considering the large population size of China, effective screening and management strategies for GERD are needed.

The diagnosis of GERD is commonly based on the combination of symptoms, endoscopic findings, reflux monitoring and therapeutic response.¹ American College of Gastroenterology (ACG) clinical guidelines recommend starting with a proton pump inhibitor (PPI) among patients with typical symptoms.⁴ For patients with alarm symptoms **D** (such as dysphagia, weight loss, bleeding, **G** vomiting and/or anaemia) or risk factors for Barrett's oesophagus, endoscopy is strongly recommended as the first step for evaluating oesophageal mucosa. In contrast, the Chinese expert consensus recommends endoscopy for all patients with reflux symptoms at the initial diagnosis.⁵ The rationale is based on the fact that China is a country with a high incidence of upper gastrointestinal tumours and readily available gastroscopy at a low cost.^{6–8}

text

Dr Dong Wu; wudong@pumch.cn

Correspondence to

BMJ Group.

end of article.

Early endoscopic examination is beneficial for tumour screening and assessment of disease status. A metaanalysis found that the tumour detection rate of endoscopy in patients with upper gastrointestinal symptoms at the initial consultation in Asia was 1.3%.⁶ A study in Guangzhou reported a detection rate of 0.8% for oesophageal and gastric cancers in patients with initial heartburn without alarm symptoms.⁷ However, no study provides economic evidence for this strategy in China. Therefore, we compared the two recommended diagnostic processes described above using a Chinese population-based health economics analysis.

METHODS

Our analysis considered a hypothetical cohort of patients with typical reflux symptoms (heartburn and regurgitation) in China. Our decision tree model incorporated base-case estimates of most likely clinical scenarios and then used sensitivity analysis to evaluate a range of cost and probability estimates on costs and health outcomes over a 1-year time horizon from the healthcare system perspective. All analyses were performed using TreeAge Pro 2022 software.

Decision model

The decision model considered two strategies representing different diagnostic processes in international or Chinese guideline recommendations (figure 1).

As recommended in international guidelines, the first strategy begins with hazard stratification based on alarm symptoms, including dysphagia, weight loss, gastrointestinal bleeding and persistent vomiting (stratified endoscopy strategy). Patients without alarm symptoms are considered at low risk of malignancy and receive PPI as diagnostic treatment. Ineffective PPI therapy is indicative of sequential invasive testing using endoscopy and oesophageal reflux monitoring. Patients with alarm symptoms directly undergo endoscopic examination, followed by a biopsy for suspected lesions. If no positive endoscopic results are found, a PPI test and oesophageal reflux monitoring will be performed for next-step testing. Patients with reflux oesophagitis (RE) or Barrett's oesophagus (BE) confirmed by endoscopic biopsy, positive PPI response or reflux evidence from oesophageal monitoring are diagnosed as having GERD in this strategy. Peptic ulcer disease (PUD) and upper gastrointestinal carcinoma (CA) can also be detected during endoscopy examination. If endoscopy, PPI test and reflux monitoring are negative, GERD is excluded.

The second strategy is based on an expert consensus in China, the endoscopy-first strategy. All patients first complete an endoscopic examination. The subsequent assessment algorithm is the same as that in the first strategy.

The biopsy is considered the gold standard for differentiating upper gastrointestinal lesions under endoscopy and oesophageal monitoring for pathological reflux. We

≥

did not consider the potential side effects of PPIs, complications of diagnostic procedures or the impact of the diagnosis on quality of life or the subsequent utilisation of healthcare resources.

Clinical inputs and transition probabilities

Preference was given to the most recent studies based on the Chinese population. When more than one value of the same parameters was reported in multiple studies, the maximum and minimum values, 95% CI or baseline ±20% (if insufficient parameters) were included as the value range. For unavailable parameters, data were obtained through expert consultation or referred to releby copyright, vant studies from other countries. All input parameters are listed in table 1.

