

Vol. 74 No. 1-3

December 2022

CODEN: KDIZAA

ISSN 0368-5063

鹿児島大学医学雑誌
MEDICAL JOURNAL OF
KAGOSHIMA UNIVERSITY

鹿大医誌

Med J

Kagoshima Univ

鹿児島大学医学会

MEDICAL SOCIETY OF KAGOSHIMA UNIVERSITY

Index

【Original Article】

The Effects of Prior Esophagogastroduodenoscopy on Cecal Insertion in Same-Visit Bidirectional Endoscopy: A Pilot Study

Satoru MATSUOKA, Hidehito MAEDA, Fumisato SASAKI, Kengo TSUNEYOSHI,
Masayuki KABAYAMA, Shuji KANMURA, Akio IDO

P1-7

鹿児島大学医学雑誌 第74巻 1-3号 2022年発行

目 次

【原著】

上下部消化管内視鏡検査における下部消化管内視鏡の挿入性の検討

松岡慧, 前田英仁, 佐々木文郷, 恒吉研吾, 樺山雅之, 上村修司, 井戸章雄

1-7 頁

The Effects of Prior Esophagogastroduodenoscopy on Cecal Insertion in Same-Visit Bidirectional Endoscopy: A Pilot Study

Satoru MATSUOKA¹⁾, Hidehito MAEDA^{1,*}, Fumisato SASAKI²⁾, Kengo TSUNEYOSHI¹⁾, Masayuki KABAYAMA²⁾, Shuji KANMURA²⁾, Akio IDO²⁾

¹⁾ Kagoshima Prefectural Oshima Hospital, Kagoshima, Japan

²⁾ Digestive and Lifestyle Diseases, Kagoshima University Graduate School of Medical and Dental Sciences, Kagoshima, Japan

(Received 7 September 2021; Revised 19 December 2021; Accepted 26 December 2021)

*Address to correspondence

Hidehito MAEDA

Kagoshima Prefectural Oshima Hospital

18-1, Nazemanatsu, Amami, Kagoshima, 894-0015 Japan

Phone: +81-997-52-3611, Fax: +81-997-53-9017

e-mail: hidehitomaeda@gmail.com

Abstract

OBJECTIVES: Same-day bidirectional endoscopy (BDE) has become a commonly used. Several studies have identified that the optimal sequence of a same-day BDE was esophagogastroduodenoscopy (EGD) followed by colonoscopy (CS). However, in recent years there are no reports from Japanese facilities regarding the difficulty of colonoscopy insertion along with a same-day BDE. In this study, we sought to clarify CS difficulties if EGD was performed first followed by CS on the same-day.

METHODS: This study was a single-center retrospective study, and included 61 patients who underwent EGD followed by CS (E-C group) and 120 patients who underwent CS only (CS only group). We defined a “difficult CS case” as one that required ≥ 650 s for colonoscope insertion.

RESULTS: The numbers of difficult CS cases were not significantly different between the E-C and CS only groups ($p = 0.131$). Furthermore, no correlations existed between EGD examination times and colonoscope insertion times (Spearman $\rho = 0.096$). In addition, for patients whose body mass index (BMI) was <18.5 and ≥ 25 , the number of difficult CS cases was significantly lower in the E-C group than that in the CS only group ($p = 0.038$).

CONCLUSIONS: No significant differences were seen between the number of difficult cases in the E-C and CS only groups. In patients with BMI of <18.5 or ≥ 25 , fewer cases of CS difficulty might be encountered if EGD is performed first.

Key words: bidirectional endoscopy, colonoscopy insertion, difficult colonoscopy case

Introduction

Colonoscopy (CS) is widely used to diagnose and treat colorectal diseases. A high rate of cecal intubation is required to achieve a complete and thorough examination of the colon; however, sometimes difficulties arise during colonoscope insertion. Several studies have identified that certain variables pose difficulties during colonoscope insertion¹⁻⁶. In addition, the colon is an easily distensible, mobile elastic tube, which becomes long and tortuous when overinflated, thereby enhancing procedural difficulties. Hence, endoscopists must frequently minimize air insufflation and suction during CS intubation periods^{7, 8}. Equally, esophagogastroduodenoscopy (EGD) and CS may be sequentially performed on the same day. In our hospital, we routinely perform EGD first when we perform same-day bidirectional endoscopy (BDE). Several studies reported that the optimal sequence of a same-day BDE was EGD followed by CS^{9,10}. Additionally, previous studies reported that there was no difference in the cecal intubation time between patients in EGD followed by CS group and CS followed by EGD group^{9,10}. However, there are no reports from Japanese facilities about the difficulty of colonoscopy insertion along with a same-day BDE in recent years. Hence, we sought to clarify the insertion effects of CS if EGD was performed first, followed by CS on the same-day.

