### Supplemental Table 2. Results from Round 2 survey.

| Item | Statements | Votes (n) | Median | 1 – 3 n (%) | 4 – 6 n (%) | 7 – 9 n (%) |
|------|------------|-----------|--------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 1    | In RCTs, PEC should be assessed as eos/hpf | 58 | 9 | 1 (1.7%) | 9 (15.5%) | 48 (82.8%) |
| 2    | In RCTs, PEC should be assessed as eos/mm2 hpf | 61 | 9 | 2 (3.3%) | 9 (14.8%) | 50 (82.0%) |
| 3    | In OBS, PEC should be assessed as eos/hpf | 58 | 8 | 1 (1.7%) | 6 (10.3%) | 51 (87.9%) |
| 4    | In OBS, PEC should be assessed as eos/mm2 hpf | 61 | 8 | 4 (6.6%) | 8 (13.1%) | 49 (80.3%) |
| 5    | Histologic remission should be measured in all RCTs | 62 | 9 | 0 (0%) | 1 (1.6%) | 61 (98.4%) |
| 6    | In RCTs, histologic remission should be defined as PEC ≤6/hpf in any location | 58 | 7.5 | 2 (3.4%) | 14 (24.1%) | 42 (72.4%) |
| 7    | In RCTs, histologic remission should be defined as PEC <15/hpf in any location | 57 | 8 | 6 (10.5%) | 11 (19.3%) | 40 (70.2%) |
| 8    | In RCTs, histologic remission should be defined as PEC ≤25/mm2 hpf in any location | 55 | 7 | 13 (23.6%) | 13 (23.6%) | 29 (52.7%) |
| 9    | In RCTs, histologic remission should be defined as PEC <60/mm2 hpf in any location | 55 | 6 | 18 (32.7%) | 10 (18.2%) | 27 (49.1%) |
| 10   | Histologic remission should be measured in all OBS | 61 | 9 | 0 (0%) | 6 (9.8%) | 55 (90.2%) |
| 11   | In OBS, histologic remission should be defined as PEC ≤6/hpf in any location | 58 | 7 | 4 (6.9%) | 18 (31.0%) | 36 (62.1%) |
| 12   | In OBS, histologic remission should be defined as PEC <15/hpf in any location | 57 | 8 | 6 (10.5%) | 12 (21.1%) | 39 (68.4%) |
| 13   | In OBS, histologic remission should be defined as PEC ≤25/mm2 hpf in any location | 57 | 7 | 13 (22.8%) | 15 (26.3%) | 29 (50.9%) |
| 14   | In OBS, histologic remission should be defined as PEC <60/mm2 hpf in any location | 55 | 6 | 18 (32.7%) | 14 (25.5%) | 23 (41.8%) |
| 15   | The grade (severity) and stage (extent) of all components in the EoEHSS should be measured in all RCTs | 60 | 8 | 1 (1.7%) | 11 (18.3%) | 48 (80.0%) |
| 16   | The EoEHSS remission score should be measured in all RCTs (For EACH proximal and distal esophagus: ≤3 for grade AND ≤3 for stage AND PEC of <15 eos/hpf) | 59 | 8 | 2 (3.4%) | 11 (18.6%) | 46 (78.0%) |
| 17   | Only eosinophil inflammation grade should be measured in all OBS | 55 | 7 | 4 (7.3%) | 20 (36.4%) | 31 (56.4%) |
| 18   | Only eosinophil inflammation stage should be measured in all OBS | 57 | 6 | 5 (8.8%) | 25 (43.9%) | 27 (47.4%) |
| 19   | The EREFS should be measured and reported in all RCTs | 58 | 9 | 0 (0%) | 1 (1.7%) | 57 (98.3%) |
| 20   | The EREFS should be measured and reported in all OBS | 58 | 8 | 1 (1.7%) | 12 (20.7%) | 45 (77.6%) |
| 21   | In RCTs, EREFS should be scored from 0 to 8, scoring the most severe grade of esophageal EoE-associated features present in proximal and distal esophagus (furrows scored as absent and present) | 53 | 8 | 0 (0%) | 4 (7.5%) | 49 (92.5%) |
| 22   | In OBS, EREFS should be scored from 0 to 8, scoring the most severe grade of esophageal EoE-associated features present in proximal and distal esophagus (furrows scored as absent and present) | 53 | 8 | 2 (3.8%) | 15 (28.3%) | 36 (67.9%) |
| 23   | Endoscopic remission based on EREFS should be measured and reported in all RCTs | 55 | 9 | 0 (0%) | 3 (5.5%) | 52 (94.5%) |
| 24   | In RCTs, the endoscopic EREFS-based remission should be defined as score ≤2 (total score 0 to 8, scoring the most severe grade of esophageal EoE-associated features present in proximal and distal esophagus) | 52 | 8 | 0 (0%) | 8 (15.4%) | 44 (84.6%) |
| Item | Statements                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Votes (n) | Median | 1 – 3 n (%) | 4 – 6 n (%) | 7 – 9 n (%) |
|------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|--------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 25   | In RCTs, the endoscopic inflammatory EREFS-based remission should be defined as the inflammation-associated components EEF score ≤ 2 (total score 0 to 8, scoring the most severe grade of esophageal EoE-associated features present in proximal and distal esophagus) | 49       | 8      | 1 (2.0%)    | 10 (20.4%)  | 38 (77.6%)  |
