CAP Pathology Laboratory Quality Center: Cooperative Grant with Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Results for the pilot test post-survey for Immunohistochemistry Validation Practices and Procedures.

Pilot responses and questionnaire responses reviewed by Drs Nakhleh, Fitzgibbons, Ms Souers and Ms Fatheree via conference call on 1-5-15.

Pilot Tester Information

Institution Name and Address	7 Respondents
	4 MDs (IHC Directors)
	3 Histology Supervisors
	2 Non-Respondents (CDC contacts, non CAP PT customers)
Time to complete IHC Validation	Average: 25 minutes
survey (not including this form)	Range: 15 – 60 minutes
	2 @ 15
	1 @ 25
	1@ 30
	2 @ 20
	1 @ 60 (most time spent finding the data)

CAP Pathology Laboratory Quality Center: Cooperative Grant with Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Survey Introduction

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
After reading the introduction, my interest in continuing the survey is high Average: 4	1	2	3	4	5
Range:2-4					
The introduction helped me understand what to expect from this survey.	1	2	3	4	5
Average: 4					
Range: 3-4					
The amount of detail provided was adequate.	1	2	3	4	5
Average: 4					
Range: 3-4					
What recommendations do you have for the Introduction?	1				
• List of definitions is a bit off-putting – can you put them somewhere else -	-like end- but clearly	refer to	o them?		

• I hardly read directions -note I had seen elements of survey before

Recommendation by Biostats to leave definitions at beginning for consistency.

CAP Pathology Laboratory Quality Center: Cooperative Grant with Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Section I: IHC Validation Procedure survey questions 1-7

.

Summary: Questions 1-7 all ACCEPTABLE from respondents except for following comments on #5

Q #.	Elements		Specific Observations/Other Comments
1.	Question clarity	AcceptableNeeds revision	
	Answers (clarity and no. of responses)	 Acceptable Needs revision 	
2.	Question clarity	 Acceptable Needs revision 	
2.	Answers (clarity and no. of responses)	 Acceptable Needs revision 	
3.	Question clarity	○ Acceptable○ Needs revision	
5.	Answers (clarity and no. of responses)	AcceptableNeeds revision	

CAP Pathology Laboratory Quality Center: Cooperative Grant with Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Q #.	Elements		Specific Observations/Other Comments
4.	Question clarity	AcceptableNeeds revision	
4.	Answers (clarity and no. of responses)	 Acceptable Needs revision	
5.	Question clarity	 Acceptable Needs revision 	How is this different from Q3 – I know you are trying to split out predictive markers but seems redundant Modified answers for clarity.
	Answers (clarity and no. of responses)	 Acceptable Needs revision 	Typo – stray " in question stem Corrected.
6.	Question clarity	 Acceptable Needs revision	
	Answers (clarity and no. of responses)	 Acceptable Needs revision	
7.	Question clarity	 Acceptable Needs revision	
/.	Answers (clarity and no. of responses)	 Acceptable Needs revision	

CAP Pathology Laboratory Quality Center: Cooperative Grant with Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Section II: Re-Validation Procedures survey questions 8-9

Summary: Both acceptable except for comments listed below:

Revised order of questions for better flow. These are the original pilot question numbers.

Q #.	Elements		Specific Observations/Other Comments
8.	Question clarity	 Acceptable Needs revision 	
	Answers (clarity and no. of	 Acceptable 	
	responses)	\circ Needs revision	
9.	Question clarity	 ○ Acceptable ○ Needs revision 	 Suggest breakdown into 2 separate questions Done If you want respondents to list number of cases they used for revalidation, add an empty box in the Number of Cases column Taken care of by Forms Dept Answer boxes for 'change incubation or retrieval time' is missing. Taken care of by Forms Dept This is a complex question and could be confusing to some. The Number of cases will have to look like a blank or answer box. Taken care of by Forms Dept Also there should be a comment field. Instructing "0" when number not specified in protocol is not fair. Guideline leaves discretion for lab director in many of the options and this could be formulated prior to –illegible-project. Added additional responses to address
	Answers (clarity and no. of	 Acceptable 	
	responses)	\circ Needs revision	

CAP Pathology Laboratory Quality Center: Cooperative Grant with Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

9. Please answer: Note: If your laboratory does not have separate procedures for predictive and non-predictive assays please enter your responses in the <u>non-predictive</u> section

Are the following changes explicitly specified in the validation procedure? (Note: *No of cases refer to minimum number cases required to test in validation set. If no minimum number is specified in procedure, enter 0 in the number column.)	Non IHC	assays (e.g	oved, <u>no</u> I., cytoke CD45)	<u>n-predictive</u> eratin, S100,	ma	n-FDA appı <u>rker</u> IHC as ER2, ER/Pg	says of	Unsure O O O
	Yes	*No of case(s)	No	Unsure	Yes	*No of case(s)	No	Unsure
Introduction of a new lot of antibody	ø	2	0	0	S.	2	0	0
Change in antibody dilution	Ø	4	0	0	×	4	0	0
Change in antibody vendor (same clone)	Ŕ	4	0	0	X	4	0	0
Change in antibody clone	ø	20	0	0	ø	40	0	0
Introduction or change in antigen retrieval method	X	*	0	0	Ø	*	0	0
Change in incubation or retrieval times (same method)	X	4			×	4		
Change in antigen detection system	Ø	*	0	0	ø	*	0	0
Change in fixative type	ø	*	0	0	威	X	0	0
Change in tissue processing	X	*	0	0	ø	*	0	0
Change in testing equipment	X	*	0	0	ø	÷	0	0
Change in environmental conditions (e.g., laboratory relocation)	×	*	0	0	ø	¥	0	0
Change in water supply	9	*	0	0	8	*	0	0

* medical Director to assess case - by - couse + develop plan

Citeribhers DI Desdaul & Cathering I.A. 1. 1. 2. 1.

