Web-based system for training and dissemination of a magnification chromoendoscopy classification
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AIM: To evaluate the use of web-based technologies to assess the learning curve and reassess reproducibility of a simplified version of a classification for gastric magnification chromoendoscopy (MC).

METHODS: As part of a multicenter trial, a hybrid approach was taken using a CD-ROM, with 20 films of MC lasting 5 s each and an "autorun" file triggering a local HTML frameset referenced to a remote questionnaire through an Internet connection. Three endoscopists were asked to prospectively and independently classify 10 of these films randomly selected with at least 3 d apart. The answers were centrally stored and returned to participants together with adequate feedback with the right answer.

RESULTS: For classification in 3 groups, both intra- [Cohen’s kappa (κ) = 0.79-1.00 to 0.89-1.00] and inter-observer agreement increased from 1st (moderate) to 6th observation (κ = 0.94). Also, agreement with reference increased in the last observations (0.90, 1.00 and 1.00, for observers A, B and C, respectively). Validity of 100% was obtained by all observers at their 4th observation. When a 4th (sub)group was considered, inter-observer agreement was almost perfect (κ = 0.92) at 6th observation. The relation with reference clearly improved into κ (0.93-1.00) and sensitivity (75%-100%) at their 6th observations.

CONCLUSION: This MC classification seems to be easily explainable and learnable as shown by excellent intra- and inter-observer agreement, and improved agreement with reference. A web system such as the one used in this study may be useful for endoscopic or other image based diagnostic procedures with respect to definition, education and dissemination.
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INTRODUCTION

The dissemination and teaching of image based medical technologies depend on adequate training. Mostly, medical doctors perform specific training by visiting experts. New information technologies, namely those based on the internet, may circumvent such difficulties at least at early phases of training.

Gastric cancer is the second most lethal cancer in the World. Early stages at diagnosis are related to better prognosis. Minute flat non-invasive neoplastic lesions...
The mucosa presented a regular pattern and was stained color after staining with methylene blue; Group showed a regular mucosal pattern and no change in homogeneity: Group endoscope, defined according to differences in color and maximum magnification power possible with this DVCAM Sony Recorder (DSR-20MDP, Sony, Tokyo, Japan), performed in a cohort of patients under follow-up at our institution, were used to prospectively classify 20 endoscopic videos of magnification chromoendoscopy using a web-based learning system, a hybrid system composed of a CD-ROM (Figure 1). At the top, a schematic representation of each pattern was always visible. Each endoscopist was asked to classify 10 videos randomly selected from the 20 videos included in the CD, with a minimum interval of 3 d. Before classifying each video, the user could run the film as many times as necessary before the decision was taken. After deciding, the user had to lock his answer in order to advance to the next question, not allowing subsequent videos to influence previous responses. After each questionnaire, ie for each 10 film sets classified, their answer or classification together with the proposed answer (to be used as reference, see below) was returned to participants. By this time, all videos included in that set could again be seen.

The expected download time for each 5 s film (Windows Media Player video clips with 36 Mbytes) of about 120 min (at a 56 Kbits/s connection) and the user’s physical location were instrumental in choosing the hybrid system architecture. Using an Internet connection, a CD-ROM including all 20 selected endoscopic movies and an “autorun” file used to trigger a local HTML frameset (two frames) referenced to the remote questionnaire on the classification of each film were developed for this project (on the left). The right frame was used to play the films stored on the CD-ROM (Figure 1). The HTML questionnaire was stored on an Oracle database using a Hypertext Pre-Processor (PHP) script. The web-server is run on RedHat Linux 7.2 (Enigma), Apache 1.3, PHP 4.0 compiled with GD Graphics Library 1.8 and Oracle 8 DBMS. Answers were centrally stored on an Oracle 8 DBMS. The HTML questionnaire was stored on an Oracle database using a PHP script. The web-server is run on RedHat Linux 7.2 (Enigma), Apache 1.3, PHP 4.0 compiled with GD Graphics Library 1.8 and Oracle 8 DBMS. Answers were centrally stored on an Oracle database using a Hypertext Pre-Processor (PHP) script.

