Effectiveness of Two Regimens for Colon Cleansing Using Polyethylene Glycol 4000: A Randomized Open Label Trial
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ABSTRACT

Aim: To compare effectiveness, safety and tolerance of two colon cleansing regimens using polyethylene glycol 4000 (PEG) in children. Methods: Prospective, randomized, open clinical trial carried out in 129 children, 3 to 18 years old undergoing colonoscopy. Patients were randomized into two groups, 64 children received PEG with electrolyte (50 mL/kg) and oral bisacodyl (PEG+B) group or 65 other children received PEG with electrolyte (70 mL/kg) and glycerol enema (PEG+G) group. Results: Both regimens showed a good colon cleansing effectiveness with the percentage of successful cleansing being 93.8% for PEG+B regimen and 89.1% for PEG+G regimen (\( P=0.510 \)). There was no statistically significant difference between the pre-regimen and post-regimen laboratory values. The rates of nausea (65.6% vs 31.3%; \( P<0.001 \)) and bloating (50% vs 17.2%; \( P<0.001 \)) of PEG+G group were significantly higher than that of PEG+B group. Conclusion: Both regimens had good efficacy and safety for colon cleansing in children. The tolerance of PEG+B regimen was better.
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METHODS

This study was a prospective, randomized, open clinical trial, conducted in our hospital from October 1, 2016 to June 31, 2017. We enrolled consecutive children aged 3–18 years undergoing colonoscopy in our hospital. A written parental consent was obtained for all the enrolled patients in this study.

We excluded children with: severe systemic disease that require parenteral nutrition, known chronic cardiovascular, liver, kidney, neurological or systemic diseases, known coagulopathy and/or thrombocytopenia with a decreased platelet function, known chronic granulocytopenia and/or immune deficiency, electrolyte imbalance, and finally children with acute intestinal obstruction.

Patients’ colonoscopy eligibility for enrollment selection was done at the outpatient department. A complete clinical physical examination was performed with the blood tests: hemoglobin, hematocrit, sodium, potassium, chloride, phosphorus, calcium, glucose, urea, creatinine, and alanine transaminase, aspartate transaminase. If all results were normal, the patient moved to next step.

Eight paper notes were prepared in a box, which contained four options for PEG+B regimen and another four options for PEG+G regimen. Then, selected patients were openly randomized to receive an option regimen in a box. When all paper notes in a box were selected, other 8 paper notes were prepared and the random selection process was repeatedly performed. The researchers recorded clinical symptoms and laboratory parameters before the beginning of the trial medication. The researchers, then prescribed, distributed a guide explaining to the patients’ parents how to implement the regimen for CC, including diet, how to prepare drugs and PEG solution according to the selected regimen. Researchers also explained the possible side effects of drugs, instructed how to monitor and manage them initially when encountering these problems. The patient was then discharged home for the beginning of the selected regimen with a patient parental questionnaire reporting all clinical manifestations, side effects, therapeutic compliance and tolerance during the selected study regimen.

After applying the selected regimen, patients were monitored by researchers with a complete clinical physical examination, and patients or patients’ parents were interviewed with the questionnaire during the selected regimen. The researchers recorded clinical manifestations, side effects, therapeutic compliance and tolerance of the used regimen, then the second blood tests were performed, as those before colonoscopy, and results recorded. Colonoscopy was performed by an experienced pediatric endoscopist and evaluated with the Boston scale. Researchers recorded all endoscopic information, completed clinical research records, and requested a second physical examination, if any abnormalities occurred during colonoscopy.

All researchers and endoscopists were blind to the used regimens during monitoring visit before colonoscopy, colonoscopy and the post-coonoscopy period.
Colonic cleansing process: Both groups received a diet including snacks until 4 pm on the day before the colonoscopy. PEG+B regimen; after 4 pm on the day before the colonoscopy, children received an oral bisacodyl tablet of 5 mg according to their body weight (Bisacodyl, fabrication: 1 tablet ≤ 20 kg, 2 tablets 20–30 kg, and 3 tablets > 30 kg) [2, 3, 9]. From 6 pm to 9 pm on the day before the colonoscopy, children were given PEG 4000 solution with electrolytes (Fortrans, fabrication), with a dose of 50 mL/kg of body weight with a maximum amount of two liters [9]. One Fortrans package contains 64g macrogol is dissolved in one litre of water before drinking.

For PEG+G regimen, children were given PEG 4000 with a dose of 70 mL/kg of body weight with a maximum amount of 4 liters. Children had to drink half the dose of solution from 4 pm to 6 pm, took 2 hours off, and then drank the remaining half dose from 8 pm to 10 pm on the day before the colonoscopy [10]. Children received two glycerol 9g (Microlismi fabrication) by rectal enema. The first time was done at 4 pm on the day before colonoscopy and the second one was done in the morning at 8 am on colonoscopy day.

