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Who made it possible?

PROCARE steering group & participating teams
Who made it possible?

Cumulative number of patients by academic status surgeon

- Cumulative non academic
- Cumulative academic
Who made it possible?

Foundation Belgian Cancer Registry
Who made it possible?

Belgian Federation against Cancer
KCE
RIZIV / INAMI
The first feedback (Nov 2008)
Why feedback with benchmarking?

1. To know where 'we' stand (Belgium, team)
2. To illustrate variability in management and outcome
3. To induce improvement in all teams
The first feedback (Nov 2008)
Number of cases per team

Feedback given if > 10 cases
Adapted risk adjustment possible for ‘low-volume’ data ?...
The first feedback (Nov 2008) Targets achieved …

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QCI</th>
<th>p25</th>
<th>median</th>
<th>p75</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colon imag.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortality</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR / HART</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first feedback (Nov 2008)
APR and Hartmann

0 – 15 cm

0 – 5 cm

APR and Hartmann’s procedure

APR/Hartmann – level tumour LOW

Teams with at least 10 registered patients

Percent (%) – 95% CI
The first feedback (Nov 2008)
Problems and solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROBLEMS</th>
<th>SOLUTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>‘required data’; datamanager cross-check completeness (FBCR, IMA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing patients</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of data</td>
<td>definition(s): read/apply inconsistency: check (‘flags’ in web applic) datamanager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>presentation: better risk adjustment (statisticians + PROCARE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmarking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No onco. outcome</td>
<td>follow-up data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How to move on?
How to move on?

- Web application for registration
- Web application for review of CT/MRI staging
- Review of RT planning?
- Risk adjusted benchmarking & feedback?
- International benchmarking?
- Re-allocation of support for TME-training !?
- The burden of registration …
- Decrease the fear for audit
How to overcome our fear for audit and benchmarking?

- guarantee of confidentiality, privacy
- audit by clinicians + med. statisticians
- educational nature of audit
  - No shame, no blame
  - No search for excuses
- ‘unconditional’ willingness to improve
- (re)act as appropriate and
  - avoid external interference
How to improve?

• Knowledge (data)
• Knowledge of the ‘best practices’
• Recognise a ‘problem’
  • definition(s) applied?
  • reliability of the data?
• plan + re-action
DISCUSSION

The burden of registration (follow-up data !)

Risk adjustment (study 2009 – 2010 ?)

Re-allocation of financial support for TME training

.../...