| 26   | In RCTs, the endoscopic fibrotic EREFS-based remission should be defined as categorical definition as absence of strictures, moderate and severe rings                                                                 | 51       | 8      | 0 (0%)      | 10 (19.6%)  | 41 (80.4%)  |
| 27   | Endoscopic remission based on EREFS should be measured and reported in all OBS                                                                                                                           | 56       | 8      | 2 (3.6%)    | 17 (30.4%)  | 37 (66.1%)  |
| 28   | In OBS, the endoscopic EREFS-based remission should be defined as score ≤ 2 (total score 0 to 8, scoring the most severe grade of esophageal EoE-associated features present in proximal and distal esophagus)            | 49       | 7      | 2 (4.1%)    | 13 (26.5%)  | 34 (69.4%)  |
| 29   | In OBS, the endoscopic inflammatory EREFS-based remission should be defined as the inflammation-associated components EEF score ≤ 2 (total score 0 to 8, scoring the most severe grade of esophageal EoE-associated features present in proximal and distal esophagus) | 48       | 7      | 2 (4.2%)    | 18 (37.5%)  | 28 (58.3%)  |
| 30   | In OBS, the endoscopic fibrotic EREFS-based remission should be defined as categorical definition as absence of strictures, moderate and severe rings                                                                 | 50       | 7      | 1 (2.0%)    | 15 (30.0%)  | 34 (68.0%)  |
| 31   | In all RCTs, symptom severity in adults with EoE should be assessed using the Dysphagia Symptom Questionnaire                                                                                           | 45       | 7      | 0 (0%)      | 14 (31.1%)  | 31 (68.9%)  |
| 32   | In all RCTs, symptom severity in adults with EoE should be assessed using the Dysphagia Symptom Diary                                                                                                     | 45       | 7      | 3 (6.7%)    | 18 (40.0%)  | 24 (53.3%)  |
| 33   | In all RCTs, symptom severity in adults with EoE should be assessed using the Eosionophilic Esophagitis Activity Index (7-day recall period)                                                             | 47       | 8      | 1 (2.1%)    | 6 (12.8%)   | 40 (85.1%)  |
| 34   | In all RCTs, symptom severity in adults with EoE should be assessed using the Numeric Rating Scale for dysphagia                                                                                           | 46       | 7      | 3 (6.5%)    | 19 (41.3%)  | 24 (52.2%)  |
| 35   | In all RCTs, symptom severity in adults with EoE should be assessed using the Numeric Rating Scale for pain                                                                                            | 45       | 6      | 7 (15.6%)   | 16 (35.6%)  | 22 (48.9%)  |
| 36   | In all RCTs, symptom severity in adults with EoE should be assessed using the Visual Analogue Scale for dysphagia severity                                                                               | 45       | 5      | 6 (13.3%)   | 25 (55.6%)  | 14 (31.1%)  |
| 37   | In all RCTs, symptom severity in adults with EoE should be assessed using the Episode-based patient-reported outcome measure of dysphagia experience used in the FLUTE study                                          | 45       | 6      | 5 (11.1%)   | 25 (55.6%)  | 15 (33.3%)  |
| 38   | In all RCTs, the trouble swallowing should be used as language to query dysphagia in adults with EoE                                                                                                     | 50       | 8      | 1 (2.0%)    | 2 (4.0%)    | 47 (94.0%)  |
| 39   | In all RCTs, delayed or slow passage of food should be used as language to query dysphagia in adults with EoE                                                                                           | 52       | 9      | 1 (1.9%)    | 4 (7.7%)    | 47 (90.4%)  |
| 40   | In all RCTs, food being stuck should be used as language to query dysphagia in adults with EoE                                                                                                      | 51       | 8      | 5 (9.8%)    | 6 (11.8%)   | 40 (78.4%)  |
