

Table of Contents

Executive Summary..... 1

Dr. Robert Bree Collaborative Background..... 2

Background 3

Recommendation Framework 4

Stakeholder Checklists 6

 Delivery Organizations 6

 Patients and Family Members 7

 Providers 7

 Health Plans 7

 Employers 7

 Washington State Health Care Authority 7

 Washington State Department of Health 8

 Washington State Legislature 8

Evidence 9

 Addressing Disparities..... 9

 Increasing Colorectal Cancer Screening..... 9

 Follow-Up After Positive Fecal Test 10

 Sedation During Colonoscopy 10

Measurement..... 12

Appendix C: Guideline and Systematic Review Search Results 13

References 18

Executive Summary

*Colon cancer is the second leading cause of cancer death in the United States.
Black Americans have a 10% higher colon cancer mortality rate from later
diagnosis than white Americans.*

Colorectal cancer is common, being the fourth most diagnosed cancer in the United States, after lung, prostate, and breast cancers but is the second leading cause of cancer deaths. Survival rates vary based on the stage of cancer at diagnosis, but also by race with Black Americans having a 9-10% net lower survival at five years than white Americans. Colorectal cancer screening decreases both the incidence of and mortality from colorectal cancer due to finding cancer in earlier stages where cancer is not widespread and through finding and removing precancerous lesions through direct visualization tests.

Currently, the United States Preventive Services Task Force strongly recommends starting screening for colorectal cancer at age 50 and continuing to age 75, with some risk factors such as a family history indicating earlier screening. For those 75 to 85 years, the USPSTF recommends screening to be a individualized, considering a person's overall health and history of prior screening. Nationally, 52% of Americans have received recommended colorectal cancer screening, 73% for those receiving Medicare. Within Washington State, 63% of those aged 50-75 on commercial insurance and 43% of those receiving Medicaid have received recommended colorectal cancer screening. Colorectal cancer screening is cost effective, lowering overall health care cost relative to those who have not received screening due to avoidance of the high cost of colon cancer treatment.

The workgroup met from January to November 2020 to develop multi-stakeholder recommendations to address the barriers to comprehensive screening including:

- Tracking
- Measurement
- Patient-centered care
- Payment

Dr. Robert Bree Collaborative Background

The Dr. Robert Bree Collaborative was established in 2011 by Washington State House Bill 1311 “...to provide a mechanism through which public and private health care stakeholders can work together to improve quality, health outcomes, and cost effectiveness of care in Washington State.” The Bree Collaborative was named in memory of Dr. Robert Bree, a leader in the imaging field and a key member of previous health care quality improvement collaborative projects.

Members are appointed by the Washington State Governor and include public health care purchasers for Washington State, private health care purchasers (employers and union trusts), health plans, physicians and other health care providers, hospitals, and quality improvement organizations. The Bree Collaborative is charged with identifying health care services annually with substantial variation in practice patterns, high utilization trends in Washington State, or patient safety issues. For each health care service, the Bree Collaborative identifies and recommends best-practice, evidence-based approaches that build upon existing efforts and quality improvement activities to decrease variation. In the bill, the legislature does not authorize agreements among competing health care providers or health carriers as to the price or specific level of reimbursement for health care services. Furthermore, it is not the intent of the legislature to mandate payment or coverage decisions by private health care purchasers or carriers.

See **Appendix A** for a list of current Bree Collaborative members.

Recommendations are sent to the Washington State Health Care Authority for review and approval. The Health Care Authority (HCA) oversees Washington State’s largest health care purchasers, Medicaid and the Public Employees Benefits Board Program, as well as other programs. The HCA uses the recommendations to guide state purchasing for these programs. The Bree Collaborative also strives to develop recommendations to improve patient health, health care service quality, and the affordability of health care for the private sector but does not have the authority to mandate implementation of recommendations.

For more information about the Bree Collaborative, please visit: www.breecollaborative.org.

Bree Collaborative members identified colorectal cancer screening as a priority improvement area and convened a workgroup to develop evidence-based standards. The workgroup met from January to November 2020.

See **Appendix B** for the Colorectal Cancer Screening Workgroup Charter and a list of members.

See **Appendix C** for results of the guideline and systematic review search.

