# World Journal of *Clinical Cases*

World J Clin Cases 2022 August 6; 10(22): 7620-8056





Published by Baishideng Publishing Group Inc

W J C C World Journal of Clinical Cases

#### Contents

#### Thrice Monthly Volume 10 Number 22 August 6, 2022

#### **OPINION REVIEW**

7620 Whipple's operation with a modified centralization concept: A model in low-volume Caribbean centers Cawich SO, Pearce NW, Naraynsingh V, Shukla P, Deshpande RR

#### REVIEW

7631 Role of micronutrients in Alzheimer's disease: Review of available evidence Fei HX, Qian CF, Wu XM, Wei YH, Huang JY, Wei LH

#### **MINIREVIEWS**

- 7642 Application of imaging techniques in pancreaticobiliary maljunction Wang JY, Mu PY, Xu YK, Bai YY, Shen DH
- 7653 Update on gut microbiota in gastrointestinal diseases Nishida A, Nishino K, Ohno M, Sakai K, Owaki Y, Noda Y, Imaeda H
- 7665 Vascular complications of pancreatitis Kalas MA, Leon M, Chavez LO, Canalizo E, Surani S

#### **ORIGINAL ARTICLE**

#### **Clinical and Translational Research**

7674 Network pharmacology and molecular docking reveal zedoary turmeric-trisomes in Inflammatory bowel disease with intestinal fibrosis

Zheng L, Ji YY, Dai YC, Wen XL, Wu SC

#### **Case Control Study**

7686 Comprehensive proteomic signature and identification of CDKN2A as a promising prognostic biomarker and therapeutic target of colorectal cancer

Wang QQ, Zhou YC, Zhou Ge YJ, Qin G, Yin TF, Zhao DY, Tan C, Yao SK

#### **Retrospective Cohort Study**

7698 Is anoplasty superior to scar revision surgery for post-hemorrhoidectomy anal stenosis? Six years of experience

Weng YT, Chu KJ, Lin KH, Chang CK, Kang JC, Chen CY, Hu JM, Pu TW

#### **Retrospective Study**

7708 Short- (30-90 days) and mid-term (1-3 years) outcomes and prognostic factors of patients with esophageal cancer undergoing surgical treatments

Shi MK, Mei YQ, Shi JL



Camban	World Journal of Clinical Cases
Conten	Thrice Monthly Volume 10 Number 22 August 6, 2022
7720	Effectiveness of pulsed radiofrequency on the medial cervical branches for cervical facet joint pain <i>Chang MC, Yang S</i>
7728	Clinical performance evaluation of O-Ring Halcyon Linac: A real-world study Wang GY, Zhu QZ, Zhu HL, Jiang LJ, Zhao N, Liu ZK, Zhang FQ
7738	Correlation between the warning symptoms and prognosis of cardiac arrest Zheng K, Bai Y, Zhai QR, Du LF, Ge HX, Wang GX, Ma QB
7749	Serum ferritin levels in children with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder and tic disorder <i>Tang CY, Wen F</i>
7760	Application of metagenomic next-generation sequencing in the diagnosis of infectious diseases of the central nervous system after empirical treatment
	Chen YY, Guo Y, Xue XH, Pang F
7772	Prognostic role of multiple abnormal genes in non-small-cell lung cancer
7785	Prospective single-center feasible study of innovative autorelease bile duct supporter to delay adverse events after endoscopic papillectomy
	Liu SZ, Chai NL, Li HK, Feng XX, Zhai YQ, Wang NJ, Gao Y, Gao F, Wang SS, Linghu EQ
	Clinical Trials Study
7794	Performance of Dexcom G5 and FreeStyle Libre sensors tested simultaneously in people with type 1 or 2 diabetes and advanced chronic kidney disease
	Ólafsdóttir AF, Andelin M, Saeed A, Sofizadeh S, Hamoodi H, Jansson PA, Lind M
	Observational Study
7808	Complications of chronic pancreatitis prior to and following surgical treatment: A proposal for classification
	Murruste M, Kirsimägi Ü, Kase K, Veršinina T, Talving P, Lepner U
7825	Effects of comprehensive nursing on postoperative complications, mental status and quality of life in patients with glioma
	Dong H, Zhang XL, Deng CX, Luo B
	Prospective Study
7832	Predictors of long-term anxiety and depression in discharged COVID-19 patients: A follow-up study
	Boyraz RK, Şahan E, Boylu ME, Kırpınar İ
	META-ANALYSIS
7844	Same-day single-dose <i>vs</i> large-volume split-dose regimens of polyethylene glycol for bowel preparation: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Pan H, Zheng XL, Fang CY, Liu LZ, Chen JS, Wang C, Chen YD, Huang JM, Zhou YS, He LP



	World Journal of Clinical Cases
Conter	Thrice Monthly Volume 10 Number 22 August 6, 2022
7859	Rectal nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, glyceryl trinitrate, or combinations for prophylaxis of post- endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography pancreatitis: A network meta-analysis
	Shi QQ, Huang GX, Li W, Yang JR, Ning XY
7872	Effect of celecoxib on improving depression: A systematic review and meta-analysis
	Wang Z, Wu Q, Wang Q
	CASE REPORT
7883	Rectal mature teratoma: A case report
	Liu JL, Sun PL
7890	Antibiotic and glucocorticoid-induced recapitulated hematological remission in acute myeloid leukemia: A case report and review of literature
	Sun XY, Yang XD, Yang XQ, Ju B, Xiu NN, Xu J, Zhao XC
7899	Non-secretory multiple myeloma expressed as multiple extramedullary plasmacytoma with an endobronchial lesion mimicking metastatic cancer: A case report
	Lee SB, Park CY, Lee HJ, Hong R, Kim WS, Park SG
7906	Latamoxef-induced severe thrombocytopenia during the treatment of pulmonary infection: A case report
	Zhang RY, Zhang JJ, Li JM, Xu YY, Xu YH, Cai XJ
7913	Multicentric reticulohistiocytosis with prominent skin lesions and arthritis: A case report
	Xu XL, Liang XH, Liu J, Deng X, Zhang L, Wang ZG
7924	Brainstem abscesses caused by Listeria monocytogenes: A case report
	Wang J, Li YC, Yang KY, Wang J, Dong Z
7931	Primary hypertension in a postoperative paraganglioma patient: A case report
	Wei JH, Yan HL
7936	Long-term survival of gastric mixed neuroendocrine-non-neuroendocrine neoplasm: Two case reports
	Woo LT, Ding YF, Mao CY, Qian J, Zhang XM, Xu N
7944	Percutaneous transforaminal endoscopic decompression combined with percutaneous vertebroplasty in treatment of lumbar vertebral body metastases: A case report
	Ran Q, Li T, Kuang ZP, Guo XH
7950	Atypical imaging features of the primary spinal cord glioblastoma: A case report
	Liang XY, Chen YP, Li Q, Zhou ZW
7960	Resection with limb salvage in an Asian male adolescent with Ewing's sarcoma: A case report
	Lai CY, Chen KJ, Ho TY, Li LY, Kuo CC, Chen HT, Fong YC
7968	Early detection of circulating tumor DNA and successful treatment with osimertinib in thr790met-positive leptomeningeal metastatic lung cancer: A case report
	Xu LQ, Wang YJ, Shen SL, Wu Y, Duan HZ



Cantan	World Journal of Clinical Cases
Conten	Thrice Monthly Volume 10 Number 22 August 6, 2022
7973	Delayed arterial symptomatic epidural hematoma on the 14 <sup>th</sup> day after posterior lumbar interbody fusion: A case report
	Hao SS, Gao ZF, Li HK, Liu S, Dong SL, Chen HL, Zhang ZF
7982	Clinical and genetic analysis of nonketotic hyperglycinemia: A case report
	Ning JJ, Li F, Li SQ
7989	Ectopic Cushing's syndrome in a patient with metastatic Merkel cell carcinoma: A case report
	Ishay A, Touma E, Vornicova O, Dodiuk-Gad R, Goldman T, Bisharat N
7994	Occurrence of MYD88L265P and CD79B mutations in diffuse large b cell lymphoma with bone marrow infiltration: A case report
	Huang WY, Weng ZY
8003	Rare case of compartment syndrome provoked by inhalation of polyurethane agent: A case report
	Choi JH, Oh HM, Hwang JH, Kim KS, Lee SY
8009	Acute ischemic Stroke combined with Stanford type A aortic dissection: A case report and literature review
	He ZY, Yao LP, Wang XK, Chen NY, Zhao JJ, Zhou Q, Yang XF
8018	Compound-honeysuckle-induced drug eruption with special manifestations: A case report
	Zhou LF, Lu R
8025	Spontaneous internal carotid artery pseudoaneurysm complicated with ischemic stroke in a young man: A case report and review of literature
	Zhong YL, Feng JP, Luo H, Gong XH, Wei ZH
8034	Microcystic adnexal carcinoma misdiagnosed as a "recurrent epidermal cyst": A case report
	Yang SX, Mou Y, Wang S, Hu X, Li FQ
8040	Accidental discovery of appendiceal carcinoma during gynecological surgery: A case report
	Wang L, Dong Y, Chen YH, Wang YN, Sun L
8045	Intra-ampullary papillary-tubular neoplasm combined with ampullary neuroendocrine carcinoma: A case report
	Zavrtanik H, Luzar B, Tomažič A
	LETTER TO THE EDITOR
8054	Commentary on "Primary orbital monophasic synovial sarcoma with calcification: A case report"

Tokur O, Aydın S, Karavas E

#### Contents

Thrice Monthly Volume 10 Number 22 August 6, 2022

#### **ABOUT COVER**

Editorial Board Member of World Journal of Clinical Cases, Bennete Aloysius Fernandes, MDS, Professor, Faculty of Dentistry, SEGi University, Kota Damansara 47810, Selangor, Malaysia. drben17@yahoo.com

#### **AIMS AND SCOPE**

The primary aim of World Journal of Clinical Cases (WJCC, World J Clin Cases) is to provide scholars and readers from various fields of clinical medicine with a platform to publish high-quality clinical research articles and communicate their research findings online.

