

The Presence of Adenomas in Screening and Surveillance Colonoscopies Ethnic Differences for Gender, Age and BMI

Anne G De Volder*

Institute of Neuroscience, MSL-IN Lab., Université Catholique de Louvain, Belgium

*Corresponding author

Anne G De Volder, Institute of Neuroscience, MSL-IN Lab., Université Catholique de Louvain, Belgium,
E-mail: anne.de.volder@uclouvain.be

Received Date: June 13 2022

Accepted Date: June 15 2022

Published Date: July 15 2022

Abstract

1.1. Introduction: This study estimated the correlation of the presence of cysts and adenomas with respect to age, gender, and BMI in the environment of AA as compared to Non-AA cases in the setting of colonoscopy webbing and surveillance.

1.2. Methods: A retrospective medical map review was conducted on 1095 webbing or surveillance colonoscopy cases in 2017 to determine whether the colonoscopies were completed and if a neoplasm was removed successfully and transferred for pathological examination.

1.3. Results: There were 376 cases with at least one adenoma and 635 with no adenoma detected (376/1011 = 37%) with the maturity witnessing webbing by academic gastroenterologists. Age (OR2.4) and gender (OR1.95) were primary threat factors in webbing whereas age (OR5.6) and race (OR4.07) dominated surveillance. Non-AA cases had an increase in adenoma threat with an increase in BMI (OR 6.58) while AA cases had the contrary result (OR0.32). AA cases witnessing surveillance were also more likely to have a neoplasm be an adenoma (78%) than Non-AA cases (37%).

1.4. Conclusion: The fact that BMI in AA as compared to Non-AA cases wasn't associated with the threat of adenomas was an unanticipated observation. The fact that if a neoplasm was set up on surveillance in AA cases, it was more likely to be an adenoma than in Non-AA cases may suggest an increased emphasis on the significance of reprise colonoscopy after discovery of an adenoma in AA cases at shorter intervals.

Key words

ethnic difference; Colonoscopy; Webbing; Surveillance; Adenomas; Body Mass Index

Abbreviations: CRC:Colorectal Cancer; AA: African American; BMI: Body Mass Index; A-GI: Academic Gastroenterologist; P-GI: Private Gastroenterologist; ADR: Adenoma Discovery Rate; SAR: Surveillance Adenoma Rate; PDR: Polyp Detection Rate.

Introduction

Colorectal cancer (CRC) is a common cancer in the world with geographic variability in prevalence, frequency, and mortality [1]. Progression from cysts to adenoma, advanced adenoma and CRC provides the occasion for interposing the development of CRC by junking of cysts and histologically characterizing them [2-5]. therefore, screening for colon cancer and junking of adenomas are critical for reducing the prevalence of colon cancer. Unfortunately, screening rates are sour and the rates of discovery of adenomas are variable as a function of the croaker performing the colonoscopy [7]. An mindfulness of the part of various demographic factors in the threat for the adenomatous cysts and posterior CRC are useful with respect to relating populations and settings where bettered webbing and adenoma discovery rates should be targeted. While individualities of African American (AA) race as compared to Non-AA are at advanced threat for CRC, the ethnic difference of other threat factors for CRC similar as age, gender, and body mass indicator (BMI) are less characterized. The prevalence of adenoma easily correlates with threat of CRC but the relative relationship between the presence of adenomas and age, gender, and body mass indicator (BMI) has not been constantly demonstrated among populations especially African Americans (AA) [8-12]. Also applicable to this study is that CRC identification and issues are told by ethnic difference with respect to health care, making CRC and the genetics of race less clear [13-15]. The evaluation of ethnic differences in adenoma development addresses this important issue of cancer development biology, since the presence of adenomas which are the precursors to CRC should reduce the part of difference in health care as it affiliated to CRC discovery.

The ideal of this study was to estimate the correlation of the presence of cysts and adenomas with respect to age, gender, and BMI in the environment of AA as compared to Non- AA

cases in the setting of colonoscopy webbing and surveillance. Although manly gender and age are threat factors in CRC, it isn't clear where in the adenoma progression to cancer these pitfalls are manifested. Also, increased body mass indicator (BMI) is a honored threat factor for the development of CRC but its relationship to the presence of adenomas is less clear. clearly, variations of the frequence of adenomatous cysts in different patient populations have the eventuality to affect screening recommendations. Using predominately African American cases from an civic medical center endoscopy suite, we estimated implicit ethnical diversity between AA and non-AA cases with respect to age, gender and BMI and adenomas. Given the participated nature of the endoscopy suite, we could also estimate whether there was a variation in ADR and these factors with respect to the three specialties in the suite (Academic gastroenterologists, non-Academic gastroenterologists and surgeons).

