

Quality Indicators of Colonoscopy: A Study of 150 Patients

Awanwosa Valentine Agho*, Adel Elnashar

DO, MSc Mercy Catholic Medical Center, Darby, PA.

ABSTRACT

Background: Colonoscopy is the most effective method for detecting and preventing colorectal cancer (CRC). Its diagnostic success is strongly tied to bowel preparation quality and performance metrics such as adenoma detection rate (ADR). Poor preparation leads to missed lesions, prolonged procedures, and higher repeat-colonoscopy rates, making quality monitoring essential.

Objectives: This study evaluated colonoscopy performance indicators specifically bowel-prep quality and ADR among patients undergoing screening, surveillance, and diagnostic colonoscopies. It also assessed how patient comorbidities, lesion distribution, and histopathology influenced detection outcomes.

Methods: A retrospective quality improvement (QI) review of 150 colonoscopies was performed at Mercy Fitzgerald Hospital between January and April 2022. Data were extracted from endoscopy and pathology reports, including ASA classification, bowel preparation quality, lesion characteristics, and recommended follow-up. Descriptive analysis was conducted using SPSS v27.

Results: Most patients were ASA II or III, with a mean age of 61 years. An exceptional ADR of 88% was observed, far surpassing typical organizational benchmarks (25–30%). Tubular adenomas were the most common finding. Good bowel preparation yielded the highest lesion-detection efficiency, while excellent prep improved visualization but did not significantly increase polyp counts. Fair or poor prep was more frequent among patients with higher ASA classifications.

Conclusion: While ADR was exceptionally high, bowel prep quality especially among medically complex patients remains an area for targeted improvement. Enhanced preparation strategies, individualized regimens, and patient education could improve visualization, reduce missed lesions, and align performance with national guidelines.

This is an Open Access article that uses a funding model which does not charge readers or their institutions for access and distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>) and the Budapest Open Access Initiative (<http://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/read>), which permit unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided original work is properly credited.

INTRODUCTION

Colorectal cancer is a major contributor to global cancer morbidity and mortality. Colonoscopy plays a critical role in early detection and prevention by allowing direct visualization of the mucosa and enabling removal of premalignant polyps [1]. Its effectiveness depends on multiple factors, but bowel preparation quality is one of the strongest determinants of diagnostic accuracy.

Inadequate bowel cleansing decreases mucosal visibility and increases the likelihood of missed lesions, incomplete procedures, and shorter surveillance intervals placing a burden on both the healthcare system and patients [12]. Prior research suggests that a significant proportion of interval cancers arise due to missed lesions or inadequate prep [13,15]. Multiple bowel-prep strategies exist, including polyethylene

glycol (PEG) solutions, sodium phosphate, low-residue diets, and adjunctive agents. Evidence increasingly supports split-dose regimens, low-volume PEG with enhancers, and individualized prep plans for patients with comorbidities [5–9]. To measure prep quality, validated scoring tools such as the Boston Bowel Preparation Scale (BBPS) are widely used [2].

Adenoma detection rate (ADR) is another key quality indicator. Higher ADRs correlate closely with lower rates of interval colorectal cancer, making adherence to ADR benchmarks fundamental for endoscopist assessment and institutional quality monitoring [10]. Surveillance intervals after polypectomy are guided by US Multi-Society Task Force (USMSTF) recommendations, which depend on the number, size, and histology of detected lesions [11].

This study examines colonoscopy quality performance at a community hospital by analyzing bowel preparation, ADR, lesion characteristics, and compliance with evidence-based surveillance recommendations.

*Correspondence

Awanwosa Valentine Agho

DO, MSc Mercy Catholic Medical Center, Darby, PA.

METHODS

Study design and setting

This retrospective QI study was conducted at Mercy Fitzgerald Hospital, a community-based facility with an active outpatient endoscopy unit. The hospital serves a mixed urban-suburban population with a wide range of comorbid conditions. This QI activity was conducted according to internal standards and required no IRB approval under institutional policy [3].

Study population

The study involved 150 consecutive patients undergoing colonoscopy for:

1. Routine screening,
2. Post-polypectomy surveillance,
3. Or diagnostic evaluation for gastrointestinal symptoms.

Exclusion criteria were:

- Incomplete colonoscopy (failure to reach the cecum),
- Unviewable colon due to severely poor preparation,
- Missing pathology data.

