World Journal of *Gastroenterology*

World J Gastroenterol 2022 August 21; 28(31): 4235-4474





Published by Baishideng Publishing Group Inc

WJG

World Journal of Gastroenterology

Contents

Weekly Volume 28 Number 31 August 21, 2022

REVIEW

4235	Early diagnosis of pancreatic cancer: What strategies to avoid a foretold catastrophe	
	Tonini V, Zanni M	
4249	Insights into induction of the immune response by the hepatitis B vaccine	
	Di Lello FA. Martínez AP. Flichman DM	

4263 Evidence-based pathogenesis and treatment of ulcerative colitis: A causal role for colonic epithelial hydrogen peroxide

Pravda J

MINIREVIEWS

4299 Recent advances in multidisciplinary therapy for adenocarcinoma of the esophagus and esophagogastric junction

Zheng YH, Zhao EH

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Basic Study

4310 Exosomal glypican-1 is elevated in pancreatic cancer precursors and can signal genetic predisposition in the absence of endoscopic ultrasound abnormalities

Moutinho-Ribeiro P, Batista IA, Quintas ST, Adem B, Silva M, Morais R, Peixoto A, Coelho R, Costa-Moreira P, Medas R, Lopes S, Vilas-Boas F, Baptista M, Dias-Silva D, Esteves AL, Martins F, Lopes J, Barroca H, Carneiro F, Macedo G, Melo SA

4328 Duodenal-jejunal bypass reduces serum ceramides via inhibiting intestinal bile acid-farnesoid X receptor pathway

Cheng ZQ, Liu TM, Ren PF, Chen C, Wang YL, Dai Y, Zhang X

4338 Duodenal-jejunal bypass increases intraduodenal bile acids and upregulates duodenal SIRT1 expression in high-fat diet and streptozotocin-induced diabetic rats

Han HF, Liu SZ, Zhang X, Wei M, Huang X, Yu WB

Retrospective Study

4351 Approaches to reconstruction of inferior vena cava by ex vivo liver resection and autotransplantation in 114 patients with hepatic alveolar echinococcosis

Maimaitinijiati Y, AJi T, Jiang TM, Ran B, Shao YM, Zhang RQ, Guo Q, Wang ML, Wen H

4363 Application of computed tomography-based radiomics in differential diagnosis of adenocarcinoma and squamous cell carcinoma at the esophagogastric junction