Methods

From a procedure- grounded population of 1095 cases witnessing webbing or surveillance colonoscopy in the last 6 months of 2017, a retrospective medical map review was conducted to determine whether the colonoscopies were complete and if a neoplasm was linked, it was successfully biopsied and transferred for pathological examination. Data collected included age, race, gender, BMI, time of procedure, reason for procedure (webbing or surveillance), croaker specialty (academic gastroenterologist(A-GI), private gastroenterologist (P-GI) or surgeon (S)), number and size of cysts, and the pathology report (to define CRC, adenoma or no adenoma). The strict description of Adenoma Detection Rate (ADR) is the number of cases with at least 1 adenoma divided by the total number of cases witnessing webbing colonoscopies (AADR). We could also use our data to calculate, over all adenoma discovery rates, surveillance adenoma rate (SAR) and neoplasm discovery rate (PDR). Analysis was performed using JMP/ SAS statistical analysis tools.

Results

Colonoscopy Case Demographics and Procedures

The review of the 1095 case maps set up that 8 cases (0.7%) had cysts that weren't biopsied, 6 cases (0.5%) had missing pathology and 62 cases (6%) didn't have a completed colonoscopy. CRC was linked in 8 cases. All of them were witnessing a first- time webbing colonoscopy ($8/1096 = 0.6\%$). The age range of cancer cases was from 46- 65 with 7 AA and 1 non-AA. therefore, this final study population contains 376 cases with at least one adenoma and 635 with no adenoma detected ($376/1011 = 37\%$). The maturity (837) were for webbing and utmost of the procedures were performed by academic gastroenterologists (AG- I(665); P-GI (176); Surgeons (172)). utmost cases were African Americans (88%) with slightly further males as compared to ladies (54%). There was

no difference in age by race or gender (59 times of age; range 46- 73 times). The BMI (kg/ m²) was slightly advanced in ladies as compared to males (32.4 ± 0.3 vs 29.3 ± 0.33 $p < 0.005$) and in AA as compared to non-AA (31.1 ± 0.2 vs 29.5 ± 0.65 $p < 0.02$).

Adenoma Detection and Case Characteristics

The presence of at least one adenoma was set up in 283 (35%) out of 804 cases witnessing a webbing colonoscopy and in 93 (45%) of the 207 cases witnessing surveillance ($p < 0.01$). further cases with adenomas were linked by A-GI (47%) as compared to P-GI (24%) and Surgeons (15%) ($p < 0.0001$). Webbing and surveillance colonoscopies are largely effective in precluding posterior interval colon cancer through the identification and junking of implicit adenomas. therefore, it was hypothecated that adding age, AA race (AA>Non-AA), manly gender (men>female) and adding body weight indicator (high BMI> low BMI) would all impact the development adenoma's which are the precursors to colorectal cancer (Table 1). Grounded on univariate analysis, age (OR2.41) and gender (OR1.95) were the dominant factors with respect to the presence of adenomas in the webbing colonoscopies. With respect to surveillance colonoscopies, age (OR5.6) and race (OD4.07) were dominant with respect to adenoma threat. Since Academic GI(A-GI) had a advanced ADR, Table 1 also presents the data for the A-GP croakers and the Low ADR

croakers with results grounded on odds rates analogous to all croakers primarily due to the dominant number of A-GI croakers in the dataset. With respect to the BMI thesis, the results were in contrast to the thesis with an odd portion lower than 1 indicating a advanced BMI didn't relate with an increase in the discovery of an adenoma. When all variables were samples contemporaneously in the Nominal Logistic Fit Model for Adenoma vs No Adenoma the results were also analogous to the univariate analysis (Table 2).

Ethnical Difference in Adenoma Detection

To assess difference by race, we estimated the correlation of Age, BMI and Gender as factors which could impact the presence of adenomas by race. The evaluation grounded on the parallels between endoscopists was primarily for all endoscopists with the cases stratified by screening vs surveillance. In utmost cases an fresh assessment was also for only the high performing academic gastroenterologists.