Background

Colorectal cancer is common, being the fourth most commonly diagnosed cancer in the United States, after lung, prostate, and breast cancers.¹ Approximately 4.2% of people are diagnosed at some point in their lifetime.¹ However, colon cancer is the second leading cause of cancer death in the United States, following lung cancer, showing the need for better interventions to increase screening.¹ Colon cancer is much more common in older adults with the rate of diagnosis being 237 per 100,000 people for those 85 years and older while the rate is less than 1 per 100,000 in those 10-14 years.²

Survival rates vary based on the stage of cancer at diagnosis, but also by race with Black Americans having a 9-10% net lower survival at five years than white Americans.³ Part of this disparity is due to cancer being diagnosed at a later stage for Black Americans. Of all people diagnosed with colon cancer, approximately 64.6% survive for five years post diagnosis, increasing to 89.7% if cancer is localized at diagnoses and decreasing to 13.8% if cancer is distant and more widespread (metastatic).³

Colorectal cancer screening decreases both the incidence of and mortality from colorectal cancer due to finding cancer in earlier stages where cancer is not widespread and through finding and removing precancerous lesions through direct visualization tests.⁴ Nationally, the incidence of colorectal cancer has declined because of increased screening and changes in risk factors.⁵ Currently, the United States Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) strongly recommends to start screening for colorectal cancer at age 50 and continuing to age 75, with some risk factors such as a family history indicating earlier screening.⁶ For those 75 to 85 years, the USPSTF recommends screening to be individualized, taking into account a person's overall health and history of prior screening.⁵ Colorectal cancer screening is also cost effective, lowering overall health care cost for a person receiving screening relative to not receiving screening due to the high cost of treating colon cancer.⁷

Healthy People 2020, the Federal initiative to set goals to improve the health of all Americans in specific topic areas, aims to increase appropriate colorectal cancer screening to 70.5%, from the current rate of 52% nationally.⁸ Nationally, the Medicare colorectal cancer screening rate is 73%. In Washington State, of adults aged 50 to 75 years, only 63% with commercial insurance and 43% of Medicaid recipients received screening, with significant variation county by county.⁹

There are a variety of CRC screening tests available, with varying levels of evidence to support their use, differing strengths and weaknesses (i.e., risks and benefits), and a range of screening intervals from annual to once every 10 years. Recommended tests are either stool-based or are direct visualization tests that are more invasive, but that offer the opportunity to remove pre-cancerous polyps. Stool-based tests include: annual guaiac-based fecal occult blood test (gFOBT), annual fecal immunochemical testing (FIT), FIT-DNA every one or three years.⁵ Direct visualization tests include: colonoscopy every ten years, CT colonography every five years, flexible sigmoidoscopy every five years, flexible sigmoidoscopy every ten years plus annual FIT.⁵ When a non-colonoscopy screening test is abnormal, diagnostic colonoscopy is recommended to assess for CRC and to remove any pre-cancerous colorectal polyps. The removal of these polyps is associated with a decreased risk of future CRC.

Recommendation Framework

The workgroup’s goal is to increase appropriate colorectal cancer screening in Washington State to decrease incidence of and mortality from colorectal cancer. Focus areas include:

| Focus Area | Action Steps |
|------------------------------|---|
| Tracking | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Track outcomes and identify disparities in cancer screening and mortality through a comprehensive cancer screening registry including colon, breast, and cervical cancers. The registry will include at minimum screening, screening outcome, and factors known to affect screening and outcome including race, ethnicity, and insurance status. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Long-term goal: a centralized registry managed by a Washington state agency. ○ Short term goal: each health care delivery organization keeps a site-level registry of screening, outcomes, and factors listed above ● Conduct outreach to people within the population identified for needing cancer screening at appropriate intervals depending on the colorectal cancer screening modality they have selected or that is most appropriate for them including follow-up on abnormal non-colonoscopy screening tests. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Manage this outreach and the registry through a dedicated person or persons at the site level. ○ Conduct targeted outreach to sub-populations with known historical or demonstrated lower colorectal cancer screening rates including Black Americans. |
| Measurement | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Request self-reported race and ethnicity at a site level and report at a health plan level. ● Include measurement of the colorectal cancer screening rate (NQF #0034) for all appropriate populations including for Medicaid. ● Develop a cost calculation worksheet to show a return on investment for colorectal cancer screening |
| Patient-Centered Care | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● For patients 50-75 screening modality choice should be individualized, considering overall health, history of prior screening, and risk factors, using shared decision making. ● For patients electing or who are recommended to have a colonoscopy, offer education around sedation options, including no sedation or sedation on demand. |
| Payment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Tie provider payments to showing improvement in colorectal cancer screening rates in state health care purchasing contracts. ● Provide coverage for all colorectal cancer screening examinations and laboratory tests assigned either a grade of A or a grade of B by the United |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>States Preventive Services Task Force. If an insured person is 50 years of age or older, an insurer may not impose cost sharing on the coverage including at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Fecal occult blood tests using a high-quality, one-sample FIT○ Colonoscopies, including the removal of polyps during a screening procedure○ Double contrast barium enemas○ A colonoscopy, including the removal of polyps during the procedure, if the insured has a positive result on any fecal test assigned either a grade of A or a grade of B by the United States Preventive Services Task Force. <ul style="list-style-type: none">● If an insured is at high risk for colorectal cancer, coverage shall include colorectal cancer screening examinations and laboratory tests as recommended by the treating physician.● Allow patients who are income-eligible to have the same access to free screening and treatment as those with breast and cervical cancer |
|--|--|