CC efficacy was evaluated by endoscopists according to the Boston Bowel Preparation Scale (BBPS) [11] consisting of a 4-point scoring system applied to each of the 3 broad regions of the colon: right colon, transverse colon, and left colon. Overall colon cleansing was scored by summing up the scores of each segment. The total score ranging from 0 to 9 was divided into 4 grades: excellent cleansing (total score, 8–9), good cleansing (total score, 6–7), poor cleansing (total score, 4–5) and inadequate cleansing (total score, 0–5). Successful colon cleansing was defined with a total score of at least 6.

Vital signs, physical examination, and blood tests were performed at the time of patient enrollment and after a colonoscopy that included hematological parameters, liver and kidney function test, sodium, potassium, chloride, calcium, phosphorus, glucose. Immediately before the procedure, each patient was asked about his or her experience by using a standardized questionnaire and answered about tolerability, acceptability and compliance. Tolerability assessment was based on the recording of the occurrence and severity of gastrointestinal symptoms such as nausea, bloating, abdominal pain and anal discomfort. We evaluated the acceptability of colon cleansing regimens by willingness to repeat with 3 grades: willingness to repeat, difficulty to repeat and no acceptance to repeat.

All participants were recorded completely using oral Bisacodyl 5 mg tablets as well as glycerol rectal enema 9g. Hence, treatment compliance was based on the volume of PEG; it was considered as excellent when the patient intake >90% of prescribed volume of PEG, moderate between 50 to 90%, and poor < 50%.

Statistical analyses: The statistical analyses were performed by using absolute and relative frequency tables and contingency tables. For categorical variables we used chi-square test and Fisher exact test, and
Student t-test for continuous variables. Differences in pre-post laboratory variables for each group were assessed using the Wilcoxon signed-ranks test. The statistical significance was set at \( P<0.05 \). The analyses were conducted using SPSS, version 20.0.

**RESULTS**

Our study had 136 patients who had indication of colonoscopy, of which 129 were finally randomized to two groups: 65 patients received PEG+B regimen and 64 other patients received PEG+G regimen. However, one patient in PEG+B group did not complete intervention because this patient drank under 30% of PEG solution and made solid stools before the procedure. This patient had delayed colonoscopy after 1 day later with another CC regimen. There were no differences in gender and age between the two groups (Table I).

The total score was observed by 4 grades without statistically significant difference in two groups. The rates of PEG+G group and PEG+B group were 9.4% vs 15.6% in excellent cleansing; and 4.7% vs 1.6% in inadequate cleansing (Table II).

CC was also evaluated by each colonic segment and there was no significant difference in the efficacy of the two protocols in the different colonic segments. Mean BBPS score of PEG+G group and PEG+B group were similar (Table II).

Both regimens were equally efficient with a high rate of successful CC (95.3% of PEG+B regimen and 89.1% of PEG+G regimen, respectively) by per-protocol analysis or intention-to-treat analysis (93.8% vs. 89.1%; \( P=0.510 \)). 128 patients were performed colonoscopy to the cecum.

In this study, none of the enrolled children from both used regimens developed any severe side effects. The hemoglobin and hematocrit tended to decline in both 2 groups. Glucose level tends to decrease slightly in both groups; however, there were no children having hypoglycemia after implementing the regimen. There were 2 children with high blood glucose at 199.8 mg/dL and 176.4 mg/dL but without any clinical significance. The rest laboratory indicators were normal.

The rates of nausea (65.6% vs 31.3%; \( P<0.001 \)) and bloating (50% vs 17.2%; \( P<0.001 \)) of PEG+G group were significantly higher than that of PEG+B group. However, the rate of vomiting (18.8% vs 10.9%) and abdominal pain (32.8 vs 27.9%) were not different between both groups.

We found that 79.7% (\( n=51 \)) of families and children had willingness to repeat the same CC regimen if needed in the PEG+B group. This rate was significantly higher compared to that of 35.9% (\( n=23 \)) in the PEG+G group, \( P<0.001 \). The rate of excellent compliance children with \( \geq 90\% \) of fluid intake in PEG+B group accounted for 62.5%, significantly higher than that in the PEG+G group 42.2%, (\( P=0.033 \)). Our results showed no significant difference in poor; moderate compliance between in PEG+G group and PEG+B group was (9.4% vs 3.1%), (48.4% vs 34.4%) with \( P>0.05 \).
DISCUSSION

Our study found that regimens were equally effective for colonic cleansing, with success rate of PEG+G group of 89.1% and PEG+B of 93.8%. Different reports in children report a successful rate of 72-95% [4-7,9,12,13]. The wide range of these results are related to the regimen used in research. Our study; thus, demonstrated the efficacy of low-volume PEG 4000 solution with oral bisacodyl in colon preparation as the other protocol (high-volume PEG 4000 or 3350, split-dose, length preparation) in children [4-7].

None of the children in this study developed any severe side effects with use of either regimen, compared to the study by Di Nardo, et al. [9] who reported a 10-year-old girl developing severe dehydration, and orthostatic hypotension, with use of PEG 4000 requiring intravenous fluid for 6 hours [9].