Gender and Race

The influence of gender stratified by race and webbing or surveillance, was assessed and the results presented in Figure 1. Males were more likely than ladies to have excrescences (Odds rate from 2.02 to 1.14), but the difference was statistically significant only in AA males witnessing webbing colonoscopies. When only the high ADR performing A-GI croaker data was use, a analogous result was seen (Screening AA OR = 1.97; $p = 0.0003$ vs Non-AA OR = 1.01; $p = 0.98$; Surveillance AA OR = 1.16; $p = 0.69$ vs Non-AA OR = 1.6; $p = 0.66$).

Age and Race

Anyhow of race (AA vs Non-AA) or procedure (webbing vs surveillance), adding age redounded in a advanced liability of detecting an adenoma (Figure 2). When the statistical significance of the fit was estimate using whole model logistic fit analysis, AA cases had a steeper wind and a statistically significant fit of the wind whereas Non-AA didn't (Figure 2a). A analogous observation was made when using age greater/equal to vs lower than 60 times (Figure 2b). As with gender, the data suggests a ethnical difference in that age was more likely to relate with a significant increase in adenomas in AA cases as compared to Non-AA cases.

BMI and Race

As shown in numbers 3- 5, AA and Non-AA differ dramatically with respect to the influence of BMI on the presence of adenomas in both webbing and surveillance colonoscopies. While Non-AA cases have an increase in adenomas detected with adding BMI, AA cases have a drop. This was true for BMI as a nonstop variable (Figure 3) or when distributed as fat, fat or normal (Figure 4). analogous results were set up for all procedures and providers (AA OR = 0.32; $p = 0.035$) vs Non-AA OR = 6.58) and for high performing Academic- GI colonoscopies for both webbing (AA OR = 0.43 vs Non-AA OR = 3.73) and surveillance (AA OR = 0.49 vs Non-AA OR = 2.9) we also used all cases and all providers to estimate whether gender might impact the results. As shown in Figure 5a & b, the ethnical difference for BMI was apparent in both genders.

Race and Liability of Adenomatous Neoplasm

While the discovery of adenomas was a crucial focus of the study, we also estimated the relationship between race and the liability that a neoplasm would be an adenoma. As shown in Table 3, the largest variation between AA and Non-AA cases witnessing surveillance colonoscopy (78 vs 37 $p < 0.005$). For the other settings the range wasn't significantly different (i.e., between 58 and 69). This observation is verified by calculating the variation between cysts and adenomas in surveillance for AA as compared to non-AA (62 cysts vs 52 cysts $p = 0.24$ as compared to 49 adenomas vs 21 adenomas).

Discussion

As prognosticated grounded on the literature, adding age and manly gender were both positive predictors in cases witnessing webbing colonoscopies while BMI and race weren't with respect to the discovery adenomas in an endoscopy suite with predominately African American cases, we set up the only setting where race was an independent predictor was in cases witnessing surveillance due to a former adenoma detected on webbing. The fact that cysts from AA surveillance cases were more likely to be adenomas than from non-AA cases witnessing surveillance at our study is important with respect to race and surveillance threat. The lack of race to be an independent factor in the discovery of adenomas in webbing colonoscopies but to be significant in surveillance

suggests that the biology of adenoma development may be different and account for the observation that AA cases are more likely to be diagnosed with CRC than non-AA cases.

In discrepancy to utmost of the former studies, we made a distinction between webbing and surveillance colonoscopies. With respect to cases witnessing surveillance primarily due to a former positive adenoma circumstance while age was easily significant, the fact that AA cases were more likely than non-AA to have an adenoma detected on their reprise colonoscopy is new and important. The fact that AA cases have a advanced odds rate for the presence of adenoma (4.07 vs 2.33) easily suggests that redundant trouble to have AA cases who have preliminarily had an adenoma should be encouraged to have a regular follow up. Whether this should have an impact with respect to having AA cases returning sooner than Caucasians are debatable given that both have a high odds rate for chancing adenomas. With respect to gender and the threat of adenoma in discrepancy to Non-AA where there was no gender difference, African American males are more likely to have an adenoma as compared to ladies in webbing populations. The reason Non-AA individualities don't have a gender difference is puzzling given the known threat of gender for CRC. still, it may just be that a larger sample of Non-AA cases will be needed to induce a statistical difference.