As part of a multicenter trial, the training of endoscopists and teaching of this classification was planned using a web-based system. This manuscript reports the feasibility of such a system for the learning and dissemination of endoscopic classifications.
in Porto, and CUH in Coimbra) inclined to implement this technology, but with no previous experience of it or without previous participation in the development of the classification.

**Statistical analysis**

For each image, proposed classification (Group I, Group II, Subgroup II E or II F, or Group III) was considered as if another observer would have classified it, and also, as a reference classification or gold standard. This allowed us to consider both agreement and validity measures, respectively, in the evaluation of reproducibility and learning curve.

Inter-observer agreement and agreement with the reference agreement were estimated using different measures of agreement\(^{[27]}\), simple proportions of agreement (Pa) and proportions of specific agreement, and quadratic weighted Cohen’s kappa coefficient (Kc) (estimated by intra-class correlation coefficient)\(^{[28–33]}\). The confidence intervals for proportions of agreements were estimated with binomial distribution\(^{[34]}\). Strength of agreement was considered as follows: 0.01-0.2 slight, 0.21-0.4 fair, 0.41-0.6 moderate, 0.61-0.8 substantial, 0.81-1 almost perfect\(^{[34]}\). No bias was observed [McNemar test (P = 1.0); bias index (0.117, P = 0.289)]\(^{[35,36]}\).

Estimates of sensitivity (Se), specificity (Sp) and validity were also calculated comparing the classification for each film against the proposed classified as reference. For classification in groups, true positives were defined if the observer correctly classified each film as group III. For classification in subgroups, diagnostic positivity was considered in cases of Subgroups II F and III. These options and the decision to use weighted kappa coefficient were based upon the relation of these patterns with both dysplasia and incomplete intestinal metaplasia, named as being high-risk lesions for adenocarcinoma\(^{[37]}\).

The learning curve was defined by visual analysis of a plot of both validity and agreement measures. Statistical estimates were performed with r-project v2.1.1, SPSS\(^{®}\) and MedCalc\(^{®}\).

**RESULTS**

**Reproducibility**

Both classification in groups (I vs II vs III) and subgroups (I vs II E vs II F vs III) showed substantial to excellent inter-observer agreement. In fact, at 6th observation, proportion of agreement is 0.90 and 0.75 respectively and weighted kappa is 0.94 and 0.94, respectively (Table 1).

As far as intra-observer agreement is concerned this was substantial in all observers, initially from first to second observation (κ = 0.79 to 1.00), and excellent from 5th to 6th observation (0.89 to 1) considering the classification in Groups (I vs II vs III); and for classification in subgroups (I vs II E vs II F vs III), 0.74-0.85 to 0.75-1.00.

Specific proportions of agreement were also very high varying from 0.43, 0.79 and 0.82 (for groups III, II and I, respectively) to 0.96, 0.92 and 0.92 (III, II and I) at last classification. Concerning specific proportions of agreement, only a slight increase was observed from 0.50 and 0.50 (II E and II F) to 0.64 and 0.60 (at last observation).

**Learning curve**

An increase was observed in both proportions of agreement and kappa values, as far as agreement with original classification was concerned, from moderate to substantial/excellent in all observers (Table 2). Also inter-observer agreement varied from Kc = 0.52 or 0.49, respectively for groups and subgroups classification, from 1st to 6th classification (Figure 2). Excellent agreement was obtained by the 4th time for all observers irrespective of institution or time between classifications, by the time they had evaluated 80 videos.

Also, concerning validity measures, paired sensitivity and specificity of 100% were achieved at 4th classification for all observers, at 4th time for classification in groups and at 6th for classification in subgroups by observer A. Observers B and C achieved a validity of 0.85 and 0.90 at their 6th classification (Figure 2).

