Agreement and Reproducibility in the Re-diagnosis of Serrated Polyps

Samuel S. Ji, DO¹; Whayoung Lee², MD; Ahmad Charifa, MD²; Cary Johnson, MD²; Mahra Nourbakhsh², MD; Xiaodong Li, MD²; Vishal Chandan, MD²; William E. Karnes³

¹University of California Irvine, Department of Medicine ²Digestive Health Institute, University of California Irvine Medical Center ³University of California Irvine, Department of Pathology

Introduction

- Serrated polyps (SPs) fall into two categories: Hyperplastic polyps (HPs) and sessile serrated polyps (SSPs).
- HPs lack precancerous potential while SSPs are precancerous, but between the two they are difficult to diagnose histologically.
- Inaccuracy in SP diagnosis can lead to incorrect colonoscopy surveillance recommendations.

Aim

• Quantify the frequency of diagnostic change of SPs and diagnostic agreement by presenting previously diagnosed SPs to a panel of GI pathologists.

Methods

- Polyp pathology data was utilized from a colonoscopy quality database on colonoscopies performed from 2012-2020.
- 167 polyps, either HP or SSP, was selected for analysis based on previous histology, size, and location.
- Polyp specimens underwent independent re-diagnosis from a five member GI pathology team, their experience ranging from fellow to experienced attending.
- Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS. Kappa analysis was performed for inter-observer agreement. Kappa values were grouped as poor (<0.2), fair (0.21-0.40), moderate (0.41-0.60), good (0.61-0.80), and perfect (>0.80).







Patholog

- Pathologi Pathologis Pathologis
- Pathologis Pathologi

Pathologist

- Pathologist A
- Pathologist B
- Pathologist C
- Pathologist D
- Pathologist E

Pathologist

- Pathologist A
- Pathologist B
- Pathologist C
- Pathologist D
- Pathologist E

Origi

Kap

Original Diagno Inter-path

Kappa

Original Diagno

Inter-path

gist Number of polyps diagnosed				Number of agreeing diagnoses		Results	
ist A 102				84 (82.4	1%)		
ist B	B 78			57 (73.1%)		 On average, the five 	
ist C 163				122 (74.8%)		previous diagnosis c	
ist D 162				125 (77.2%)			
ist E 19				12 (63.2%)		 The mean kappa val diagnoses between 	
Original of HP			x as HP	Re- Dx as TSA	Re-Dx as normal	GI pathologist was 0 _	
67	10 (14	.9%) 51 (76.1%)	3 (4.5%)	3 (4.5%)	 Kappa value for poly 	
49	5 (10	.2%) 39 (79.6%)	2 (4.1%) 3 (6.1%) Vers	versus 0.682 for poly		
108	23 (21	.3%) 75 (69.4%)		(p=0.006).		
107	18 (16	6.8%) 83 (77.6%)	5 (4.7%)	1 (0.9%)		
11	4 (36	.4%) 7 (6	63.6%)	0	0	The mean kappa va	
Original of SSI				Re-Dx as TSA	Re-Dx as normal	in their re-diagnosis	
35	35 33 (94.3%)		2.9%)	0	1 (2.9%)	 There was no signifi 	
29	18 (62	2.1%) 9 (3	81.0%)	2 (6.9%) 0	0	when stratified by pr	
55	47 (85	5.5%) 7 (1	2.7%)		1 (1.8%)		
55	42 (76	.4%) 10 (18.2%)		3 (5.5%)	0		
8	8 5 (62.		25%)	1 (12.5%)	0		
Kappa Analysis				Карра		Discussion	
ginal Diagnosis vs Pathologists A-E (Mean)				0.497		De diagnosia of CDa	
Inter-pathologist agreement				0.669		 Re-diagnosis of SPs level agreement bety 	
ppa by Size		Kappa (less than 1 cm)		Kappa (greater than 1 cm) P-value		previous diagnosis.	
osis vs Pathologists A-E		0.313		0.682	0.006	• Interactingly inter	
nologist agreement		0.606		0.697	0.148	 Interestingly, inter-ol pathologists was at a 	
a by Location		Kappa (Proximal colon)		Kappa (Distal colon) P-value		 There was increase 	
nosis vs Pathologists A- E		0.579		0.520	0.530	polyps, but not for lo	
ologist agreement		0.700		0.676	0.704		



e five GI pathologists matched the osis on 74.1% of 163 SPs.

pa value for variability in SP veen original diagnosis and each was 0.497.

r polyps less than 1 cm was 0.313 or polyps greater than 1 cm

pa value between all pathologists nosis was 0.669.

significant difference in kappa by proximal versus distal colon.

of SPs resulted in only moderate nt between GI pathologists and the

nter-observer agreement among as at a good level.

eased agreement for larger for location.