The sample represented real-world clinical diversity, including patients with multiple comorbidities and high ASA classifications.

Data collection and variables

Data were extracted from electronic medical records, colonoscopy reports, and pathology results. Variables included:

- Demographic data (age, sex),
- ASA physical status,
- Colonoscopy indication,
- Bowel-prep quality (poor, fair, good, excellent),
- Caecal intubation documentation,
- Lesion number, size, and anatomical distribution,
- Histology (adenoma type, dysplasia grade).

Two independent reviewers checked all data to ensure accuracy and reduce extraction errors [2].

Procedure protocol

Patients were instructed to follow a 1–3-day low-residue diet. Prep solutions included PEG-based regimens, sodium phosphate, or low-volume PEG with adjuncts such as simethicone, olive oil, or ascorbic acid depending on physician preference [5–9]. Split dosing was encouraged for morning procedures.

Sedation followed ASA fasting guidelines and typically included midazolam with fentanyl or propofol infusion when appropriate [14]. Vital signs were continuously monitored. Cecal intubation was confirmed by visualizing anatomic landmarks.

Minimum withdrawal times of six minutes were maintained for non-polypectomy examinations to ensure adequate mucosal inspection. Lesions were resected or biopsied and submitted for histopathology analysis [13].

Histopathology

Resected specimens were analyzed for adenoma subtype (tubular, tubulovillous, villous), hyperplastic changes, inflammatory pathology, or malignancy. Dysplasia grading

followed institutional standards and widely accepted classification guidelines [13].

Statistical analysis

Descriptive statistical analysis was performed using IBM SPSS v27. Continuous variables were expressed as means and standard deviations, and categorical variables as counts and percentages. ADR was defined as the proportion of colonoscopies identifying at least one adenoma. Associations between ASA classification, preparation quality, and lesion detection were described qualitatively to guide QI initiatives [3,16].

RESULTS

Patient demographics

Of the 150 patients, 86 (57%) were female and 64 (43%) male, with a mean age of 61 years. ASA classifications were:

- ASA II: 39%
- ASA III: 58%
- ASA I/IV: 3%

Screening accounted for nearly half the procedures, while the remainder were surveillance or diagnostic evaluations.

Bowel preparation quality

Preparation scores at the start of each procedure were:

- Good: 45%
- Fair: 31%
- Excellent: 16%
- Poor: 8%

Lavaging improved visualization in many poor cases, enabling adequate inspection. Higher ASA scores correlated strongly with poorer initial prep, likely due to medication burden, limited mobility, or intolerance of full-volume solutions [16].

Adenoma detection rate and lesion types

Of the 150 colonoscopies, 129 identified at least one adenoma, yielding an ADR of 88% markedly above recommended thresholds. Lesion distribution included:

- Tubular adenomas: 51%
- Tubulovillous adenomas: 7%
- Hyperplastic polyps: 39%
- Hemorrhoids: 69%
- Inflammatory lesions: 3%
- Rare benign lesions: <2%

Polyp localization favored the sigmoid (distal colon) and transverse colon, consistent with other population studies [4].

Relationship between prep quality and detection

Good preparation produced the highest detection efficiency. Although excellent prep provided the clearest visualization, the number of polyps detected did not substantially exceed those with good prep. Poor prep required extensive lavage, increased withdrawal time, and risked missing flat or right-sided lesions, consistent with prior literature showing increased adenoma miss rate in inadequate prep [12,15].

Follow-up recommendations

Follow-up intervals followed USMSTF recommendations [11]:

- Single small tubular adenoma: 3 years
- Multiple adenomas / high-grade dysplasia: 1 year
- Incomplete polypectomy: early repeat within weeks to months
- Inflammatory findings: clinical follow-up within 3–6 months

Patients with high-risk lesions were enrolled in early surveillance schedules.

DISCUSSION

Interpretation of the exceptionally high ADR

ADR is a powerful predictor of interval CRC risk [10]. The 88% ADR in this study is significantly higher than standard expectations. This may reflect:

- A mixed population with many surveillance cases,
- Experienced endoscopists with strong withdrawal technique,
- Effective use of photographic documentation,
- Institutional culture emphasizing completeness and accuracy [1,4].