Disease prevalence

Bai et al conducted a large-scale retrospective analysis in a single tertiary medical centre and demonstrated the symptomatic profile of patients undergoing upper endoscopy.⁹ A total of 15431 patients had regurgitation or heartburn, and 1204 had alarm symptoms (7.8%). Common endoscopic lesions included RE, PUD and BE, while CA was uses rela rarely detected. In patients with reflux symptoms but no alarm symptoms, the proportions of RE, PUD and CA were 25.8%, 12.7% and 0.7%, respectively.¹⁰ However, no study has separately characterised endoscopic performance in patients with reflux and alarm symptoms. The đ results from all alarm symptom populations (12.5% RE, ŧ 17.9% PUD and 7.7% CA under endoscopy) were used to estimate these parameters in our model.¹⁰ For all patients with reflux symptoms, the proportions were calculated data using the following formula:

Probability of certain lesion in all patients = probability of certain lesion in patients with alarm symptoms × probability of alarm symptoms + probability of certain lesion in patients without alarm symptoms \times (1 - probability of alarm symptoms).

The detected rate of BE has been rarely investigated, and the approximate estimation of baseline values was obtained through a meta-analysis (total endoscopic detection rate 1.0%, 95% CI 0.1% to 1.8%).¹¹ The proportion of patients without clinically significant endoscopic findings in this model was calculated from one minus the sum

of other lesions. **Diagnostic test characteristics** The response rate of PPI over 2–8 weeks in patients with reflux symptoms ranged from 54.1% to 63.9%.^{12–16} We chose the result of an RCT evaluating esomeprazole as the baseline.¹⁴ The PPI test's pooled sensitivity, specificity and positive predictive value from a previous meta-analysis were 0.52, 0.32 and 0.38, respectively.¹⁷ Oesophageal reflux monitoring was once considered the 'gold standard' in many diagnostic test accuracy studies (DTAs) and guidelines. However, the diagnostic performance in Chinese patients was limited, and results varied widely.^{18–21} Wang *et al* retrospectively investigated



Figure 1 Decision tree model for cost-effectiveness analysis.

, decision nodes;
, chance nodes;
, terminal nodes; BE, Barrett's oesophagus; CA, carcinoma; GERD, gastro-oesophageal reflux disease; NERD, non-erosive reflux disease; PPI, proton pump inhibitors; PUD, peptic ulcer disease; RE, reflux oesophagitis.

177 patients with typical reflux symptoms who received oesophageal function tests, and 122 of them had AET >4%. In patients who did not respond to PPI, 50.0% had AET >4%. In patients without positive endoscopic findings, 65.9% had AET >4%.¹⁸

Cost

All costs were converted to US\$ using published exchange rates. Only direct healthcare costs were considered. Costs for drugs and endoscopic and diagnostic procedures were in Peking Union Medical College Hospital. There was no time discounting of future costs and health outcomes as the period of the model was less than 1 year.

Base-case analysis

The base-case analysis estimated the incremental costeffectiveness ratio (ICER) between the stratified endoscopy strategy and the endoscopy-first strategy. We used the incremental cost per additional correct diagnosis

Table 1 Model parameters			
Parameters	Baseline	Range	Reference
Clinical probability			
Proportion of patients with alarm symptoms	0.078	0.062-0.270	9 10 38 39
Response rate to PPI treatment	0.571	0.457-0.685	12–16
Probability of true positive in PPI test	0.380	0.300-0.490	17
Probability of positive reflux monitoring	0.500	0.400-0.689	18 20
In patients with alarm symptoms			
Probability of RE under endoscopy	0.125	0.100-0.359	10 39
Probability of PUD under endoscopy	0.179	0.143-0.476	10 38 39
Probability of BE under endoscopy	0.010	0.001-0.018	11
Probability of CA under endoscopy	0.077	0.023-0.172	10 39
In patients without alarm symptoms			
Probability of RE under endoscopy	0.258	0.206-0.410	7 10 19 35 36
Probability of PUD under endoscopy	0.127	0.027-0.152	7 10 19 35
Probability of BE under endoscopy	0.010	0.001-0.018	11
Probability of CA under endoscopy	0.007	0.004-0.009	7 10 19 40
In all patients with reflux symptoms			
Probability of RE under endoscopy	0.248	0.227-0.298	10 41 42
Probability of PUD under endoscopy	0.131	0.068-0.157	10 41
Probability of BE under endoscopy	0.010	0.001-0.018	11
Probability of CA under endoscopy	0.012	0.010-0.017	10 41
Cost (US\$)			
Cost of PPI*	28.602	22.826-34.377	
Cost of upper endoscopy	56.378	45.103-67.654	
Cost of endoscopic biopsy	41.253	33.002-49.503	
Cost of oesophageal reflux monitoring	233.760	187.010-280.520	

*Omeprazole 20 mg twice daily for 2 weeks.