Du KP, Huang WP, Liu SY, Chen YJ, Li LM, Liu XN, Han YJ, Zhou Y, Liu CC, Gao JB



Conton	Contents World Journal of Gastroenterology Weekly Volume 28 Number 31 August 21, 2022	
Conten		
4376	Preoperative contrast-enhanced computed tomography-based radiomics model for overall survival prediction in hepatocellular carcinoma	
	Deng PZ, Zhao BG, Huang XH, Xu TF, Chen ZJ, Wei QF, Liu XY, Guo YQ, Yuan SG, Liao WJ	
4390	Nationwide retrospective study of hepatitis B virological response and liver stiffness improvement in 465 patients on nucleos(t)ide analogue	
	Ramji A, Doucette K, Cooper C, Minuk GY, Ma M, Wong A, Wong D, Tam E, Conway B, Truong D, Wong P, Barrett L, Ko HH, Haylock-Jacobs S, Patel N, Kaplan GG, Fung S, Coffin CS	
	Observational Study	
4399	Radiomics and nomogram of magnetic resonance imaging for preoperative prediction of microvascular invasion in small hepatocellular carcinoma	
	Chen YD, Zhang L, Zhou ZP, Lin B, Jiang ZJ, Tang C, Dang YW, Xia YW, Song B, Long LL	
4417	Prevalence and clinical characteristics of autoimmune liver disease in hospitalized patients with cirrhosis and acute decompensation in China	
	Shen ZX, Wu DD, Xia J, Wang XB, Zheng X, Huang Y, Li BL, Meng ZJ, Gao YH, Qian ZP, Liu F, Lu XB, Shang J, Yan HD, Zheng YB, Gu WY, Zhang Y, Wei JY, Tan WT, Hou YX, Zhang Q, Xiong Y, Zou CC, Chen J, Huang ZB, Jiang XH, Luo S, Chen YY, Gao N, Liu CY, Yuan W, Mei X, Li J, Li T, Zhou XY, Deng GH, Chen JJ, Ma X, Li H	
4431	Simple cholecystectomy is an adequate treatment for grade I T1bN0M0 gallbladder carcinoma: Evidence from 528 patients	
	Shao J, Lu HC, Wu LQ, Lei J, Yuan RF, Shao JH	
	META-ANALYSIS	
4442	Current standard values of health utility scores for evaluating cost-effectiveness in liver disease: A meta- analysis	
	Ishinuki T, Ota S, Harada K, Kawamoto M, Meguro M, Kutomi G, Tatsumi H, Harada K, Miyanishi K, Kato T, Ohyanagi T, Hui TT, Mizuguchi T	
	CASE REPORT	
4456	Low-grade myofibroblastic sarcoma of the liver misdiagnosed as cystadenoma: A case report	
	Li J, Huang XY, Zhang B	
	LETTER TO THE EDITOR	
4463	Evidence-based considerations on bowel preparation for colonoscopy	
	Argyriou K, Parra-Blanco A	
4467	Influence of different portal vein branches on hepatic encephalopathy during intrahepatic portal shunt <i>via</i> jugular vein	

Yao X, He S, Wei M, Qin JP

4471 Promising role of D-amino acids in irritable bowel syndrome Ikeda Y, Taniguchi K, Sawamura H, Tsuji A, Matsuda S

Contents

Weekly Volume 28 Number 31 August 21, 2022

ABOUT COVER

Editorial Board Member of World Journal of Gastroenterology, Mortada H F El-Shabrawi, MD, FAASLD, Professor, Department of Paediatrics, Kasr Alainy School of Medicine, Cairo University, Cairo 11562, Egypt. melshabrawi@kasralainy.edu.eg

AIMS AND SCOPE

The primary aim of World Journal of Gastroenterology (WJG, World J Gastroenterol) is to provide scholars and readers from various fields of gastroenterology and hepatology with a platform to publish high-quality basic and clinical research articles and communicate their research findings online. WJG mainly publishes articles reporting research results and findings obtained in the field of gastroenterology and hepatology and covering a wide range of topics including gastroenterology, hepatology, gastrointestinal endoscopy, gastrointestinal surgery, gastrointestinal oncology, and pediatric gastroenterology.

INDEXING/ABSTRACTING

The WJG is now abstracted and indexed in Science Citation Index Expanded (SCIE, also known as SciSearch®), Current Contents/Clinical Medicine, Journal Citation Reports, Index Medicus, MEDLINE, 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 WJG as 5.374; IF without journal self cites: 5.187; 5-year IF: 5.715; Journal Citation Indicator: 0.84; Ranking: 31 among 93 journals in gastroenterology and hepatology; and Quartile category: Q2. The WJG's CiteScore for 2021 is 8.1 and Scopus CiteScore rank 2021: Gastroenterology is 18/149.

RESPONSIBLE EDITORS FOR THIS ISSUE

Production Editor: Yi-Xuan Cai; Production Department Director: Xiang Li; Editorial Office Director: Jia-Ru Fan.