Stakeholder Checklists

Delivery Organizations

- Onsite cancer registry of colon, breast, and cervical cancer includes patients aged 50-75 or who are otherwise appropriate for receiving colorectal cancer screening of the attributed population includes:
 - Age
 - Modality selected for colorectal cancer
 - Screening date
 - Screening outcome
 - Race
 - Ethnicity
 - Insurance
- Registry is used to electronically notify providers during a visit with patients aged 50-75 or who are otherwise due for colorectal cancer screening
- Specific staff person or persons is dedicated to managing registry and outreach
- Outreach occurs to those within attributed population due for cancer screening at appropriate intervals depending on the colorectal cancer screening modality they have selected or that is most appropriate for them
- A mailed FIT program exists for average risk individuals not current for colorectal cancer screening who are identified through the registry (unless have opted for different modality)
- Positive FIT tests are tracked and patients receive follow-up until colonoscopy is completed or there is adequate documentation in the EHR as to why a colonoscopy was not done
- Targeted outreach to sub-populations with known historical or demonstrated lower colorectal cancer screening rates occurs including Black Americans
- Providers are trained or receive access to training on the indications for colonoscopy including family history and signs and symptoms of colorectal cancer
- Providers are trained or receive access to training on how to have a conversation about selecting the colorectal cancer screening modality using shared decision making for patients aged 50-75 or who are otherwise appropriate
- Patient decision aids on colorectal cancer screening modality selection are reviewed as an organization and make the patient decision aid available to the patient. This may also be done in partnership with a health plan's patient-facing webpage.

Patients and Family Members

- Understand your personal family history and risk of colorectal cancer. You can find information from the American Cancer society [here](#) and if high risk, consider screening earlier than age 50.
- Understand the signs and symptoms of colorectal cancer and talk to your doctor or care team if you have signs or symptoms. More information [here](#).
- If you are aged 50 to 75, you should be screened for colorectal cancer using a test that you choose. More information [here](#).
- If you are 75 to 85, think about your overall health and wellness-related goals, risks of screening procedures, your personal preferences, and whether you have been screened previously
 - Give your provider(s) information about your values and preferences and discuss options, tradeoffs, and implications of a decision together.
 - Ask about whether a patient decision aid is available.

Providers

- Understand risk factors for colorectal cancer including symptoms, family history, and genetic factors.
- Participate in skills training around shared decision making specific to colorectal cancer screening and/or other cancer screening. This is a learned skill set that is supported by patient decision aids.

Health Plans

- Collect data on colorectal cancer screening participation, including demographics such as patient race
- Do not require out-of-pocket costs for colonoscopies that convert from screening to diagnostic following an abnormal fecal test, sigmoidoscopy or CT colonography
- Do not require out-of-pocket costs for colonoscopies that begin as screening and convert to diagnostic due to the identification and removal of a polyp
- Track and report colorectal cancer screening for eligible adults (NQF #0034)

Employers

- Incorporate colorectal cancer screening metrics into any value-based contracts (e.g., Centers of Excellence, Accountable Care Organizations)

Washington State Health Care Authority

- Require Medicaid Managed Care Plans to report on percentage of eligible adults screened for colorectal cancer NQF #0034 and by race and ethnicity
- Certify patient decision aids for colorectal cancer screening

Washington State Department of Health

- Develop a registry for breast, cervical, and colorectal cancer including tracking modality of screening and intervals of screenings for average risk screening and abnormal test follow-up
- Use data from the registry to compare the rate of colorectal cancer screening, stage at diagnosis, and mortality compared across health plans and delivery systems.

Washington State Legislature

- Mandate health plan reporting on race and ethnicity data for all quality performance metrics
- Pass legislation requiring health plans to cover colonoscopy in full for follow up testing after a positive FIT and screening colonoscopy that turns into a diagnostic exam because a polyp is removed
- Increase funding to provide colorectal cancer screenings to the uninsured
- Allow patients who are income-eligible to have the same access to free screening and treatment as those with breast and cervical cancer

Evidence

Addressing Disparities

For those who are underserved, as indicated through lower colorectal cancer screening rates and higher mortality for Black Americans as well as other groups, targeted efforts are needed to reduce disparity in screening rather than a one-size fits all approach.¹⁰ In the state of Delaware, targeted efforts to reduce disparity in colorectal cancer screening between white and black residents resulted in an increase in screening participation from 48% to 74% among black residents, mirroring the overall population screening rate post-intervention of 74%.¹³