Materials and Methods

Patients: This was a single-center retrospective study. In total, 203 patients underwent CS between May and August 2020 at our hospital. The medical records of these 203 consecutive patients were retrospectively reviewed, at which point 22 patients with a history of colonic surgery were excluded. Of the remaining 181 patients, 61 underwent EGD followed by CS (E-C group), whereas 120 patients underwent CS only (CS only group) (Figure 1). The study was approved by the

Institutional Review Board of Kagoshima Prefectural Oshima Hospital (Permission number: 63). This project was a retrospective observational study. We offered an opt-out for participants to provide the opportunity to reject participation in the study.

Bowel preparation: Patients underwent bowel preparation using senna and sodium picosulfate on the day before the examination, and polyethylene glycol solution-containing lavage the morning of the procedure. We used the Boston bowel preparation scale (BBPS) for analyses.

Sedation and antispasmodic drugs: Midazolam was administered based on the judgment of the examining colonoscopist or when requested by the patient. Scopolamine butylbromide was administered intramuscularly to suppress bowel movement, while patients with cardiac disease or benign prostatic hypertrophy received intramuscular glucagon.

CS and EGD: CS and EGD were conducted at dedicated endoscopy suites. We used the following equipment: Olympus Evis-Lucera CV-290 and CV-260SL based unit; Olympus PCF-Q260AI and PCF-Q260AZI model colonoscopes; and Olympus GIF-H290Z, GIF-H260Z, GIF-Q260J, and GIF-Q260 model gastrointestinal endoscopes. CO₂ or air insufflation was used as required during EGD and CS. Additionally, three highly experienced colonoscopist (≥ 1000 previous colonoscopies) performed the procedures.

Colonoscope insertion times were defined as the time from the first image of the rectal mucosa, to the first image of the cecal mucosa. In addition, EGD examination times were defined as the time from the first image of the esophagus mucosa during insertion, to the last image of the esophagus mucosa during removal. Although previous reports classified a 10 min insertion time as a “difficult CS case”^{1,2}, for more accuracy, we defined it as a case that required ≥ 650 s for insertion. This cutoff value of time was defined as twice the median (326.5 s) from a box plot of insertion times in the CS only group (Figure 2). In E-C group, the median




Figure 1 Study flowchart.




Figure 2 CS insertion times in the CS only group. The median in box plot of insertion time in the CS only group was 326.5.

from a box plot of insertion times was 288 s.

Date collection and outcome measures: Demographic data and clinical characteristics [age, gender, body mass index (BMI), patient type, diverticulosis, melanosis, indication for CS, history of abdominal surgery, CO₂ use, sedation, BBPS, and adenoma detection rate (ADR)] of all patients were collected. Patient backgrounds of the E-C group and the CS only group were compared. ADR was defined for the patients ≥ 50 years undergoing screening colonoscopy for the first time and who had one or more conventional adenoma detected and removed¹¹. The primary outcome was the number of difficult CS cases. Moreover, the relationship between EGD examination time and colonoscope insertion time (for patients with < 650 s for insertion) was also examined. In addition, based on the results of previous literatures, female, BMI of < 18.5 or ≥ 25 , and patients with a history of abdominal surgery were identified as factors associated with difficult CS cases¹⁻⁶. Thus, secondary outcomes were defined as the number of difficult CS cases by these factors.

Statistical analysis: Differences between the two groups were assessed using Student's t-test or the Mann-Whitney test and Fisher's exact test. The Student's t-test or the Mann-Whitney test was depended on the result of the Shapiro-Wilk test and Levine's test for normality and equality of variance. A p value < 0.05 indicated statistical significance. The Spearman's rank correlation test was used to assess the relationship between EGD examination time and colonoscope insertion time. All statistical analyses were performed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences Statistic (SPSS) software version 25 (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY, USA).

Results

Baseline demographic characteristics are presented in Table 1. There was no significant difference in the patient age, sex, BMI, patient type, diverticulosis, melanosis coli, indication for CS, history of abdominal surgery, CO₂ use, and sedation. Additionally, bowel cleansing did not show any significant difference. Among the patients aged ≥ 50 years undergoing screening colonoscopy for the first time, 23 were in the E-C group and 27 in the CS only group. Furthermore, no significant difference was observed in the ADR between the E-C and CS only groups (Table 1).

