

SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

# Long-Term Follow Up of Colonoscopy Quality Monitoring

Feenalie Patel MD<sup>1</sup>, Christen Dilly MD MEHP<sup>1,2</sup>, Nabil Fayad MD<sup>1,2</sup>, Smitha Marri MD<sup>1,2</sup>, George J. Eckert<sup>3</sup> MAS, Charles Kahi MD MS<sup>1,2</sup>

- <sup>1</sup> Department of Medicine, Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, <sup>2</sup> Richard L. Roudebush VA Medical Center,
- <sup>3</sup> Department of Biostatistics and Health Data Science, Indiana University School of Medicine, Indianapolis IN 46202

#### **BACKGROUND AND AIMS**

- High-quality colonoscopy is paramount for colorectal cancer (CRC) prevention.
- Interventions have been proposed to improve colonoscopy quality at the operator and institutional levels.
- Since 2009, endoscopists at our universityaffiliated, Veterans Affairs medical center have received a quarterly report card summarizing individual colonoscopy quality indicators.
- We have previously shown that this intervention was associated with short-term improvement in adenoma detection rate (ADR).
- However, the long-term effect on colonoscopy quality is unclear.

#### **METHODS**

- We conducted a retrospective study of prospectively administered quarterly colonoscopy quality report cards at the Roudebush VA Medical Center between April 1, 2012 and August 31, 2019.
- The anonymized reports included individual endoscopists' ADRs, cecal intubation rates, and withdrawal times.
- We included endoscopists who had contributed at least 50 colonoscopies per year, and at least 4 consecutive quarters during the study period.
- Linear regression models were used to determine slopes over time for each quality metric by physician.
- Analyses were performed to assess for differences based on whether ADRs were calculated quarterly or yearly.

**Table 1.** Mean ADR and Slopes of ADR between yearly and quarterly measurement

	Quarterly	Quarterly Yearly						
	Mean			p-	Mean			
Physician	( <u>+</u> SD)	Slope	SE	value	( <u>+</u> SD)	Slope	SE	p-value
	51.7%				47.2%			
All	( <u>+</u> 11.7%)	0.6%	0.2%	0.021	( <u>+</u> 13.8%)	2.7%	0.4%	<.001
	48.5%				49.3%			
Physician A	( <u>+</u> 7.8%)	1.1%	2.6%	0.689	( <u>+</u> 5.7%)	-3.0%	2.3%	0.314
	39.4%				36.8%			
Physician B	( <u>+</u> 5.4%)	0.2%	0.5%	0.628	( <u>+</u> 9.4%)	1.6%	1.4%	0.306
	66.3%				64.1%			
Physician C	( <u>+</u> 6.0%)	1.6%	0.7%	0.022	( <u>+</u> 7.6%)	2.3%	1.2%	0.113
	53.4%				47.9%			
Physician D	( <u>+</u> 9.2%)	1.2%	0.8%	0.155	( <u>+</u> 13.3%)	3.5%	1.7%	0.084
	33.8%				21.0%			
Physician E	( <u>+</u> 11.5%)	4.7%	10.8%	0.692	( <u>+</u> 15.0%)	13.6%	6.3%	0.275
	46.4%	0.60/	2.00/	0.764	48.2%	4.00/	2.20/	0.524
Physician F	( <u>+</u> 6.3%)	0.6%	2.0%	0.761	( <u>+</u> 4.8%)	1.8%	2.3%	0.531
Dharistan C	48.0%	0.40/	4.40/	0.040	39.6%	4.00/	4.20/	0.204
Physician G	( <u>+</u> 11.5%)	0.1%	1.1%	0.948	( <u>+</u> 9.1%)	1.9%	1.3%	0.201
Dhysisian II	60.3%	1.2%	0.8%	0.118	54.0%	3.6%	1.6%	0.070
Physician H	( <u>+</u> 8.6%) 55.1%	1.2%	0.8%	0.118	( <u>+</u> 13.3%) 53.2%	3.0%	1.0%	0.070
Physician I	(+ 6.2%)	-1.3%	0.9%	0.167	(+ 9.1%)	1.4%	2.3%	0.589
Filysicialiii	51.8%	-1.5/0	0.570	0.107	48.9%	1.470	2.3/0	0.565
Physician J	( <u>+</u> 7.5%)	0.4%	1.5%	0.802	46.9% ( <u>+</u> 12.2%)	3.6%	3.9%	0.431
Titysicians	38.5%	0.470	1.570	0.002	35.5%	3.070	3.570	0.431
Physician K	(+ 11.0%)	-1.4%	1.3%	0.290	(+ 12.2%)	1.6%	2.4%	0.533
· mysician ic	50.1%	1.170	1.570	0.230	35.9%	1.070	2.170	0.555
Physician L*	(+ 8.1%)	14.2%	3.4%	0.052	(+ 14.9%)	-21.0%		
	48.2%				38.6%			
Physician M	(+ 11.3%)	11.8%	3.8%	0.026	(+ 15.3%)	7.1%	13.6%	0.692
	60.0%				59.7%			
Physician N	( <u>+</u> 7.5%)	2.0%	2.9%	0.506	( <u>+</u> 2.8%)	0.8%	2.7%	0.819
	52.9%				52.1%			
Physician O	( <u>+</u> 6.4%)	1.3%	1.2%	0.277	( <u>+</u> 5.2%)	1.9%	1.6%	0.302
	59.1%				59.2%			
Physician P	( <u>+</u> 10.4%)	6.0%	2.5%	0.043	( <u>+</u> 8.6%)	5.6%	2.6%	0.160
	55.2%				48.5%			
Physician Q	( <u>+</u> 10.7%)	0.4%	1.1%	0.747	( <u>+</u> 13.6%)	3.0%	1.9%	0.169