WJCC mainly publishes articles reporting research results and findings obtained in the field of clinical medicine and covering a wide range of topics, including case control studies, retrospective cohort studies, retrospective studies, clinical trials studies, observational studies, prospective studies, randomized controlled trials, randomized clinical trials, systematic reviews, meta-analysis, and case reports.

#### **INDEXING/ABSTRACTING**

The WJCC is now abstracted and indexed in Science Citation Index Expanded (SCIE, also known as SciSearch®), Journal Citation Reports/Science Edition, Current Contents®/Clinical Medicine, PubMed, PubMed Central, Scopus, Reference Citation Analysis, China National Knowledge Infrastructure, China Science and Technology Journal Database, and Superstar Journals Database. The 2022 Edition of Journal Citation Reports® cites the 2021 impact factor (IF) for WJCC as 1.534; IF without journal self cites: 1.491; 5-year IF: 1.599; Journal Citation Indicator: 0.28; Ranking: 135 among 172 journals in medicine, general and internal; and Quartile category: Q4. The WJCC's CiteScore for 2021 is 1.2 and Scopus CiteScore rank 2021: General Medicine is 443/826.

#### **RESPONSIBLE EDITORS FOR THIS ISSUE**

Production Editor: Xu Guo; Production Department Director: Xiang Li; Editorial Office Director: Jin-Lei Wang.

NAME OF JOURNAL World Jaurenal of Clinical Casas	INSTRUCTIONS TO AUTHORS
ISSN ISSN 2307-8960 (online)	GUIDELINES FOR ETHICS DOCUMENTS
LAUNCH DATE April 16, 2013	GUIDELINES FOR NON-NATIVE SPEAKERS OF ENGLISH https://www.wignet.com/bpg/gerinfo/240
FREQUENCY Thrice Monthly	PUBLICATION ETHICS https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/288
<b>EDITORS-IN-CHIEF</b> Bao-Gan Peng, Jerzy Tadeusz Chudek, George Kontogeorgos, Maurizio Serati, Ja Hyeon Ku	PUBLICATION MISCONDUCT https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/208
EDITORIAL BOARD MEMBERS https://www.wjgnet.com/2307-8960/editorialboard.htm	ARTICLE PROCESSING CHARGE https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/242
PUBLICATION DATE August 6, 2022	STEPS FOR SUBMITTING MANUSCRIPTS https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/239
COPYRIGHT © 2022 Baishideng Publishing Group Inc	ONLINE SUBMISSION https://www.f6publishing.com

© 2022 Baishideng Publishing Group Inc. All rights reserved. 7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com



W J C C World Journal of Clinical Cases

Submit a Manuscript: https://www.f6publishing.com

World J Clin Cases 2022 August 6; 10(22): 7844-7858

DOI: 10.12998/wjcc.v10.i22.7844

ISSN 2307-8960 (online)

META-ANALYSIS

# Same-day single-dose vs large-volume split-dose regimens of polyethylene glycol for bowel preparation: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Hui Pan, Xiao-Ling Zheng, Chao-Ying Fang, Lan-Zai Liu, Jian-Su Chen, Chao Wang, Yu-Dai Chen, Jian-Min Huang, Yu-Shen Zhou, Li-Ping He

Specialty type: Gastroenterology and hepatology

Provenance and peer review:

Unsolicited article; Externally peer reviewed.

Peer-review model: Single blind

#### Peer-review report's scientific quality classification

Grade A (Excellent): 0 Grade B (Very good): 0 Grade C (Good): C, C Grade D (Fair): 0 Grade E (Poor): 0

P-Reviewer: El-Nakeep S, Egypt; Watanabe J, Japan

Received: September 8, 2021 Peer-review started: September 8, 2021 First decision: December 4, 2021 Revised: December 11, 2021 Accepted: June 27, 2022 Article in press: June 27, 2022 Published online: August 6, 2022



Hui Pan, Xiao-Ling Zheng, Gastrointestinal Endoscopy Center, Fujian Provincial Hospital, The Shengli Clinical Medical College, Fujian Medical University, Fuzhou 350001, Fujian Province, China

Chao-Ying Fang, Lan-Zai Liu, Jian-Su Chen, Chao Wang, Yu-Dai Chen, Jian-Min Huang, Yu-Shen Zhou, Li-Ping He, Gastrointestinal Endoscopy Center, Fujian Provincial Hospital South Branch, Fuzhou 350001, Fujian Province, China

Corresponding author: Xiao-Ling Zheng, MD, PhD, Chief Physician, Professor, Gastrointestinal Endoscopy Center, The Shengli Clinical Medical College, Fujian Medical University, No. 134 Dong Street, Gulou District, Fuzhou 350001, Fujian Province, China. shengli888220@163.com

## Abstract

#### BACKGROUND

Split-dose regimens (SpDs) of 4 L of polyethylene glycol (PEG) have been established as the "gold standard" for bowel preparation; however, its use is limited by the large volumes of fluids required and sleep disturbance associated with night doses. Meanwhile, the same-day single-dose regimens (SSDs) of PEG has been recommended as an alternative; however, its superiority compared to other regimens is a matter of debate.

#### AIM

To compare the efficacy and tolerability between SSDs and large-volume SpDs PEG for bowel preparation.

#### **METHODS**

We searched MEDLINE/PubMed, the Cochrane Library, RCA, EMBASE and Science Citation Index Expanded for randomized trials comparing (2 L/4 L) SSDs to large-volume (4 L/3 L) SpDs PEG-based regimens, regardless of adjuvant laxative use. The pooled analysis of relative risk ratio and mean difference was calculated for bowel cleanliness, sleep disturbance, willingness to repeat the procedure using the same preparation and adverse effects. A random effects model or fixed-effects model was chosen based on heterogeneity analysis among studies.



#### RESULTS

A total of 18 studies were included. There was no statistically significant difference of adequate bowel preparation (relative risk = 0.97; 95%CI: 0.92-1.02) (14 trials), right colon Boston Bowel Preparation Scale (mean difference = 0.00; 95%CI: -0.04, 0.03) (9 trials) and right colon Ottawa Bowel Preparation Scale (mean difference = 0.04; 95%CI: -0.27, 0.34) (5 trials) between (2 L/4 L) SSDs and large-volume (4 L/3 L) SpDs, regardless of adjuvant laxative use. The pooled analysis favored the use of SSDs with less sleep disturbance (relative risk = 0.52; 95%CI: 0.40, 0.68) and lower incidence of abdominal pain (relative risk = 0.75; 95%CI: 0.62, 0.90). During subgroup analysis, patients that received low-volume (2 L) SSDs showed more willingness to repeat the procedure using the same preparation than SpDs (P < 0.05). No significant difference in adverse effects, including nausea, vomiting and bloating, was found between the two arms (P > 0.05).

#### CONCLUSION

Regardless of adjuvant laxative use, the (2 L/4 L) SSD PEG-based arm was considered equal or better than the large-volume ( $\geq$  3 L) SpDs PEG regimen in terms of bowel cleanliness and tolerability. Patients that received low-volume (2 L) SSDs showed more willingness to repeat the procedure using the same preparation due to the low-volume fluid requirement and less sleep disturbance.

Key Words: Bowel preparation; Colonoscopy; Polyethylene glycol; Same-day single-dose; Split-dose; Metaanalysis

©The Author(s) 2022. Published by Baishideng Publishing Group Inc. All rights reserved.

**Core Tip:** Same-day single-dose polyethylene glycol-based regimens for bowel preparation seemed to be equal or better than large-volume ( $\geq$  3 L) split-dose polyethylene glycol solution in terms of bowel cleanliness and tolerability as long as the optimal preparation-to-colonoscopy interval and diet instruction for bowel preparation were respected.

**Citation:** Pan H, Zheng XL, Fang CY, Liu LZ, Chen JS, Wang C, Chen YD, Huang JM, Zhou YS, He LP. Sameday single-dose *vs* large-volume split-dose regimens of polyethylene glycol for bowel preparation: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *World J Clin Cases* 2022; 10(22): 7844-7858 **URL:** https://www.wjgnet.com/2307-8960/full/v10/i22/7844.htm

DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.12998/wjcc.v10.i22.7844

#### INTRODUCTION

A colonoscopy is an important tool used for colorectal cancer screening and the management of colorectal lesions. However, the success of colonoscopy is strongly dependent on the quality of bowel preparation. Prior studies have reported that poor bowel preparation can increase the risk of missed diagnosis for smaller and/or flat lesions, especially in the right colon, and prolong cecal intubation time [1,2]. Polyethylene glycol (PEG) solutions, as efficient and safe purgative agents, offer the advantage of minimal fluid and electrolyte shifts and are reportedly the most widely used solutions for bowel preparation[1-3].