Increasing Colorectal Cancer Screening

Death from colorectal cancer occurs when screening does not occur, when screening does not occur at the appropriate interval(s), when screening is inaccurate or fails, when surveillance following the identification of an adenoma fails, or when follow-up from a positive screen does not occur.¹⁰ A failure at any one of the points along the screening pathway significantly increases the likelihood of death from colorectal cancer when compared to those who experience adherence to clinical best practice.⁹ Of these modifiable failure points in the screening pathway, interventions to increase the initial colorectal cancer screening have been the most well-studied and are most numerous.⁴ The most effective interventions are direct mailing of fecal testing to a person's home, as well as patient navigation alone and especially when coupled with mailed fecal testing.^{4,11} Direct mailing of fecal tests to age eligible individuals overdue for colorectal cancer screening increased the percent current for colorectal cancer screening to 51% compared to 26% over usual care, adding navigation to the mailed fecal testing program increased screening uptake to 65%.¹² The state of Delaware established a cancer treatment program in 2004 that emphasized colonoscopy and provided a nurse navigator and care coordinator at all five acute care hospital sites and physician communities that increased colorectal cancer screening rates from 57% to 74% overall.¹³ While this program cost \$1 million annually, the state saved \$6 million annually in downstream costs.¹³

Among Medicaid recipients, mailed fecal testing from the health plan has been shown to be effective in increasing screening rates, especially if the recipient received a follow-up telephone call.^{14,15} One of the most dramatic examples of the benefits of programmatic mailed FIT comes from Kaiser of Northern California, where initiation of mailed FIT in 2006 was associated with a significant increase in screening participation to 83% and an associated 50% decrease in colorectal cancer screening mortality.¹⁶ Coupling fecal testing with annual flu shots has been moderately effective, but patient education alone and provider education alone have not been shown to be effective at increasing screening rates.⁴

Barriers to these interventions include capacity within health care delivery systems for initiatives, higher cost for initiatives that need dedicated resources, lack of time in the clinical visit, and assuring follow-up for positive tests.⁴ The cost to a patient if colorectal screening transitions to a diagnostic procedure, for which co-insurance may be charged, serve as a further disincentive to receipt of any colorectal cancer screening. Estimates of removing this coinsurance in these two cases predict fewer deaths from colorectal cancer (around 13% in the Medicare population) and lower overall cost.¹⁷

Further, stigma around the colorectal system and fecal matter, the difficulties in preparing for a colonoscopy, and issues with copays being present if a colonoscopy is indicated after a positive fecal test serve as significant barriers.¹⁸ Many researchers and organizations promote the idea that the best test is the one that gets done, acknowledging some patients' preference for the annual fecal test over the more invasive colonoscopy.¹¹ This is an especially important concept in the era of the COVID-19 pandemic which has been associated with reluctance of many individuals to seek care in medical facilities. FIT is a home-based, non-invasive screening test that only requires travel to a medical facility if the FIT is abnormal (approximately one in 20). Other researchers and public health organizations have successfully maintained high rates of screening by colonoscopy by health navigators educating patients on the advantages of colonoscopy in terms of cancer prevention by polypectomy as well as long term effectiveness (every 10 years rather than annual).¹³

Follow-Up After Positive Fecal Test

While annual FIT screening can identify the majority of patients at risk for colorectal cancer, the effectiveness depends upon adherence with diagnostic colonoscopy after an abnormal FIT result. Unfortunately, many individuals with an abnormal FIT fail to undergo colonoscopy and a delay in colonoscopy is associated with an increased risk of late stage cancer.¹⁹ Factors associated with higher rates of colonoscopy completion include having a registry at the site to track abnormal FIT results and colonoscopy completion, having at least two staff members tasked with communicating abnormal FIT results to the patient, and having those staff members include a nurse and medical assistant were associated with higher rates of follow-up after a positive FIT.²⁰ However, interventions around increasing follow-up after an abnormal fecal test with a diagnostic colonoscopy are less well studied than initial screening.²¹

Sedation During Colonoscopy

Most patients undergoing colonoscopy receive sedation to manage discomfort and anxiety, though unsedated colonoscopy is commonplace in much of the world.²² In the United States, intravenous sedation with a narcotic (e.g., fentanyl) in combination with a benzodiazepine (e.g., midazolam) under the direction of the colonoscopy provider had been the most common type of sedation used during colonoscopy. However, there has been a relatively recent dramatic increase in the use of monitored anesthesia care (MAC) during colonoscopy, typically involving use of intravenous Propofol.²³ While MAC sedation with Propofol is associated with a small but significant increase in patient satisfaction, there is increasing evidence of an increased risk of significant complications compared to moderate sedation.^{24,25}

