

## Computer-aided detection for colorectal neoplasia in randomized and non-randomized studies



The widespread adoption of artificial intelligence (AI) for polyp detection in colonoscopy necessitates a thorough understanding of its benefits and harms. While AI has shown promise in increasing the adenoma detection rate (ADR), potentially reducing colorectal cancer [1], it also raises concerns about increased removal of non-neoplastic polyps. However, conflicting results from recent meta-analyses [2, 3] about the effectiveness of AI in colonoscopy have caused confusion in clinical practice.

One meta-analysis of 21 randomized controlled trials (RCTs) involving 18,232 patients demonstrated that AI-assisted colonoscopy increased the ADR (risk ratio 1.24; 95% confidence interval 1.16–1.33) but also led to a higher rate of non-neoplastic polyp removal compared with standard colonoscopy (mean difference of 0.18 polyps per colonoscopy [0.11–0.26]) [2]. Conversely, another meta-analysis of eight non-randomized studies with 9,687 patients failed to find significant changes in these benefit and harm outcomes, respectively [3].

The debate over the reliability of study designs further complicates the issue. While non-blinded RCTs are generally considered the most trustworthy evidence, they may suffer from artificially controlled environments and unconscious bias favoring the intervention (e.g., the Hawthorne effect) [4]. On the other hand, non-randomized observational studies reflect real-world scenarios but are susceptible to selection bias and lack of adequately controlled groups.

Theoretically, pragmatic RCTs such as randomized health services studies could be the optimal way to measure the real-world effectiveness of medical interventions in which study subjects are less monitored but evenly controlled as compared with traditional randomized trials [5]. Given that we do not have robust results based on such study designs now, a comprehensive consideration of the ben-

efit-harm balance of AI in colonoscopy is needed. Of particular importance is involving patients, physicians, academic societies, and policymakers in evaluating the use of AI to ensure patient-centered care.

### Conflict of Interest

YM: Olympus (Consultancy, lecture fees, and equipment loan), Cybernet System (Loyalty) HKP: No conflict of interest AR: Medtronic (equipment loan); Fujifilm (consulting); Olympus (consulting; NEC (equipment loan); Satisfy (equipment loan); Odin (equipment loan); AIM (equipment loan) DKR: Olympus Corporation, Boston Scientific, Braintree Laboratories, Norgine, Medtronic, Acacia Pharmaceuticals (Consultancy); Olympus Corporation, Medivators, Erbe USA Inc, Braintree Laboratories (Research Support) PS: Bausch, Boston Scientific Corporation, CDx Labs, Covidien LP, Exact Sciences, Fujifilm Medical Systems USA, Inc, Lucid, Lumendi, Medtronic, Olympus, Phathom, Takeda, and Samsung Bioepis (Consultation); Cosmo Pharmaceuticals, Covidien, Docbot, ERBE USA Inc, Fujifilm Holdings America Corporation, Ironwood Pharmaceuticals Inc, Medtronic USA, Inc, and Olympus (Grant support) CH: Medtronic (equipment loan); Fujifilm (consulting); Olympus (consulting; NEC (equipment loan); Satisfy (equipment loan); Odin (equipment loan); AIM (equipment loan)

### The authors

**Yuichi Mori**<sup>1,2</sup>, **Harsh K Patel**<sup>3</sup>, **Alessandro Repici**<sup>4,5</sup>, **Douglas K. Rex**<sup>6</sup>, **Prateek Sharma**<sup>3,7</sup>, **Cesare Hassan**<sup>4,5</sup>

- 1 Clinical Effectiveness Research Group, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway
- 2 Digestive Disease Center, Showa University Northern Yokohama Hospital, Yokohama, Japan
- 3 Gastroenterology and Hepatology, University of Kansas Medical Center, Kansas City, United States

- 4 Department of Biomedical Sciences, Humanitas University, Milan, Italy
- 5 Endoscopy Unit, Humanitas Clinical and Research Center – IRCCS, Milan, Italy
- 6 Division of Gastroenterology, Indiana University School of Medicine, Indianapolis, United States
- 7 Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Kansas City VA Medical Center and University of Kansas School of Medicine, Kansas City, United States

### Corresponding author

**Yuichi Mori, MD**

University of Oslo – Clinical Effectiveness Research Group, Sognsvannsveien 21, Oslo 0372, Norway  
ibusiginjp@gmail.com

### Publication note

Letters to the editor do not necessarily represent the opinion of the editor or publisher. The editor and publisher reserve the right to not publish letters to the editor, or to publish them abbreviated or in extracts.

### References

- [1] Areia M, Mori Y, Correale L et al. Cost-effectiveness of artificial intelligence for screening colonoscopy: a modelling study. *Lancet Digital Health* 2022; 4: e436–e444 doi:10.1016/S2589-7500(22)00042-5
- [2] Hassan C, Spadaccini M, Mori Y et al. Real-time computer-aided detection of colorectal neoplasia during colonoscopy: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann Intern Med* 2023; 176: 1209–1220
- [3] Patel HK, Mori Y, Hassan C et al. Lack of effectiveness of computer aided detection for colorectal neoplasia: A systematic review and meta-analysis of nonrandomized studies. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2023; 23: 1542–3565
- [4] Sedgwick P, Greenwood N. Understanding the Hawthorne effect. *BMJ (clinical research ed)* 2015; 351: h4672 doi:10.1136/bmj.h4672

- [5] Gamerman V, Cai T, Elsässer A. Pragmatic randomized clinical trials: best practices and statistical guidance. *Health Serv Outcomes Res Method* 2019; 19: 23–35

### **Bibliography**

*Endosc Int Open* 2024; 12: E598–E599

DOI 10.1055/a-2295-2177

ISSN 2364-3722

© 2024. The Author(s).

This is an open access article published by Thieme under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonDerivative-NonCommercial License, permitting copying and reproduction so long as the original work is given appropriate credit. Contents may not be used for commercial purposes, or adapted, remixed, transformed or built upon. (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

Georg Thieme Verlag KG, Rüdigerstraße 14,  
70469 Stuttgart, Germany