There were no biochemical abnormalities due to these regimes, except the blood glucose levels slightly decreased in both groups but without any documented hypoglycemia. There were two children with hyperglycemia that could be resulted from the fact that we had instructed patients to take sugar 3 hours before endoscopy. These results were similar to other studies using PEG 3350 and PEG 4000 [9,13]. In contrast, another study showed the rate of hypokalemia was 24%, but without clinical manifestations, in electrolyte-free PEG-3350 regimen [4].

Among our patients none presented with extra-intestinal symptoms such as seizures. However, digestive symptoms as nausea and bloating after bowel preparation occurred significantly more commonly in the PEG+G group vs the PEG+B group. This could be related to the higher ingested fluid volume in the PEG+G regimen vs the PEG+B one. Likely, these symptoms are more likely to occur when patients need to drink more fluid. Such symptoms also affect the patient’s ability to comply with the regimen [9]. However, there were no differences between both groups about vomiting and abdominal pain in our results.

Our study showed the rate of children complying with ≥ 90% of the fluid in PEG+G group (42.2%) was lower than the other group PEG+B (62.5%). Some recent studies presented the percentage of compliance in slip dose or low-volume solution or length of preparation was higher than full single dose [4-7,9]. The PEG+B group in our study had significantly higher acceptability in the willingness to repeat than PEG+G group, which was similar to a previous report. This result was also similar to another study on split dose versus full single-dose regimen of PEG [6].

Limitation of our study was mainly that the dose of PEG 4000 volume in two groups was different and made difficulties to compare in the compliance. Other limitations of this study are our knowledge, small sample size and in only one centre. As a matter of fact, our results of Boston scores in both regimens were not as high as our expectation, around 6 points. Therefore, we hope to conduct a meta-analysis in the future to find the optimal protocol for bowel preparation in Vietnamese children.
Both regimens used had a good colon cleansing efficacy in children, with a high safety by both clinical and biochemical indicators. The tolerance of PEG+B regimen was better.
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**WHAT IS ALREADY KNOWN?**

- Using PEG 4000 with electrolyte is effective and safe in CC in children.

**WHAT THIS STUDY ADDS?**

- Using PEG+B or PEG+G regimen was effective and safe in CC in children.
- The tolerance of PEG+B regimen was better.
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Table I Baseline Characteristics of Children Receiving Two Colon Cleansing Regimens (N=128)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>PEG+B (n=64)</th>
<th>PEG+G (n=64)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male sex</td>
<td>39 (60.9)</td>
<td>44 (68.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (y)</td>
<td>5.80 (2.67)</td>
<td>5.67 (2.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body mass index (kg/ m^2)</td>
<td>15.1 (2.18)</td>
<td>16.26 (2.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for colonoscopy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloody stools</td>
<td>62 (96.8)</td>
<td>59 (92.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistent diarrhea</td>
<td>1 (1.6)</td>
<td>3 (4.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistent abdominal pain</td>
<td>1 (1.6)</td>
<td>1 (1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonoscopy findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>10 (15.6)</td>
<td>9 (14.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polyp</td>
<td>38 (59.4)</td>
<td>37 (57.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anal fissure</td>
<td>15 (23.4)</td>
<td>13 (20.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 (1.6)</td>
<td>5 (7.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values in no. (%) or mean (SD). Cleansing regimen – polyethylene glycol with electrolytes and oral bisacodyl (PEG+B) or glycerol enema (PEG+G). One child in PEG+G group underwent colonoscopy for anal mass.

Table II Efficacy of Two Colon Cleansing Regimens Among Children Undergoing Colonoscopy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>PEG+B (n=64)</th>
<th>PEG+G (n=64)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative cleansing rating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent (BBPS score: 8–9)</td>
<td>6 (9.4)</td>
<td>10 (15.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good (BBPS score: 6–7)</td>
<td>51 (79.7)</td>
<td>51 (79.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor (BBPS score: 4–5)</td>
<td>4 (6.2)</td>
<td>2 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate (BBPS score: 0–3)</td>
<td>3 (4.7)</td>
<td>1 (1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful colon cleansing</td>
<td>57 (89.1)</td>
<td>61 (95.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBPS score per segment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>6.1 (1.2)</td>
<td>6.4 (1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right colon</td>
<td>2.02 (0.4)</td>
<td>2.13 (0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tranversal colon</td>
<td>2.05 (0.4)</td>
<td>2.16 (0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left colon</td>
<td>2.03 (0.4)</td>
<td>2.13 (0.45)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values in no. (%) or mean (SD). All patients in both groups had cecal intubation. Polyethylene glycol with electrolytes and oral bisacodyl (PEG+B) or glycerol enema (PEG+G). BBPS- Boston bowel preparation scale. All P>0.05.
Fig. 1 Study flow chart.