\*Physician L performed colonoscopies over six consecutive quarters, so there were insufficient data to assess yearly measures over time.

**Table 2.** Individual endoscopists' ADR standard deviation differences between yearly and quarterly measurement

Physician	Quarterly	Yearly	Yearly-Quarterly
All	8.7%	10.8%	2.1%
Physician A	7.8%	5.7%	-2.1%
Physician B	5.4%	9.4%	4.0%
Physician C	6.0%	7.6%	1.6%
Physician D	9.2%	13.3%	4.1%
Physician E	11.5%	15.0%	3.5%
Physician F	6.3%	4.8%	-1.5%
Physician G	11.5%	9.1%	-2.4%
Physician H	8.6%	13.3%	4.7%
Physician I	6.2%	9.1%	2.9%
Physician J	7.5%	12.2%	4.6%
Physician K	11.0%	12.2%	1.3%
Physician L	8.1%	14.9%	6.8%
Physician M	11.3%	15.3%	4.0%
Physician N	7.5%	2.8%	-4.7%
Physician O	6.4%	5.2%	-1.2%
Physician P	10.4%	8.6%	-1.7%
Physician Q	10.7%	13.6%	2.8%

### **RESULTS**

- A total of 24,361 colonoscopies were performed by 17 endoscopists over a mean (range) of 18 quarters (6-28).
- The mean quarterly ADR ( $\pm$ SD) was 51.7% ( $\pm$ 11.7%), while the mean yearly ADR was 47.2% ( $\pm$ 13.8%).
- Over the study time frame, there was a small increase in overall ADR based on both quarterly and yearly measurements (slope + 0.6%, p=0.02; and slope +2.7%, p < 0.001, respectively).</li>
- However, most endoscopists had no significant change in their ADRs (**Table 1**).

## RESULTS (CONTINUED)

- Overall mean quarterly and yearly cecal intubation rates (99.6% ± 0.9%; 99.6% ± 0.5%) and withdrawal times (16.3 ± 5.8 min; 16.7 ± 5.9 min) did not change significantly.
- Analysis of standard deviation of ADRs to represent outcome variability over time within a physician showed no significant difference between yearly and quarterly measurements (p=0.064).
- Individual endoscopists' ADR standard deviation differences between yearly and quarterly measurement ranged from -4.7% to +6.8% (Table 2).

#### CONCLUSION

- After an initial positive effect, we found that long-term quarterly colonoscopy quality monitoring did not significantly change individual ADR but had a modest and stable improvement in overall pooled ADR.
- The magnitude of this ADR improvement was small and likely due to temporal trends rather than an independent causal effect
- For endoscopists with baseline high ADR and who abide by the precepts of highquality colonoscopy, frequent monitoring and reporting of colonoscopy quality metrics may not be necessary.
- The optimal frequency requires additional study.