NAME OF JOURNAL	INSTRUCTIONS TO AUTHORS
World Journal of Gastroenterology	https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/204
ISSN	GUIDELINES FOR ETHICS DOCUMENTS
ISSN 1007-9327 (print) ISSN 2219-2840 (online)	https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/287
LAUNCH DATE	GUIDELINES FOR NON-NATIVE SPEAKERS OF ENGLISH
October 1, 1995	https://www.wignet.com/bpg/gerinfo/240
FREQUENCY	PUBLICATION ETHICS
Weekly	https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/288
EDITORS-IN-CHIEF	PUBLICATION MISCONDUCT
Andrzej S Tarnawski	https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/208
EDITORIAL BOARD MEMBERS	ARTICLE PROCESSING CHARGE
http://www.wignet.com/1007-9327/editorialboard.htm	https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/242
PUBLICATION DATE	STEPS FOR SUBMITTING MANUSCRIPTS
August 21, 2022	https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/239
COPYRIGHT	ONLINE SUBMISSION
© 2022 Baishideng Publishing Group Inc	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



WJG

World Journal of Gastroenterology

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

World J Gastroenterol 2022 August 21; 28(31): 4463-4466

ISSN 1007-9327 (print) ISSN 2219-2840 (online)

DOI: 10.3748/wjg.v28.i31.4463

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Evidence-based considerations on bowel preparation for colonoscopy

Konstantinos Argyriou, Adolfo Parra-Blanco

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): B, B, B Grade C (Good): 0 Grade D (Fair): 0 Grade E (Poor): 0

P-Reviewer: Basson MD, United States; Kobayashi N, Japan; Okasha H, Egypt

Received: December 20, 2021 Peer-review started: December 20, 2021 First decision: March 10, 2022 **Revised:** March 26, 2022 Accepted: July 24, 2022 Article in press: July 24, 2022 Published online: August 21, 2022



Konstantinos Argyriou, Department of Gastroenterology, University Hospital of Larisa, Larisa GR41334, Greece

Adolfo Parra-Blanco, Department of Gastroenterology, Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust, Nottingham NG51PB, United Kingdom

Corresponding author: Konstantinos Argyriou, MD, MSc, PhD, Academic Research, Consultant Physician-Scientist, Department of Gastroenterology, University Hospital of Larisa, Mezourlo, Larisa GR41334, Greece. kosnar2@doctors.org.uk

Abstract

We recently read with interest the article, "Novel frontiers of agents for bowel cleansing for colonoscopy". This is a practical narrative review, which could be of particular importance to clinicians in order to improve their current practice. Although we appreciate the venture of our colleagues, based on our in-depth analysis, we came across several minor issues in the article; hence, we present our comments in this letter. If the authors consider these comments further in their relevant research, we believe that their contribution would be of considerable importance for future studies.

Key Words: Colonoscopy; Bowel preparation; Polyethylene glycol; Post-polypectomy syndrome; Post-polypectomy complications

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

Core Tip: Colonoscopy is the gold standard investigation for the detection and treatment of colorectal neoplasia. The effectiveness and safety of the procedure mainly depends on the quality of bowel preparation (BP). Although international guidelines underline methods to ensure adequate BP, inadequate BP occurs in approximately one-third of the colonoscopies. The search for an ideal regimen to improve BP remains. The article by the authors addressed this issue successfully, but we detected several minor issues. Therefore, we would like to share our views and opinions on this interesting review.



WJG | https://www.wjgnet.com

Citation: Argyriou K, Parra-Blanco A. Evidence-based considerations on bowel preparation for colonoscopy. World J Gastroenterol 2022; 28(31): 4463-4466 URL: https://www.wjgnet.com/1007-9327/full/v28/i31/4463.htm DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.3748/wjg.v28.i31.4463

TO THE EDITOR

We read with great interest the frontier article, "Novel frontiers of agents for bowel cleansing for colonoscopy"[1]. Although the authors follow the infrastructure of the updated version of the European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy Guideline on bowel preparation (BP) for the main part of their article, they do not make absolutely clear to the reader the way they selected the studies included in their own updated review^[2]. Despite this shortcoming, in general the authors summarize the major findings of several reference studies successfully. The salient highlight of this article is that Di Leo et al [1] address the issue of BP holistically, from cleansing agents to the multifaceted outcomes of the currently followed BP strategies in specific populations, such as those with congestive heart failure or chronic renal failure, disclosing areas that need to be further investigated. However, we believe that the most striking point of this article is the introduction of the novel term "post colonoscopy syndrome," which sums up all the minor complications that an individual could develop post colonoscopy, worsening his/her quality of life. Therefore, this research has a strong reference and practical value for future studies, overcoming limitations. Nevertheless, through our in-depth reading, we found several shortcomings and anticipate a discussion with the authors.

