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Introduction

Timothy Vreeland, MD FACS
Why are Surgery Standards different?

• First time the **conduct of the surgery** is being scrutinized by CoC standards

• Many surgeons have **limited/no experience** with CoC standards and, therefore, **little knowledge** of the standards

• Imperative that we get buy in from surgeons for these standards
Definition of synoptic reporting

Standardized data elements organized as a structured checklist or template

Each data element’s value is “filled in” using a pre-specified format to ensure interoperability of information

- The information being sought is standardized
- The options for each variable are constrained to a pre-defined set of responses

Synoptic reports allow information to be easily collected, stored, and retrieved
Synoptic Reporting vs. Narrative Reporting

**Synoptic reporting...**
- **Always** uses pre-determined data fields and pre-determined responses
- **Always** uses standardized terminology
- Presented in **checklist** format
- **Always** allows for discrete data capture
  - Information is formatted so it can be collected, stored, and is easily retrievable for data repositories
  - Can automatically populate data from the EHR

**Narrative reporting...**
- May use pre-determined data fields and pre-determined responses
- May use standardized terminology
- Presented in a **prose** format
- Prone to **omission** of necessary data and **inconsistencies** in language and formatting
- **MAY** allow for discrete data capture
Accuracy of Pathology Reports – Systematic Review

# Synoptic vs. Narrative Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome or Subgroup</th>
<th># Studies</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Statistical Method</th>
<th>Effect Estimate – Synoptic v. Narrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to complete (min)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>Mean Difference (95% CI)</td>
<td>−0.86 m [−1.17, −0.55]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to verified report in EMR (hours)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>Mean Difference</td>
<td>−373.53 h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>Mean Difference (95% CI)</td>
<td>40.60% [38.54, 42.66]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction Critical Error (% of op notes)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Mean Difference</td>
<td>32.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction Error Rate (% of op notes)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Mean Difference</td>
<td>75.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>Mean Difference (95% CI)</td>
<td>3.40% [2.02, 4.78]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost ($/note)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Mean Difference</td>
<td>−$8.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shoe on the other foot…

Narrative Path Report

* Diagram courtesy of Cancer Care Ontario

CAP Synoptic Report

- **Specimen type**: left modified radical mastectomy
- **Tumour site**: left outer upper quadrant
- **Tumour size**: 3 x 2 x 1 cm
- **Histologic type**: ductal, NOS
- **Histologic grade**: 2/3 (modified SBR)
  - tubules - 2/3
  - nuclei - 2/3
  - mitoses - 2/3
- **Margins**: uninvolved by invasive carcinoma
- **Distance to closest margin**: 1 cm to deep margin
- **Number of nodes examined**: 9
- **Number of nodes involved**: 1
What is the value of Synoptic Operative Reporting?

- Improve accuracy of documentation
- Improve efficiency of data entry and data abstraction
- Reinforce education (can emphasize the critical elements of oncologic operations)
- Reduce variability in care
- Improve quality of cancer care
## Synoptic Operative Reporting Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Future State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standardized data elements organized as a structured checklist or template</td>
<td>Synoptic reports allow information to be easily collected, stored, &amp; retrieved, resulting in...</td>
<td>Standardization of documentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Each data element’s value is filled in using a pre-specified format | • Improved accuracy  
• Improved efficiency of entry  
• Improved efficiency of data abstraction  
• Reinforced education  
• Reduced variability | Interoperability of information  
➢ Advanced analytics  
➢ Greater availability for research  
➢ Real-time data analysis  
➢ Streamlined processes |
Synoptic Operative Reporting
Now and in the Future

1. First phase of synoptic operative report (SOR) development and implementation via local or third-party vendor solutions

2. Comprehensive set of SOR content developed covering all disease sites represented in surgical oncology

3. Universal implementation of structured SORs

4. EMR-integrated SORs allowing for data sharing across groups, automated data abstraction, and improved quality
SOR Implementation Survey

• Survey open to CoC accredited cancer programs 1/6-1/21

• Seeking information about sites’ synoptic operative reporting solution and implementation experience

