Supplementary Material: British Society of Gastroenterology Guidelines On Colorectal Surveillance In Inflammatory Bowel Disease: An Update From 2010 (Standard Operating Procedure)

Risk Thresholding and Effect Size Determination

CRC risk in IBD compared to general population for considering colonoscopic surveillance

Please specify the relative risk level (ranging from 1.01 to infinity) above the general population that you believe should prompt the initiation of colonoscopic surveillance in patients with IBD.

Total responses – 16

Mean – 1.5 (SD - 0.4)
Median – 1.2 (IQR – 1.2-1.6)

Surveillance Frequency categorisation

1. Relative risk cut-offs

Please specify the relative risk cut-off (ranging from 1.01 -infinity) that you would consider before concluding that the risk category is changing from trivial-risk (population-based surveillance) to small-risk of developing advanced colorectal neoplasia i.e. triggering 3 yearly surveillance?

Total responses – 13

Mean – 1.7 (SD – 0.5)
Median – 1.8 (IQR – 1.5-2)

Please specify the relative risk cut-off (ranging from 1.01 -infinity) that you would consider before concluding that the risk category is changing from small-risk to moderate-risk category of developing advanced colorectal neoplasia i.e. triggering annual surveillance?

Total responses – 13

Mean – 3 (SD – 1.3)
Median – 3 (IQR – 1.8-3.5)

Please specify the relative risk cut-off (ranging from 1.01 -infinity) that you would consider before concluding that the risk category is changing from medium-risk to large-risk category of developing advanced colorectal neoplasia i.e. triggering a discussion of colectomy?

Total responses – 13

Mean – 5.2 (SD – 3.1)
Median – 5 (IQR – 2-6)

2. Absolute percentage cut-offs

Please specify the absolute percentage change, ranging from 0.01 to 100, that would lead you to conclude that the risk category is transitioning from trivial to small risk of developing advanced colorectal neoplasia at 5 years i.e., intermediate-risk category i.e., triggering 3 yearly surveillance?

Total responses – 13

Mean – 3.6 (SD – 2.9)
Median – 2 (IQR – 2-5)

Please specify the absolute percentage change, ranging from 0.01 to 100, that would lead you to conclude that the risk category is transitioning from small to medium risk of developing advanced colorectal neoplasia at 5 years i.e., higher-risk category triggering annual surveillance?

Total responses – 13

Mean – 6.9 (SD – 4.4)
Median – 5 (IQR - 5-10)

Please specify the absolute percentage change, ranging from 0.01 to 100, that would lead you to conclude that the risk category is transitioning from medium to large risk of developing advanced colorectal neoplasia at 5 years i.e., very high-risk category i.e., triggering discussion of colectomy?

Total responses – 13

Mean – 14.4 (SD – 9.1)
Median – 10 (IQR - 10-20)

Bowel Prep in IBD Colonoscopy

1. OUTCOME: Preparation Quality

Comparing intervention, A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on Preparation Quality (using validated scores), please specify the absolute percentage change (ranging from 0.1 -100%) in people who had a successful bowel prep that you would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from trivial to small?

Total responses – 16

Mean – 6.7 (SD – 3)
Median – 5 (IQR – 5-10)

Comparing intervention, A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on Preparation Quality (using validated scores), please specify the absolute percentage change (ranging from 0.1 -100%) in people who had a successful bowel prep that you would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from small to medium?

Total responses – 17

Mean – 12.7 (SD 7.7)
Median – 10 (IQR – 7-20)

Comparing intervention, A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on Preparation Quality (using validated scores), please specify the absolute percentage change (ranging from 0.1 -100%) in people who had a successful bowel prep that you would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from medium to large?

Total responses – 17

Mean – 23.5 (SD – 14.7)
Median – 20 (IQR 15-30)

2. OUTCOME: **Adenomas/polyps detected**

Comparing intervention, A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on adenomas/polyps detected, please specify the absolute percentage change (ranging from 0.1 -100%) in people that have adenomas/polyps detected that you would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from trivial to small?

Total responses – 17

Mean – 3.9 (SD -2.8)
Median – 5 (IQR 2-5)

Comparing intervention, A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on adenomas/polyps detected, please specify the absolute percentage change (ranging from 0.1 -100%) in people that have adenomas/polyps detected that you would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from small to medium?