BE, Barrett's oesophagus; CA, carcinoma; PPI, proton pump inhibitors; PUD, peptic ulcer disease; RE, reflux esophagitis.

of GERD. As a primary outcome measure for effectiveness, the correct diagnosis of GERD (including biopsyconfirmed RE and BE, NERD confirmed by reflux monitoring and true positive results in the PPI test) was assigned a value of 1. When the final diagnosis was incorrect (false positive) or was determined as PUD, CA or other disorders, we assigned a value of 0. We also evaluated the incremental cost per additional detection of upper gastrointestinal CA (biopsy-confirmed CA was assigned a value of 1, while other results were 0). The result of the cost-effectiveness analysis was only described in this study since there is no accepted willing-to-pay (WTP) threshold for ICER.

Sensitivity analysis

To evaluate the robustness of the results of the decision tree analyses, we explored broad distributions around uncertain parameters using one-way sensitivity analysis. Each parameter varied within the value range to explore the potential factors affecting the optimal strategy, and the results were shown in the tornado diagrams.

Patient and public involvement

No patients were involved in the development of the research question or its outcome measures, the conduct of the research or the preparation of the manuscript.

RESULTS

Base case analysis

The results of our base case analysis are presented in **6** table 2. The total expected costs were US\$122.51 for the stratified endoscopy strategy and US\$150.12 for the endoscopy-first strategy. The rate of correct diagnosis of GERD was 0.45 and 0.52 for the stratified strategy and the endoscopy-first strategy, respectively. The ICER comparing the endoscopy-first strategy with the stratified endoscopy strategy was US\$440.39 per additional correct case of GERD. The rates of detecting upper gastrointestinal CA of the two strategies were 0.0088 and 0.0120. The ICER was US\$8561.34. A total of 47.4% of patients underwent endoscopy, and 25.8% finished reflux monitoring

Table 2 Dase-Case analysis					
		Diagnosis of GERD		Detection of CA	
Strategy	Cost (US\$)	Effectiveness	ICER	Effectiveness	ICER
Stratified endoscopy strategy	122.5103	0.4538		0.0088	
Endoscopy-first strategy	150.1226	0.5165	440.3854	0.0120	8561.3360

CA, carcinoma: GERD, gastro-oesophageal reflux disease: ICER, incremental cost-effectiveness ratio

in the stratified endoscopy strategy. In the other strategy, where all patients underwent endoscopy, 25.7% needed reflux monitoring.

One-way sensitivity analyses

The one-way sensitivity analysis related to the GERD diagnosis is shown in figure 2. The most sensitive parameters were the probability of RE in patients without alarm symptoms, the probability of true positives in the PPI test, the probability of RE in all patients, the cost of endoscopy and the probability of patients with alarm symptoms. When the probability of RE in patients without alarm symptoms varied from 0.206 to 0.410, the ICER would range from 324.78 to 1190.42; when the probability of true positives in the PPI test varied from 0.300 to 0.490, the ICER would range from 348.07 to 693.18; when the probability of RE in all patients varied from 0.227 to 0.298, the ICER would 2 tected range from 580.22 to 254.93; when the cost of endoscopy varied from 45.103 to 67.654, the ICER would range from Š 345.72 to 535.06; when the probability of patients with alarm symptoms varied from 0.062 to 0.270, the ICER would range from 455.33 to 291.56 (online supplemental table S1).

DISCUSSION

There is an increasing trend of GERD globally, as well as in the Chinese population. However, the diagnostic processes still vary in different regions of the world.² ⁴ The endoscopy-first strategy used in China was more



Figure 2 Tornado diagram of ICER. BE, Barrett's oesophagus; CA, carcinoma; PPI, proton pump inhibitors; PUD, peptic ulcer disease; RE, reflux oesophagitis.

effective but also more expensive than the stratified endoscopy strategy recommended by international guidelines.