CAP Pathology Laboratory Quality Center: Cooperative Grant with Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Section III: Documentation Procedures survey questions 10-11 Summary: Both acceptable except for comments listed below:

Q #.	Elements		Specific Observations/Other Comments
10.	Question clarity	AcceptableNeeds revision	
10.	Answers (clarity and no. of responses)	○ Acceptable○ Needs revision	
11.	Question clarity	 Acceptable Needs revision 	 Suggest breakdown into 2 separate questions Same as comments for number 9 Done
11.	Answers (clarity and no. of responses)	 Acceptable Needs revision 	 Answers misaligned Same as above – with adding empty boxes
			Done – added minimum overall concordance rate also

CAP Pathology Laboratory Quality Center: Cooperative Grant with Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Section IV: General IHC Laboratory Data – Survey Questions 12-16 Summary: All Acceptable except for comment on Q16 below

Q #.	Elements		Specific Observations/Other Comments
12.	Question clarity	AcceptableNeeds revision	
12.	Answers (clarity and no. of responses)	AcceptableNeeds revision	
13.	Question clarity	AcceptableNeeds revision	
13.	Answers (clarity and no. of responses)	 Acceptable Needs revision 	
14.	Question clarity	AcceptableNeeds revision	
14.	Answers (clarity and no. of responses)	AcceptableNeeds revision	

CAP Pathology Laboratory Quality Center: Cooperative Grant with Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Q #.	Elements		Specific Observations/Other Comments
15.	Question clarity	AcceptableNeeds revision	
13.	Answers (clarity and no. of responses)	AcceptableNeeds revision	
	Question clarity	AcceptableNeeds revision	
16.	Answers (clarity and no. of responses)	 Acceptable Needs revision 	This needs to allow multiple answers Clarified by adding 'primary' to question but multiple answers would be acceptable

CAP Pathology Laboratory Quality Center: Cooperative Grant with Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Section V: Awareness and Adoption – Survey Questions 17-20 Summary: All Acceptable except for comment on Q19 and Q20 below

17.	Question clarity	AcceptableNeeds revision	
	Answers (clarity and no. of responses)	AcceptableNeeds revision	
18.	Question clarity	 Acceptable Needs revision	
10.	Answers (clarity and no. of responses)	AcceptableNeeds revision	
19.	Question clarity	AcceptableNeeds revision	
13.	Answers (clarity and no. of responses)	 Acceptable Needs revision 	Need to stipulate more than one answer is acceptable Comment meant for Q20 because (check all that apply is there)
	Question clarity	 Acceptable Needs revision	
20.	Answers (clarity and no. of responses)	 Acceptable Needs revision 	 More than one answer acceptable?? Not specified if single or multiple answers are acceptable – implied with 'most difficult'. Added "choose up to 3 responses"

CAP Pathology Laboratory Quality Center: Cooperative Grant with Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Section VI: Conclusion

Summary: All Acceptable except for one comment

Q #.	Elements		Specific Observations/	Other Co	omment	ts		
	Question clarity	AcceptableNeeds revision						
21.	Answers (clarity and no. of responses)	 Acceptable Needs revision 	Would be good to specify N Added clarifying credentials to				boratory D	irector"
				Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
The confid Average: 4 Range: 3-4		nfortable with submitting the	survey.	1	2	3	4	5
	nt of detail provided about the outo 4	come of the survey was adec	quate.	1	2	3	4	5
-	mmendations do you have for the	Conclusion?		1	1	1	1	

CAP Pathology Laboratory Quality Center: Cooperative Grant with Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Overall Survey Review Goals and Objectives

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
The survey questions are easy to understand.		1	2	3	4	5
Average: 4						
Range: 4-5						
The answer choices are clearly written.		1	2	3	4	5
Average: 4						
Range: 4-5						
I was always able to find an appropriate answer to choose		1	2	3	4	5
Average: 4						
Range: 3-4						
The order of questions was easy to follow.		1	2	3	4	5
All: 4						
Overall, the length of the survey was (circle one)			I	[1	<u> </u>
All: Appropriate						
	too short	app	propriate	e	too lo	ong

CAP Pathology Laboratory Quality Center: Cooperative Grant with Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

What did you like best about the survey?

- Survey is well structured and questions are clearly stated
- Made you think about what I do
- Pretty straight forward

If given the option to change parts of the survey what changes would you make?

Need a comment box at end of survey and for Q9 and Q11

Added free text comment box at end. Changed responses for Q9 and Q11 to address better.

Additional thoughts/comments: **None**