Total responses – 17

Mean – 7.2 (SD 4.4)
Median – 5 (IQR – 4-10)

Comparing intervention, A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on adenomas/polyps detected, please specify the absolute percentage change (ranging from 0.1 -100%) in people that have adenomas/polyps detected that you would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from medium to large?

Total responses – 17

Mean – 12.3 (SD – 7.5)
Median – 9 (IQR- 7-20)

***3. OUTCOME: Tolerate* the regimen**

Comparing intervention, A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on Patient tolerability to take/complete the bowel prep, please specify the absolute percentage change (ranging from 0.1 -100%) in people who tolerate the regimen that you would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from trivial to small?

Total responses – 16

Mean – 5.6 (SD – 2.9)
Median – 5 (IQR 4.5-6.2)

Comparing intervention, A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on Patient tolerability to take/complete the bowel prep, please specify the absolute percentage change (ranging from 0.1 -100%) in people who tolerate the regimen that you would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from small to medium?

Total responses – 16

Mean – 11.2 (SD – 7.4)
Median – 9 (IQR 6.75-12.5)

Comparing intervention A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on Patient tolerability to take/complete the bowel prep, please specify the absolute percentage change (ranging from 0.1 -100%) in people who tolerate the regimen that you

would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from medium to large?

Total responses – 16

Mean – 18.8 (SD – 11.6)
Median – 13.5 (IQR 10-26.2)

***4. OUTCOME:* serious adverse events**

Comparing intervention A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on Patients with serious adverse events, please specify the absolute percentage change (ranging from 0.1 -100%) in people with serious adverse events that you would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from trivial to small?

Total responses – 16

Mean – 2.4 (SD – 1.4)
Median – 2 (IQR 1.2-3)

Comparing intervention A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on Patients with serious adverse events, please specify the absolute percentage change (ranging from 0.1 -100%) in people with serious adverse events that you would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from small to medium?

Total responses – 16

Mean – 4 (SD – 2.8)
Median – 3.5 (IQR 2-5.3)

Comparing intervention A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on Patients with serious adverse events, please specify the absolute percentage change (ranging from 0.1 -100%) in people with serious adverse events that you would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from medium to large?

Total responses – 16

Mean – 6.4 (SD – 5.1)
Median – 5 (IQR 2-9.7)

5. OUTCOME: Caecum successfully intubated

Comparing intervention A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on Caecal intubation rates, please specify the absolute percentage change (ranging from 0.1 -100%) in the number of people that had their caecum successfully intubated that you would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from trivial to small?

Total responses – 16

Mean – 3.5 (SD – 1.5)
Median – 3 (IQR – 2-5)

Comparing intervention A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on Caecal intubation rates, please specify the absolute percentage change (ranging from 0.1 -100%) in the number of people that had their caecum successfully intubated that you would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from small to medium?

Total responses – 16

Mean – 6.9 (SD – 3.6)
Median – 5.5 (IQR 4-10)

Comparing intervention A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on Caecal intubation rates, please specify the absolute percentage change (ranging from 0.1 -100%) in the number of people that had their caecum successfully intubated that you would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from medium to large?

Total responses – 16

Mean – 10.8 (SD 5.4)
Median – 9.5 (IQR – 6.7-15)

6. OUTCOME: **willingness to repeat the regimen**

Comparing intervention A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on Patient acceptability / willingness to repeat, please specify the absolute percentage change (ranging from 0.1 -100%) in people who were willing to repeat the regimen that you would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from trivial to small?

Total responses – 16

Mean – 4.9 (SD – 2.8)
Median – 5 (IQR 3-5)

Comparing intervention A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on Patient acceptability / willingness to repeat, please specify the absolute percentage change (ranging from 0.1 -100%) in people who were willing to repeat the regimen that you would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from small to medium?

Total responses – 16

Mean – 10.7 (SD – 7.2)
Median – 9 (IQR 5-11.2)

Comparing intervention A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on Patient acceptability / willingness to repeat, please specify the absolute percentage change (ranging from 0.1 -100%) in people who were willing to repeat the regimen that you would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from medium to large?