• 43 responses total
**SOR Survey Results - Demographics**

- **Respondent Role**
  - 33% Cancer Liaison Physicians
  - 21% Certified Tumor Registrars
  - 10% Cancer Committee Chair
  - 36% Other

- **EMR Used**
  - 63% Epic
  - 23% Cerner
  - 7% Meditech
  - 8% Other

- **Type of Institution**
  - 30% Comprehensive Community Cancer Program
  - 16% Community Cancer Program
  - 14% Academic Comprehensive Cancer Program
  - 14% NCI-Designated Comprehensive Cancer Center Program
  - 12% Integrated Network Cancer Program
  - 14% Other
SOR Survey Results- In Practice

Disease Sites Covered
• Breast
• Colon
• Skin (Melanoma)
• Lung
• Rectum
• Thyroid

Solutions
• 84% Internally-developed checklist using auto-text
  • smart phrase/smart list
• 17% Other
  • Dictation
  • digital form
  • checklist
SOR Survey Results- Education

• Email/written communications to surgeons including special communications to surgeons from CLPs, surgical specialty leads, department chairs

• Presented during tumor board/cancer committee meetings, at surgical grand rounds, and department of surgery meetings

• Scheduled separate training sessions

• Shared resources from Operative Standards Toolkit
SOR Survey Results - Barriers

• General lack of awareness (e.g., of synoptic reporting or of the CoC Operative Standards)
• Surgeon Buy-In
  • Initial surgeon buy-in (e.g., to synoptic reporting or importance of the CoC Operative Standards)
  • Consistent use of synoptic operative reporting tools by surgeons
• IT issues
  • Limited local IT resources/bandwidth
  • Challenges with EMR software integration
• Lack of clarity on synoptic reporting implementation options
• Administrative buy-in (e.g., regulatory committees)
Existing and New Solutions

Kristan Staudenmayer, MD FACS
Current Options for Synoptic Operative Reporting

Create Your Own Basic Synoptic Templates

- Use required elements and responses from the CoC 2020 Standards manual
- Can be done using smart phrases/smart tools to supplement a traditional narrative operative report
- Can be integrated into an existing smartform or synoptic report within EMR
- Reporting format must be uniform across all surgeons at the facility
Current Options for Synoptic Operative Reporting

License Third-Party Vendor Tools

- Includes all data elements and responses from comprehensive CSSP synoptic operative reporting templates, including elements required for CoC accreditation
- Fully developed tool supported by vendor
- Current vendor list available on ACS website
Current Options for Synoptic Operative Reporting

Use Fillable PDF Forms

- Includes only the required elements and responses from the CoC 2020 Standards manual
- Downloads as blank PDF from the Standards Resource Library
- Supplements a traditional narrative operative report
- Stop-gap measure to allow programs to ensure compliance with synoptic formatting requirements
Panel Session

Moderators:
Michael Archer, DO FACS
Ingrid Lizarraga, MBBS FACS
Physician Buy-In

Lisa Ganem, CTR
FirstHealth of the Carolinas
Pinehurst, NC

- Category of cancer program: Comprehensive Community Cancer Center
- Number of surgeons: 14
- Caseload: 1500+
- Synoptic operative reporting solution: EPIC Smart Phrases
## Opportunities & Challenges to Physician Buy-In

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Opportunity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Physician Champion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception- Intent of Standard</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception- Workflow Impact</td>
<td>Review of Technology Solution and Ongoing Involvement in Development and Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable and Scalable Process</td>
<td>Designated EPIC and CoC Standard Contact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monitoring and Tracking

Mazin Shackour, MD FACS
WVU Eastern Division, Berkeley and Jefferson

- Category of cancer program: Community Hospital

- Number of surgeons: 9 General Surgeons

- Caseload: Variable

- Synoptic operative reporting solution: Smart Phrases.
WVU Eastern Division, Berkley and Jefferson
Our Implementation Pathway