Sedation during a colonoscopy is used to help manage discomfort. Sedation options range from none to general anesthesia, which are both rare, and includes light sedation in which the patient can feel pain, moderate sedation in which the patient is conscious (usually a combination of benzodiazepine and a narcotic), and deep sedation in which the patient falls asleep and wakes up rapidly (propofol). Moderate sedation is the most common, practice patterns show midazolam to be the most commonly used sedative and fentanyl the most commonly analgesic (moderate) with propofol, that results in a lack of memory and is considered deep sedation, showing an increase in use.²⁶ Some studies have shown that patients prefer deep sedation.²⁷ Approximately 34.4% of colonoscopies nationally use anesthesia services (ranging from 53% to 8% in the Western region) but was increased with an increased risk of

Bree Collaborative Colorectal Cancer Screening Workgroup
August 7, 2020

complications within 30 days of the procedure and with increased risk of perforation, hemorrhage, abdominal pain, and stroke.²⁸

The use of MAC sedation is also associated with a significant increase in the cost of colonoscopy.²³ Recommendations from a multidisciplinary group prioritizing patient safety around sedation were that all endoscopists be able to perform colonoscopy with moderate sedation, that an endoscopist and a single trained nurse are sufficient for performing colonoscopy with moderate sedation, and that anesthesia- provided deep sedation be used only for select patients.²⁹

Measurement

Options for tracking colorectal cancer screening are below including those aligning with value-based reimbursement models from the Bree Collaborative and Federal programs:

□ **Colorectal Cancer Screening**

NQF #0034

DESCRIPTION: Percentage of patients 50-75 years of age who had appropriate screening for colorectal cancer

NUMERATOR: Patients with one or more screenings for colorectal cancer. Appropriate screenings are defined by any one of the following criteria:

- Fecal occult blood test (FOBT) during the measurement period
- Flexible sigmoidoscopy during the measurement period or the four years prior to the measurement period
- Colonoscopy during the measurement period or the nine years prior to the measurement period
- Computed tomography (CT) colonography during the measurement period or the four years prior to the measurement period
- Fecal immunochemical DNA test (FIT-DNA) during the measurement period or the two years prior to the measurement period

DEMONINATOR (Eligible Cases):

Patients 50 to 75 years of age on date of encounter

Patient encounter during the performance period (CPT or HCPCS): 99201, 99202, 99203, 99204, 99205, 99211, 99212, 99213, 99214, 99215, 99341, 99342, 99343, 99344, 99345, 99347, 99348, 99349, 99350, 99386*, 99387*, 99396*, 99397*, G0402, G0438, G0439

[https://www.ncqa.org/hedis/measures/colorectal-cancer-screening/#:~:text=Colorectal%20Cancer%20Screening%20\(COL\),DNA%20test%20every%203%20years.](https://www.ncqa.org/hedis/measures/colorectal-cancer-screening/#:~:text=Colorectal%20Cancer%20Screening%20(COL),DNA%20test%20every%203%20years.)

□ **Follow-up colonoscopy after a positive fecal test**

DESCRIPTION: Percentage of patients 50-75 years of age who had had a positive fecal test receiving a follow-up colonoscopy within X months

Patients 50 to 75 years of age on date of encounter

Fecal occult blood test (FOBT): 82274

Colonoscopy: 45378-45398, G0105, G0121

Appendix C: Guideline and Systematic Review Search Results

| | Year | Title | Summary or Findings |
|--|------|--|---|
| AHRQ: Research Findings and Reports | 2019 | Achieving Health Equity in Preventive Services | No eligible studies evaluated effects of provider-specific barriers; 18 studies of population barriers provided low or insufficient evidence regarding insurance coverage, access, age, rural location, low income, language, low health literacy, country of origin, and attitudes. In 12 studies of clinician interventions, screening was higher for colorectal cancer with patient navigation, risk assessment and counseling, educational materials, and decision aids; breast and cervical cancer with reminders involving lay health workers; and cervical cancer with outreach and health education. Clinician-delivered interventions were effective for smoking cessation and weight loss. In 11 studies of health information technologies, automated reminders and electronic decision aids increased colorectal cancer screening, and web- or telephone-based self-monitoring improved weight loss, but other technologies were not effective. In 88 studies of health system interventions, evidence was strongest for patient navigation to increase screening for colorectal (risk ratio [RR] 1.64; 95% confidence interval [CI] 1.42 to 1.92; 22 trials), breast (RR 1.50; 95% CI 1.22 to 1.91; 10 trials), and cervical cancer (RR 1.11; 95% CI 1.05 to 1.19). Screening was also higher for colorectal cancer with telephone calls, prompts, other outreach methods, screening checklists, provider training, and community engagement; breast cancer with lay health workers, patient education, screening checklists, and community engagement; cervical cancer with telephone calls, prompts, and community engagement; and lung cancer with patient navigation. Trials of smoking cessation and obesity education and counseling had mixed results. In populations adversely affected by disparities, evidence is strongest for patient navigation to increase colorectal, breast, and cervical cancer screening; telephone calls and prompts to increase colorectal cancer screening; and reminders including lay health workers encouraging breast cancer screening. Evidence is low or insufficient to determine effects of barriers or effectiveness of other interventions because of lack of studies and methodological limitations of existing studies. |
| | 2016 | Improving Cultural Competence to Reduce Health Disparities | None of the included studies measured the effect of cultural competence interventions on health care disparities. Most of the training interventions measured changes in professional attitudes toward the population of interest but did not measure the downstream effect of changing provider beliefs on the care delivered to patients. Interventions that altered existing protocols, empowered patients to interact with the formal health care system or prompted provider behavior at the point of care were more likely to measure patient-centered outcomes. The medium or high risk of bias of the included studies, the heterogeneity of populations, and the lack of measurement consensus prohibited pooling estimates or commenting about efficacy in a meaningful or responsible way. The term "cultural competence" is not well defined for the LGBT and disability populations and is often conflated with patient-centered or individualized care. There are many gaps in the literature; many large subpopulations are not represented. |

