



## Identifying Constraints in Quality Indicators for Colonoscopy Polypectomy

Charles Zongyu\*

Department of Physics, University of Ankara, Tandogan, Ankara, Turkey

\*Corresponding author: Charles Zongyu, Department of Physics, University of Ankara, Tandogan, Ankara, Turkey; E-mail: charlzong@gmail.com

Received date: 03 February, 2023, Manuscript No. JDTBA-23-93579;

Editor assigned date: 07 February, 2023, PreQC No. JDTBA-23-93579 (PQ);

Reviewed date: 21 February, 2023, QC No. JDTBA-23-93579;

Revised date: 28 February, 2023, Manuscript No. JDTBA-23-93579 (R);

Published date: 07 March, 2023, DOI: 10.4172/2469-5653.1000269

### Description

Colonoscopy polypectomy is a minimally invasive procedure used to remove abnormal growths, called polyps, from the lining of the colon. The procedure is performed using an endoscope, which is a flexible tube with a camera and a light attached to the end. The endoscope is inserted through the rectum and advanced to the colon, where the polyps can be visualized and removed using specialized tools.

This is typically performed to prevent colon cancer. Polyps can develop into cancer over time, and removing them during a colonoscopy can significantly reduce the risk of colon cancer. The procedure is generally safe and well-tolerated, although there is a small risk of bleeding or perforation of the colon [1].

This is an outpatient procedure and usually takes less than an hour to complete. Patients are typically sedated during the procedure and can return to normal activities shortly afterward, although they may need to avoid strenuous activity and heavy lifting for a few days. Follow-up colonoscopies may be recommended to monitor for the development of new polyps [2].

### Limitations of the Study

There were certain limitations of the study that need to be considered while interpreting the results. First, the local partner was assumed to be representative of the national partner, but caution should be taken while extrapolating the results to the national level. Second, the compliance with surveillance guidelines was limited, which may have led to an underestimation of recurrence rates [3]. Third, the accessibility component of the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) score was not described in the partner, making it difficult to draw conclusions about the value of the score. Fourth, the training level of the endoscopists was not measured systematically [4].

### Importance of quality monitoring

Endoscopic resection is a common procedure for removing gastrointestinal polyps, which are growths that can develop in the colon, stomach, or esophagus. While endoscopic resection is generally safe and effective, there are risks associated with the procedure, including bleeding and perforation of the gastrointestinal tract. Quality

monitoring of endoscopic resection is essential to improve the outcomes of quality indicators and reduce practice variability [5].

### Compliance with surveillance guidelines

Compliance with surveillance guidelines is important in maintaining the effectiveness of endoscopic resection. If surveillance is not performed within six months, there may be a missed opportunity to detect and treat potential recurrences early. This delay can lead to lower clinical success rates and increased morbidity and mortality [6].

### Centralization within or between centers

Centralization of endoscopic resection services can improve accessibility and consistency in the quality of care provided. Centralization within a single center or between multiple centers can help to ensure that procedures are performed by experienced and qualified endoscopists [7]. Centralization can also reduce practice variability and improve the quality of care for patients.

### Extra training in clinical practice

Extra training in clinical practice can help to improve the quality of endoscopic resection. Endoscopists can benefit from additional training in advanced endoscopic techniques, such as Endoscopic Mucosal Resection (EMR) and Endoscopic Sub-mucosal Dissection (ESD). Training programs can also help to improve the skills and knowledge of endoscopists, thereby reducing the risk of complications and improving patient outcomes [8].

These are all important considerations to improve the outcomes of endoscopic resection and reduce the risk of complications.

### Significance of HCPs

Host Cell Proteins (HCPs) are protein contaminants that can remain in the final drug product even after purification. They can cause immunogenicity in patients or reduce the efficacy and potency of a drug. Because of limitations in detection and analytical techniques, the acceptable amount of HCPs in a final drug product is essential [9,10].

### Conclusion

The study emphasizes the importance of quality indicators for polypectomy and the need for quality monitoring to improve outcomes. The limitations of the study should be considered while interpreting the results. The presence of HCPs in drug products should also be monitored to ensure patient safety.

### References

1. Meester RGS, Doubeni CA, Zauber AG, Goede SL, Levin TR et al. (2015) Public health impact of achieving 80% colorectal cancer screening rates in the United States by 2018. *Cancer* 121:2281-2285.
2. Rex DK, Schoenfeld PS, Cohen J, Pike IM, Adler DG, et al. (2015) Quality indicators for colonoscopy. *Am J Gastroenterol* 110:72-90.
3. Benson AB, Venook AP, Saab TB, Chan E, Chen YJ, et al. (2015) Rectal Cancer, Version 2.2015. *J Natl Compr Canc Netw* 13:719-728.

4. Cardoso R, Guo F, Heisser T, Hackl M, Ihle P, et al. (2021) Colorectal cancer incidence, mortality, and stage distribution in European countries in the colorectal cancer screening era: an international population-based study. *Lancet Oncol* 2:1002-1013.
5. Burt RW, Barthel JS, Dunn KB, David DS, Drelichman E, et al. (2010) NCCN clinical practice guidelines in oncology. Colorectal cancer screening. *J Natl Compr Canc Netw* 8:8-61.
6. Mishkin DS, Chuttani R, Croffie J, DiSario J, Liu J, et al. (2006) ASGE technology status evaluation report: wireless capsule endoscopy. *Gastrointest Endosc* 63:539-545.
7. Consolo P, Luigiano C, Strangio G, Scaffidi MG, Giacobbe G, et al. (2008) Efficacy, risk factors and complications of endoscopic polypectomy: ten year experience at a single center. *World J Gastroenterol* 14:2364-2369.
8. Hassan C, Repici A, Sharma P, Correale L, Zullo A, et al. (2016) Efficacy and safety of endoscopic resection of large colorectal polyps: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Gut* 65:806-820.
9. Zhang Q, Gao P, Han B, Xu J, Shen Y (2017) Polypectomy for complete endoscopic resection of small colorectal polyps. *Gastrointest Endosc* 87:733-740.
10. Li C, Liang C, Wang X, Le M, Liu D, et al. (2021) Safety and efficacy of surgical and endoscopic resection in the treatment of duodenal subepithelial lesions. *Surg Endosc* 36:4145-4153.