The Chinese expert consensus that prioritises the recommendation of endoscopy is based on two main facts, the first of which is the risk of malignant lesions.⁵ Upper gastrointestinal tract cancer (UGIC), including oesophageal cancer (EC) and gastric cancer (GC), is prevalent in China.²² In 2020, UGIC accounted for 11.38% and 15.97% of all new incident cases and deaths from malignant tumours in China.²³ Endoscopic screening can reduce the incidence and mortality associated with UGIC.²⁴⁻²⁷ Multiple economic evaluation studies from different countries indicated that endoscopic screening was cost-effective compared with no screening.²³ 28-32 Xia et al constructed a Markov model to evaluate the cost-effectiveness of endoscopic screening strategies for UGIC among people aged 40-69 years in areas of China where the risk of these cancers is high.³³ Combined endoscopic screening for EC and GC may be cost-effective, and screening every 2 years would be optimal. The use of endoscopy is common in China. According to the national gastrointestinal endoscopy census in 2020, from 2012 to 2019, the number of medical institutions conducting gastrointestinal endoscopies increased from 6128 to 7470; the number of practitioners had a growth rate of 51.27%, and a total of 38,730,000 cases of gastrointestinal endoscopy were carried out nationwide in 2019, representing an increase of 34.62% from 2012.

When we focused on diagnosing GERD or CA in this model, the endoscopy-first strategy showed increased effectiveness and more costs. The use of alarm symptom stratification avoided endoscopy in more than half of all patients, while the need for expensive reflux monitoring was comparable between the two strategies. Moreover, we noted that the proportion of CA in the reflux symptomatic population does not correlate with the traditionally high prevalence of upper gastrointestinal CA in China. In addition, chronic inflammation caused by GERD is one of the most critical risk factors for oesophageal adenocarcinoma, while squamous carcinoma accounts for more than 80% of cases in China.³⁴ Therefore, the significance of reflux symptoms alone in suggesting upper gastrointestinal malignancies in the Chinese population still needs to be supported by large-scale studies.

According to the one-way sensitivity analysis, the first five factors affecting the baseline results of ICER were the probability of RE in patients without alarm symptoms, the probability of true positives in the PPI test, the probability of RE in all patients, the cost of endoscopy and the probability of patients with alarm symptoms. Based on the literature search results, alarm symptoms are commonly used exclusion criteria when investigating endoscopic manifestations. RE is the most common lesion observed under endoscopy in patients with reflux symptoms, and the range of its probability was obtained from different single-centred research data covering the provinces of Guangdong, Shanghai, Beijing and Xinjiang.^{7 10 19 35 36} However, given the differences between regions and age groups in China, the characterisation of upper digestive tract lesions detected by endoscopy still requires more well-planned epidemiological investigations. For the diagnostic accuracy of the PPI test, pooled results and its 95% CI from a meta-analysis were used as baseline and range.¹⁷ However, these results are not specific to the Chinese population alone. The price of endoscopes is another critical point to focus on. We used the pricing of endoscopes in Beijing hospitals as the basis, with a 20% upward and downward fluctuation as the range according to **v** expert consultation. The real world is bound to be more complex, influenced by different regions, hospital grades and health insurance policies. The main difference between the two strategies compared in this decision tree model is risk stratification according to the presence or absence of alarm symptoms. Therefore, the proportion of alarm symptoms in the tested population obviously has a greater impact on the results of the model operation. When the probability of alarm symptoms increased, more subjects directly entered the endoscopy session and the difference between the two strategies decreased, with the ICER showing a decreasing trend. The probabilistic sensitivity analysis would provide a more comprehensive understanding of the uncertainty in our model. However, due to the lack of a recognised WTP threshold, we are unable to conduct a probabilistic sensitivity analysis at this stage. Although the one-way sensitivity analyses may not capture the full range of uncertainty, we believe it offers $\overline{\mathbf{s}}$ preliminary insights and highlights potential directions for future research. We hope that as more data and methodological support become available, probabilistic sensitivity analysis can be incorporated in subsequent studies.

In 1999, Ofman et al compared the clinical and a economic outcomes of the empiric trial of omeprazole Ξ and the traditional invasive strategy for diagnosing GERD as the cause of non-cardiac chest pain.³⁷ Results showed ≥ that the omeprazole test was related to reduced costs and improved diagnostic certainty, providing a simple, cost-effective choice for common disorders in primary care settings. However, no cost-effectiveness studies compared different diagnosis strategies in patients with typical reflux. Compared with non-cardiac chest pain, reflux symptoms suggest different differential diagnoses and different significance in predicting malignancy, thus affecting patient treatment choices and outcomes. The stratified endoscopy strategy in this model used alarm symptoms as the rationale for hazard stratification. Additional factors are considered to identify high risk $\ensuremath{\underline{\mathsf{G}}}$ for malignant lesions, including region, family history, **3** dietary habits, Helicobacter pylori infection, etc, which are potentially to be included in further hazard stratification. Accurate risk stratification helps to highlight the value of endoscopy for precise screening and definite diagnosis rather than crude primary screening.

