Proposed Minimum and Aspirational Quality Measures for the Colposcopic Exam

| Recommendation | Context/background | Calculation for individual provider or | Minimum | Aspiration | References and notes |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|--|---------|------------|--------------------------------|
| | | group of providers | Target | al Target | |
| #1 Document that | Adequate visualization at the | Numerator: N colposcopy notes with | 90 | 100 | Massad et al. ASCCP |
| squamo-columnar | time of colposcopy is | documentation of visualized | | | management guidelines (J Low |
| junction visualized | important in management of | (fully/partial/not) | | | Genit Tract Dis. 2013 Apr;17(5 |
| (fully/partial/not) | abnormal screening tests. | Denominator: N total colposcopies | | | Suppl 1):S1-S27) |
| | Lack of such visualization can | performed by individual provider or | | | WHO: IARC 2003, European |
| | alter management | group | | | Federation of Colposcopy |
| | | | | | 2013, New Zealand 2013, |
| | | | | | ECF 2013 |
| #2 Document if any | Documentation of presence | Numerator: N colposcopy notes with | 90% | 100% | Massad et al. ASCCP |
| acetowhite lesion is | of a lesion is important in | documentation of lesion present | | | management guidelines (J Low |
| present (yes/no) | correlating histopathologic | Denominator: N total colposcopies | | | Genit Tract Dis. 2013 Apr;17(5 |
| | data and appropriate | performed by individual provider or | | | Suppl 1):S1-S27) |
| | management. Lack of such | group | | | British 2016, New Zealand |
| | documentation can alter | | | | 2013, Italian 2006 |
| | management and lead to less | | | | |
| | optimal outcomes | | | | |
| #3 Document of | Documentation of | Numerator: N colposcopy notes with | 80% | 100 | Australia 2016 draft, British |
| colposcopic impression | colposcopic impression is | documentation of colposcopic | | | 2016, WHO: IARC 2003, New |
| (normal/benign; low | helpful in quality assurance | impression | | | Zealand 2013 |
| grade; high grade; | and precision metrics for | Denominator: N total colposcopies | | | |
| cancer) | colposcopy | performed by individual provider or | | | |
| | | group | | | |
| #4 Documentation of | Adequate visualization of the | Numerator: N colposcopy notes with | 70% | 100 | British 2016, WHO: IARC |
| cervix visibility | cervix at the time of | documentation of adequate | | | 2003, New Zealand 2013 |
| (fully/partial/not) | colposcopy is important in | visualization of the cervix at the time | | | |
| | management of abnormal | of colposcopy | | | |
| | screening tests. Lack of or | Denominator: N total colposcopies | | | |
| | partial visualization can alter | performed by individual provider or | | | |
| | management | group | | | |
| #5 Documentation of | Adequate visualization of the | Numerator: N colposcopy notes with | 70% | 100 | British 2016, WHO: IARC |
| Extent of Lesion | extent of the lesion(s) at the | documentation of visualization of | | | 2003, New Zealand 2013 |
| Visualized (fully/partial) | time of colposcopy is | extent of any/all lesion(s) or no lesion | | | |
| | important in management of | Denominator: N total colposcopies | | | |
| | abnormal screening tests. | performed by individual provider or | | | |
| | Partial visualization of the | group | | | |