Our observation on webbing colonoscopy cases provides another set of data to an ongoing contestation with respect to race and adenomas. David, et al. and Collazo, et al. both reported chancing like ours with respect to webbing [16-18]. In contract several other studies set up the contrary to be true [19-22]. The reason for this variation in findings when comparing across studies may be due to essential impulses that aren't apparent. Among the possibilities are that African Americans are different than Caribbean Blacks and the sections are different in colorful studies, there may be variations in adenoma discovery rates in studies where multiple centers with different ADR contributed to the data set and that there are variations in gender rates and age distribution between studies. Given our observation with respect to the contrary effect of BMI variations in BMI between groups may also play a part? Our study is single centered, has analogous gender rates and age and there was no difference between the whole group of croakers and when data analysis was confined to the high ADR academic gastroenterologists.

The most dramatic observation with respect to ethnical differences passed in the comparison of the effect of BMI on the discovery of adenoma. The Non-AA cases were more likely to have adenomas as body weight increased as compared to AA cases where the contrary was true. This easily contributes to the overall observation that BMI wasn't an independent predictor of adenoma in the whole population. With respect to the literature, a meta- analysis by Wong, et al. set up that White and Asian cases had a positive correlation and AA cases had a negative correlation. Since utmost of the studies in the

meta-analysis were rich in Asian cases, the odds ratio variability between the White and AA cases (1.42 vs 0.88) didn't reach statistical significance. An analogous issue with respect to AA cases and BMI was set up in several different studies including one using a large database which reflected the US population distribution and was therefore low in AA cases [23]. Also, in discrepancy to utmost of the literature, this study reduces the part of variation in endoscopists by also reporting the data for high adenoma discovery rate academic GI croakers in a homogeneous population with respect to gender and age. The reason that AA cases have smaller adenomas as body weight increases isn't clear and has not been addressed adequately in the literature. Possible explanations for these variations with respect to AA vs Non-AA in adenoma discovery as a function of BMI include, differences in the distribution of adipose tissue, variation in microbiome in the large intestine, variations in diet, and the eventuality that despite the drop in adenomas there may be an increased likelihood of a more rapid-fire progression to CRC [12]. Whether this suggests a need to modify repeat colonoscopy recommendations grounded on race can not be determined by our study.

The primary outgrowth of this study is the observation that while ethnic differences in adenoma threat can be linked, the fact that AA cases overall don't have further adenomas than Non-AA cases suggests that health care difference with respect to colon cancer screening presumably plays the major part in the fact that AA cases are more likely to be diagnosed with CRC than Non-AA cases. As a result of the large AA population in this study, it was also determined that in discrepancy to Non-AA cases, BMI was equally identified with the discovery of adenomas. While the significance of this observation with respect to rotundity and cancer is unclear, unborn disquisition of the reason for this difference clearances disquisition. The most important observation was that not only is AA race as compared to Non-AA a more significant threat factor for adenomas on surveillance, but the neoplasm was more likely to be an adenoma than in Non-AA cases. This supports the need to emphasize that AA cases with indeed small tubular adenomas on screening should be seen at 3-5 times intervals as opposed to Non-AA where 7-10 times intervals can be comfortably recommended. Our data demonstrated that AA cases aren't at advanced threat than Non-AA cases at screening but do have an increased threat upon surveillance due to a former adenoma, clearances an increased emphasis on the significance of repeat colonoscopy at shorter intervals after discovery of an adenoma in AA

References

1. Sung H, Ferly J, Siegel RL, Laversanne M, Soerjomataram I, et al. (2021) Global cancer statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN Estimates of Incidence and Mortality Worldwide for 36 Cancers in 185 Countries. *CA Cancer J Clin* 71(3): 209-249.