**DISCUSSION**

The concept of ‘learning by doing’ in invasive procedures such as endoscopy, even though current and acceptable, may be affected by the continuous research in this field leading to new endoscopes and gastrointestinal mucosal description availability.

In a preliminary form, we have described the feasibility of a hybrid approach of Internet and CD-ROM/DVD technology as a web-based education system\(^{[37]}\). Such desktop virtual reality systems\(^{[38]}\) were described in several fields of knowledge\(^{[24,25]}\) as recently in endoscopy by de Lange\(^{[39]}\).

According to our study, the classification proposed is both easily explainable and learnable. The simplicity of this classification, the fact that it includes in the instrument description the phenomenon itself (i.e. intestinal metaplasia) and the feedback given to each observer at the end of a single classification\(^{[40,41]}\) may.
Learning curves for most procedures concern efficacy and time to achievement of such efficacy. For example, in surgical procedures how fast trainees achieve the ability to get surgery adequately performed without complications[^42,43]. Also in endoscopy some reports use colonoscopy models[^44] and endoscopic ultrasound fine needle aspiration[^45] with similar methodology.

A single report exists on the learning curve for the diagnostic performance of endoscopy. Besides simplification of any visual categorization, Tung and Tagashi defined the need of a steep learning curve for magnifying colonoscopy. They used for that evaluation the evolution of validity measures, that is sensitivity, specificity and global accuracy. However, there is no one particular statistical procedure for learning assessment, to be named in diagnostic technologies outcomes as a measure of reality[^46-47].

Diagnostic procedures are aimed at being both valid, ie to measure what they are supposed to. However, even though most studies concern validity assessment, reliability of a measure should be a condition to be verified before any other quality feature. For dichotomic, nominal or ordinal variables, proportion of agreement (Pa) or Kappa statistics may be used. Pa is easily acceptable and interpretable. However, it is not corrected to the amount of agreement that was expected by chance (Pe) and endoscopic ultrasound fine needle aspiration[^45] with similar methodology.

Table 2  Agreement with reference and validity measures for the classification in groups (Ⅰ vs Ⅱ vs Ⅲ) and in subgroups (Ⅰ vs Ⅱ vs E vs F vs Ⅲ) according to number of times observers (A, B and C) classified the films of magnification chromoendoscopy (95% CI)

