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Outline of presentation

• Introduction and purpose of study
• Demographics: Comparing to 2005 and 2008 studies
• Review of Breast, Colon, Lung and Prostate results
• Comparison with 2005 and 2008 results
Goals and Methods for CS Reliability Studies

• Does everyone interpret the same set of rules in the same way?

• A reconciliation process is used to understand discrepant answers.

• There is an assessment of major and minor errors based on whether the answer made a difference in stage.
Why reliability studies

• Focus on more difficult cases
• Improve documentation
• Improve areas of education
The First CS Reliability Study

- Study done 1 year after release of CS
- Version 01.03
- Focus on general understanding of CS
- Project managed by CoC, NPCR, SEER, NCRA
The Second CS Reliability Study

- Study done 4 years after release of CS
- Version 01.04
- Cases selected based on problem areas found in the first study
- Project managed by SEER

2008
The Third CS Reliability Study

- Study done 7 years after release of CS
- Version 02.03
- Sites tested on expanded
- Project managed by the CSv2 Field Study Team
### Overall review of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canada</strong></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CoC Hospitals</strong></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Registries</strong></td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*<em>Other</em>  **</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>971</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>1040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Other includes: non-CoC hospitals, contractors, registry services companies, and National Standard setters*
Demographics: CTR

- Comparison of CTR’s across all three studies
• Demographics among all three studies
• A few more demographic slides comparing the three studies
GENERAL FINDINGS
The #1 Problem Site (All 3 Studies)

• Can you guess?
General Findings-Core Data Items

- Regional nodes positive and examined
- CS lymph nodes and mets when there is no information available
- CS Extension-understanding anatomy
- CS Lymph nodes-terminology used for regional lymph nodes
General Findings-SSF’s

- What to do with no documentation in record
- Finding test results
- Timing of test results
- Multiple test results
COMPARING RESULTS FROM THE THREE STUDIES
Lymph Nodes

Breast
Colon
Lung
Prostate
Breast: SSF’s 1-3

- SSF 1
- SSF 2
- SSF 3

Years:
- 2005
- 2008
- 2011
Breast: SSF’s 4-6

[Bar chart showing data for SSF 4, SSF 5, and SSF 6 for the years 2005, 2008, and 2011.]
Conclusions
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CAnswer Forum

• Submit questions to CS Forum
  – Located within the CAnswer Forum
  – Provides information for all
  – Allows tracking for educational purposes
  – Includes archives of Inquiry & Response System

• http://cancerbulletin.facs.org/forums/
Questions