

VU Research Portal

Opportunities and pitfalls in colorectal cancer screening

Terhaar sive Droste, J.S.

2011

document version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication in VU Research Portal](#)

citation for published version (APA)

Terhaar sive Droste, J. S. (2011). *Opportunities and pitfalls in colorectal cancer screening*.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.


- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

E-mail address:

vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl



CHAPTER 1

Dutch endoscopic capacity in the era of colorectal cancer screening

J.S.Terhaar sive Droste [1], M.E.Craanen [1], J.J.Kolkman [2], C.J.J. Mulder [1]

[1] Department of Gastroenterology and Hepatology.
VU University Medical Centre. Amsterdam, The Netherlands

[2] Department of Gastroenterology and Hepatology.
Medisch Spectrum Twente, Enschede, The Netherlands

Abstract

Background: Future colorectal cancer (CRC) screening programmes should not (greatly) interfere with regular health care. Hence, we analysed the Dutch endoscopic practice to provide a clear insight into endoscopic workload and manpower with a special emphasis on the current ability to facilitate a successful implementation of a faecal occult blood test (FOBT)-based nationwide CRC screening programme.

Methods: A questionnaire was sent to all Dutch endoscopy units (N=100) in the spring of 2005. The questionnaire included topics ranging from the numbers and specifications of endoscopies performed in 2004 and the numbers of endoscopists per unit to expected vacancies for gastroenterologists and waiting times.

Results: The response rate was 98%, representing a total of 49,253 hospital beds. Overall, a 26% increase in the number of endoscopies from 325,000 in 1999 to almost 410,000 in 2004 was found, accompanied by a 25% increase in manpower. The total number of endoscopists was 598. Regional differences were observed in the number of endoscopists, the total number of endoscopies and colonoscopies and the number of endoscopies per endoscopist. A biennial FOBT-based screening programme would yield an additional workload of 25,385 colonoscopies a year amounting to a 22% increase in the total number of colonoscopies performed. However, the workload per unit would only have to increase with five extra colonoscopies per week.

Conclusions: Whereas a FOBT-based CRC screening programme is currently feasible without strongly interfering with regular health care, future plans regarding the scale and preferred mode of screening should incorporate solid data on the (regional) endoscopic capacity and manpower needed for a successful implementation.

Introduction

In view of the demographic changes and altered morbidity patterns in the Dutch general population, it is questionable whether the anticipated qualitative and quantitative changes in routine daily endoscopic practice can be met in the (near) future. In addition to an expected increase in the total number of endoscopies performed, the widespread clinical implementation of advanced imaging techniques, e.g. magnifying endoscopy, video capsule endoscopy and double-balloon enteroscopy will undoubtedly lead to a qualitative change in endoscopic practice as well. If not adequately managed, these quantitative and qualitative changes will not only hamper future endoscopic practice but may also frustrate the successful implementation of a nation-wide colorectal cancer (CRC) screening programme. Although the scale and optimal mode of screening is still controversial (1-4), it is likely that a future Dutch CRC screening programme will use a biennial faecal occult blood test (FOBT)-based screening strategy for the general population between 50-75 years (1). Despite many arguments in favour of a screening programme (5-7), a future CRC screening programme should not (greatly) interfere with regular health care in terms of endoscopic capacity and manpower. Hence, we analysed the current Dutch endoscopic practice to provide a clear insight into endoscopic workload and manpower with special emphasis on the additional requirements, if any, to accommodate a biennial FOBT-based CRC screening programme.

Methods

A questionnaire was sent, by mail and by e-mail, to all Dutch endoscopy units, either single- or multi-institutional (N=100) in the spring of 2005. Non-responders were sent several reminders and, if necessary, were contacted by phone at regular intervals of three to six weeks. The questionnaire included general topics ranging from the numbers and specifications of endoscopies performed in 2004 and the numbers of endoscopists and nurses per unit to waiting times and expected vacancies for gastroenterologists. The mean numbers of endoscopies, gastroscopies, colonoscopies, sigmoidoscopies and endoscopic retrograde cholangio-pancreatographies (ERCs) per 100,000 inhabitants were calculated. Finally, the geographical distribution of endoscopic procedures, manpower and workload per endoscopist were assessed. SPSS for Windows version 11.0 was used for descriptive statistical analysis of the data.