While this reflects high-quality practice, ADR must always be interpreted in context of case mix.

Bowel preparation as a modifiable quality factor

Poor bowel preparation is consistently linked to missed adenomas, incomplete exams, prolonged procedures, and shortened follow-up intervals [12]. Improving prep quality especially among high-ASA patients can significantly improve detection rates. Interventions supported by literature include:

- Split-dose regimens,
- Low-volume PEG with adjuvants,
- Personalized prep plans for comorbid patients,
- Low-residue diets instead of clear-liquid diets [5–9].

These strategies can improve tolerability and cleansing effectiveness and reduce the need for early repeat procedures.

Patient education and communication

Quality outcomes strongly depend on patient adherence to preparation instructions. Research shows that verbal counseling, written instructions, and telephone reminders significantly increase prep adequacy [16]. Multifaceted education is especially crucial for patients with mobility limitations, older adults, or those taking multiple medications.

Implications for surveillance and long-term cancer prevention

Proper interval timing reduces the risk of interval cancers. Incomplete or partial polypectomy is a known source of recurrence; some studies find residual neoplasia in up to 17% of large sessile lesions [15]. Early repeat colonoscopy when margins are uncertain, combined with preventive strategies (aspirin, NSAIDs, dietary modification), may reduce recurrence risk [15].

Quality improvement recommendations

To sustain and improve performance, the following QI measures are suggested:

- Standardized prep algorithms including low-volume and

split-dose options,

- Targeted prep modifications for high-ASA patients,
- Continuous tracking of ADR, cecal intubation rate, and prep quality,
- Regular performance feedback to endoscopists,
- Patient-friendly educational materials and reminder calls.

These initiatives can improve prep quality and reduce variability in colonoscopy performance over time [1,5,16].

CONCLUSION

This retrospective QI study highlights strong colonoscopy performance at a community hospital, demonstrated by an ADR of 88%, well above established quality benchmarks. Nevertheless, bowel-prep quality especially among medically complex patients remains a limiting factor. Personalized preparation protocols, enhanced education, and consistent adherence to surveillance guidelines are essential to improve overall outcomes.

Ongoing data tracking, performance feedback, and patient-centered strategies will help maintain high-quality colonoscopy practices and reduce missed lesions and interval cancers [5,9,11,16].

REFERENCES

- Rosenfeld G, Krygier D, Enns RA, Singh H. Quality indicators in colonoscopy: A systematic review. *Am J Gastroenterol*. 2015;110(2):236–248.
- Lai EJ, Calderwood AH, Doros G, Fix OK, Jacobson BC. The Boston Bowel Preparation Scale: A valid and reliable instrument for colonoscopy-oriented research. *Gastrointest Endosc*. 2009;69(3 Pt 2):620–625.
- ASGE Standards of Practice Committee; Pasha SF, Acosta R, et al. Routine laboratory testing before endoscopic procedures. *Gastrointest Endosc*. 2014;80(1):28–33.
- Leufkens AM, van Oijen MG, Vleggaar FP, Siersema PD. Factors influencing the miss rate of polyps in a back-to-back colonoscopy study. *Endoscopy*. 2012;44(5):470–475.
- Wexner SD, Beck DE, Baron TH, et al. A consensus document on bowel preparation before colonoscopy. *Gastrointest Endosc*. 2006;63(7):894–909.
- Abut E, Guveli H, Yasar B, et al. Administration of olive oil followed by low-volume PEG improves patient satisfaction with right-side colonic cleansing over conventional preparation. *Gastrointest Endosc*. 2009;70(3):515–521.
- Park DI, Park SH, Lee SK, et al. Efficacy of prepackaged, low-residual test meals with 4 L polyethylene glycol versus a clear liquid diet with 4 L polyethylene glycol bowel preparation: A randomized trial. *J Gastroenterol Hepatol*. 2009;24(6):988–991.
- Scaglione G, Oliviero G, Labianca O, et al. One-day versus three-day low-residue diet and bowel preparation quality before colonoscopy: A multicenter, randomized, controlled trial. *Digest Dis*. 2023;41(6):708–717.
- Parra-Blanco A, Ruiz A, Alvarez-Lobos M, et al. Achieving the best bowel preparation for colonoscopy. *World J Gastroenterol*. 2014;20(47):17709–17726.
- Corley DA, Jensen CD, Marks AR, et al. Adenoma detection rate and risk of colorectal cancer and death. *N Engl J Med*. 2014;370(14):1298–1306.
- U.S. Multi-Society Task Force on Colorectal Cancer. Recommendations for follow-up after colonoscopy and

