A MULTI-CENTRE AUDIT OF 16 064 COLONOSCOPIES LOOKING AT CAECAL INTUBATION RATES, OVER A 2-YEAR PERIOD. NON-GI OPERATORS AND THOSE DOING <100 P.A. NEED TO IMPROVE OR STOP PERFORMING COLONOSCOPY
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Introduction Colonoscopy is the gold standard assessment for large bowel mucosal pathology, but a complete examination is an essential requirement. The first national colonoscopy audit carried out in 1999 demonstrated caecal intubation rates (CIRs) of 56.9%, which the authors described as “unacceptably low”. As a result the Joint Advisory Group on Gastrointestinal endoscopy (JAG) launched a programme of continuous quality improvement by standardising training, peer review and audit. JAG recommends practitioners undertake at least 100 procedures per annum with target CIRs of 90%. This current audit provides an assessment of performance against these quality standards.

Methods Data were collected from all colonoscopies undertaken in 2008–2009 from six hospitals across three English regions. The data included grade and specialism of operator, number of procedures and CIRs. Caecal intubation was recorded if reports positively documented reaching defined landmarks.

Results 16 064 colonoscopies performed with a CIR of 90.57% (95% CI 90.11% to 91.01%). Operators doing 100+ procedures per annum. CIR=91.76% (95% CI 91.24% to 92.25%). Operators doing <100 procedures per annum =87.77% (95% CI 86.82% to 88.67%). Gastroenterologists=91.01% (95% CI 90.32% to 91.70%). Surgeons=91.03% (95% CI 90.27% to 91.79%). Others practitioners=81.51% (95% CI 78.79% to 84.22%). Bowel cancer screening colonoscopies=97.71% (95% CI 97.07% to 98.34%). Non-screening colonoscopies=88.31% (95% CI 87.68% to 88.94%).

Conclusion This audit of 16 064 colonoscopies over three regions demonstrates aggregated achievement of the CIR quality standard, which is evidence of the effects of improvements in training and the implementation of standards Introduced by JAG since the 1999 national audit of colonoscopy. There is however a significant performance gap when comparing BCSP colonoscopists with non-screening colonoscopists and the CIR of >90% is supported by the volume of BCS colonoscopy work load (BCSP colonoscopies should be considered the new “gold standard”). Endoscopists performing low volume colonoscopy (<100 procedures per annum) and non-GI practitioners have a CIR (including the 95% CIs) of <90%. Endoscopists and/or non-GI practitioners with low volume practice who does not meet the quality standards should engage in skills augmentation plus further training and increase the numbers of procedures performed with local mentorship, or stop performing colonoscopy.
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Introduction Colonoscopy is the gold standard assessment for large bowel mucosal pathology, but a complete examination is an essential requirement. Higher caecal intubation rates in male patients vs female patients have been shown in the literature. Several theories are mooted for this difference such as female patients undergoing previous hysterectomy,1 low BMI2 and the suggestion that female patients have longer colons.3 The published papers on this subject are mostly over 10 years old and colonoscopy practice has changed dramatically over the last decade in the UK. The Joint Advisory Group on Gastrointestinal endoscopy (JAG) has run a programme of continuous quality improvement by standardising training, peer review and audit. The Bowel Cancer Screening Programme (BCSP) has been rolled out since 2006. This large audit revisits this subject to see if the improvements in colonoscopic practice have ironed out the differences.

Methods Data were collected from all colonoscopies undertaken (symptomatic, surveillance and BCSP procedures) at Kettering General Hospital between 1 July 2007 and 30 June 2011.

Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number of colonoscopies</th>
<th>Reached caecum/T/Ti/anastomosis</th>
<th>Failed</th>
<th>CIR (%)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>2640</td>
<td>2138</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>87.62</td>
<td>86.26 to 88.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>2772</td>
<td>2524</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>92.73</td>
<td>91.69 to 93.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5162</td>
<td>4854</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>90.31</td>
<td>89.48 to 91.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion Analysis of the data reveals significant differences in CIR between female and male patients (87.62% vs 92.73% (p=0.0001) NNT 19.57). This large retrospective audit shows despite the improvements in training and practice overseen by JAG and the introduction of BCSP, significant gender differences remain in CIR. Perhaps it would be prudent for endoscopy units to delineate these differences in gender and the potential ramifications (missed polyps etc) when giving information and consenting patients for