High volume (4 L) split-dose regimens (SpDs) of PEG have been recommended as the gold-standard regimen for bowel preparation[4]; however, the large volume of fluids or poor tolerability associated with SpDs have become a source of patient dissatisfaction. The same-day single-dose (SSD) PEG has been recommended as an alternative for patients scheduled for afternoon colonoscopy[5,6], exhibiting equal cleansing efficacy and fewer sleep disturbances than SpDs. Meanwhile, it was reported to be in favor of reducing the preparation volume and improving patient tolerance by using PEG solution combined with adjuvant laxative agents for those at risk of bowel preparation[7]. A previous systematic review by Enestvedt *et al*[8] revealed that 4 L split-dose PEG was better than other bowel preparation comparators including a regimen of 4 L single-dose PEG the night before the procedure and MiraLAX/Gatorade solutions, regardless of adjuvant laxative use. However, in order to evaluate bowel cleanliness of the SSD regimens of PEG and patient tolerance in terms of sleep disturbances and side effects for bowel preparation, we conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis to compare the efficacy and tolerability of SSD PEG-based arm *vs* large-volume ( $\geq 3$  L) split-dose PEG solutions for bowel preparation before colonoscopy, regardless of adjuvant laxative use.

WJCC | https://www.wjgnet.com

#### MATERIALS AND METHODS

#### Search strategy and study selection

Systemic searches were performed in June 2021 using MEDLINE/PubMed, EMBASE, Web of Science, Google Scholar and Cochrane Library by two independent reviewers. The search strategy used the Medical Subject Heading term along with the keywords "polyethylene glycol, (bowel preparation OR bowel preparation solution), (split dose OR split-dose) and randomized controlled." Only full texts published in English with one arm using single-dose PEG on the day of colonoscopy, regardless of adjuvant laxative use and the other arm consisting of a split-dose regimen of PEG for bowel preparation before and on the day of the procedure, were included. References from the reviewed articles were also searched to identify relevant articles that may have been missed.

Exclusion criteria consisted of the following: (1) Participants: pediatric patients, cases of prior colorectal resection and incomplete or complete bowel obstruction cases; (2) Non-colonoscopy studies; (3) Interventions: non-PEG-based solution (*i.e.* sodium phosphate, picosulfate, sodium picosulfate with magnesium citrate agents, *etc*); and (4) Comparisons: trials comparing evening-before *vs* split-dose, twice a same-day *vs* split-dose and low-volume ( $\leq 2$  L) split-dose. A flowchart of the literature search is shown in Figure 1.

#### Data extraction and methodologic quality assessment

Two authors independently conducted the screening and extracted the data from selected trials with the intention to treat numbers preferred. Results from included studies reported as percentages were converted to absolute numbers.

The methodological quality of each study was graded by two investigators using a modified Jadad scoring system utilized for single (endoscopist) blinding trials<sup>[8]</sup>. This 5-point scale assigns a single point for each of the following: (1) The study is described as randomized; (2) The randomization method is described and appropriate; (3) The study is described as blind; (4) The blinding method is described and appropriate; and (5) There is a description of withdrawals and drop-outs. A score of 5 suggested excellent quality, and a score of 0 implied a poor-quality randomized controlled trial. Single-blinding rather than double-blinding can be executed logistically for bowel preparation studies. To ensure the adequacy of blinding, all endoscopists were blinded to the bowel preparation, and staff, nurses and patients were instructed not to discuss the bowel preparation with the endoscopist. The funnel plot was used to assess publication bias. The Grades of Recommendation, Assessment, Development and Evaluation approach was presented to rate the certainty of evidence. Points of disagreement were reconciled by a discussion with another author when required.

#### Outcomes

The primary outcome measure was bowel cleanliness, defined as adequate bowel preparation using validated scales [Ottawa Bowel Preparation Scale (OBPS) or Boston Bowel Preparation Scale (BBPS)]. Secondary outcomes included the willingness to repeat the procedure using the same preparation, sleep disturbance and side effects, including nausea, vomiting, bloating and abdominal pain/cramps.

The total OBPS score was based upon the sum of the right, transverse and left colonic segments (reference range of 0-4 each segment) plus an overall colonic fluid score (range 0-2)[9]. The total score ranged from 0 to 14; the lower the score, the better the preparation. The total BBPS score was the sum of the right colon, mid-colon and left colonic segmental scale. The total score ranged from 0 to 9 (0 = very poor, 9 = excellent)[10].

#### Statistical analysis

Statistical analysis was conducted with Review Manager (Version 5.4, Cochrane Collaboration, Oxford, GB). The categorical outcomes were analyzed using relative risk ratio (RR) and its corresponding 95% confidence interval (CI). Continuous data were analyzed using mean differences (MD) and corresponding 95% CI. Statistical heterogeneity was measured by graphic examination of forest plots and statistically through a homogeneity test based on the  $\chi^2$  test ( $I^2 \ge 50\%$  suggests heterogeneity) in which P < 0.10 was considered significant for heterogeneity. A fixed-effects model was used unless there was significant heterogeneity, in which case a random-effects model was applied. Weighted MDs were used for outcomes measured on different scales. A RR > 1 favored the SSD arm, while a RR < 1 favored the SpDs arm for the favorable outcomes (adequate preparation and willingness to repeat) and the adverse outcomes (sleep disturbance and adverse effects). The MD represented the difference in means between SSD and SpDs (SSD – SpDs = MD); an MD > 0 favored the SSD arm, while an MD < 0 favored the SpDs arm. A higher mean BBPS score indicated better quality of bowel preparation, which was the opposite for OBPS scores. Subgroup analysis was performed to characterize heterogeneity and sensitivity.

Raisbideng® WJCC | https://www.wjgnet.com



DOI: 10.12998/wjcc.v10.i22.7844 Copyright ©The Author(s) 2022.

Figure 1 Flowchart of the study selection. PEG: Polyethylene glycol; RCT: Randomized controlled trial.

#### RESULTS

#### Search results

The initial search identified 490 potentially relevant articles. A total of 422 articles were excluded based on titles and abstracts because they included patients < 18 years of age, non-colonoscopy studies, reviews, retrospective studies or duplications. Sixty-eight articles were reviewed by full text. Overall, 18 articles[11-28] comparing bowel preparation with SSDs *vs* SpDs PEG were included in this analysis. Figure 1 shows a flowchart of studies from initial results of publication searches to final inclusion or exclusion.

Table 1 summarizes the characteristics of the 18 included studies (n = 5464), which consisted of 2793 patients who received SSDs and 2671 patients who received the SpDs regimen. Nine trials evaluated low-volume (2 L) SSD PEG with adjuvant laxative use vs large-volume( $\geq 3$  L) SpDs PEG[11,12,22-28], four trials compared 4 L SSD PEG vs 4 L SpDs PEG[13,14,19,20], and six trials compared 2 L SSD PEG vs ( $\geq 3$  L) SpDs PEG[11,15-18,21]. Interestingly, in a study by Zhang *et al*[11], patients were assigned to three groups: 2 L SSD PEG, 2 L SSD PEG with adjuvant laxative (linaclotide) and 4 L SpDs PEG.

Bowel cleanliness was evaluated either with BBPS[11,12,14,15,18,23-27] or OBPS[13,16,17,19-22,28]. An adequate bowel preparation was defined as a total BBPS score  $\geq 6$  with all colon segments scores  $\geq 2$ , or a total OBPS score < 5 (including score < 7 by De Leone, score  $\leq 3$  by Cesaro) or all colon segment OBPS score < 2. Diet restriction was mentioned in 16 trials and consisted of low residual diet/low-fiber foods[11,14-16,20-25,27-28] or clear liquid diet[13,15,17,19,26,28] before colonoscopy. Colonoscopy was performed with optimal preparation-to-colonoscopy (PC) interval time in only 6 trials[11,12,15,16,21, 24], while 9 trials did not mention the PC interval[13,14,20,22,23,25-28].

#### Quality of bowel cleanliness

Fourteen studies provided dichotomous information on adequate bowel preparation between the SSDs and SpDs groups, regardless of adjuvant laxative use, and significant heterogeneity was observed (P < 0.00001, P = 76%) in the pooled estimate. Using a random-effects model, no statistically significant difference was found between the two groups (RR = 0.97; 95%CI: 0.92-1.02) (P = 0.19) as shown in Figure 2.

Continuous data on right colon BBPS was available in 9 trials (Figure 3). No significant heterogeneity was observed (P = 0.22,  $I^2 = 25\%$ ). Using a fixed-effects model, we found that there was no significant difference between the two arms (MD = 0.00; 95% CI: -0.04, 0.03).

Five studies provided continuous data on right colon OBPS (Figure 4), and significant heterogeneity was observed (P = 0.001,  $l^2 = 78\%$ ). Using a random-effects model, no significant difference was found between the two arms (MD = 0.04; 95%CI: -0.27, 0.34) (P = 0.82).