- polypectomy: A consensus update. *Gastrointest Endosc.* 2020;91(3):463–485.
15. Chokshi RV, Hovis CE, Hollander T, Early DS, Wang JS, Sharma VK. Prevalence of missed adenomas in patients with inadequate bowel preparation on screening colonoscopy. *Gastrointest Endosc.* 2012;75(6):1197–1203.
 16. Oyeboode, O. A. (2022). *Using Deep Learning to Identify Oil Spill Slicks by Analyzing Remote Sensing Images* (Master's thesis, Texas A&M University-Kingsville).
 17. Olalekan, M. J. (2021). Determinants of Civilian Participation Rate in G7 Countries from (1980–2018). *Multidisciplinary Innovations & Research Analysis*, 2(4), 25–42.
 18. Sanusi, B. O. (2024). The Role of Data-Driven Decision-Making in Reducing Project Delays and Cost Overruns in Civil Engineering Projects. *SAMRIDDHI: A Journal of Physical Sciences, Engineering and Technology*, 16(04), 182–192.
 19. Asamoah, A. N. (2022). Global Real-Time Surveillance of Emerging Antimicrobial Resistance Using Multi-Source Data Analytics. *International Journal Of Applied Pharmaceutical Sciences And Research*, 7(02), 30–37.
 20. Pullamma, S. K. R. (2022). Event-Driven Microservices for Real-Time Revenue Recognition in Cloud-Based Enterprise Applications. *SAMRIDDHI: A Journal of Physical Sciences, Engineering and Technology*, 14(04), 176–184.
 21. Oyeboode, O. (2022). Neuro-Symbolic Deep Learning Fused with Blockchain Consensus for Interpretable, Verifiable, and Decentralized Decision-Making in High-Stakes Socio-Technical Systems. *International Journal of Computer Applications Technology and Research*, 11(12), 668–686.
 22. SANUSI, B. O. (2023). Performance monitoring and adaptive management of as-built green infrastructure systems. *Well Testing Journal*, 32(2), 224–237.
 23. Olalekan, M. J. (2023). Economic and Demographic Drivers of US Medicare Spending (2010–2023): An Econometric Study Using CMS and FRED Data. *SAMRIDDHI: A Journal of Physical Sciences, Engineering and Technology*, 15(04), 433–440.
 24. Asamoah, A. N. (2023). The Cost of Ignoring Pharmacogenomics: A US Health Economic Analysis of Preventable Statin and Antihypertensive Induced Adverse Drug Reactions. *SRMS JOURNAL OF MEDICAL SCIENCE*, 8(01), 55–61.
 25. Rehan, H. (2025, August). Advanced Network Traffic Analysis for Intrusion Detection Using RNN and CNN. In *2025 9th International Conference on Man-Machine Systems (ICoMMS)* (pp. 459–464). IEEE.
 26. Asamoah, A. N. (2023). Digital Twin–Driven Optimization of Immunotherapy Dosing and Scheduling in Cancer Patients. *Well Testing Journal*, 32(2), 195–206.
 27. Asamoah, A. N. (2023). Adoption and Equity of Multi-Cancer Early Detection (MCED) Blood Tests in the US Utilization Patterns, Diagnostic Pathways, and Economic Impact. *International Journal Of Applied Pharmaceutical Sciences And Research*, 8(02), 35–41.
 - Odunaike, A. (2023). Time-Varying Copula Networks for Capturing Dynamic Default Correlations in Credit Portfolios. *Multidisciplinary Innovations & Research Analysis*, 4(4), 16–37.
 28. Rehan, H. (2025). Bridging the Digital Divide: A Socio-Technical Framework for AI-Enabled Rural Healthcare Access in Developing Economies. *Euro Vantage journals of Artificial intelligence*, 2(1), 19–27.
 29. SANUSI, B. O. (2022). Sustainable Stormwater Management: Evaluating the Effectiveness of Green Infrastructure in Midwestern Cities. *Well Testing Journal*, 31(2), 74–96.