| | | |
|----------------------------|---|--|
| | 2012 Fecal DNA Testing in Screening for Colorectal Cancer in Average Risk Adults | Fecal DNA tests have insufficient evidence about its diagnostic accuracy to screen for colorectal cancer in asymptomatic, average-risk patients. There is also insufficient evidence for the harms, analytic validity, and acceptability of testing in comparison to other screening modalities. Existing evidence has little or no applicability to currently available fecal DNA testing. |
| <i>Cochrane Collection</i> | 2012 Narrow band imaging versus conventional white light colonoscopy for the detection of colorectal polyps | We could not find convincing evidence that NBI is significantly better than high definition WLC for the detection of patients with colorectal polyps, or colorectal adenomas. We found evidence that NBI might be better than standard definition WLC and equal to high definition WLC for detection the patients with colorectal polyps, or colorectal adenomas. |
| | 2016 Interventions to encourage uptake of cancer screening for people with severe mental illness | A comprehensive search showed that currently there is no RCT evidence for any method of encouraging cancer screening uptake in people with SMI. No specific approach can therefore be recommended. High-quality, large-scale RCTs are needed urgently to help address the disparity between people with SMI and others in cancer screening uptake. |
| | 2019 Follow-up strategies for patients treated for non-metastatic colorectal | The results of our review suggest that there is no overall survival benefit for intensifying the follow-up of patients after curative surgery for colorectal cancer. Although more participants were treated with salvage surgery with curative intent in the intensive follow-up groups, this was not associated with improved survival. Harms related to intensive follow-up and salvage therapy were not well reported. |

| | | |
|------|---|---|
| | cancer | |
| 2013 | Personalised risk communication for informed decision making about taking screening tests | There is strong evidence from three trials that personalised risk estimates incorporated within communication interventions for screening programmes enhance informed choices. However the evidence for increasing the uptake of such screening tests with similar interventions is weak, and it is not clear if this increase is associated with informed choices. Studies included a diverse range of screening programmes. Therefore, data from this review do not allow us to draw conclusions about the best interventions to deliver personalised risk communication for enhancing informed decisions. The results are dominated by findings from the topic area of mammography and colorectal cancer. Caution is therefore required in generalising from these results, and particularly for clinical topics other than mammography and colorectal cancer screening. |
| 2017 | Strategies for detecting colon cancer in patients with inflammatory bowel disease | The current data suggest that colonoscopic surveillance in IBD may reduce the development of both CRC and the rate of CRC-associated death through early detection, although the quality of the evidence is very low. The detection of earlier stage CRC in the surveillance group may explain some of the survival benefit observed. RCTs assessing the efficacy of endoscopic surveillance in people with IBD are unlikely to be undertaken due to ethical considerations. |
| 2017 | Decision aids for people facing health treatment or screening decisions | Compared to usual care across a wide variety of decision contexts, people exposed to decision aids feel more knowledgeable, better informed, and clearer about their values, and they probably have a more active role in decision making and more accurate risk perceptions. There is growing evidence that decision aids may improve values-congruent choices. There are no adverse effects on health outcomes or satisfaction. New for this updated is evidence indicating improved knowledge and accurate risk perceptions when decision aids are used either within or in preparation for the consultation. Further research is needed on the effects on adherence with the chosen option, cost-effectiveness, and use with lower literacy populations. |
| 2013 | Flexible sigmoidoscopy versus faecal occult blood testing for colorectal cancer screening in asymptomatic | There is high quality evidence that both flexible sigmoidoscopy and faecal occult blood testing reduce colorectal cancer mortality when applied as screening tools. There is low quality indirect evidence that screening with either approach reduces colorectal cancer deaths more than the other. Major complications associated with screening require validation from studies with more complete reporting of harms. |