Initially, we agree with the authors that the assessment of the quality of BP is of utmost importance. Adequate BP is crucial, not only to the efficacy and safety of colonoscopies but also for awarding privileges to the endoscopists[3]. However, there are no universally accepted criteria that endoscopists can use for the assessment of the quality of BP. As a result, at least five quality assessment scales have been currently fully or partially validated and used in daily practice for the assessment of the quality of BP, inducing significant heterogeneity when quality results are compared among different studies. The unanimous approval of a single scale is expected to resolve this issue but is still awaited[3]. By comparing the specific characteristics of all available scales, the authors can disclose areas that need to be further investigated, facilitating endoscopists to reach consensus. However, in this article, the authors only refer to the Ottawa Bowel Preparation Quality Scale, Boston Bowel Preparation Scale and the partially validated Aronchick Scale, excluding other validated scales, such as the Harefield Cleansing Scale, which was the first scale to be developed^[3]. This limitation leaves an initial critical step underdiscussed in this review, perpetuating confusion.

In their summary of current evidence, the authors focus on high and low volume polyethylene glycol (PEG)-based preparations, leaving non-PEG-based solutions that have been found to be of equal efficacy to PEG-based formulas under-reviewed. The reason behind this exclusion is not mentioned. However, it constitutes an omission. For example, in this article, the authors do not discuss lactulose, a semisynthetic derivative of lactose that after fermentation stimulates intestinal motility and increases osmotic pressure within the colon. Accumulated evidence from clinical trials suggest that lactulose has similar efficacy to PEG-based solutions with acceptable safety when used for BP not only in individuals undergoing ambulatory colonoscopy but also in those undergoing colonoscopy for lower gastrointestinal bleeding[4-6]. These results expand the armamentarium of our available solutions for BP; hence, all the relevant information should be supplemented in this review.

In addition to the under-discussed non-PEG based solutions, the authors provided sparse data regarding the safety of using non-PEG based and PEG-based preparations in specific populations. Although the authors quote evidence on the effectiveness and safety of these agents in various patient populations included in this review, their efficacy and safety in patients with liver cirrhosis are not examined. The reason behind this exclusion is not mentioned by the authors, leaving a critical step under-discussed in this review. Patients with cirrhosis demonstrate alterations in physiology and hemodynamics that make them vulnerable to develop electrolyte imbalances during BP[7]. Osmotically balanced solutions have been shown to be effective and safe for the management of hepatic encephalopathy in this patient population[8]. However, little is known regarding their safety when used for BP as patients with liver cirrhosis are often excluded from randomized controlled trials comparing different bowel cleansing agents. In a recent study that examined the safety and efficacy of low volume and high volume PEG based solutions in 166 patients with liver cirrhosis, it was shown that both formulations can be effectively and safely used for BP with low volume formulations showing better acceptability and compliance[9]. Considering the absence of an established BP protocol in patients with liver cirrhosis, we believe that all the relevant information should be included in this review, allowing the reader to acquire a detailed overview of the subject.

Another shortcoming lies at the reference of the agents intended to improve patient experience. More specifically, the authors suggest that the menthol candy drops improve BP in the candy drops-added group compared to controls, with no benefit in side effects. However, in the reference trial, other than



WJG | https://www.wjgnet.com

the efficacy, the trial authors state that menthol drops improved nausea (24.5% drops vs 4% controls; P =0.04). Since this finding is important, this detail should be clarified [10].