Zaishidenq® WJCC | https://www.wjgnet.com

#### Table 1 Characteristics of included studies

Ref.	Type of study	Participants and years of age	Bowel preparation	Patients with SSD/SpDs, <i>n</i>	Diet instruction	Colonoscopy timing	Outcomes	Interval, PC	Jadad score, modified	Use of adjuvant
Zhang et al [11], 2021	Single-center, single-blind, RCT	Outpatients 18-70 yr	$\begin{array}{l} SSD \ (A): 2 \ L \ PEG \ 6 \ h \ before \ procedure; \\ SSD \ (B): 290 \\ \mu g \ Lin \ 7 \ h \ before \ + \ 0.5 \ L \ water, \ 2 \ L \ PEG \ 6 \ h \ before \\ colonoscopy; \\ SpDs: 2 \ L \ PEG \ at \ 21:00 \ the \ day \ prior, \ 2 \ L \\ PEG \ 6 \ h \ before \ colonoscopy \end{array}$	139A/141B/140	1-d LRD	Morning: 8:00-11:30; Afternoon: 13:30- 17:00	BBPS	6 h	4	SSD (B): Linaclotide
Barkun <i>et</i> al[ <mark>12</mark> ], 2020	Multicenter, single-blind, RCT	Outpatients ≥ 18 yr	SSD: 2 L PEG 4 h before colonoscopy + 15 mg bis at 14:00 the day before; SpDs: 2 L PEG at 19:00 the day before, 2 L PEG 4-5 h before colonoscopy	583/582	Not described	10:30-16:30	BBPS	2-3 h	5	Bisacodyl
Castro <i>et al</i> [13], 2019	Single-center, single-blind, RCT	Outpatients ≥ 18 yr	SSD: 4 L PEG at 6:00; SpDs: 2 L PEG at 18:00 the day before, 2 L PEG 6 h before colonoscopy	142/158	CLD after regular breakfast the day before	13:00-16:30	OBPS	Not described	5	No
Seo <i>et al</i> [14], 2019	Single-center, single-blind, RCT	Outpatients 40-75 yr	SSD (Mor): 4 L PEG at 5:00; SSD (Aft): 2 L PEG at 7:00 + 2 L PEG at 10:00; SpDs: 2 L PEG at 21:00 the day before, 2 L PEG at 7:00 (Mor) or at 10:00 (Aft)	172/167	LFF for 2 d, soft diet dinner the day prior	Morning 10:00-12:00; Afternoon 13:30- 17:00	BBPS	Not described	3	No
Kang <i>et al</i> [ <b>15</b> ], 2018	Single-center, single-blind, RCT	Patients 18-70 yr	SSD: 2 L PEG 4-6 h before colonoscopy; SpDs: 2 L PEG at 19:00-21:00 the day before, 2 L PEG 4-6 h before colonoscopy	470/470	Regular meal for lunch and CLD or LRD for dinner the day before	Morning 8:30-12:00; Afternoon 13:00- 16:00	BBPS	2-4 h	5	No
Zhang <i>et al</i> [ <mark>16</mark> ], 2015	Multicenter, single-blind, RCT	Patients 18-75 yr	SSD: 2 L PEG 4-6 h before colonoscopy; SpDs: 1 L PEG at 21:00 the day before, 2 L PEG 4-6 h before colonoscopy	159/159	1-d LRD	Not described	OBPS	2-4 h	3	No
Shah <i>et al</i> [ <mark>17]</mark> , 2014	Single-center, single-blind, RCT	Patients ≥ 18 yr	SSD: 2 L PEG at 5:00-7:00; SpDs: 1 L PEG at 18:00-19:00 the day before, 1 L PEG at 6:00-7:00	103/97	1-d liquid diet and CLD after midnight	11:00-16:00	OBPS	≥4 h	5	No
Tellez- Avila <i>et al</i> [ <mark>18]</mark> , 2014	Single-center, single-blind, RCT	Inpatients ≥ 18 yr	SSD: 2 L PEG at 6:00-8:00; SpDs: 2 L PEG at 17:00-19:00 the day before, 2 L PEG at 6:00-8:00	61/67	Not described	Not described	BBPS	≥3 h	5	No
Kotwal <i>et</i> al[ <mark>19</mark> ], 2014	Single-center, single-blind, RCT	Inpatients 18-80 yr	SSD: 4 L PEG at 5:00-9:00; SpDs: 2 L PEG at 19:00-21:00 the day before, 2 L PEG at 7:00-9:00	60/60	1-d CLD	After 11:00	OBPS	≥2 h	5	No
Kim et al [ <mark>20]</mark> , 2014	Single-center, single-blind, RCT	Outpatients 18-75 yr	SSD: 4 L PEG 6 h before colonoscopy; SpDs: 2 L PEG at 18:00 the day before, 2 L PEG 4-6 h before colonoscopy	50/50	Avoid high-fiber foods 3 d prior	Not described	OBPS	Not described	2	No
Seo <i>et al</i> [21], 2013	Single-center, single-blind, RCT	Outpatients 18-85 yr	SSD: 2 L PEG 5 h before colonoscopy; SpDs: 2 L PEG at 18:00 the day before, 2 L PEG 5 h before colonoscopy	103/102	3-d LRD	9:00-17:00	OBPS	≥3 h	5	No
Cesaro <i>et al</i> [22], 2013	Single-center, single-blind,	Outpatients 18-85 yr	SSD: 2 L PEG-CS at 6:00 + bis 10-20 mg at 22:00 the day before; SpDs: 3 L PEG at 19:00 the day before, 1 L	50/51	3-d LRD	11:00-18:00	OBPS	Not described	5	Bisacodyl

	RCT		PEG at 7:00							
Kwon <i>et al</i> [ <mark>23</mark> ], 2016	Multicenter, single-blind, RCT	Outpatients ≥ 18 yr	SSD: 1 L PEG-ASc + 0.5 L water at 6:00, 20 mg bis + 0.5 L water at 20:00 the day before; SpDs: 1 L PEG-ASc + 0.5 L water at 20:00 the day before, 1 L PEG-ASc + 0.5 L water at 6:00	92/97	LFF for 3 d, soft meal on the day prior	Not described	BBPS	≥3 h	5	Bisacodyl
Kang et al [ <mark>24</mark> ], 2017	Single-center, single-blind, RCT	Outpatients 20-75 yr	SSD: 1 L PEG-ASc 4 h before colonoscopy + 1 L water, 10 mg bis at 21:00 the day before; SpDs: 1 L PEG-ASc at 20:00 the day before + 0.5 L water, 1 L PEG-ASc 4 h before colonoscopy + 0.5 L water	100/100	3-d LRD	9:00-13:00	BBPS	> 2 h	3	Bisacodyl
Choi <i>et al</i> [ <mark>25</mark> ], 2018	Single-center, single-blind, RCT	Outpatient 18-80 yr	SSD: 1 L PEG-ASc 5 h before colonoscopy + 0.5 L water, Pru at 19:00 the day before + 0.5 L water; SpDs: 1 L PEG-ASc at 19:00 the day before + 0.5 L water, 1 L PEG-ASc 5 h before colonoscopy + 0.5 L water	130/130	3-d LRD	9:00-13:00	BBPS	Not described	5	Prucalopride
Kim et al [ <mark>26</mark> ], 2019	Single-center, single-blind, RCT	Outpatients 20-70 yr	SSD: 1L PEG-ASc at 5:00 + 1 L water + 20 mg bis; SpDs: 1 L PEG-ASc at 21:00 the day before + 0.5 L water, 1 L PEG-ASc at 5:00 + 0.5 L water	83/85	1-d CLD	8:30-12:00	BBPS	Not described	4	Bisacodyl
Kim et al [ <mark>27</mark> ], 2020	Single-center, single-blind, RCT	Patients 18-74 yr	SSD: 1 L PEG-ASc 5 h before endoscopy + 1 L water, 10 mg bis at 21:00 the day before; SpDs: 1 L PEG-ASc at 21:00 the day before + 0.5 L water, 1 L PEG-ASc 5 h before endoscopy + 0.5 L water	99/99	3-d LRD	9:00-17:00	BBPS	Not described	4	Bisacodyl
de Leone <i>et al</i> [28], 2013	Multicenter, single-blind, RCT	Outpatients 18-85 yr	SSD: 3-4 tablets bis at bedtime, 2 L PEG-CS 5 h before endoscopy; SpDs: 2 L PEG at 18:00 the day before, 2 L PEG 5 h before endoscopy	78/79	LFF for 3 d, CLD the day before	Morning	OBPS	Not described	4	Bisacodyl

SSD: Same-day single-dose; SpDs: Split-dose; PC: Preparation-to-colonoscopy; LFF: Low-fiber foods; LRD: Low residual diet; CLD: Clear liquid diet; PEG-CS: Polyethylene glycol with citrates and simethicone; PEG-ASC: Polyethylene glycol ascorbic acid; RCT: Randomized controlled trial; PEG: Polyethylene glycol; Lin: Linaclotide; BBPS: Boston Bowel Preparation Scale; bis: Bisacodyl; OBPS: Ottawa Bowel Preparation Scale; Mor: Morning; Aft: Afternoon; Pru: Prucalopride.

#### Subgroup analysis

**2** L SSD with adjuvant *vs* SpDs: Seven trials provided dichotomous information on adequate bowel preparation comparing the 2 L SSDs with adjuvant laxative use to the ( $\geq$  3 L) SpDs regimen. The pooled estimates showed significant heterogeneity within the included studies (*P* = 0.05, *I*<sup>2</sup> = 51%). Using a random-effects model, no statistically significant difference was found between the two groups (RR = 1.00; 95% CI: 0.95, 1.05) (*P* = 0.99). Continuous data on the right colon BBPS was provided in 7 studies. Pooled estimate results showed no significant heterogeneity (*P* = 0.12, *I*<sup>2</sup> = 41%). Using a fixed-effects model, we found that there was no significant difference between the two groups. (MD = 0.00; 95% CI: -0.05, 0.05) (*P* = 0.93). Only 1 study reported data on right colon OBPS (Table 2).