| Classification in groups Ⅰ vs Ⅱ vs Ⅲ | Classification in Subgroups Ⅰ vs Ⅱ vs E vs F vs Ⅲ |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Observer A                           | Pa  wK  Se  Sp  V                      | Pa  wK  Se  Sp  V                      |
| 1st observation                      | 0.90  0.66  0.75  0.94  0.90          | 0.75  0.63  0.75  0.75  0.75          |
| 2nd observation                      | (0.68-0.99)  (0.32-0.85)  (0.56-0.94)  (0.83-1.00)  (0.77-1.00) | (0.51-0.91)  (0.29-0.84)  (0.56-0.94)  (0.56-0.94)  (0.59-0.94) |
| 3rd observation                      | 0.90  0.79  1.00  0.94  0.95          | 0.71  0.70  0.75  0.67  0.70          |
| 4th observation                      | (0.75-1.00)  (0.64-0.93)  (0.83-1.00)  (0.85-1.00)  (0.85-1.00) | (0.46-0.88)  (0.50-0.90)  (0.56-0.94)  (0.48-0.88)  (0.50-0.90) |
| 5th observation                      | 0.90  0.94  1.00  0.94  0.95          | 0.80  0.79  1.00  0.75  0.83            |
| 6th observation                      | (0.68-0.99)  (0.54-0.91)  (0.83-1.00)  (0.85-1.00)  (0.85-1.00) | (0.56-0.94)  (0.55-0.91)  (0.56-0.94)  (0.69-1.00)  (0.69-1.00) |
| Observer B                           | Pa  wK  Se  Sp  V                      | Pa  wK  Se  Sp  V                      |
| 1st observation                      | 0.90  0.80  0.75  0.95  1.00          | 0.65  0.71  0.75  0.50  0.83            |
| 2nd observation                      | (0.51-0.91)  (0.57-0.92)  (0.56-0.94)  (0.85-1.00)  (0.85-1.00) | (0.41-0.85)  (0.42-0.88)  (0.28-0.72)  (0.67-1.00)  (0.50-0.90) |
| 3rd observation                      | 0.90  0.77  0.75  1.00  0.95          | 0.80  0.78  0.75  0.92  0.85          |
| 4th observation                      | (0.68-0.99)  (0.52-0.90)  (0.56-0.94)  (0.85-1.00)  (0.85-1.00) | (0.56-0.94)  (0.56-0.94)  (0.79-1.00)  (0.69-1.00)  (0.69-1.00) |
| 5th observation                      | 0.95  0.96  1.00  1.00  1.00          | 0.65  0.82  0.50  0.75  0.65          |
| 6th observation                      | (0.75-1.00)  (0.90-0.98)  (0.83-1.00)  (0.83-1.00)  (0.83-1.00) | (0.63-0.93)  (0.63-0.93)  (0.63-0.93)  (0.63-0.93)  (0.63-0.93) |
| Observer C                           | Pa  wK  Se  Sp  V                      | Pa  wK  Se  Sp  V                      |
| 1st observation                      | 0.90  0.80  0.75  0.95  1.00          | 0.65  0.71  0.75  0.50  0.83            |
| 2nd observation                      | (0.51-0.91)  (0.57-0.92)  (0.56-0.94)  (0.64-0.99)  (0.62-0.98) | (0.36-0.81)  (0.60-0.92)  (0.56-0.94)  (0.67-1.00)  (0.62-0.98) |
| 3rd observation                      | 0.95  0.96  1.00  1.00  1.00          | 0.60  0.93  0.95  0.75  0.65          |
| 4th observation                      | (0.75-1.00)  (0.89-1.00)  (0.89-1.00)  (0.89-1.00)  (0.89-1.00) | (0.36-0.81)  (0.67-0.94)  (0.28-0.72)  (0.56-0.94)  (0.44-0.86) |
| 5th observation                      | 0.85  0.72  1.00  0.84  0.85          | 0.50  0.65  0.63  0.75  0.60          |
| 6th observation                      | (0.62-0.97)  (0.42-0.88)  (0.67-1.00)  (0.69-1.00)  (0.73-1.00) | (0.41-0.85)  (0.45-0.88)  (0.41-0.84)  (0.79-1.00)  (0.62-0.98) |
| Observer A                           | Pa  wK  Se  Sp  V                      | Pa  wK  Se  Sp  V                      |
| 1st observation                      | 0.95  0.96  0.75  0.95  1.00          | 0.83  0.95  0.75  0.92  0.85          |
| 2nd observation                      | (0.68-0.99)  (0.81-0.97)  (0.83-1.00)  (0.83-1.00)  (0.83-1.00) | (0.56-0.94)  (0.84-0.97)  (0.73-1.00)  (0.79-1.00)  (0.77-1.00) |

Pa: Proportion of agreement; wK: Weighted kappa; Se: Sensitivity; V: Validity.
and others advocate the use of either McNemar’s test or the bias index (proportion of deviated ratings) to assess bias, following which Cohen’s kappa could then be used. It seems reasonable to consider that both agreement measures (proportion of agreement and weighted Cohen’s kappa) and validity measures. Thus, the proposed original classification could be considered either as the classification by a different observer and agreement with it by each observer would be evaluated for reliability or it may be considered as reference and common measures of validity would be used similarly to the paper of Tung and Tagashi.