Finally, the authors attempted to shed light on the pathophysiology of minor post colonoscopy complications that mainly included the symptoms of pain, discomfort and bloating, defined as post colonoscopy syndrome (PCS). We agree that the post BP changes in microbiota composition contribute to the occurrence of PCS. However, we believe that this is the tip of the iceberg. In order to understand the pathophysiology of PCS accurately, researchers should look into the complex mechanisms of abdominal pain and study the impact of BP in all of them[11]. Previous evidence suggested that mucosal changes occurring secondary to colonic over-distension during colonoscopy as well as stress, inflammation, ischemia, pH, bacterial products, immune mediators and neurotransmitters can all be related to visceral pain[12-16]. However, whether BP can have a negative impact is unknown. Future studies should aim to investigate these complex relationships and unravel the exact role of BP in the pathophysiology of PCS, as their results may allow clinicians to mitigate the negative effects and increase the individual acceptance of colonoscopy.

In summary, this review can be a valuable reference study, guiding clinicians in their daily practice. We offer our evidence-based considerations on the shortcomings of this review in an effort to further increase the value of the review and direct more comprehensive future studies. But, whether BP can have a negative impact is unknown. Future studies should aim to investigate these complex relationships and unravel the exact role of BP in the pathophysiology of PCS, as their results may allow clinicians to mitigate the negative effects and increase the individual acceptance of colonoscopy. In summary, this review can be a valuable reference study, guiding clinicians in their daily practice. We offer our evidence-based considerations on the shortcomings of this review in an effort to further increase the value of the review and direct more comprehensive future studies.

FOOTNOTES

Author contributions: Argyriou K and Parra-Blanco A designed and performed the research; Argyriou K wrote this comment; Parra-Blanco A revised the manuscript.

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

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: Greece

ORCID number: Konstantinos Argyriou 0000-0002-2026-9678; Adolfo Parra-Blanco 0030226.

S-Editor: Wang JJ L-Editor: Filipodia P-Editor: Wang JJ

REFERENCES

- 1 Di Leo M, Iannone A, Arena M, Losurdo G, Palamara MA, Iabichino G, Consolo P, Rendina M, Luigiano C, Di Leo A. Novel frontiers of agents for bowel cleansing for colonoscopy. World J Gastroenterol 2021; 27: 7748-7770 [PMID: 34963739 DOI: 10.3748/wjg.v27.i45.7748]
- 2 Hassan C, East J, Radaelli F, Spada C, Benamouzig R, Bisschops R, Bretthauer M, Dekker E, Dinis-Ribeiro M, Ferlitsch M, Fuccio L, Awadie H, Gralnek I, Jover R, Kaminski MF, Pellisé M, Triantafyllou K, Vanella G, Mangas-Sanjuan C, Frazzoni L, Van Hooft JE, Dumonceau JM. Bowel preparation for colonoscopy: European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ESGE) Guideline - Update 2019. Endoscopy 2019; 51: 775-794 [PMID: 31295746 DOI: 10.1055/a-0959-0505]
- 3 Kastenberg D, Bertiger G, Brogadir S. Bowel preparation quality scales for colonoscopy. World J Gastroenterol 2018; 24: 2833-2843 [PMID: 30018478 DOI: 10.3748/wjg.v24.i26.2833]
- Jagdeep J, Sawant G, Lal P, Bains L. Oral Lactulose vs. Polyethylene Glycol for Bowel Preparation in Colonoscopy: A Randomized Controlled Study. Cureus 2021; 13: e14363 [PMID: 33972914 DOI: 10.7759/cureus.14363]
- Menacho AM, Reimann A, Hirata LM, Ganzerella C, Ivano FH, Sugisawa R. Double-blind prospective randomized study 5 comparing polyethylene glycol to lactulose for bowel preparation in colonoscopy. Arq Bras Cir Dig 2014; 27: 9-12 [PMID: 24676290 DOI: 10.1590/s0102-67202014000100003]
- Li CX, Guo Y, Zhu YJ, Zhu JR, Xiao QS, Chen DF, Lan CH. Comparison of Polyethylene Glycol versus Lactulose Oral Solution for Bowel Preparation prior to Colonoscopy. Gastroenterol Res Pract 2019; 2019: 2651450 [PMID: 31097959 DOI: 10.1155/2019/2651450]