1. Met with Providers, provided options for synoptic reporting. All favored smart phrases.

2. Reached out to IT, created smart phrases.

3. Compliance monitoring started on a monthly basis, currently done quarterly.

4. Deficiencies are addressed by direct communication with the providers.
## Opportunities & Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual variations in adaptation of change</td>
<td>Standardize performance of oncologic surgery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical glitches with Epic updates</td>
<td>Data Mining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring in larger systems</td>
<td>Potential for automated reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understaffing</td>
<td>Expand synoptic reporting to other specialties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Health Systems

Marc Mandel, MD FACS
Overlook Medical Center
Atlantic Health System

- Category of cancer program: Academic Cancer Program
- Number of surgeons:
  - OMC-single med center 25
  - AHS-system 75
- Caseload: OMC 928  AHS Total 3684 (2020-decreased secondary to COVID)
- Synoptic operative reporting solution: Worked with our Medical center/system EPIC team to make smart lists of each of the four procedures to insert into the Operative Report template.
- Extensive education prior to roll out.
- Staged roll out-CLP at OMC, Surg Oncs OMC. CLPs entire system. Surg Oncs entire system. All surgeons entire system
- Every Operative Report includes the drop down and must be answered either Not Applicable or the appropriate report must be completed
Opportunities & Challenges

• Early adaptation gets surgeons used to doing them prior to deadlines
• Ability to be part of the development process with Epic’s national team
• Improve uniformity/quality across our system
• Allows for data mining-more specific info on each case
• Surgeon buy in-so far, no push back
Implementing

Christine Colarusso, CTR and Denise Vose, R.T. (R)(T)
Seacoast Cancer Center at Wentworth-Douglass Hospital

- Category of cancer program: Community Hospital
- Number of surgeons: 14
- Caseload: 1500+

- Synoptic operative reporting solution: Operations Excellence Project
  - Objective: implement a process to report out on CoC surgical measures to meet 85% process compliance by September 22, 2020
  - Team lead by Black Belt: CTR, thoracic surgery, lung nurse navigator, quality improvement, clinical informatics, and *CLP medical director of surgical oncology
  - Created smart phrases, devised a quick tip sheet, educated surgeons, developed audit and feedback processes, and created a plan for future revisions
Opportunities & Challenges

Opportunities:
1. Formal OE project sanctioned by hospital leadership
2. Team consisted of appropriate experts
3. Dr. David Coppola, CLP & Medical Director of Surgical Oncology, was extremely supportive and acted as liaison to the involved surgeons
4. Surgeons were informed of the standards and project expectations at surgery meetings and tumor boards. Their feedback was collected and considered.

Challenges:
1. Epic platform was new to our hospital
2. Surgeons had different preferences on how to be contacted
3. Meeting with surgeons one-on-one for training proved difficult
4. Two surgeons performing procedures are from an outside hospital
5. CoC standard revisions: updating and uploading revised SmartPhrases into the surgeon templates
Research Opportunities

Laura Dominici, MD FACS
Dana-Farber Cancer Institute/Brigham and Women’s Hospital

- Category of cancer program: NCIN
- Number of surgeons: 187 faculty (19 who do CoC synoptic procedures)
- Caseload: 28000 (~3500 CoC synoptic operative note-relevant)
- Synoptic operative reporting solution: Created electronic medical record template that surgeons manually insert into notes
Opportunities & Challenges

- Division-specific prospective databases that collect disease site-specific information
  - General clinical data from OR cases (ex. intraoperative pathology)
  - Quality information (ex. Enhanced Recovery after Surgery adherence)
  - Clinical trials data (ex. Success of targeting clipped node)
- Addition of data fields from prospective databases into CoC templates
- Data transfers from electronic medical record into database (Redcap) properly formatted
- Challenges:
  - Consistent use, especially for surgeons who dictate operative notes
  - Surgeon “edits” of templates and/or data from standard format
  - Running reports and aligning data so that it properly inserts into database
- Ultimately 85% compliance in breast, our first disease site to go live
- Audits demonstrate success in importing data to prospective database
Question and Answer

Mediget Teshome, MD FACS
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