Total responses – 16

Mean – 17.4 (SD – 11.4)
Median – 11 (IQR 10-20)

7. OUTCOME: **withdrawals due to adverse events**

Comparing intervention A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on Patient withdrawals due to adverse events, please specify the absolute percentage change (ranging from 0.1 -100%) in people who withdraw due to adverse events that you would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from trivial to small?

Total responses – 16

Mean – 3.6 (SD 2.5)
Median – 3 (IQR 2-5)

Comparing intervention A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on Patient withdrawals due to adverse events, please specify the absolute percentage change (ranging from 0.1 -100%) in people who withdraw due to adverse events that you would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from small to medium?

Total responses – 16

Mean – 5.1 (SD – 3.2)
Median – 5 (IQR 2.5-7.5)

Comparing intervention A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on Patient withdrawals due to adverse events, please specify the absolute percentage change (ranging from 0.1 -100%) in people who withdraw due to adverse events that you would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from medium to large?

Total responses – 16

Mean – 9.3 (SD – 8)
Median – 8.5 (IQR 3-10.5)

Colonoscopy modalities/techniques IBD Colonoscopy

Outcome 1: Detection of dysplastic lesions (as per Vienna classification - indefinite for dysplasia, low-grade dysplasia, high-grade dysplasia, or invasive neoplasia at histological examination)

Comparing intervention A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on dysplasia detection rate, please specify the absolute percentage change (ranging from 0.1 -100%) in rates of detection of patients with dysplastic lesions that you would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from trivial to small?

Total responses – 15

Mean – 3.3 (SD – 2.4)
Median – 2 (IQR – 2-5)

Comparing intervention A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on dysplasia detection rate, please specify the absolute percentage change (ranging from 0.1 -100%) in rates of detection of patients with dysplastic lesions that you would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from small to medium?

Total responses – 15

Mean – 5.8 (SD 3)
Median – 4.5 (IQR – 4-9.2)

Comparing intervention A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on dysplasia detection rate, please specify the absolute percentage change (ranging from 0.1 -100%) in rates of detection of patients with dysplastic lesions that you would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from medium to large?

Total responses – 15

Mean – 11.2 (SD – 7.1)
Median – 10 (IQR 8-15)

Outcome 2: Yield of any dysplasia from targeted biopsies

Comparing intervention A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on Yield of any dysplasia from targeted biopsies, please specify the absolute percentage change(ranging from 0.1 -100%) in patients with at least one dysplastic lesion from targeted biopsies that you would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from trivial to small?

Total responses – 15

Mean – 3.4 (SD – 2.9)
Median – 2 (IQR – 2-3.5)

Comparing intervention A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on Yield of any dysplasia from targeted biopsies, please specify the absolute percentage change (ranging from 0.1 -100%) in patients with at least one dysplastic lesion from targeted biopsies that you would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from small to medium?

Total responses – 15

Mean – 6.7 (SD – 5)
Median – 5 (IQR 4-8)

Comparing intervention A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on Yield of any dysplasia from targeted biopsies, please specify the absolute percentage change (ranging from 0.1 -100%) in patients with at least one dysplastic lesion from targeted biopsies that you would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from medium to large?

Total responses – 15

Mean – 10.9 (SD 7.5)
Median – 8 (IQR – 7-12.5)

Outcome 3: Yield of dysplasia from random biopsies if taken during the procedure

Comparing intervention, A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on yield of dysplasia from random biopsies if taken during the procedure, please specify the absolute percentage change (ranging from 0.1 -100%) in patients with at least one dysplastic lesion from random biopsies (if taken during the procedure) that you would

consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from trivial to small?

Total responses – 15

Mean – 3.5 (SD – 4.8)
Median – 2 (IQR 1-3.7)

Comparing intervention A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on yield of dysplasia from random biopsies if taken during the procedure, please specify the absolute percentage change (ranging from 0.1 -100%)in patients with at least one dysplastic lesion from random biopsies (if taken during the procedure) that you would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from small to medium?