**2** L SSD without adjuvant *vs* SpDs: Five trials compared 2 L SSDs without adjuvant to  $\geq$  3 L SpDs regimens and provided categorical data on the adequacy of bowel preparation. The pooled estimate results showed significant heterogeneity within the included studies (*P* < 0.00001, *I*<sup>2</sup> = 90%). Using a random-effects model, no statistical difference was reported between the two groups (RR = 0.86; 95% CI:

#### Pan H et al. Bowel cleansing efficacy and tolerability

Table 2 Subgroup analysis								
Subgroup	Studies, <i>n</i>	SSD, n	SpDs, <i>n</i>	ľ², %	<i>P</i> value for heterogeneity	Pooled analysis (cat- RR/con-MD)	95%CI	<i>P</i> value
2 L SSD with adjuvant vs SpDs								
Adequate bowel preparation (categorical)[11,12,22,23,25,27,28]	7	1172	1177	51	0.05	1.00	(0.95, 1.05)	0.99
BBPS score for right colon (continuous)[11,12,23-27]	7	1227	1232	41	0.12	0.00	(-0.05, 0.05)	0.93
OBPS score for right colon (continuous)[22]	1	50	51					
2 L SSD without adjuvant vs SpDs								
Adequate bowel preparation (categorical)[11,15,16,18,21]	5	932	938	90	< 0.00001	0.86	(0.72, 1.02)	0.07
BBPS score for right colon (continuous)[11,15]	2	611	610	0	1.00	0.00	(-0.07, 0.07)	1.00
OBPS score for right colon (continuous)[16,21]	2	262	261	89	0.003	0.26	(-0.20, 0.72)	0.26
4 L SSD without adjuvant vs SpDs								
Adequate bowel preparation (categorical)[13,14,20]	3	364	375	0	0.66	0.99	(0.94, 1.05)	0.82
BBPS score for right colon (continuous)[14]	1	172	167					
OBPS score for right colon (continuous)[19,20]	2	110	110	0	0.71	-0.06	(-0.30, 0.18)	0.62

SSD: Same-day single-dose; SpDs: Split-dose; BBPS: Boston bowel preparation scale; OBPS: Ottawa bowel preparation scale; cat-RR/con-MD: Categoricalrelative risk ratio/continuous-mean differences; CI: Confidence interval.

0.72, 1.02) (P = 0.07).

Two trials provided continuous data on right colon BBPS. The pooled estimates showed no significant heterogeneity between both studies (P = 1.00,  $l^2 = 0\%$ ). Using a fixed-effects model, no significant difference was found between the two groups. (MD = 0.00; 95% CI: -0.07, 0.07) (P = 1.00). Two studies provided continuous data on right colon OBPS. The pooled estimates showed significant heterogeneity (P = 0.003, P = 89%). Using a random-effects model, no significant difference was found between the two groups. (MD = 0.26; 95%CI: -0.20, 0.72) (P = 0.26) (Table 2).

4 L SSD without adjuvant vs SpDs: Three trials compared the adequacy of bowel preparation between 4 L SSDs without adjuvant and 4 L SpDs regimens. The pooled estimates showed that no significant heterogeneity was present within these studies (P = 0.66, P = 0.66). Using a fixed-effects model, we found that there was no significant difference between the two groups (RR = 0.99; 95% CI: 0.94, 1.05) (P = 0.82). Only 1 study reported data on the right colon BBPS.

The right colon OBPS scores were provided in 2 studies. The pooled estimates showed no significant heterogeneity between both studies (P = 0.71,  $I^2 = 0\%$ ). Using a fixed-effects model, no significant difference was found between the two groups. (MD = -0.06; 95% CI: -0.30, 0.18) (P = 0.62) (Table 2).

#### Secondary outcomes

Fifteen studies provided dichotomous information on sleep disturbance between the SSD and SpDs PEG groups (Table 3). During the pooled estimates, significant heterogeneity was observed (P < 0.00001,  $I^2 =$ 74%). Using a random-effects model, a significant difference was found between the two groups (RR = 0.52; 95% CI: 0.40, 0.68) (P < 0.00001). During subgroup analysis, 7 trials comparing 2 L SSD with adjuvant vs SpDs showed no significant difference in sleep disturbance between the two groups (RR = 0.69; 95%CI: 0.43, 1.10) (P = 0.12).

Ten trials provided dichotomous information on patient willingness to repeat the procedure using the same preparation between the SSD and SpDs PEG groups (Table 3). During the pooled estimates, significant heterogeneity was observed (P < 0.00001,  $l^2 = 90\%$ ). Using a random-effects model, a significant difference was found between the two groups (RR=1.15; 95% CI: 1.03, 1.29) (P = 0.01). Two trials in subgroup analysis of 4 L SSD without adjuvant vs SpDs found no significant difference between the two groups (RR = 0.89; 95%CI: 0.71, 1.13) (P = 0.34).



WJCC | https://www.wjgnet.com

Table 3 Secondary out	Table 3 Secondary outcome												
Secondary outcome	Studies ( <i>n</i> )	SSD ( <i>n</i> )	SpDs ( <i>n</i> )	ľ (%)	<i>P</i> value for heterogeneity	Pooled analysis (cat- RR/con-MD)	95%CI	P value					
Sleep disturbance	15	2591	2463	74	< 0.00001	0.52	(0.40, 0.68)	< 0.00001					
2 L SSD with adjuvant <i>vs</i> SpDs	7	1214	1215	69	0.003	0.69	(0.43, 1.10)	0.12					
2 L SSD without adjuvant <i>vs</i> SpDs	6	1014	1013	80	0.0002	0.45	(0.30, 0.67)	< 0.0001					
4 L SSD without adjuvant <i>vs</i> SpDs	3	363	375	67	0.05	0.47	(0.28, 0.78)	0.004					
Willingness to repeat	10	1996	1855	90	< 0.00001	1.15	(1.03 <i>,</i> 1.29)	0.01					
2 L SSD with adjuvant <i>vs</i> SpDs	6	1073	1078	89	< 0.00001	1.24	(1.06, 1.45)	0.008					
2 L SSD without adjuvant <i>vs</i> SpDs	3	691	690	82	0.004	1.14	(1.01, 1.29)	0.03					
4 L SSD without adjuvant <i>vs</i> SpDs	2	232	227	54	0.14	0.89	(0.71, 1.13)	0.34					
Side effects													
Nausea	17	2715	2592	68	< 0.0001	0.95	(0.78 <i>,</i> 1.16)	0.63					
Vomiting	16	2644	2521	64	0.0002	0.96	(0.66, 1.38)	0.81					
Abdominal pain	17	2715	2592	38	0.06	0.75	(0,62, 0.90)	0.002					
Bloating	15	2205	2077	67	0.0001	0.80	(0.63, 1.01)	0.06					

SSD: Same-day single-dose; SpDs: Split-dose; cat-RR/con-MD: Categorical-relative risk ratio/continuous-mean differences; CI: Confidence interval.

The incidence of adverse effects, including nausea, vomiting, abdominal pain and bloating, was reported in 17, 16, 17 and 15 trials, respectively (Table 3). No significant difference in nausea (RR = 0.95; 95% CI: 0.78, 1.16), vomiting (RR = 0.96; 95% CI: 0.66, 1.38) and bloating (RR = 0.80; 95% CI: 0.63, 1.01) was found between the two groups. However, there was a significant difference in abdominal pain between the two arms, favoring the SSD group (RR = 0.75; 95% CI: 0.62, 0.90).

#### Publication bias

For the publication bias, in our meta-analysis a better symmetry was present with the use of funnel plots (Figure 5). The Grades of Recommendation, Assessment, Development and Evaluation as one systematic approach rated the certainty of evidence for moderate level in this systematic review and meta-analysis (Table 4).

#### DISCUSSION

This updated meta-analysis reviewed 18 trials comparing the efficacy and tolerability of bowel preparation between SSD PEG-based and large-volume SpDs PEG regimens. In recent years, the split dose of 4 L PEG has been adopted as a standard regimen for bowel preparation. However, patients often complain of the large-volume regimen and sleep disturbance due to frequent bowel movements and abdominal discomfort. To enhance patient compliance with the preparation, several studies have suggested adding other laxatives, such as bisacodyl, linaclotide or prucalopride, to a low-volume PEG bowel preparation to reduce the solution volume[11,12,25]. In the present study, according to the volume of PEG ingested and combination with adjuvant laxative, SSD PEG-based regimens were separated into three subgroups: low-volume (2 L) SSD PEG combined with an adjuvant agent, lowvolume (2 L) SSD PEG without adjuvant laxative and large-volume (4 L) SSD PEG without adjuvant laxative. In a pooled analysis, we have shown that SSD PEG was as effective as SpDs PEG-based regimens in terms of bowel cleanliness, regardless of adjuvant laxative use and dosage.

WJCC | https://www.wjgnet.com

### Table 4 Grades of Recommendation, Assessment, Development and Evaluation rated the certainty of evidence

No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	SSD	SpDs	RR (95%CI)	Effect/Absolute	Quality	Importance
Adequate b	owel cleanliness											
14	Randomized trials	No serious risk of bias	Serious <sup>1</sup>	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	2002/2468 (81.1%)	1973/2350 (84.0%)	RR 0.97 (0.92 to 1.02)	25 fewer per 1000 (from 67 fewer to 17 more)	(+++) moderate	Critical
								85.5%		26 fewer per 1000 (from 68 fewer to 17 more)		
Right colon	BBPS											
9	Randomized trials	No serious risk of bias	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	1869	1869	-	Md 0 higher (0.04 lower to 0.03 higher)	(++++) high	Critical
Right colon	OBPS											
5	Randomized trials	No serious risk of bias	Serious <sup>1</sup>	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	422	422	-	Md 0.04 higher (0.27 lower to 0.34 higher)	(+++) moderate	Critical
Sleep distur	bance											
15	Randomized trials	No serious risk of bias	Serious <sup>1</sup>	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	348/2591 (13.4%)	651/2463 (26.4%)	RR 0.52 (0.40 to 0.68)	127 fewer per 1000 (from 85 fewer to 159 fewer)	(+++) moderate	Critical
								32.0%		154 fewer per 1000 (from 102 fewer to 192 fewer)		
Willingness	to repeat											
10	Randomized trials	No serious risk of bias	Serious <sup>1</sup>	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	1624/1996 (81.4%)	1269/1855 (68.4%)	RR 1.15 (1.03 to 1.29)	103 more per 1000 (from 21 more to 198 more)	(+++) moderate	Critical
								65.2%		98 more per 1000 (from 20 more to 189 more)		
Nausea												
17	Randomized trials	No serious risk of bias	Serious <sup>1</sup>	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	516/2715 (19.0%)	559/2592 (21.6%)	RR 0.95 (0.78 to 1.16)	11 fewer per 1000 (from 47 fewer to 35 more)	(+++) moderate	Critical
								20.0%		10 fewer per 1000 (from 44 fewer to 32 more)		
Vomiting												
16	Randomized trials	No serious risk of bias	Serious <sup>1</sup>	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	191/2644 (7.2%)	202/2521 (8.0%)	RR 0.96 (0.66 to 1.38)	3 fewer per 1000 (from 27 fewer to 30 more)	(+++) moderate	Critical
								7.2%		3 fewer per 1000 (from 24 fewer to 27 more)		

