QUALITY INDICATORS OF COLORECTAL CANCER SCREENING PROGRAM IN CATALONIA (SPAIN)

Mercè Peris, Gemma Binefa, Núria Diaz, Montse Garcia, Matilde Navarro

Cancer Prevention and Control Department Institut Català d'Oncologia

International Cancer Screening Network, June 4-6, 2008





Catalan Colorectal Cancer Screening Program





Population-based program



Started in 2000 L'Hospitalet, Barcelona

Screening policy



- > Target population: men and women aged 50-69
- Screening Test: faecal occult blood test (FOBT)
 - (Hema-screen® Immunostics.Inc.)
 - No dietary restrictions at initial test.
- > Screening interval: two years
- Diagnostic study of positive results of FOBT: colonoscopy

Screening policy



- Demographic data: population-based register
- Free of charge, voluntary
- ➤ Invitation: personal letter by mail + reminder 6 weeks later
- ➤ In the 3rd round: Individual evaluation through a questionnaire to identify people at increased risk (family history/symptoms). This procedure is under evaluation as a triage step for FOBT or colonoscopy

Key Issues for Quality Assurance of CCR Screening Program



- Official Target: Universal coverage of colorectal cancer screening in 2010
- Regional Guidelines on CCR Screening : Still missing
- Central coordination: Still missing
- Quality indicators: Available for the index area
- Central evaluation: Assigned
- Publication of results: Early reports 1 published and 1 in press, 4 in preparation. Full report of work in index area 2009.

Quality Indicators



Performance Indicators

Early Impact Indicators



All subjects included irrespective of participation in 3 rounds

Eligible population

Positivity

4-4 DOLIND



2rd DOLIND

1.1% (189)

1St ROUND	2nd ROUND	3rd ROUND
00.000	00 504	05 447
63,880	66,534	65,147

0.8% (123)

Participation 17.2% (11,011) 22.3% (14,818) 27.2% (17,74
--

Adherence		67.4%	87.0%
-----------	--	-------	-------

Adequate FOBT	96.4%	95.5%	96.8%

3.4% (372)



1st ROUND

2nd ROUND

3rd ROUND

Colonoscopy compliance

89.8%

87.8%

95.2%

Complete colonoscopy

92.3% (1st and 2nd rounds together)

91.1%

Repeated colonoscopy for polypectomy

32.7%

19.3%

8.9%

Colonoscopy complication rate

8.8‰ (n=4)

11.3‰ (n=2)

9.6%o (n=2)



Positive Predictive Values (%)

	1st ROUND	2nd ROUND	3rd ROUND
Polyps (no adenoma)	6.7	1.6	3.7
Low Risk Adenoma	5.9	5.7	7.4
High Risk Adenoma	21.2	34.1	30.7
Invasive Cancer	6.2	10.6	14.3
Advanced Neoplasia*	27.4	44.7	45.0

^{*} Advanced Neoplasia= High Risk Adenoma + Invasive Cancers



All subjects included irrespective of participation in 3 rounds



Detection rate (%)

	1st ROUND	2nd ROUND	3rd ROUND
Polyps no adenoma	2.3	0.1	0.4
Low Risk Adenoma	2.0	0.5	0.8
High Risk Adenoma	7.2	2.8	3.3
Invasive Cancer	2.1	0.9	1.5
Advanced Neoplasia	9.3	3.7	4.8

^{*} Advanced Neoplasia= High Risk Adenoma + Invasive Cancers



Stage distribution of screen detected cancers

	1st R	1st ROUND		2nd ROUND		3rd ROUND	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
I	8	34.8	7	53.8	9	33.3	
II	5	21.7	2	15.4	5	18.6	
III	8	34.8	2	15.4	9	33.3	
IV	2	8.7	2	15.4	4	14.8	
TOTAL	23	100.0	13	100.0	27	100.0	



Colonoscopy Results from the individuals with higher risk identified by a Colorectal Risk Questionnaire- 3rd Round

Total individuals:91; Family history: 46; Symptoms: 45

	Family history		Symp	otoms	
	n	%	n	%	
Negative	27	58.7	33	73.3	
Polyps (hp)	3	6.5	1	2.2	
LRA	7	15.2	3	6.7	
HRA	8	17.4	2	4.4	
Invasive cancer	1	2.2	6	13.3	



Timeline of screening process

	1st ROUND	2nd ROUND	3rd ROUND
Timeline (days)	Median	Median	Median
First stool sample and FOBT result *	6	7	9
FOBT positive and colonoscopy**	41	47	49
Diagnosis of cancer and first treatment			60

[•]FOBT returned by mail in 3rd round, FOBT was delivered to Primary Health Care Centers in 1st and 2nd round.

^{•**} A medical exam, ECG, xR and a blood test prior to colonoscpy

Impact indicators



Follow-up of screen-detected adenomas

➤ Adherence to follow-up 88.0%

> HRA detection rate at follow up 19.2%

Conclusions (I)



- > To increase participation:
 - To run health education programs to the general public and to health professionals to increase awareness about CRC prevention
 - To achieve higher implication of General Practitioners
 - The full budget and human resources are needed to extend the program to the whole region
- ➤ It seems beneficial to select subjects at higher-thanaverage risk of developing CRC but at increased resources

Conclusions (II)



- ➤ CRC screening indicators must be reported using common terminology definitions and classifications, suited to the screening approach as well as diagnosis and treatment in order to compare data from other programs.
- ➤ We are searching for active involvement in cancer screening networks.

Thank you for your attention





m.peris@iconcologia.net