| | individuals | |
|---|-----------------------------|---|
| <i>Veterans Administration Evidence-based Synthesis Program</i> | 2014 | <p>The Effects of Shared Decision Making on Cancer Screening</p> <p>The ideal SDM intervention would enhance Decision Quality (i.e., increase knowledge and values clarity) and Impact (i.e., increase satisfaction, reduce decision conflict, and have minimal impact on service utilization). The desired impact on Decision Action depends on the screening decision. For decisions about how to screen (such as colorectal cancer screening), the ideal SDM intervention would exert the desired effects on Decision Quality and Impact without reducing measures of Decision Action such as screening intention and behavior. For decisions about whether to screen (such as breast, cervical, and prostate cancer in some age groups and risk categories), the goal is to facilitate personalized decision making based on values and preferences. Hence, there are no desired effects on Decision Action per se in this context.</p> |
| | <u>2013</u> | <p>Patients with Positive Screening Fecal Occult Blood Tests: Evidence Brief on the Delay Between Time to Colonoscopy and Colorectal Cancer Outcomes</p> <p>No direct evidence supports the current VHA policy that requires follow-up colonoscopy to be done within 60 days of a positive screening FOBT. There is very low-strength evidence that longer post-referral delays do not worsen survival or CRC stage in patients with various signs and symptoms. One potential explanation for the nonsignificant results is the potential confounding effects of various symptomatic presentations; such that clinicians may prioritize colonoscopy in those with cancer-specific symptoms, thus obscuring a natural association between increased delays and more advanced cancers.</p> |
| <i>Health Technology Assessment Program</i> | 2008 | <p>Virtual colonoscopy or computed tomographic colonography (CTC)</p> <p>Computed Tomographic Colonography (CTC) for routine colorectal cancer screening is not a covered benefit. This decision does not apply to use of CTC for other diagnostic purposes.</p> |
| <i>Centers for Disease Control and Prevention</i> | | <p>Colorectal (Colon) Cancer https://www.cdc.gov/cancer/colorectal/index.htm</p> |

Bree Collaborative Colorectal Cancer Screening Workgroup

August 7, 2020

*Institute for
Clinical and
Economic
Review*

| | | |
|------|---------------------------------------|---|
| 2008 | Computed tomography (CT) colonography | Given the possible benefits of introducing a widely available minimally-invasive option for colorectal cancer screening, there is considerable interest in CTC. |
|------|---------------------------------------|---|