Abdominal	pain											
17	Randomized trials	No serious risk of bias	Serious <sup>1</sup>	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	168/2715 (6.2%)	221/2592 (8.5%)	RR 0.75 (0.62 to 0.9)	21 fewer per 1000 (from 9 fewer to 32 fewer)	(+++) moderate	Critical
								8.2%		20 fewer per 1000 (from 8 fewer to 31 fewer)		
Bloating												
15	Randomized trials	No serious risk of bias	Serious <sup>1</sup>	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	322/2205 (14.6%)	415/2077 (20.0%)	RR 0.8 (0.63 to 1.01)	40 fewer per 1000 (from 74 fewer to 2 more)	(+++) moderate	Critical
								18.4%		37 fewer per 1000 (from 68 fewer to 2 more)		

<sup>1</sup>Only a few different studies have shown conflicting results. SSD: Same-day single-dose; SpDs: Split-dose; CI: Confidence interval; RR: Relative risk; BBPS; Boston Bowel Preparation Scale; Md: Moderate; OBPS: Ottawa Bowel Preparation Scale.

Previous meta-analyses by Cheng *et al*[29] and Avalos *et al*[30] showed a trend to the equivalent efficacy for bowel preparation in terms of bowel cleanliness and adenoma detection rate when compared to same-day (one or two doses) with split-dose bowel preparation regimens regardless of purgative type. Patients with a history of pelvic surgery and colorectal surgery as high-risks of poor bowel preparation were not excluded by the forementioned studies[29,30]. Other identified patient-related risk factors for inadequate bowel preparation include diabetes and constipation[31]. In the present study, patients with a history of constipation and diabetes mellitus were included, and analysis results obtained were consistent with previous studies. We considered that the SSD PEG-based arm had the same efficacy in bowel cleanliness as the SpDs arm for patients at high-risk of poor bowel preparation by complying with the optimal PC interval and diet instruction before colonoscopy.

In a study by Seo *et al*[3], multivariate analysis showed that the PC interval, the amount of PEG ingested and compliance with diet instructions were significant contributors to satisfactory bowel preparation, regardless of when the procedure was performed during the day. Colonoscopies performed with a PC interval of 3 to 5 h had the best bowel-cleansing quality throughout the colon, while a PC interval of 3 to 7 h was an acceptable scale for bowel preparation. It has been reported that after the optimal time window, small-bowel contents of bubbles and viscous bile-stained mucous are evacuated into the colon and restrict the visibility of the colonic mucosa, especially in the right colon. Small flat lesions that are difficult to identify in the right colon can easily be missed by the endoscopist if concealed by opaque small bowel effluent. Accordingly, same-day preparation with split-doses and full-doses improves bowel cleansing and increases the detection rate of small adenomas[28].

Compliance with dietary instructions has been documented as another factor affecting the quality of bowel preparation. A meta-analysis by Chen *et al*[32] that analyzed factors of inadequate bowel preparation found no significant difference between a low residual diet and a clear liquid diet the day before colonoscopy. In our meta-analysis, in all included trials, patients in both arms followed a low residual diet or clear liquid diet, and no heterogeneity was found for dietary restriction before colonoscopy.

Pan H et al. Bowel cleansing efficacy and tolerability

	SSD	)	SPD	)		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
Zhang 2021	231	280	128	140	9.6%	0.90 [0.84, 0.97]	
Barkun 2020	478	583	495	582	10.8%	0.96 [0.92, 1.01]	
Castro 2019	94	142	107	158	5.4%	0.98 [0.83, 1.15]	
Seo 2019	169	172	163	167	11.6%	1.01 [0.98, 1.04]	+
Kang 2018	414	470	409	470	10.9%	1.01 [0.96, 1.06]	+
Zhang 2015	77	159	124	159	4.6%	0.62 [0.52, 0.74]	<b>←</b>
Tellez 2014	41	61	51	67	3.6%	0.88 [0.71, 1.10]	
Kim 2014	41	50	42	50	4.7%	0.98 [0.82, 1.17]	
Seo 2013	72	103	75	102	4.9%	0.95 [0.80, 1.13]	
Cesaro 2013	35	50	25	51	1.9%	1.43 [1.02, 1.99]	<b>&gt;</b>
Kwon 2016	87	91	84	96	8.8%	1.09 [1.00, 1.19]	
Choi 2018	108	130	115	130	8.2%	0.94 [0.85, 1.04]	
Kim 2020	85	99	85	99	7.4%	1.00 [0.89, 1.12]	<b>_</b>
de Leone 2013	70	78	70	79	7.6%	1.01 [0.91, 1.13]	
Total (95% CI)		2468		2350	100.0%	0.97 [0.92, 1.02]	◆
Total events	2002		1973				
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.01; Chi	I² = 76%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.30 (P = 0.19)							U.7 U.85 I 1.2 1.5
						<b>DOT</b> : 10.12998/wicc.v	10.i22.7844 <b>Convright</b> ©The Author(s) 2022.

Figure 2 Forest plot of adequate bowel cleanliness. SSD: Same-day single-dose regimen; SPD: Split-dose regimen; CI: Confidence interval.

		SSD			SPD			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl
Barkun 2020	2.45	0.64	583	2.39	0.62	582	28.9%	0.06 [-0.01, 0.13]	+
Choi 2018	2.02	0.63	130	2.15	0.65	130	6.3%	-0.13 [-0.29, 0.03]	
Kang 2017	2.02	0.81	100	2.19	0.66	100	3.6%	-0.17 [-0.37, 0.03]	<b>←</b> −−−−−−
Kang 2018	2.2	0.6	470	2.2	0.6	470	25.7%	0.00 [-0.08, 0.08]	<b>+</b>
Kim 2019	2.34	0.52	83	2.42	0.52	85	6.1%	-0.08 [-0.24, 0.08]	
Kim 2020	2.07	0.811	99	2.11	0.768	99	3.1%	-0.04 [-0.26, 0.18]	
Kwon 2016	2.5	0.6	91	2.4	0.7	96	4.4%	0.10 [-0.09, 0.29]	
Seo 2019	2.28	0.46	172	2.32	0.51	167	14.1%	-0.04 [-0.14, 0.06]	
Zhang 2021	2.3	0.6	141	2.3	0.6	140	7.7%	0.00 [-0.14, 0.14]	
Total (95% Cl)			1869			1869	100.0%	-0.00 [-0.04, 0.03]	. ◆
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> =	10.72, c	lf = 8 (P	= 0.22	); l² = 25	i%				
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.22	? (P = 0.	83)						-0.2 -0.1 0 0.1 0.2
							D.01	. 10 12000/	

**DOI**: 10.12998/wjcc.v10.i22.7844 **Copyright** ©The Author(s) 2022.

Figure 3 Forest plot of right colon Boston Bowel Preparation Scale. SSD: Same-day single-dose regimen; SPD: Split-dose regimen; CI: Confidence interval.

Consistent with a study by Avalos *et al*[30] we found that significantly less sleep disturbance was associated with the SSD PEG-based regimens without adjuvant laxatives than the SpDs PEG. However, the incidence of sleep disturbance in combination regimens of low-volume (2 L) SSD with an adjuvant laxative (bisacodyl, linaclotide or prucalopride) was comparable with SpDs regimens. It was noted that bowel movements induced by bisacodyl taken on the night before colonoscopy occurred after waking up. De Leone *et al*[28] suggested that sleeping difficulties were more likely to be attributed to the anxiety for the day-after procedure rather than nocturnal awakenings for defecation or abdominal pain in patients who took the combination regimen consisting of low-volume PEG with bisacodyl. Based on these findings, we conclude that the split-dose regimen taken the night before colonoscopy and anxiety for the procedure play an important role in the sleep quality of patients.

Patient tolerance of bowel preparation regimens mainly depends on sleep disruptions and adverse effects such as nausea, vomiting, abdominal pain/cramping and bloating. Significantly less nocturnal awakenings for defecation were reported in the SSD PEG-based arm than other SpDs PEG regimens, and no significant difference in other adverse effects was found. Given the low incidence of sleep disturbance and abdominal pain, patients were more tolerant to the SSD PEG-based arm for bowel preparation.

		SSD		SPD				Mean Difference		Mean Difference			
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl		IV, Random, 95% Cl			
Cesaro 2013	2.78	1.95	50	3.41	1.9	51	10.3%	-0.63 [-1.38, 0.12]	-		-		
Kim 2014	1.66	0.8	50	1.69	0.69	50	22.3%	-0.03 [-0.32, 0.26]			_		
Kotwal 2014	2.06	1.21	60	2.19	1.19	60	18.0%	-0.13 [-0.56, 0.30]					
Seo 2013	1.41	0.77	103	1.38	0.78	102	24.8%	0.03 [-0.18, 0.24]			_		
Zhang 2015	1.5	1	159	1	1	159	24.6%	0.50 [0.28, 0.72]					
Total (95% CI)			422			422	100.0%	0.04 [-0.27, 0.34]		•			
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.08; Chi² = 18.18, df = 4 (P = 0.001); I² = 78%										-1 0		 1	+
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.23 (P = 0.82)										SSD	SPD	I	2

DOI: 10.12998/wjcc.v10.i22.7844 Copyright ©The Author(s) 2022.