In the present study, although 20 selected non-consecutive films were assessed, no observer bias was noticeable and the fact that all categories of classification groups were included for evaluation, may allow us, even though cautiously, to consider our classification of gastric mucosa both reliable and easily learnable.

The follow-up of patients with atrophic chronic gastritis and intestinal metaplasia may lead to early diagnosis of gastric neoaplastic lesions and improvement of patients’ prognosis. Following the non-existence of distinctive symptoms, most authors based their studies (mostly) on morphologic evaluation through endoscopically performed multiple biopsies, because of the patchy characteristics of atrophic chronic gastritis and intestinalization of gastric mucosa. However, with the exception of atrophic vascularization, most studies found that for conventional endoscopy, descriptions of ‘gastritis’ showed suboptimal validity and unsatisfactory reliability.

New endoscopic methods are expected to optimise both the identification, in a (more) reproducible and valid measure for such lesions-‘optic biopsy’. An increasing number of expert opinion texts, reviews and studies report the use of magnification chromoendoscopy through the gastrointestinal tract.

As far as colorectal lesions are concerned, in 1996 Kudo et al defined a 7 patterns classification (type 1, II, IIIₐ, IIIₜ, IV, Vₐ, Vₚ) that showed consistently good sensitivity but highly heterogeneous results in its specificity. Eight years have past and recently reproducibility was demonstrated in an altered simplified three patterns classification with management consequences or prognosis implications: I and II as non-neoplastic; III and IV as neoplastic; and IIIₐ and V as neoplastic possibly invasive.

However, in upper gastrointestinal tract, both for Barrett’s mucosa and stomach mucosa, diverse classifications have been published and the need for their standardization stressed.

Endo et al and Yagi et al using methylene blue, Guelrud et al using indigo carmine, described features of intestinal metaplasia and Sharma also reported endoscopic dysplasia. Good validity results were published by all authors, but Meining et al showed a low inter-observer agreement, both for Endo and for Guelrud classifications (Cohen’s kappa of 0.017 and 0.162).

In the stomach, our own group described the use of magnification chromoendoscopy with methylene blue for the diagnosis of intestinal metaplasia and gastric epithelial dysplasia in 2003. We subsequently found that a substantial agreement was observed on the classification of endoscopic images into groups (I, II, or III), both for intra-observer (Pa = 0.91, Kc = 0.86) and for inter-observer agreement (Pa = 0.84, Kc = 0.74). Hereby, the stomach size and the presence of inflammation were considered limitations for chromoendoscopy and particularly for magnification.

However, concurrent results by others working in the field of gastric mucosa were consistent with ours. Recently, Yagi et al described aspects for normal antral mucosa and for gastritis with H pylori similar to our Group I.

Also Yang types A through D and Kim types 1 through 3 may be compared with our group classification as Group I. Furthermore, Kim’s type 4 and Yang types D and E are very similar to Subgroups II E and III F. Tajiri et al stressed that this procedure may have marked impact in the diagnosis of minute neoplastic flat ‘gastritis-like’ lesions and they described very similar features to our own research group’s Group III or pattern-less.

This means that, as with Kudo’s classification in the colon, the existence of a unique and standardized classification for magnification chromoendoscopy (both in Barrett’s and in the stomach) may have contributed to the dissemination of this technique and further use in even newer technologies.

In conclusion, a modified version of our classification for gastric mucosa diffuse changes and minute dysplastic lesions seems to be reliable and easily learnable. The web-based system hereby developed can be used for new diagnostic technology teaching and dissemination and for assessing the similarity between our own and other classifications, with the aim of the achievement of consensus.

Figure 2 Variation of agreement with reference (Kappa) and inter-observer agreement (Black) (top graphic) and validity (bottom graphic) along sequential observations (1st to 6th) for the classification in subgroups (dashed line marks for 0.80 as the cutoff for almost perfect agreement (top graphic) and validity (bottom graphic)).
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