References

- ¹ National Cancer Institute Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results Program. Cancer Stat Facts: Colorectal Cancer. Available: <https://seer.cancer.gov/statfacts/html/colorect.html>.
- ² <https://gis.cdc.gov/Cancer/USCS/DataViz.html>
- ³ White A, Joseph D, Rim SH, Johnson CJ, Coleman MP, Allemani C. Colon cancer survival in the United States by race and stage (2001-2009): Findings from the CONCORD-2 study. *Cancer*. 2017;123 Suppl 24(Suppl 24):5014–5036. doi:10.1002/cncr.31076
- ⁴ Green BB. Colorectal Cancer Control: Where Have We Been and Where Should We Go Next?. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2018;178(12):1658–1660. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2018.4627
- ⁵ American Cancer Society. Cancer Facts and Figures. 2018. Accessed: July 2020. Available: <https://www.cancer.org/content/dam/cancer-org/research/cancer-facts-and-statistics/annual-cancer-facts-and-figures/2018/cancer-facts-and-figures-2018.pdf>
- ⁶ US Preventive Services Task Force, Bibbins-Domingo K, Grossman DC, et al. Screening for Colorectal Cancer: US Preventive Services Task Force Recommendation Statement [published correction appears in *JAMA*. 2016 Aug 2;316(5):545] [published correction appears in *JAMA*. 2017 Jun 6;317(21):2239]. *JAMA*. 2016;315(23):2564–2575. doi:10.1001/jama.2016.5989
- ⁷ Heitman SJ, Hilsden RJ, Au F, Dowden S, Manns BJ. Colorectal cancer screening for average-risk North Americans: an economic evaluation [published correction appears in *PLoS Med*. 2012 Nov;9(11). doi: 10.1371/annotation/0fd49c83-2c6d-42b5-a8c1-45a0aaada77]. *PLoS Med*. 2010;7(11):e1000370. Published 2010 Nov 23.
- ⁸ <https://www.healthypeople.gov/2020/topics-objectives/topic/cancer/objectives>
- ⁹ Washington Health Alliance. “As new report shows colorectal cancer rates rising, Washington lags in appropriate screening.” August 9, 2017. Available: <https://wahealthalliance.org/as-new-report-shows-colorectal-cancer-rates-rising-washington-lags-in-appropriate-screening/>
- ¹⁰ Gupta S, Sussman DA, Doubeni CA, et al. Challenges and possible solutions to colorectal cancer screening for the underserved. *J Natl Cancer Inst*. 2014;106(4):dju032.
- ¹¹ Dougherty MK, Brenner AT, Crockett SD, et al. Evaluation of Interventions Intended to Increase Colorectal Cancer Screening Rates in the United States: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2018;178(12):1645–1658. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2018.4637
- ¹² Green BB, Wang CY, Anderson ML, et al. An automated intervention with stepped increases in support to increase uptake of colorectal cancer screening: a randomized trial. *Ann Intern Med*. 2013;158(5 Pt 1):301-311.
- ¹³ Grubbs SS, Polite BN, Carney J Jr, et al. Eliminating racial disparities in colorectal cancer in the real world: it took a village. *J Clin Oncol*. 2013;31(16):1928-1930. doi:10.1200/JCO.2012.47.8412
- ¹⁴ Coronado GD, Green BB, West II, et al. Direct-to-member mailed colorectal cancer screening outreach for Medicaid and Medicare enrollees: Implementation and effectiveness outcomes from the BENEFIT study. *Cancer*. 2020;126(3):540-548. doi:10.1002/cncr.32567
- ¹⁵ Brenner AT, Rhode J, Yang JY, et al. Comparative effectiveness of mailed reminders with and without fecal immunochemical tests for Medicaid beneficiaries at a large county health department: A randomized controlled trial. *Cancer*. 2018;124(16):3346-3354.
- ¹⁶ Levin TR, Corley DA, Jensen CD, et al. Effects of Organized Colorectal Cancer Screening on Cancer Incidence and Mortality in a Large Community-Based Population. *Gastroenterology*. 2018;155(5):1383-1391.e5.
- ¹⁷ Peterse EFP, Meester RGS, Gini A, et al. Value Of Waiving Coinsurance For Colorectal Cancer Screening In Medicare Beneficiaries. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2017;36(12):2151-2159. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2017.0228
- ¹⁸ Washington Health Alliance. Community Checkup : Improving Health Care in Washington State. April 2020. Accessed: May 2020. Available: <https://wacommunitycheckup.org/reports/2019-community-checkup-report/#Endnotes>.
- ¹⁹ [Douglas A Corley](#)¹
- ²⁰ Issaka RB, Rachocki C, Huynh MP, Chen E, Somsouk M. Standardized Workflows Improve Colonoscopy Follow-Up After Abnormal Fecal Immunochemical Tests in a Safety-Net System [published online ahead of print, 2020 Mar 31]. *Dig Dis Sci*. 2020;10.1007/s10620-020-06228-z.

- ²¹ Selby K, Baumgartner C, Levin TR, et al. Interventions to Improve Follow-up of Positive Results on Fecal Blood Tests: A Systematic Review. *Ann Intern Med.* 2017;167(8):565-575. doi:10.7326/M17-1361
- ²² Bretthauer M, Kaminski MF, Løberg M, et al. Population-Based Colonoscopy Screening for Colorectal Cancer: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Intern Med.* 2016;176(7):894-902. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2016.0960
- ²³ Inadomi JM. Editorial: Endoscopic Sedation: Who, Which, When?. *Am J Gastroenterol.* 2017;112(2):303-305. doi:10.1038/ajg.2016.557
- ²⁴ McQuaid KR, Laine L. A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized, controlled trials of moderate sedation for routine endoscopic procedures. *Gastrointest Endosc.* 2008;67(6):910-923. doi:10.1016/j.gie.2007.12.046
- ²⁵ Wernli KJ, Inadomi JM. Anesthesia for colonoscopy: too much of a good thing?. *JAMA Intern Med.* 2013;173(7):556-558. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2013.4071
- ²⁶ Sonnenberg A. Sedation in Colonoscopy. *Gastroenterol Hepatol (N Y).* 2016;12(5):327-329.
- ²⁷ <https://www.mdedge.com/surgery/article/141555/colon-and-rectal/colonoscopy-patients-prefer-propofol-over-fentanyl/midazolam>
- ²⁸ Wernli KJ, Brenner AT, Rutter CM, Inadomi JM. Risks Associated With Anesthesia Services During Colonoscopy. *Gastroenterology.* 2016;150(4):888-e18. doi:10.1053/j.gastro.2015.12.018
- ²⁹ Dossa F, Dubé C, Tinmouth J, et al. Practice recommendations for the use of sedation in routine hospital-based colonoscopy. *BMJ Open Gastroenterol.* 2020;7(1):e000348. Published 2020 Feb 16. doi:10.1136/bmjgast-2019-000348