Figure 4 Forest plot of right colon Ottawa Bowel Preparation Scale. SSD: Same-day single-dose regimen; SPD: Split-dose regimen; CI: Confidence interval.





Moreover, patients who received the low-volume (2 L) SSD PEG regimens exhibited increased willingness to repeat the procedure using the same preparation. However, the large-volume (4 L) SSD PEG arm was not superior to the SpDs regimens in terms of willingness to repeat the procedure using the same preparation. This finding suggested that patient intolerance to ingestion of large volumes over a short period was a significant factor contributing to non-compliance and decreased willingness to repeat the procedure with the same regimen.

There are several advantages to this meta-analysis. We performed the extensive retrieval strategy and included only randomized controlled trials. Other advantages were related to the quality of the included studies and to the publication bias. The methodological quality assessment of the included studies was moderate to high according to the Cochrane risk of bias tool and modified Jadad score. For the publication bias, in our meta-analysis a rough symmetry was present with the use of funnel plots and the Grades of Recommendation, Assessment, Development and Evaluation approach.

This meta-analysis has several limitations. First, we enrolled only adult patients and excluded those who had undergone colorectal surgery and/or bowel obstruction; accordingly, the findings of our metaanalysis cannot be generalized for all patients that undergo colonoscopy. Moreover, it is widely acknowledged that constipation is a high-risk factor for poor preparation; however, there was a certain level of inconsistency on the proportion and severity of constipation within the included studies. Furthermore, adenoma detection rate was not evaluated as a secondary outcome. Indeed, adenoma detection rate is a quality indicator for colonoscopy and can be influenced by the endoscopist's level of expertise and the quality of the bowel preparation[33].

Raisbideng® WJCC | https://www.wjgnet.com

#### CONCLUSION

We found that the SSD regimens of PEG were non-inferior to large-volume ( $\geq$  3 L) SpDs PEG in terms of bowel cleanliness. Better tolerance to SSD PEG was accounted for by less sleep disturbance and abdominal pain than with the SpDs regimens. Given its efficacy and tolerability, the low-volume (2 L) SSD PEG regimen has huge prospects as a superior alternative to SpDs regimens as long as the optimal PC interval and dietary instructions for bowel preparation are respected.

### ARTICLE HIGHLIGHTS

#### Research background

High volume (4 L) split-dose regimens (SpDs) of polyethylene glycol (PEG) have been recommended as the gold-standard regimen for bowel preparation, but its large volume of fluids and poor tolerability have become sources of patient dissatisfaction.

#### Research motivation

The same-day single-dose (SSD) PEG has been recommended as an alternative for bowel preparation. However, its superiority compared to other regimens is a matter of debate.

#### Research objectives

To seek one PEG-based regimen for bowel preparation with characteristics of equal cleansing efficacy, reducing the preparation volume and improving patient tolerance.

#### Research methods

We conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis to compare the efficacy and tolerability of SSD PEG-based arm vs large-volume ( $\geq$  3 L) SpDs PEG solutions for bowel preparation before colonoscopy, regardless of adjuvant laxative use.

#### Research results

A total of 18 studies were included. There was no statistically significant difference of adequate bowel preparation, right colon Boston Bowel Preparation Scale and right colon Ottawa Bowel Preparation Scale between (2 L/4 L) SSDs and large-volume (4 L/3 L) SpDs, regardless of adjuvant laxative use. The use of SSDs had advantages of less sleep disturbance and lower incidence of abdominal pain. Patients that received low-volume (2 L) SSDs showed more willingness to repeat the procedure than patients receiving SpDs (P < 0.05).

#### Research conclusions

Regardless of adjuvant laxative use, the (2 L/4 L) SSDs PEG-based arm was considered equal or better than the large-volume ( $\geq$  3 L) SpDs PEG regimen in terms of bowel cleanliness and tolerability.

#### Research perspectives

Given its efficacy and tolerability, the low-volume (2 L) SSD PEG regimen has huge prospects as a superior alternative to SpDs regimens as long as the optimal preparation-to-colonoscopy interval and dietary instructions for bowel preparation are respected.

#### FOOTNOTES

Author contributions: Pan H, Fang CY, Chen JS and Wang C contributed to data curation and writing the original draft; Zheng XL and Pan H contributed to the methodology; Zheng XL, Pan H and Fang CY contributed to the project administration; Chen YD, Huang JM and Zhou YS contributed to the supervision; Zheng XL and He LP contributed to the writing, reviewing and editing; all authors have read and approved the final manuscript.

Supported by Startup Fund for scientific research, Fujian Medical University, No. 2019QH1181.

**Conflict-of-interest statement:** All the authors report no relevant conflicts of interest for this article.

PRISMA 2009 Checklist statement: The authors have read the PRISMA 2009 Checklist, and the manuscript was prepared and revised according to the PRISMA 2009 Checklist.

**Open-Access:** This article is an open-access article that was selected by an in-house editor and fully peer-reviewed by external reviewers. It is distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution NonCommercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license



their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited and the use is noncommercial. See: https://creativecommons.org/Licenses/by-nc/4.0/

#### Country/Territory of origin: China

ORCID number: Xiao-Ling Zheng 0000-0002-7885-8790.

S-Editor: Xing YX L-Editor: Filipodia P-Editor: Xing YX

#### REFERENCES

- 1 Chung YW, Han DS, Park KH, Kim KO, Park CH, Hahn T, Yoo KS, Park SH, Kim JH, Park CK. Patient factors predictive of inadequate bowel preparation using polyethylene glycol: a prospective study in Korea. J Clin Gastroenterol 2009; 43: 448-452 [PMID: 18978506 DOI: 10.1097/MCG.0b013e3181662442]
- Nguyen DL, Wieland M. Risk factors predictive of poor quality preparation during average risk colonoscopy screening: the importance of health literacy. J Gastrointestin Liver Dis 2010; 19: 369-372 [PMID: 21188326]
- 3 Seo EH, Kim TO, Park MJ, Joo HR, Heo NY, Park J, Park SH, Yang SY, Moon YS. Optimal preparation-to-colonoscopy interval in split-dose PEG bowel preparation determines satisfactory bowel preparation quality: an observational prospective study. Gastrointest Endosc 2012; 75: 583-590 [PMID: 22177570 DOI: 10.1016/j.gie.2011.09.029]
- ASGE Standards of Practice Committee, Saltzman JR, Cash BD, Pasha SF, Early DS, Muthusamy VR, Khashab MA, Chathadi KV, Fanelli RD, Chandrasekhara V, Lightdale JR, Fonkalsrud L, Shergill AK, Hwang JH, Decker GA, Jue TL, Sharaf R, Fisher DA, Evans JA, Foley K, Shaukat A, Eloubeidi MA, Faulx AL, Wang A, Acosta RD. Bowel preparation before colonoscopy. Gastrointest Endosc 2015; 81: 781-794 [PMID: 25595062 DOI: 10.1016/j.gie.2014.09.048]
- 5 Hassan C, Bretthauer M, Kaminski MF, Polkowski M, Rembacken B, Saunders B, Benamouzig R, Holme O, Green S, Kuiper T, Marmo R, Omar M, Petruzziello L, Spada C, Zullo A, Dumonceau JM; European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy. Bowel preparation for colonoscopy: European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ESGE) guideline. Endoscopy 2013; 45: 142-150 [PMID: 23335011 DOI: 10.1055/s-0032-1326186]
- 6 Moon W. Optimal and safe bowel preparation for colonoscopy. Clin Endosc 2013; 46: 219-223 [PMID: 23767029 DOI: 10.5946/ce.2013.46.3.219]
- Lim YJ, Hong SJ. What is the best strategy for successful bowel preparation under special conditions? World J 7 Gastroenterol 2014; 20: 2741-2745 [PMID: 24659865 DOI: 10.3748/wjg.v20.i11.2741]
- Enestvedt BK, Tofani C, Laine LA, Tierney A, Fennerty MB. 4-Liter split-dose polyethylene glycol is superior to other bowel preparations, based on systematic review and meta-analysis. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol 2012; 10: 1225-1231 [PMID: 22940741 DOI: 10.1016/j.cgh.2012.08.029]
- Rostom A, Jolicoeur E. Validation of a new scale for the assessment of bowel preparation quality. Gastrointest Endosc 9 2004; **59**: 482-486 [PMID: 15044882 DOI: 10.1016/s0016-5107(03)02875-x]
- Lai EJ, Calderwood AH, Doros G, Fix OK, Jacobson BC. The Boston bowel preparation scale: a valid and reliable 10 instrument for colonoscopy-oriented research. Gastrointest Endosc 2009; 69: 620-625 [PMID: 19136102 DOI: 10.1016/j.gie.2008.05.057]
- Zhang M, Zou W, Xu C, Jia R, Liu K, Xu Q, Xu H. Polyethylene glycol combined with linaclotide is an effective and well-11 tolerated bowel preparation regimen for colonoscopy: an endoscopist-blinded, randomized, controlled trial. Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol 2021 [PMID: 34034273 DOI: 10.1097/MEG.00000000002184]
- Barkun AN, Martel M, Epstein IL, Hallé P, Hilsden RJ, James PD, Rostom A, Sey M, Singh H, Sultanian R, Telford JJ, 12 von Renteln D. The Bowel CLEANsing National Initiative: A Low-Volume Same-Day Polyethylene Glycol (PEG) Preparation vs Low-Volume Split-Dose PEG With Bisacodyl or High-Volume Split-Dose PEG Preparations-A Randomized Controlled Trial. Am J Gastroenterol 2020; 115: 2068-2076 [PMID: 32740079 DOI: 10.14309/ajg.000000000000760]
- 13 Castro FJ, Al-Khairi B, Singh H, Mohameden M, Tandon K, Lopez R. Randomized Controlled Trial: Split-dose and Same-day Large Volume Bowel Preparation for Afternoon Colonoscopy Have Similar Quality of Preparation. J Clin Gastroenterol 2019; 53: 724-730 [PMID: 31021890 DOI: 10.1097/MCG.000000000001213]
- Seo M, Gweon TG, Huh CW, Ji JS, Choi H. Comparison of Bowel Cleansing Efficacy, Safety, Bowel Movement Kinetics, 14 and Patient Tolerability of Same-Day and Split-Dose Bowel Preparation Using 4 L of Polyethylene Glycol: A Prospective Randomized Study. Dis Colon Rectum 2019; 62: 1518-1527 [PMID: 31567921 DOI: 10.1097/DCR.00000000001499]
- 15 Kang X, Zhao L, Zhu Z, Leung F, Wang L, Wang X, Luo H, Zhang L, Dong T, Li P, Chen Z, Ren G, Jia H, Guo X, Pan Y, Fan D. Same-Day Single Dose of 2 Liter Polyethylene Glycol is Not Inferior to The Standard Bowel Preparation Regimen in Low-Risk Patients: A Randomized, Controlled Trial. Am J Gastroenterol 2018; 113: 601-610 [PMID: 29533397 DOI: 10.1038/ajg.2018.25]
- Zhang S, Li M, Zhao Y, Lv T, Shu Q, Zhi F, Cui Y, Chen M. 3-L split-dose is superior to 2-L polyethylene glycol in bowel 16 cleansing in Chinese population: a multicenter randomized, controlled trial. Medicine (Baltimore) 2015; 94: e472 [PMID: 25634195 DOI: 10.1097/MD.000000000000472]
- Shah H, Desai D, Samant H, Davavala S, Joshi A, Gupta T, Abraham P. Comparison of split-dosing vs non-split (morning) 17 dosing regimen for assessment of quality of bowel preparation for colonoscopy. World J Gastrointest Endosc 2014; 6: 606-611 [PMID: 25512770 DOI: 10.4253/wjge.v6.i12.606]
- Téllez-Ávila FI, Murcio-Pérez E, Saúl A, Herrera-Gómez S, Valdovinos-Andraca F, Acosta-Nava V, Barreto R, Elizondo-Rivera J. Efficacy and tolerability of low-volume (2 L) vs single- (4 L) vs split-dose (2 L + 2 L) polyethylene glycol bowel