This study had some limitations. One of the significant limitations is the 1-year time horizon. The study did not measure the costs and outcomes related to treatment, survival and disability. Cost-effectiveness was not measured in terms of cost per disability-adjusted life year averted, which is a more robust measure of costeffectiveness. Moreover, our model is structured based on several assumptions and parameter estimates. Parameter estimates were extracted from multiple sources with different evidence quality. Considering that the prevalence also varies considerably in various regions of China and different periods of age, these results are bound to change with changes in prevalence rates from other populations. More epidemiological findings based on Chinese populations are urgently needed as a basis for further health economic analysis. While our decision tree model offers a systematic approach for selecting GERD diagnostic strategies, it is important to acknowledge that this remains a model-based study. Potential gaps may exist between the theoretical framework and real-world clinical practice, including variations in patient populations, healthcare settings and resource availability. Future studies should aim to validate and refine this model using large-scale, real-world data to assess its practicality and generalisability. Such efforts would strengthen the evidence base for optimal strategy selection and provide more robust recommendations tailored to diverse clinical scenarios.

CONCLUSION

This study provides economic evidence for the expert consensus of GERD in China. The use of endoscopy for all patients with reflux symptoms was more effective but with an increased cost compared with the strategy recommended in international guidelines. Diagnosing GERD while ruling out malignant lesions in the vastly outnumbered reflux population in China still requires more targeted, higher-quality endoscopy strategies depending on the regional spectrum of diseases and accessibility of medical resources.

Author affiliations

¹Department of Gastroenterology, Peking Union Medical College Hospital, Beijing, China

²Department of Gastroenterology, Tibet Autonomous Region People's Hospital, Lhasa, China

³Peking Union Medical College, Beijing, China

⁴Center for Prevention and Early Intervention, National Infrastructures for

Translational Medicine, Institute of Clinical Medicine, Peking Union Medical College Hospital, Beijing, China

⁵Department of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

X Feng Xie @fengxie_mac

Contributors XY and DW designed the study. XY, XL, YC, MO, ZG, CL and DY contributed to the conduction of the study. XY and XL collected the data. XY and XL performed statistical analysis and wrote the draft of the manuscript. HC and FX provided advices for the research protocol, statistical analysis plan and data analyses. HC, FX and DW reviewed and edited the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript. DW is responsible for the overall content as guarantor.

Funding National Natural Science Foundation of China (81970476) and National Key Clinical Specialty Construction Project (ZK108000).

Competing interests None declared.

Patient consent for publication Not applicable.

Ethics approval Not applicable.

Provenance and peer review Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

Data availability statement All data relevant to the study are included in the article or uploaded as supplementary information.

Supplemental material This content has been supplied by the author(s). It has not been vetted by BMJ Publishing Group Limited (BMJ) and may not have been peer-reviewed. Any opinions or recommendations discussed are solely those of the author(s) and are not endorsed by BMJ. BMJ disclaims all liability and responsibility arising from any reliance placed on the content. Where the content includes any translated material, BMJ does not warrant the accuracy and reliability of the translations (including but not limited to local regulations, clinical guidelines, terminology, drug names and drug dosages), and is not responsible for any error and/or omissions arising from translation and adaptation or otherwise.

Open access This is an open access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited, appropriate credit is given, any changes made indicated, and the use is non-commercial. See: http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/.

ORCID iDs

Xiaxiao Yan http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5153-0528 Chengzhen Lyu http://orcid.org/0009-0002-9222-7327 Feng Xie http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3454-6266