2. Winawer SJ, Zauber AG, Ho MN, O'Brien MJ, Gottlieb LS, et al. (1993) Prevention of colorectal cancer by colonoscopic polypectomy. The National Polyp Study Workgroup. *N Engl J Med* 329(27): 1977-1981.
- 3.
4. Corley DA, Levin TR, Doubeni CA (2014) Adenoma detection rate and risk of colorectal cancer and death. *N Engl J Med* 370(26): 2541.
5. Rex DK, Boland CR, Dominitz JA, Giardiello FM, Johnson DA, et al. (2017) Colorectal cancer screening: recommendations for physicians and patients from the
6. u.s. Multi-society task force on colorectal cancer. *Am J Gastroenterol* 112(7): 1016-1030.
7. Kaminski MF, Wieszczy P, Rupinski M, Wojciechowska U, Didkowska J, et al. (2017) Increased rate of adenoma detection associates with reduced risk of colorectal cancer and death. *Gastroenterology* 153(1): 98-105.
8. Cavicchi M, Tharsis G, Burtin P, Cattani P, Venezia F, et al. (2019) Difference in physician and patient dependent factors contributing to adenoma detection rate and serrated polyp detection rate. *Dig Dis Sci* 64(12): 3579-3588.
9. David Y, Ottaviano L, Park J, Iqbal S, Likhtshteyn M, et al. (2019) Confounders in adenoma detection at initial screening colonoscopy: a factor in the assessment of racial disparities as a risk for colon cancer. *J Cancer Ther* 10(4): 269-289.
10. Wong MCS, Lam TY, Tsoi KK, Chan VCW, Hirai HW, et al. (2014) Predictors of advanced colorectal neoplasia for colorectal cancer screening. *Am J Prev Med* 46(5): 433-439.
11. Dore MP, Longo NP, Manca A, Pes GM (2020) The impact of body weight on dysplasia of colonic adenomas: a case-control study. *Scand J Gastroenterol* 55(4): 460-465.
12. Roy HK, Bianchi LK (2009) Differences in colon adenomas and carcinomas among women and men: potential clinical implications. *JAMA* 302(15): 1696-1697.
13. Penn E, Garrow D, Romagnuolo J (2010) Influence of race and sex on prevalence and recurrence of colon polyps. *Arch Intern Med* 170(13): 1127-1132.
14. Wong MC, Chan CH, Cheung W, Fung DH, Liang

- M, et al. (2018) Association between investigator-measured body-mass index and colorectal adenoma: a systematic review and meta-analysis of 168,201 subjects. *Eur J Epidemiol* 33(1): 15-26.
15. Lieberman DA, Holub JL, Moravec MD, Eisen GM, Peters D, et al. (2008) Prevalence of colon polyps detected by colonoscopy screening in asymptomatic black and white patients. *JAMA* 300(12): 1417-1422.
16. Laiyemo AO, Doubeni C, Pinsky PF, Doria-Rose VP, Bresalier R, et al. (2010) Race and colorectal cancer
17. Augustus GJ, Ellis NA (2018) Colorectal cancer disparity in African Americans: risk factors and carcinogenic mechanisms. *Am J Pathol* 188(2): 291-303.
18. Jawitz NG, Gellad ZF, Lin L, Wood RK, Leiman DA, et al. (2020) Patient, physician and procedure characteristics are independently predictive of polyp detection rates in clinical practice. *Dig Dis Sci*.
19. Collazo TH, Jandorf L, Thelemaque L, Lee K, Itzkowitz SH, et al. (2015) Screening Colonoscopy among Uninsured and Underinsured Urban Minorities. *Gut Liver* 9(4): 502- 508.
20. Nouraie M, Hosseinkhah F, Zamanifekri B, Brim H, Smoot DT, et al. (2010) Clinicopathological features colon polyps from African Americans. *Dig Dis Sci* 55(5): 1442- 1449.
21. Thornton JG, Morris AM, Thornton JD, Flowers CR, McCashland TM, et al. (2007) Racial variation in colorectal polyp and tumor location. *J Natl Med Assoc* 99(7): 723-728.
22. Rex DK, Khan AM, Shah P, Newton J, Cummings OW, et al. (2000) Screening colonoscopy in asymptomatic average- risk African Americans. *Gastrointest Endosc* 51(5): 524- 527.
23. Lebwohl B, Capiak K, Neugut AI, Kastrinos F (2012) Risk of colorectal adenomas and advanced neoplasia in Hispanic, black and white patients undergoing screening colonoscopy. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 35(12): 1467- 1473.
24. Murphy CC, Martin CF, Sandler RS (2015) Racial differences in obesity measures and risk of colorectal adenomas in a large screening population. *Nutr Cancer* 67(1): 98-104.
25. Kobiela J, Wieszczy P, Reguła J, Kamiński MF (2018) Association of obesity with colonic findings in screening colonoscopy in a large population-based study. *United European Gastroenterology J* 6(10): 1538-1546.