Total responses – 15

Mean – 6.2 (SD – 7.2)
Median – 4 (IQR 2-7.5)

Comparing intervention A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on yield of dysplasia from random biopsies if taken during the procedure, please specify the absolute percentage change(ranging from 0.1 -100%) in patients with at least one dysplastic lesion from random biopsies (if taken during the procedure) that you would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from medium to large?

Total responses – 15

Mean – 10 (SD – 10.2)
Median – 6 (IQR 4-12.5)

Outcome 4: Patients with serious adverse events

Comparing intervention A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on Patients with serious adverse events, please specify the absolute percentage change (ranging from 0.1 -100%) in patients with serious adverse events that you would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from trivial to small?

Total responses – 15

Mean – 2.6 (SD – 2.5)
Median – 2 (IQR 1-3)

Comparing intervention A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on Patients with serious adverse events, please specify the absolute percentage change

(ranging from 0.1 -100%) in patients with serious adverse events that you would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from small to medium?

Total responses – 15

Mean – 5.1 (SD – 4.7)
Median – 4.5 (IQR 2.2-5)

Comparing intervention A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on Patients with serious adverse events, please specify the absolute percentage change (ranging from 0.1 -100%) in patients with serious adverse events that you would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from medium to large?

Total responses – 15

Mean – 8.4 (SD – 7.1)
Median – 8.5 (IQR 3.2-10)

Outcome 5: Detection of any lesions in patients (neoplastic lesions detected i.e. dysplastic + serrated and/or non-neoplastic-endoscopic findings with no evidence of dysplasia or invasive neoplasia at histology)

Comparing intervention A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on Detection of any lesions, please specify the absolute percentage change(ranging from 0.1 -100%) in patients detected with any lesion that you would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from trivial to small?

Total responses – 15

Mean – 4.1 (SD – 2.2)
Median – 4 (IQR 2.2-5)

Comparing intervention A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on Detection of any lesions, please specify the absolute percentage change (ranging from 0.1 -100%) in patients detected with any lesion that you would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from small to medium?

Total responses – 15

Mean – 7.9 (SD – 4.4)
Median – 8 (IQR 4-10)

Comparing intervention A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on Detection of any lesions, please specify the absolute percentage change(ranging from 0.1 -100%) in patients detected with any lesion that you would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from medium to large?

Total responses – 15

Mean – 15.1 (SD – 12.4)
Median – 12 (IQR 6.5-18.7)

Outcome 6: Patients with any adverse events

Comparing intervention A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on Patients with adverse events, please specify the absolute percentage change(ranging from 0.1 -100%) in patients with adverse events that you would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from trivial to small?

Total responses – 15

Mean – 3.7 (SD 2.4)
Median – 4 (IQR 2-5)

Comparing intervention A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on Patients with adverse events, please specify the absolute percentage change (ranging from 0.1 -100%) in patients with adverse events that you would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from small to medium?

Total responses – 15

Mean – 6.1 (SD – 4.9)
Median – 5 (IQR 2.5-8)

Comparing intervention A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on Patients with adverse events, please specify the absolute percentage change (ranging from 0.1 -100%) in patients with adverse events that you would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from medium to large?

Total responses – 15

Mean – 9.6 (SD – 7.5)
Median – 8 (IQR 5-11)

Outcome 7: Patient withdrawals due to adverse events

Comparing intervention A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on Patient withdrawals due to adverse events, please specify the absolute percentage change (ranging from 0.1 -100%) in Patient withdrawals due to adverse events that you would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from trivial to small?

Total responses – 15

Mean – 3.1 (SD - 2.5)
Median – 2 (IQR 1.2-4.5)

Comparing intervention A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on Patient withdrawals due to adverse events, please specify the absolute percentage change (ranging from 0.1 -100%) in Patient withdrawals due to adverse events that you would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from small to medium?

Total responses – 15

Mean – 5.5 (SD 4.8)
Median – 5 (IQR – 2-5.5)

Comparing intervention A to intervention B for endoscopic surveillance in IBD with emphasis on Patient withdrawals due to adverse events, please specify the absolute percentage change (ranging from 0.1 -100%) in Patient withdrawals due to adverse events that you would consider before concluding that the effect is changing (increasing or decreasing) from medium to large?

Total responses – 15

Mean – 8.6 (SD – 7.4)
Median – 6 (IQR- 3-10)