REFERENCES

- 1 Fass R. Gastroesophageal reflux disease. *N Engl J Med* 2022;387:1207–16.
- 2 Lu T-L, Li S-R, Zhang J-M, et al. Meta-analysis on the epidemiology of gastroesophageal reflux disease in China. World J Gastroenterol 2022;28:6410–20.
- 3 Eusebi LH, Ratnakumaran R, Yuan Y, et al. Global prevalence of, and risk factors for, gastro-oesophageal reflux symptoms: a metaanalysis. *Gut* 2018;67:430–40.
- 4 Katz PO, Dunbar KB, Schnoll-Sussman FH, et al. ACG clinical guideline for the diagnosis and management of gastroesophageal reflux disease. Am J Gastroenterol 2022;117:27–56.
- 5 Chinese Society of Gastroenterology, Chinese Medical Association. Chinese expert consensus of gastroesophageal reflux disease in 2020. Zhonghua Xiao Hua Za Zhi 2020;40:649–63.
- 6 Chen SL, Gwee KA, Lee JS, *et al.* Systematic review with metaanalysis: prompt endoscopy as the initial management strategy for uninvestigated dyspepsia in Asia. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2015;41:239–52.
- 7 Peng S, Xiong L-S, Xiao Y-L, *et al*. Prompt upper endoscopy is an appropriate initial management in uninvestigated chinese patients with typical reflux symptoms. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2010;105:1947–52.
- 8 Jiao Ý, Cheng Z, Gao Ý, et al. Development and status quo of digestive endoscopy in China: An analysis based on the national census in 2013 and 2020. *J Transl Int Med* 2024;12:177–87.
- 9 Bai Y, Li Z-S, Zou D-W, et al. Alarm features and age for predicting upper gastrointestinal malignancy in Chinese patients with dyspepsia with high background prevalence of Helicobacter pylori infection and upper gastrointestinal malignancy: an endoscopic database review of 102,665 patients from 1996 to 2006. *Gut* 2010;59:722–8.
- 10 Huang Y, Gui Q, Li H, *et al.* Age is the only predictor for upper gastrointestinal malignancy in Chinese patients with uncomplicated dyspepsia: a prospective investigation of endoscopic findings. *BMC Gastroenterol* 2021;21:441.
- 11 Dong Y, Qi B, Feng X-Y, et al. Meta-analysis of Barrett's esophagus in China. World J Gastroenterol 2013;19:8770–9.
- 12 Zhang MY, Tan ND, Li YW, et al. Esophageal symptoms versus epigastric symptoms: Relevance for diagnosis of gastroesophageal reflux disease. J Dig Dis 2020;21:696–704.
- 13 Yanping T, Peicai LI, Xi L, et al. A single-center retrospective study on epidemiological and Traditional Chinese Medicine syndrome characteristics of 21010 patients with reflux/heartburn symptoms. J Tradit Chin Med 2023;43:574–81.
- 14 Tan VPY, Wong WM, Cheung TK, *et al.* Treatment of non-erosive reflux disease with a proton pump inhibitor in Chinese patients: a randomized controlled trial. *J Gastroenterol* 2011;46:906–12.

Open access

- 15 Xiao YL, Nie YQ, Hou XH, *et al.* The efficacy, safety and costeffectiveness of hydrotalcite versus esomeprazole in on-demand therapy of NERD: A multicenter, randomized, open-label study in China. *J Dig Dis* 2013;14:463–8.
- 16 Niu X-P, Yu B-P, Wang Y-D, et al. Risk factors for proton pump inhibitor refractoriness in Chinese patients with non-erosive reflux disease. World J Gastroenterol 2013;19:3124–9.
- 17 Zhang M, Pandolfino JE, Zhou X, et al. Assessing different diagnostic tests for gastroesophageal reflux disease: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Therap Adv Gastroenterol* 2019;12:1756284819890537.
- 18 Wang D, Duan C, Zhang X, et al. Mean nocturnal baseline impedance and post-reflux swallow-induced peristaltic wave index could identify gastroesophageal reflux disease but pH-impedance metrics alone might not correlate with proton pump inhibitor response in chinese patients with typical reflux symptoms. J Neurogastroenterol Motil 2022;28:580–8.
- 19 Zhou LY, Wang Y, Lu JJ, et al. Accuracy of diagnosing gastroesophageal reflux disease by GerdQ, esophageal impedance monitoring and histology. J Dig Dis 2014;15:230–8.
- 20 Nian Y, Feng C, Jing F, et al. Reflux characteristics of 113 GERD patients with abnormal 24-h multichannel intraluminal impedance-pH tests. J Zhejiang Univ Sci B 2015;16:805–10.
- 21 Wang K, Duan L-P, Ge Y, *et al.* Diagnostic values of GerdQ, 24-h ambulatory oesophageal pH and impedance-pH monitoring in Barrett's esophagus, reflux esophagitis and non-erosive reflux disease. *Zhonghua Yi Xue Za Zhi* 2011;91:1228–32.
- 22 Sung H, Ferlay J, Siegel RL, et al. Global cancer statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. CA Cancer J Clin 2021;71:209–49.
- 23 Yang J, Wei W-Q, Niu J, et al. Cost-benefit analysis of esophageal cancer endoscopic screening in high-risk areas of China. World J Gastroenterol 2012;18:2493–501.
- 24 Zhang X, Li M, Chen S, *et al.* Endoscopic screening in Asian countries is associated with reduced gastric cancer mortality: a meta-analysis and systematic review. *Gastroenterology* 2018;155:347–54.
- 25 Liu M, He Z, Guo C, et al. Effectiveness of intensive endoscopic screening for esophageal cancer in China: a community-based study. Am J Epidemiol 2019;188:776–84.
- 26 Zhang N, Li Y, Chang X, et al. Long-term effectiveness of one-time endoscopic screening for esophageal cancer: A community-based study in rural China. *Cancer* 2020;126:4511–20.
- 27 Chen R, Liu Y, Song G, *et al.* Effectiveness of one-time endoscopic screening programme in prevention of upper gastrointestinal cancer in China: a multicentre population-based cohort study. *Gut* 2021;70:251–60.
- 28 Chang H-S, Park E-C, Chung W, et al. Comparing endoscopy and upper gastrointestinal X-ray for gastric cancer screening