Results

The response rate was 98%, representing a total of 49,253 hospital beds. Two centers with a combined total of 509 hospital beds, did not respond despite several reminders. The total number of endoscopists was 598 (221 gastroenterologists, 213 internists, 123 surgeons and 41 pediatricians). Specification of the numbers of endoscopies per 100,000 inhabitants and the

geographical distribution of endoscopic procedures are listed in Tables 1 and 2, respectively. The number of endoscopists per province and number of endoscopies per endoscopist are shown in Table 3. The ratio between the number of colonoscopies and sigmoidoscopies was 1.7:1 (Table 1). The mean waiting time for routine gastroscopy and colonoscopy was 3.0 weeks (range: 1-12 weeks) and 5.1 weeks (range 1-15 weeks), respectively. The expected number of vacant positions for gastroenterologists amounted to 60,4 FTE and 61,4 FTE in the period 2005-2006 and 2007-2010, respectively.

Table 1: Number of endoscopies in The Netherlands in 2004, based on a 98% response rate.

	Total number in the Netherlands	Endoscopies per 100.000 inhabitants/year*
Gastroscopies	184,915	1,137
Colonoscopies	116,815	719
Sigmoidoscopies	70,049	431
ERCs	14,596	90
Other**	22,607	139
Total	408,982	2,514

*Dutch population 2004: 16,258,032 (www.cbs.nl).

**Other endoscopic procedures, i.e. duodenal feeding tubes, gastrostomies, pediatric endoscopies, endoscopic ultrasound imaging (EUS) and emergency procedures for haematemesis or hematochezia. ERC = endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography.

Discussion

Overall, a 26% increase in the number of endoscopies from 325,000 in 1999 to almost 410,000 in 2004 was found. This was accompanied by a 25% increase in manpower, i.e. from 480 endoscopists in 1999 to 598 endoscopists in 2004 (8). The endoscopic workload was nearly equally divided between gastroscopies and colonoscopies/sigmoidoscopies. The number of ERCs represented less than 4% in total, despite a 22% increase compared to 1999 (8). The total number of endoscopies showed remarkable geographical differences ranging from 5,687 in Flevoland to 92,172 in Zuid-Holland. This difference of up to 17-fold in all probability results from differences in the number of endoscopists per province and demographic characteristics, such as number of inhabitants, age distribution and, although speculative, morbidity patterns. Hence, it is not surprising that, in contrast to the 17-fold difference in total number of endoscopies, only a modest twofold difference was observed between the highest and lowest

Table 2: Number of endoscopies per province, based on a 98% response rate.

Province	Number of endoscopies	Number of colonoscopies	Endoscopies per 100.000 inhabitants/year*	Colonoscopies per 100.000 inhabitants/year*
Noord-Holland	62,359	16,798	2,410 (± 71)	649 (± 17)
Zuid-Holland	92,172	26,992	2,670 (± 66)	782 (± 19)
Noord-Brabant	51,128	11,932	2,124 (± 66)	496 (± 17)
Utrecht	34,905	10,498	3,003 (±171)	903 (± 65)
Gelderland	47,181	13,716	2,399 (± 132)	697 (± 45)
Overijssel	31,921	9,799	2,887 (±353)	886 (± 127)
Groningen	19,767	5,739	3,441 (± 671)	999 (± 205)
Flevoland	5,687	1,822	1,580 (± 62)	506 (± 35)
Zeeland	9,026	2,691	2,381 (± 5)	710 (± 52)
Limburg	29,767	9,487	2,613 (± 195)	833 (± 72)
Friesland	14,880	4,680	2,318 (± 271)	729 (± 115)
Drenthe	10,189	2,661	2,112 (± 94)	552 (± 48)
The Netherlands	408,982	116,815	2,514 (± 14)	719 (± 4)

*Mean number (± standard deviation) per 100.000 inhabitants.

ranking province after correction for the number of inhabitants. Within this context, an interesting finding was the observation that the province Groningen, ranking 8th place in total number of endoscopies, ranked first after correction for the number of inhabitants. Whether this finding is solely caused by demographic characteristics, morbidity patterns and/or differences in clinical practice, and endoscopic practice in particular, remains elusive. However, the number of endoscopies per endoscopist, being lowest in Groningen and Drenthe, suggests that differences in attitude towards endoscopic indications do not play a major role, if any. Similar geographical differences were observed with regard to the total number of colonoscopies, yielding a tenfold difference between the highest and lowest ranking province. Correction for number of inhabitants reduced the difference to less than twofold with the province Groningen ranking first in number of colonoscopies per 100,000 inhabitants. Interestingly, the colonoscopy/sigmoidoscopy ratio of 1.7:1 was rather low compared to other countries, ranging from 4.1:1 in the United States to 9:1 in France (9-11). This difference presumably reflects national differences in routine clinical practice with regard to for instance

Table 3: Number of endoscopists per province and number of endoscopies per endoscopist/year.