Primary outcomes: The number of difficult CS cases showed no significant differences between the E-C and CS only groups ($p = 0.131$) (Table 2). Furthermore, no correlations were observed between EGD examination time and colonoscope insertion time (Spearman $\rho = 0.096$) (Fig. 3).

Secondary outcomes: In female patients and patients with a history of abdominal surgery, we observed no statistical differences between the groups in terms of the number of difficult CS cases. In patients with BMI of < 18.5 or ≥ 25 , the number of difficult CS cases was significantly decreased in the E-C group, when compared with the CS only group ($p = 0.038$) (Table 2).

Discussion

We observed no significant differences in the number of difficult cases between the E-C and CS only groups (Table 2). This result was consistent with the previous reports^{9,10}. Furthermore, there were no correlations

Table 1. Patient characteristics

| Characteristics | E-C group | CS only group | <i>p</i> value |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|
| Age, mean \pm SD (years) | 68.8 \pm 12.5 (17–91) | 66.6 \pm 12.1 (31–89) | 0.152 ^a |
| Gender, M/F | 37/24 | 75/45 | 0.467 ^b |
| BMI (kg/m ²) | 23.6 \pm 4.4 | 23.8 \pm 3.7 | 0.764 ^c |
| Patient type | | | |
| Outpatient | 53 | 110 | 0.827 ^b |
| Inpatient | 8 | 10 | |
| Emergency | 0 | 0 | |
| Diverticulosis; Yes/No | 26/35 | 53/67 | 0.485 ^b |
| Melanosis coli; Yes/No | 2/59 | 2/118 | 0.414 ^b |
| Indication for CS | | | |
| Screening or surveillance | 53 | 96 | 0.184 ^b |
| Diagnosis | 5 | 21 | |
| Inflammatory bowel disease | 3 | 3 | |
| History of abdominal surgery, Yes/No | 15/46 | 33/87 | 0.620 ^b |
| CO ₂ use; Yes/No | 36/25 | 65/55 | 0.322 ^b |
| Sedation; Yes/No | 59/2 | 112/8 | 0.284 ^b |
| BBPS, 0/1/2/3 | 0/3/18/40 | 0/5/26/89 | 0.474 ^b |
| CS Insertion time, median, range (s) | 288 (142-760) | 326.5 (94-989) | 0.233 ^a |
| ADR, n (%) | 7/23 (30.4) | 9/27 (33.3) | 0.485 ^b |

CS, colonoscopy; SD, standard deviation; BBPS, Boston bowel preparation scale; BMI, body mass index; ADR, adenoma detection rate

a. Mann-Whitney test, b. Fisher's exact test, c. Student's *t*-test

Table 2. Difficult cases

| | E-C group | CS only group | <i>p</i> value |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Total, n | 61 | 120 | |
| Difficult cases, n (%) | 4(6.6) | 17(14.2) | 0.1 ^a |
| Female, n | 24 | 45 | |
| Difficult cases, n (%) | 1 (4.2) | 6 (13.3) | 0.223 ^a |
| BMI < 18.5 or \geq 25, n | 25 | 53 | |
| Difficult cases, n (%) | 0 (0) | 8 (15.1) | 0.038 ^a |
| History of abdominal surgery (+), n | 15 | 33 | |
| Difficult cases, n (%) | 2 (13.3) | 4 (12.1) | 0.620 ^a |