preparation for colonoscopy: randomized clinical trial. Dig Endosc 2014; 26: 731-736 [PMID: 24645966 DOI: 10.1111/den.12265

- 19 Kotwal VS, Attar BM, Carballo MD, Lee SS, Kaura T, Go B, Zhang H, Trick WE. Morning-only polyethylene glycol is noninferior but less preferred by hospitalized patients as compared with split-dose bowel preparation. J Clin Gastroenterol 2014; 48: 414-418 [PMID: 24406474 DOI: 10.1097/MCG.0b013e31829f30e9]
- Kim ES, Lee WJ, Jeen YT, Choi HS, Keum B, Seo YS, Chun HJ, Lee HS, Um SH, Kim CD, Ryu HS. A randomized, 20 endoscopist-blinded, prospective trial to compare the preference and efficacy of four bowel-cleansing regimens for colonoscopy. Scand J Gastroenterol 2014; 49: 871-877 [PMID: 24940942 DOI: 10.3109/00365521.2014.910543]
- 21 Seo EH, Kim TO, Park MJ, Heo NY, Park J, Yang SY. Low-volume morning-only polyethylene glycol with specially designed test meals vs standard-volume split-dose polyethylene glycol with standard diet for colonoscopy: a prospective, randomized trial. Digestion 2013; 88: 110-118 [PMID: 23949563 DOI: 10.1159/000353244]
- 22 Cesaro P, Hassan C, Spada C, Petruzziello L, Vitale G, Costamagna G. A new low-volume isosmotic polyethylene glycol solution plus bisacodyl vs split-dose 4 L polyethylene glycol for bowel cleansing prior to colonoscopy: a randomised controlled trial. Dig Liver Dis 2013; 45: 23-27 [PMID: 22917636 DOI: 10.1016/j.dld.2012.07.011]
- Kwon JE, Lee JW, Im JP, Kim JW, Kim SH, Koh SJ, Kim BG, Lee KL, Kim SG, Kim JS, Jung HC. Comparable Efficacy 23 of a 1-L PEG and Ascorbic Acid Solution Administered with Bisacodyl vs a 2-L PEG and Ascorbic Acid Solution for Colonoscopy Preparation: A Prospective, Randomized and Investigator-Blinded Trial. PLoS One 2016; 11: e0162051 [PMID: 27588943 DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0162051]
- 24 Kang SH, Jeen YT, Lee JH, Yoo IK, Lee JM, Kim SH, Choi HS, Kim ES, Keum B, Lee HS, Chun HJ, Kim CD. Comparison of a split-dose bowel preparation with 2 Liters of polyethylene glycol plus ascorbic acid and 1 Liter of polyethylene glycol plus ascorbic acid and bisacodyl before colonoscopy. Gastrointest Endosc 2017; 86: 343-348 [PMID: 27889546 DOI: 10.1016/j.gie.2016.10.040]
- 25 Choi SJ, Kim ES, Choi BK, Min G, Kim W, Lee JM, Kim SH, Choi HS, Keum B, Jeen YT, Lee HS, Chun HJ, Kim CD. A randomized controlled trial comparing the efficacy of 1-L polyethylene glycol solution with ascorbic acid plus prucalopride vs 2-L polyethylene glycol solution with ascorbic acid for bowel preparation. Scand J Gastroenterol 2018; 53: 1619-1624 [PMID: 30621479 DOI: 10.1080/00365521.2018.1543450]
- 26 Kim SH, Kim ER, Kim K, Kim TJ, Hong SN, Chang DK, Kim YH. Combination of bisacodyl suppository and 1 L polyethylene glycol plus ascorbic acid is a non-inferior and comfortable regimen compared to 2 L polyethylene glycol plus ascorbic acid. Dig Endosc 2020; 32: 600-607 [PMID: 31574170 DOI: 10.1111/den.13548]
- Kim SH, Kim JH, Keum B, Jeon HJ, Jang SH, Choi SJ, Kim SH, Lee JM, Choi HS, Kim ES, Jeen YT, Lee HS, Chun HJ, 27 Kim CD. A Randomized, Endoscopist-Blinded, Prospective Trial to Compare the Efficacy and Patient Tolerability between Bowel Preparation Protocols Using Sodium Picosulfate Magnesium Citrate and Polyethylene-Glycol (1L and 2L) for Colonoscopy. Gastroenterol Res Pract 2020; 2020: 9548171 [PMID: 32190045 DOI: 10.1155/2020/9548171]
- 28 de Leone A, Tamayo D, Fiori G, Ravizza D, Trovato C, De Roberto G, Fazzini L, Dal Fante M, Crosta C. Same-day 2-L PEG-citrate-simethicone plus bisacodyl vs split 4-L PEG: Bowel cleansing for late-morning colonoscopy. World J Gastrointest Endosc 2013; 5: 433-439 [PMID: 24044042 DOI: 10.4253/wjge.v5.i9.433]
- Cheng YL, Huang KW, Liao WC, Luo JC, Lan KH, Su CW, Wang YJ, Hou MC. Same-day Versus Split-dose Bowel 29 Preparation Before Colonoscopy: A Meta-analysis. J Clin Gastroenterol 2018; 52: 392-400 [PMID: 28727630 DOI: 10.1097/MCG.00000000000860]
- 30 Avalos DJ, Castro FJ, Zuckerman MJ, Keihanian T, Berry AC, Nutter B, Sussman DA. Bowel Preparations Administered the Morning of Colonoscopy Provide Similar Efficacy to a Split Dose Regimen: A Meta Analysis. J Clin Gastroenterol 2018; 52: 859-868 [PMID: 28885304 DOI: 10.1097/MCG.00000000000866]
- Johnson DA, Barkun AN, Cohen LB, Dominitz JA, Kaltenbach T, Martel M, Robertson DJ, Boland CR, Giardello FM, 31 Lieberman DA, Levin TR, Rex DK; US Multi-Society Task Force on Colorectal Cancer. Optimizing adequacy of bowel cleansing for colonoscopy: recommendations from the US multi-society task force on colorectal cancer. Gastroenterology 2014; 147: 903-924 [PMID: 25239068 DOI: 10.1053/j.gastro.2014.07.002]
- 32 Chen E, Chen L, Wang F, Zhang W, Cai X, Cao G. Low-residue vs clear liquid diet before colonoscopy: An updated metaanalysis of randomized, controlled trials. Medicine (Baltimore) 2020; 99: e23541 [PMID: 33285772 DOI: 10.1097/MD.00000000023541
- 33 Kaminski MF, Regula J, Kraszewska E, Polkowski M, Wojciechowska U, Didkowska J, Zwierko M, Rupinski M, Nowacki MP, Butruk E. Quality indicators for colonoscopy and the risk of interval cancer. N Engl J Med 2010; 362: 1795-1803 [PMID: 20463339 DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa0907667]



WJCC | https://www.wjgnet.com



## Published by Baishideng Publishing Group Inc 7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA Telephone: +1-925-3991568 E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com Help Desk: https://www.f6publishing.com/helpdesk https://www.wjgnet.com

