

1 **Effect of combined cap-assisted, water-aided, and prone position**  
2 **colonoscopy for adenoma detection: A retrospective study**

3

4 **Short Title:** CMC for adenoma detection

5

6 Jihwan Ko<sup>1</sup>, Byung Gu Ko<sup>1</sup>, Seong Ho Han<sup>1</sup>, Hyung Wook Kim<sup>2</sup>

7

8 <sup>1</sup> Health Promotion Center, Baekyang Jeil Internal Medicine Clinic, Busan,  
9 Korea

10 <sup>2</sup> Department of Internal Medicine, Pusan National University School of  
11 Medicine and Research Institute for Convergence of Biomedical Science  
12 and Technology, Pusan National University Yangsan Hospital, Yangsan,  
13 Korea

14

15 **Corresponding author:** Hyung Wook Kim, Ph.D., M.D.

16 Department of Internal Medicine, Medical Research Institute

17 Pusan National University School of Medicine and Research Institute for

18 Convergence of Biomedical Science and Technology, Pusan National

19 University Yangsan Hospital

20 20, Geumo-ro, Mulgeum-eup, Yangsan-si, Gyeongsangnam-do 50612,

21 Korea

22 Tel: +82-55-360-1535

23 Fax: +82-55-360-1536

24 E-mail: bravefish1@gmail.com

**NOTE:** This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

25

26

27 **Abbreviations**

28

29 ADR: Adenoma detection rate

30 CMC: Combined method colonoscopy

31 FOBT: Fecal occult blood test

32 IRB: Institutional review board

33 MAP: Mean number of adenomas detected per procedure

34 PDR: Polyp detection rate

35 SC: Standard colonoscopy

36

## 37 **Abstract**

38 *Background:* The efficacy of cap-assisted, water-aided, and 12 o'clock-  
39 prone position colonoscopy as individual techniques for adenoma  
40 detection is well documented. However, the efficacy of the combination  
41 of the three colonoscopy methods is unclear. Therefore, the present  
42 study aimed to retrospectively compare the efficacy between combined-  
43 method colonoscopy (CMC) and standard colonoscopy (SC).

44 *Methods and Findings:* A total of 746 patients who underwent either  
45 CMC or SC, performed by two board-certified gastroenterologists  
46 between December 2019 and March 2020 at Baekyang Jeil Internal  
47 Medicine Clinic, were retrospectively evaluated. We evaluated polyp  
48 detection rate (PDR), adenoma detection rate (ADR), and mean number  
49 of adenomas detected per procedure (MAP). Statistical analysis for  
50 comparison between the groups was performed using the Student's t-test,  
51 and ADR and PDR were analyzed using Fisher's exact test. The study  
52 population was predominantly women (55.4%). The mean patient age  
53 (standard deviation) was 62.87 ( $\pm 7.83$ ) years. There was no significant  
54 difference in sex, number of fecal occult blood test-positive patients, and  
55 age between the two groups. The PDR, ADR, and proximal colon MAP  
56 were significantly higher in the CMC group than in the SC group (PDR:  
57 59.8% vs. 84.9%,  $p < 0.001$ ; ADR: 49.2% vs. 70.1%,  $p < 0.001$ ; proximal  
58 colon MAP: 0.55 vs. 1.24,  $p < 0.001$ ).

59 *Conclusions:* Compared with SC, CMC increases PDR, ADR, and MAP,  
60 especially proximal colon MAP. Therefore, CMC may be more useful than  
61 SC in clinical settings. This study is the first to evaluate the efficacy of

62 the three techniques in combination.

63

64 **Key words:** adenoma; colonoscopy; water-aided; clear cap; prone

65 position

66

## 67 **Introduction**

68 Colorectal cancer is the third leading cause of new cancer cases and  
69 second leading cause of cancer deaths worldwide [1]. Colonoscopic  
70 screening of colorectal cancer has several advantages, such as high-  
71 sensitivity detection of cancer and precancerous lesions and single-step  
72 diagnosis and treatment [2]. Several studies have reported the efficacy of  
73 colonoscopy in preventing incident colorectal cancer and cancer deaths  
74 [3-6]. Although colonoscopic screening has many advantages, it has a  
75 single most important disadvantage: it is operator dependent for the  
76 detection of precancerous lesions and cancer [7,8]. To decrease this  
77 operator dependency, many quality parameters have been used,  
78 including adenoma detection rate (ADR) and mean number of adenomas  
79 detected per procedure (MAP) [9,10] Because these two parameters are  
80 important in improving the colonoscopic screening effect, many studies  
81 have been performed focusing on the improvement of cap-assisted  
82 colonoscopy [11], water-aided colonoscopy [12], and prone position  
83 colonoscopy [13]. Water infusion instead of air insufflation during the  
84 insertion phase increased ADR. Prone position reduces ileal intubation  
85 time. This is not directly related to the ADR, but there was a study that  
86 showed shorter insertion times to be associated with an increased rate of  
87 small colorectal adenomas [14].