CS, colonoscopy; BMI, body mass index

a. Fisher's exact test

between EGD examination time and colonoscope insertion time (Figure 3). Additionally, we investigated literature-identified factors attributed to difficult CS cases, i.e., female patients, patients with BMI of <18.5 or ≥ 25 , and patients with a history of abdominal surgery¹⁻⁶. Of these factors, the proportion of patients with BMI of <18.5 or ≥ 25 was the highest at 43.1%. Moreover, for that proportion of patients, the number of difficult CS cases significantly decreased in the E-C group when compared with the CS only group. BMI was reported to be one of the predicting factors of difficult CS cases^{2,6}. In cases of lower BMI, these studies explained that lower amount of visceral fat in patients may be the cause of difficult CS cases. It can be inferred that visceral fat allows for an easier passage of the colonoscope by supporting the colon in the pelvis and thereby reducing loop formation⁶. When EGD was performed before CS, presence of gas in the upper gastrointestinal tract may reduce the mobility of the colon and reduce loop formation. In addition, Moon et al. reported that BMI ≥ 25 was a predictor of a longer cecal insertion time². Previous reports have indicated that transabdominal pressure was useful for CS procedures^{12,13}, but the application of abdominal pressure was difficult on obese patients^{14,15}. A recent study in which abdominal compression was obtained with a fitted corset to facilitate CS reported that extra abdominal compression and a change of position was used less frequently in the study facilitating lower procedural pain¹⁶. The presence of gas in the upper gastrointestinal tract due to EGD may have had the same effect as transabdominal pressure. The recommendation of ADR was reported to be $\geq 25\%$ ¹⁷. In this study, ADR of the E-C group was 30.4% and the quality of CS was maintained. In patients with BMI of <18.5 or ≥ 25 , fewer cases of CS difficulty may be encountered if EGD is performed first. We believe that patient pain, associated with the examination, and safety such as sedative dose, must be evaluated to determine whether EGD or CS should be performed first^{9,10,18}. Our study had some limitations. First, it was a single-center retrospective study with a small sample size. Second, only expert endoscopists were permitted to work with patients. Third, this study did not include water-assisted methods which are reported to affect CS insertion times¹⁹. Therefore, further studies are required to examine the effects of water-assisted methods when we performed same-day BDE. Fourth, the degree of sedation could not be confirmed. Since sleep quality during the examination has been reported as an




Figure 3 Correlation between EGD examination times and colonoscope insertion times. No correlations were observed between EGD examination times and colonoscope insertion times.

independent predictor of prolonged insertion time¹, further studies are required to examine the sleep quality and patient pain during EGD and CS. Thirdly, we had not clearly decided whether to use normal air or CO₂ during upper gastrointestinal endoscopy. It is necessary to investigate whether normal air or CO₂ have different effects on CS insertion time. Lastly, we examined difficult CS cases with BMI of <18.5 and ≥ 25 together as BMI abnormal cases because of the small number of cases in this study. Further studies are required to examine each of these separately.

Conclusion

In conclusion, there was no significant difference in the number of difficult CS cases between the E-C and CS only groups, and EGD examination time was not related to colonoscope insertion time. In patients with BMI of <18.5 or ≥ 25 , fewer cases of CS difficulty might be encountered if EGD is performed first.

COI declaration

The authors have no potential conflicts of interest.

Acknowledgments

We thank Dr. Sumiya Ishigami for his helpful comments on this work and we are grateful for the help of the nurses at Endoscopic Center of Kagoshima Prefectural Oshima Hospital.

References

- 1) Jia H, Wang L, Luo H, et al. Difficult colonoscopy score identifies the difficult patients

- undergoing unsedated colonoscopy. *BMC Gastroenterol* 2015;15:46.
- 2) Moon SY, Kim BC, Sohn DK, et al. Predictors for difficult cecal insertion in colonoscopy: the impact of obesity indices. *World J Gastroenterol* 2017;23:2346-2354.
 - 3) Koido S, Ohkusa T, Nakae K, et al. Factors associated with incomplete colonoscopy at a Japanese academic hospital. *World J Gastroenterol* 2014;20:6961-6967.
 - 4) Arcovedo R, Larsen C, Reyes HS. Patient factors associated with a faster insertion of the colonoscope. *Surg Endosc* 2007;21:885-888.
 - 5) Shah HA, Paszat LF, Saskin R, et al. Factors associated with incomplete colonoscopy: a population-based study. *Gastroenterology* 2007;132:2297-2303.
 - 6) Anderson JC, Messina CR, Cohn W, et al. Factors predictive of difficult colonoscopy. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2001;54:558-562.
 - 7) Lee SH, Park YK, Lee DJ, et al. Colonoscopy procedural skills and training for new beginners. *World J Gastroenterol* 2014;20:16984-16995.
 - 8) Rodrigues-Pinto E, Ferreira-Silva J, Macedo G, et al. (Technically) Difficult colonoscope insertion – Tips and tricks. *Dig Endosc* 2019;31:583-587.
 - 9) Laoveeravat P, Thavaraputta S, Suchartlikitwong S, et al. Optimal sequences of same-visit bidirectional endoscopy: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Dig Endosc* 2020;32:706-714.
 - 10) Chen SW, Cheng CL, Liu NJ, et al. Optimal procedural sequence for same-day bidirectional endoscopy with moderate sedation: A prospective randomized study. *J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2018;33:689-695.
 - 11) Marcondes FO, Dean KM, Schoen RE, et al. The impact of exclusion criteria on a physician's adenoma detection rate. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2015;82:668-675.
 - 12) Sedlack RE, Shami VM, Adler DG, et al. Colonoscopy core curriculum. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2012;76:482-490.
 - 13) Wayne JD, Yessayan SA, Lewis BS, et al. The technique of abdominal pressure in total colonoscopy. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1991;37:147-151.
 - 14) Uddin FS, Iqbal R, Harford WV, et al. Prone positioning of obese patients for colonoscopy results in shortened cecal intubation times: a randomized trial. *Dig Dis Sci* 2013;58:782-787.
 - 15) Lucendo AJ. Colonoscopy in obese patients: time to change position. *Dig Dis Sci* 2013;58:608-609.
 - 16) Toros AB, Ersoz F, Ozcan O. Does a fitted abdominal corset makes colonoscopy more tolerable? *Dig Endosc* 2012;24:164-167.
 - 17) Rex DK, Schoenfeld PS, Cohen J, et al. Quality indicators for colonoscopy. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2015;110:72-90.
 - 18) Vergis N, Scarborough AJ, Morris JA, et al. Prone or left for colonoscopy? A randomized controlled trial of prone versus left-sided starting position for colonoscopy. *J Clin Gastroenterol* 2018;52:e82-e86.
 - 19) Maple JT, Banerjee S, Barth BA, et al. Methods of luminal distention for colonoscopy. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2013;77:519-525.