 30. Bodunwa, O. K., & Makinde, J. O. (2020). Application of Critical Path Method (CPM) and Project Evaluation Review Techniques (PERT) in Project Planning and Scheduling. *J. Math. Stat. Sci.*, 6, 1–8.
 31. Sanusi, B. O. Risk Management in Civil Engineering Projects Using Data Analytics.
 32. Isqeel Adesegun, O., Akinpeloye, O. J., & Dada, L. A. (2020). Probability Distribution Fitting to Maternal Mortality Rates in Nigeria. *Asian Journal of Mathematical Sciences*.
 33. Hussain, M. K., Rahman, M., & Soumik, S. (2025). Iot-Enabled Predictive Analytics for Hypertension and Cardiovascular Disease. *Journal of Computer Science and Information Technology*, 2(1), 57–73.
 34. Soumik, M. S., Omim, S., Khan, H. A., & Sarkar, M. (2024). Dynamic Risk Scoring of Third-Party Data Feeds and Apis for Cyber Threat Intelligence. *Journal of Computer Science and Technology Studies*, 6(1), 282–292.
 35. Rahman, M. M., Soumik, M. S., Farids, M. S., Abdullah, C. A., Sutrudhar, B., Ali, M., & HOSSAIN, M. S. (2024). Explainable Anomaly Detection in Encrypted Network Traffic Using Data Analytics. *Journal of Computer Science and Technology Studies*, 6(1), 272–281.
 36. Oyeboode, O. (2024). Federated Causal-NeuroSymbolic Architectures for Auditable, Self-Governing, and Economically Rational AI Agents in Financial Systems. *Well Testing Journal*, 33, 693–710.
 37. Olalekan, M. J. (2024). Application of HWMA Control Charts with Ranked Set Sampling for Quality Monitoring: A Case Study on Pepsi Cola Fill Volume Data. *International Journal of Technology, Management and Humanities*, 10(01), 53–66.
 38. SANUSI, B. O. (2024). Integration of nature-based solutions in urban planning: policy, governance, and institutional frameworks. *Journal of Mechanical, Civil and Industrial Engineering*, 5(2), 10–25.
 39. Olalekan, M. J. (2024). Logistic Regression Predicting the Odds of a Homeless Individual being approved for shelter. *Multidisciplinary Innovations & Research Analysis*, 5(4), 7–27.
 40. Asamoah, A. N., Appiagyei, J. B., Amofa, F. A., & Otu, R. O. Personalized Nanomedicine Delivery Systems Using Machine Learning and Patient-Specific Data. syed Khundmir Azmi. (2024). Jvm Optimization Techniques For High-Throughput Ai And Ml Systems. In Tianjin Daxue Xuebao (Ziran Kexue yu Gongcheng Jishu Ban)/ Journal of Tianjin University Science and Technology (Vol. 57, Number 1, pp. 315–330). Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17556601>
 41. Hussain, M. K., Rahman, M. M., Soumik, M. S., & Alam, Z. N. (2025). Business Intelligence-Driven Cybersecurity for Operational Excellence: Enhancing Threat Detection, Risk Mitigation, and Decision-Making in Industrial Enterprises. *Journal of Business and Management Studies*, 7(6), 39–52.
 42. Abraham NS, Barkun AN, Sauer BG, et al. American College of Gastroenterology–Canadian Association of Gastroenterology clinical practice guideline: Management of anticoagulants and antiplatelets during acute gastrointestinal bleeding and the periendoscopic period. *Am J Gastroenterol.* 2022;117(4):542–558.
 43. American Society of Anesthesiologists Task Force on Preoperative Fasting. Practice guidelines for preoperative fasting and the use of pharmacologic agents to reduce the risk of pulmonary aspiration: An updated report. *Anesthesiology.* 2017;126(3):376–393.
 44. Faiss S. The missed colorectal cancer problem. *Dig Dis.* 2011;29(Suppl 1):60–63.