in South Korea: a cost-utility analysis. *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev* 2012;13:2721–8.

- 29 Zhou HJ, Dan YY, Naidoo N, et al. A cost-effectiveness analysis evaluating endoscopic surveillance for gastric cancer for populations with low to intermediate risk. PLoS One 2013;8:e83959.
- 30 Hur C, Choi SE, Kong CY, et al. High-resolution microendoscopy for esophageal cancer screening in China: A cost-effectiveness analysis. World J Gastroenterol 2015;21:5513–23.
- 31 Saumoy M, Schneider Y, Shen N, et al. Cost effectiveness of gastric cancer screening according to race and ethnicity. *Gastroenterology* 2018;155:648–60.
- 32 Areia M, Spaander MC, Kuipers EJ, *et al.* Endoscopic screening for gastric cancer: A cost-utility analysis for countries with an intermediate gastric cancer risk. *United European Gastroenterol J* 2018;6:192–202.
- 33 Xia R, Zeng H, Liu W, et al. Estimated cost-effectiveness of endoscopic screening for upper gastrointestinal tract cancer in highrisk areas in China. JAMA Netw Open 2021;4:e2121403.
- 34 He Y, Liang D, Du L, *et al.* Clinical characteristics and survival of 5283 esophageal cancer patients: A multicenter study from eighteen hospitals across six regions in China. *Cancer Commun* 2020;40:531–44.
- 35 Wang M, Zhang J-Z, Kang X-J, *et al*. Relevance between GerdQ score and the severity of reflux esophagitis in Uygur and Han Chinese. *Oncotarget* 2017;8:74371–7.
- 36 Peng S, Cui Y, Xiao YL, et al. Prevalence of erosive esophagitis and Barrett's esophagus in the adult Chinese population. Endoscopy 2009;41:1011–7.
- 37 Ofman JJ, Gralnek IM, Udani J, et al. The cost-effectiveness of the omeprazole test in patients with noncardiac chest pain. Am J Med 1999;107:219–27.
- 38 Lee S-W, Chang C-S, Yeh H-J, et al. The diagnostic value of alarm features for identifying types and stages of upper gastrointestinal malignancies. Gastroenterology Res 2017;10:120–5.
- 39 Hsu Y-C, Yang T-H, Liou J-M, et al. Can clinical features stratify use of endoscopy for dyspeptic patients with high background prevalence of upper gastrointestinal cancer? *Dig Liver Dis* 2012;44:218–23.
- 40 Bai Ý, Du Y, Zou D, et al. Gastroesophageal Reflux Disease Questionnaire (GerdQ) in real-world practice: a national multicenter survey on 8065 patients. J Gastroenterol Hepatol 2013;28:626–31.
- 41 Lin L, Zhou L, Wang Y, et al. The clinical significance of typical reflux symptoms in diagnosing gastroesophageal reflux disease. Zhonghua Nei Ke Za Zhi 2014;53:517–20.
- 42 Zou D, He J, Ma X, et al. Epidemiology of symptom-defined gastroesophageal reflux disease and reflux esophagitis: the systematic investigation of gastrointestinal diseases in China (SILC). Scand J Gastroenterol 2011;46:133–41.