上下部消化管内視鏡検査における下部消化管内視鏡の挿入性の検討

松岡慧¹⁾, 前田英仁¹⁾, 佐々木文郷²⁾, 恒吉研吾¹⁾, 樺山雅之¹⁾, 上村修司²⁾, 井戸章雄²⁾

¹⁾鹿児島県立大島病院 消化器内科

²⁾鹿児島大学大学院消化器疾患・生活習慣病学

和文要約

【背景】 上部消化管内視鏡検査 (EGD), 下部消化管内視鏡検査 (CS) を同日に施行する際に, 既報ではEGDを先行してもCSの挿入時間に変化はなかったと報告されているが, 日本の施設からの報告はない. 今回EGD, CSを同日に施行する際, EGDを先行するとCSの内視鏡挿入が困難になるのか明らかにすることを目的とした.

【方法】 2020年5月から8月までに鹿児島県立大島病院でEGDを先行したEGD+CS (以下E-C群とする) 61例およびCSのみを施行した (以下CS単独群とする) 120例を対象とした. 挿入困難例の定義については, CS単独群での挿入時間中央値が326.5秒であったことから, 挿入時間650秒以上の症例とした

【結果】 挿入困難症例数は, E-C群: 4例 (6.6%), CS単独群: 17例 (14.2%) で両群間に有意差はなかった ($p = 0.131$). さらに, EGDの検査時間とCSの内視鏡挿入時間の相関係数は $\rho = 0.09$ であり, 相関はなかった. また, BMI 18.5未満と25以上の症例において, 挿入困難症例数はE-C群がCS単独群と比較して有意に少なかった ($p = 0.038$).

【結論】 EGDとCSを同日に連続して施行する際は, EGDを先行してもCSの内視鏡挿入が必ずしも困難になるとはいえず, 既報と同様の結果であった. BMI 18.5未満や25以上の症例においては, EGDを先行するとCSの挿入が容易になる可能性がある.

Author Index

第74卷 人名検索

I

Akio IDO 井戸 章雄 1

K

Masayuki KABAYAMA 樺山 雅之 1

Shuji KANMURA 上村 修司 1

M

Hidehito MAEDA 前田 英仁 1

Satoru MATSUOKA 松岡 慧 1

S

Fumisato SASAKI 佐々木 文郷 1

T

Kengo TSUNEYOSHI 恒吉 研吾 1

Editorial Board

編集委員会

| | | |
|------------------------|-------------------|-------|
| <i>Editor-in-Chief</i> | Chihaya KORIYAMA | 郡山 千早 |
| <i>Editors</i> | Masahisa HORIUCHI | 堀内 正久 |
| | Michiyo HIGASHI | 東 美智代 |
| | Shuji KANMURA | 上村 修司 |
| | Shin-ichiro MORI | 盛 真一郎 |
| | Hideyuki TERAZONO | 寺蘭 英之 |
| | Hidetaka YOKOO | 横尾 英孝 |

Acknowledgement

All editorial board members deeply appreciate following reviewers. They sincerely estimated manuscripts and gave proper advices to the authors. Their gratuitous works support editing this journal.

Reviewers

Yuga KOMAKI
Yoshiaki KITA

査読者

小牧 祐雅
喜多 芳昭