- 7 Belsey J, Epstein O, Heresbach D. Systematic review: oral bowel preparation for colonoscopy. Aliment Pharmacol Ther 2007; 25: 373-384 [PMID: 17269992 DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2036.2006.03212.x]
- Pontone S, Angelini R, Standoli M, Patrizi G, Culasso F, Pontone P, Redler A. Low-volume plus ascorbic acid vs high-8 volume plus simethicone bowel preparation before colonoscopy. World J Gastroenterol 2011; 17: 4689-4695 [PMID: 22180711 DOI: 10.3748/wjg.v17.i42.4689]
- 9 Lee JM, Lee JH, Kim ES, Lee JM, Yoo IK, Kim SH, Choi HS, Keum B, Seo YS, Jeen YT, Lee HS, Chun HJ, Um SH, Kim CD. The safety and effectiveness of 2-liter polyethylene glycol plus ascorbic acid in patients with liver cirrhosis: A retrospective observational study. Medicine (Baltimore) 2017; 96: e9011 [PMID: 29390432 DOI: 10.1097/MD.000000000009011]
- 10 Sharara AI, El-Halabi MM, Abou Fadel CG, Sarkis FS. Sugar-free menthol candy drops improve the palatability and bowel cleansing effect of polyethylene glycol electrolyte solution. Gastrointest Endosc 2013; 78: 886-891 [PMID: 23769143 DOI: 10.1016/j.gie.2013.05.015]
- Pusceddu MM, Gareau MG. Visceral pain: gut microbiota, a new hope? J Biomed Sci 2018; 25: 73 [PMID: 30309367 11 DOI: 10.1186/s12929-018-0476-7]
- 12 Sengupta JN. Visceral pain: the neurophysiological mechanism. Handb Exp Pharmacol 2009; 31-74 [PMID: 19655104 DOI: 10.1007/978-3-540-79090-7 2]
- Million M, Wang L, Wang Y, Adelson DW, Yuan PQ, Maillot C, Coutinho SV, Mcroberts JA, Bayati A, Mattsson H, Wu 13 V, Wei JY, Rivier J, Vale W, Mayer EA, Taché Y. CRF2 receptor activation prevents colorectal distension induced visceral pain and spinal ERK1/2 phosphorylation in rats. Gut 2006; 55: 172-181 [PMID: 15985561 DOI: 10.1136/gut.2004.051391]
- 14 Ochoa-Cortes F, Guerrero-Alba R, Valdez-Morales EE, Spreadbury I, Barajas-Lopez C, Castro M, Bertrand J, Cenac N, Vergnolle N, Vanner SJ. Chronic stress mediators act synergistically on colonic nociceptive mouse dorsal root ganglia neurons to increase excitability. Neurogastroenterol Motil 2014; 26: 334-345 [PMID: 24286174 DOI: 10.1111/nmo.12268]
- Vanner S, Greenwood-Van Meerveld B, Mawe G, Shea-Donohue T, Verdu EF, Wood J, Grundy D. Fundamentals of 15 Neurogastroenterology: Basic Science. Gastroenterology 2016 [PMID: 27144618 DOI: 10.1053/j.gastro.2016.02.018]
- 16 Gayer CP, Basson MD. The effects of mechanical forces on intestinal physiology and pathology. Cell Signal 2009; 21: 1237-1244 [PMID: 19249356 DOI: 10.1016/j.cellsig.2009.02.011]





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