| | lesion(s) can alter management | | | | |
|--|---|---|-----|-----|---|
| #6 Documentation of Location of Lesion(s) | Documentation of number of cervical quadrants and extent of lesion involved in any abnormality. Larger lesions tend to 1) be less likely to regress spontaneously, 2) be correlated with inadequate colposcopy, 3) margin positivity with LEEP more common | Numerator: N colposcopy notes with documentation of location of the lesion(s) or no lesion Denominator: N total colposcopies performed by individual provider or group | 70% | 100 | Australia 2016 draft, New Zealand 2013 |
| #7 Provider should take multiple biopsies targeting all areas with acetowhitening, metaplasia or higher abnormalities (at least two and up to four biopsies) | Many studies have shown that taking a single biopsy targeting the worst appearing lesion may miss up to a third of prevalent precancers (Gage, Pretorius, Stoler, Wentzensen, others). In the NCI Biopsy Study, which used a very low threshold of colposcopic abnormality (any acetowhitening), the yield of precancer increased substantially from the first to second and second to third biopsies. A fourth targeted biopsy, or an additional nontargeted biopsy (random biopsy) only provided a minimal increase in disease yield. | Numerator: N colposcopy notes with documentation of any acetowhite lesion and 2 to 4 biopsies taken OR a biopsy and endocervical sampling taken. Denominator: N colposcopy notes with documentation of any acetowhite lesion | 85 | 100 | British 2016, Canadian 2012, Australia 2016 draft (in more than 95% of women with HG abnormalities), Gage JC Obstet Gynecol 108:264-72, 2006; Stoler MH Int J Cancer 128:1354-62, 2011; Pretorius RG Am J Obstet Gynecol 191:430-34; 2004; Pretorius RG JLGTD 16:333-8, 2012; Wentzensen N JCO 33:83-9, 2015 |
| #8 An attempt should be made to contact a patient with suspected invasive disease * within 2 weeks of receipt of report or referral. | Multiple factors for contacting a patient with a high acuity abnormality identified in screening including 1) screening environment, 2) insurance | Numerator: N of patients with suspected invasive disease with attempted contact within 2 weeks Denominator: N of patients with suspected invasive disease | 60% | 90% | New Zealand 2013 (call within 10 days). Expert/committee opinion. |

| | status, 3) patient communication abilities, 4) social/cultural barriers. In a system-based approach, the layers and logistics of a system should be able to prioritize this communication, which includes availability of contact information by phone or mail or emergency contact | | | | |
|---|--|---|-----|-----|---|
| #9 Patients with suspected invasive disease should be seen within 2 weeks of contact. | Multiple factors for a patient to be seen in a short interval if identified with a high acuity abnormality including 1) screening environment, 2) insurance status, 3) patient communication abilities, 4) social/cultural barriers, 5) provider availability. In a system-based approach, the layers and logistics of a system should be able to prioritize this communication and ability to extend access to a patient, which might include logistical assistance | Numerator: N of patients with suspected invasive disease seen within 2 weeks of contact Denominator: N of patients with suspected invasive disease | 60% | 90% | New Zealand 2013 (call within 10 days). Expert/committee opinion. |
| #10 An attempt should be made to contact a patient with high grade Pap results** within 4 weeks of receipt of report or referral. | Multiple factors for contacting a patient with a high acuity abnormality identified in screening including 1) screening environment, 2) insurance status, 3) patient communication abilities, 4) social/cultural barriers. In a system-based approach, the layers and logistics of a | Numerator: N of patients with high- grade Pap results** with attempted contact within 4 weeks Denominator: N of Pap tests with high grade disease | 60% | 90% | New Zealand 2013 (call within 10 days). Expert/committee opinion. |

| | system should be able to prioritize this communication, which includes availability of contact information by phone or mail or emergency contact | | | | |
|--|--|---|-----|-----|---|
| #11 Patients with high grade Pap results** should be seen within 4 weeks of contact. | Multiple factors for a patient to be seen in a short interval if identified with a high acuity abnormality including 1) screening environment, 2) insurance status, 3) patient communication abilities, 4) social/cultural barriers, 5) provider availability. In a system-based approach, the layers and logistics of a system should be able to prioritize this communication and ability to extend access to a patient, which might include logistical assistance | Numerator: N of patients with high-grade Pap results** seen within 4 weeks of contact Denominator: N of Pap tests with high grade disease | 60% | 90% | New Zealand 2013 (call within 10 days). Expert/committee opinion. |

^{*}Suspected invasive disease includes Pap tests with neoplasia or suspected neoplasia or with clinical suspicion for invasive disease.

^{**}A high grade Pap result includes any of the following cytology results: High-grade Squamous Intraepithelial Lesion (HSIL), Atypical Squamous Cells: Cannot Exclude High-grade SIL (ASC-H), Atypical Glandular Cells (AGC)