Province	Number of endoscopists	Number of endoscopies per endoscopist/year
Noord-Holland	101	617
Zuid-Holland	139	663
Noord-Brabant	69	741
Utrecht	47	743
Gelderland	68	694
Overijssel	34	939
Groningen	33	599
Flevoland	9	632
Zeeland	15	602
Limburg	42	709
Friesland	24	620
Drente	17	599
The Netherlands	598	684

endoscopic indications, practice guidelines, CRC screening guidelines and reimbursement. Finally, the waiting times for routine endoscopy were fairly uniform. Yet, unacceptable waiting times of up to 12 to 15 weeks were encountered as well.

In view of the above, it is important to consider the impact of a nation-wide CRC screening programme on (regional) endoscopic capacity, manpower and waiting times. Our data indicate that a biennial FOBT-based screening strategy (1) is currently feasible without greatly interfering with regular health care. Assuming a maximal compliance rate of 60% and a FOBT positivity rate of 2% analogous to other studies (12-14), the programme would yield an additional workload of 25,385 colonoscopies per year (www.cbs.nl) amounting to a 22% increase in the total number of colonoscopies performed in 2004. However, the workload per unit would have to increase by only a modest five extra colonoscopies per week.

In conclusion, whereas a FOBT-based CRC screening program is currently feasible, future plans regarding the scale and preferred mode of screening should incorporate solid data on the (regional) endoscopic capacity and manpower needed for a successful implementation.

References

- de Visser M, Van Ballegooijen M, Bloemers SM, van Deventer SJ, Jansen JB, Jespersen J, Kluit C, Meijer GA, Stoker J, de Valk GA, Verweij MF, Vlems FA. Report on the Dutch consensus development meeting for implementation and further development of population screening for colorectal cancer based on FOBT. *Cell Oncol* 2005;27:17-29.
- van Ballegooijen M, Habbema JD, Loeve F, Geul KW, Kleibeuker JH, Nagengast F, Hameeteman W, Snel P, Krestin GP. Screening for colorectal cancer in the Netherlands: time to start. *Cocast report* . 2003
- KWF Cancer signalling committee. Early detection of colorectal cancer. Reducing mortality by means of a national screening program. *KWF report* . 2001.
- Coebergh JW. Colorectal cancer screening in Europe: first things first. *Eur J Cancer* 2004;40:638-642
- Loeve F, van Ballegooijen M, Snel P, Habbema JD. Colorectal cancer risk after colonoscopic polypectomy: a population-based study and literature search. *Eur J Cancer* 2005;41:416-422
- Meyerhardt JA, Mayer RJ. Systemic therapy for colorectal cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2005;352:476-487.
- Schrag D. The price tag on progress - chemotherapy for colorectal cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2004;351:317-319
- Kolkman JJ, Mulder C.J. The nature of the Dutch endoscopic practice in 1999. *MAGMA* 2000;6:28-31
- Available at www.apcpr.gov/consumer/surgery.html. Agency for Health Care Policy and Research website. report . 2005
- Deux jours d'endoscopie digestive en France. Enquete nationale prospective de la Societe Francaise d'Endoscopie Digestive . report . 1999
- SNFGE. Le Livre Blanc de l'Hepato-Gastroenterologie. report . 2001
- Kronborg O, Jorgensen OD, Fenger C, Rasmussen M. Randomized study of biennial screening with a faecal occult blood test: results after nine screening rounds. *Scand J Gastroenterol* 2004;39:846-851
- Segnan N, Senore C, Andreoni B, Arrigoni A, Bisanti L, Cardelli A, Castiglione G, Crosta C, DiPlacido R, Ferrari A, Ferraris R, Ferrero F, Fracchia M, Gasperoni S, Malfitana G, Recchia S, Risio M, Rizzetto M, Saracco G, Spandre M, Turco D, Turco P, Zappa M. Randomized trial of different screening strategies for colorectal cancer: patient response and detection rates. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2005;97:347-357.
- UK Colorectal Cancer Screening Pilot Group. Results of the first round of a demonstration pilot of screening for colorectal cancer in the United Kingdom. *BMJ* 2004;329:133