| 41   | In all OBS, symptom severity in adults with EoE should be assessed using the Dysphagia Symptom Questionnaire                                                                                  | 45       | 7      | 2 (4.4%)    | 19 (42.2%)  | 24 (53.3%)  |
| 42   | In all OBS, symptom severity in adults with EoE should be assessed using the Dysphagia Symptom Diary                                                                                        | 46       | 6      | 6 (13.0%)   | 22 (47.8%)  | 18 (39.1%)  |
| 43   | In all OBS, symptom severity in adults with EoE should be assessed using the Eosionophilic Esophagitis Activity Index (7-day recall period)                                         | 46       | 7      | 1 (2.2%)    | 18 (39.1%)  | 27 (58.7%)  |
| Item | Statements                                                                 | Votes (n) | Median | 1 – 3 n (%) | 4 – 6 n (%) | 7 – 9 n (%) |
|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|--------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 44   | In all OBS, symptom severity in adults with EoE should be assessed using the Numeric Rating Scale for dysphagia | 44        | 6      | 6 (13.6%)   | 19 (43.2%)  | 19 (43.2%)  |
| 45   | In all OBS, symptom severity in adults with EoE should be assessed using the Numeric Rating Scale for pain    | 44        | 5.5    | 7 (15.9%)   | 23 (52.3%)  | 14 (31.8%)  |
| 46   | In all OBS, symptom severity in adults with EoE should be assessed using the Visual Analogue Scale for dysphagia severity | 44        | 5.5    | 7 (15.9%)   | 22 (50.0%)  | 15 (34.1%)  |
| 47   | In all OBS, the trouble swallowing should be used as language to query dysphagia in adults with EoE          | 51        | 8      | 2 (3.9%)    | 7 (13.7%)   | 42 (82.4%)  |
| 48   | In all OBS, delayed or slow passage of food should be used as language to query dysphagia in adults with EoE   | 52        | 9      | 1 (1.9%)    | 7 (13.5%)   | 44 (84.6%)  |
| 49   | In all OBS, food being stuck should be used as language to query dysphagia in adults with EoE                  | 51        | 8      | 4 (7.8%)    | 12 (23.5%)  | 35 (68.6%)  |
| 50   | In all RCTs, EoE-specific quality of life in adults should be measured using EoE-QOL-A questionnaire             | 49        | 8      | 2 (4.1%)    | 7 (14.3%)   | 40 (81.6%)  |
| 51   | In all OBS, EoE-specific quality of life in adults should be measured using EoE-QOL-A questionnaire              | 49        | 7      | 2 (4.1%)    | 16 (32.7%)  | 31 (63.3%)  |
| 52   | In all RCTs, symptom severity in pediatric EoE patients should be measured using PEESS v2.0                      | 46        | 8      | 0 (0%)      | 8 (17.4%)   | 38 (82.6%)  |
| 53   | In all OBS, symptom severity in pediatric EoE patients should be measured using PEESS v2.0                       | 46        | 7      | 0 (0%)      | 17 (37.0%)  | 29 (63.0%)  |
| 54   | In all RCTs, pediatric health-related quality of life should be measured using PedsQL                            | 44        | 8      | 2 (4.5%)    | 7 (15.9%)   | 35 (79.5%)  |
| 55   | When using generic PedsQL for children of ages, for whom both parent-proxy (PR) report and child self-report (CR) are available, both should be reported in all RCTs | 43        | 8      | 2 (4.7%)    | 9 (20.3%)   | 32 (74.4%)  |
| 56   | In all RCTs, pediatric EoE-specific quality of life should be measured using PedsQL EoE Module                  | 42        | 8      | 1 (2.4%)    | 6 (14.3%)   | 35 (83.3%)  |
| 57   | When using PedsQL EoE Module for children of ages, for whom both parent-proxy (PR) report and child self-report (CR) are available, both should be reported in all RCTs | 43        | 8      | 1 (2.3%)    | 11 (25.6%)  | 31 (72.1%)  |
| 58   | In all OBS, pediatric EoE-specific quality of life should be measured using PedsQL EoE Module                  | 43        | 7      | 2 (4.7%)    | 15 (34.9%)  | 26 (60.5%)  |
| 59   | When using PedsQL EoE Module for children of ages, for whom both parent-proxy (PR) report and child self-report (CR) are available, both should be reported in all OBS | 44        | 7      | 3 (6.8%)    | 17 (38.6%)  | 24 (54.5%)  |