88 We intended to search for a method for increasing ADR and MAP  
89 without using complicated devices that cannot be applied in the clinical  
90 setting [15] and decided to assess if there is any synergistic effect on  
91 application of all three methods at once. The aim of this study was to

92 compare the ADR between combined-method colonoscopy (CMC) (clear  
93 cap-assisted, prone position, water-aided) and standard colonoscopy (SC)  
94 (left decubitus, air insufflating).

95

## 96 **Methods**

97

### 98 ***Study design***

99 This single-center retrospective case-control study was conducted at  
100 Baekyang Jeil Internal Medicine Clinic, Busan, South Korea. This study  
101 was approved by the ethics committee of the Institutional Review Board  
102 (IRB) of Pusan National University Yangsan Hospital (IRB number: 05-  
103 2020-126) and conducted in accordance with the principles of the  
104 Declaration of Helsinki.

105

### 106 ***Patients***

107 Between December 2019 and March 2020, a total of 901 patients  
108 underwent colonoscopy at our hospital, and the procedures were  
109 performed by two board-certified gastroenterologists. In total, 442  
110 patients underwent CMC, and 459 patients underwent SC. We analyzed  
111 the data for patients over 50 years of age. Of the 746 patients enrolled,  
112 388 were included in the SC group and 358 in the CMC group. The only  
113 exclusion criterion was age below 50 years. The study groups were not  
114 randomized. Each patient was made to choose a doctor for their  
115 colonoscopy. In South Korea, the National Health Insurance System  
116 urges people over the age of 50 years to take a fecal occult blood test

117 (FOBT) annually; when the test is positive, it provides financial support  
118 for undergoing colonoscopy. The proportion of FOBT-positive patients  
119 could affect ADR [16]; hence, we compared the number of FOBT-positive  
120 patients in each group. Fortunately, age, sex, and number of positive  
121 FOBT were not significantly different (Table 1).

122  
123 Table 1. Baseline data and clinical indications for colonoscopy (n = 746)

	Standard colonoscopy	Combined colonoscopy	Total	P- value
Total No.	388	358	746	
Sex				
Male	168 (43.3%)	165 (46.1%)		0.462
Female	220 (56.7%)	193 (53.9%)		
FOBT <sup>a</sup> positive	51 (11.1)	51 (11.5)	102 (11.3)	0.916
Age	63.34 ± 7.93	62.35 ± 7.71	62.87 ± 7.83	0.085

124 <sup>a</sup>FOBT: Fecal occult blood test

125

### 126 ***Ethical approval***

127 All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were  
128 performed in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional  
129 and/or national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki  
130 Declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards.

131 Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included  
132 in the study.

133

### 134 ***Endoscopic procedure***

135 In the present study, two board-certified gastroenterologists performed  
136 colonoscopies, among which one had performed more than 10,000  
137 examinations before the study period with SC and the other had  
138 performed more than 3,000 examinations before the study period with  
139 CMC. Because there was no association between procedural volume and  
140 ADR, we assumed that procedural volume difference between the two  
141 doctors should not affect ADR [17]. Colonoscopies were performed after  
142 bowel preparation with 2 L polyethylene glycol plus ascorbic acid  
143 solution (Coolprep, Taejun, Seoul, Korea; Readyfree, Intropharm Tech.,  
144 Gyeonggi-do, Korea). Colonoscopies were performed with EPK-i5000  
145 (Pentax EPKi processor) and EC38-i10F colonoscopes (Pentax, Tokyo,  
146 Japan). A transparent cap was attached to the tip of the colonoscope  
147 (Finemedix Co. Ltd, Daegu, Korea). All examinations were performed  
148 under conscious midazolam-induced sedation. Endoscopic observation  
149 and therapeutic intervention for detected polyps were performed during  
150 the withdrawal phase. Both the groups started in the left decubitus  
151 position, but as soon as the colonoscope reached the sigmoid colon, the  
152 CMC group changed to the 12 o'clock-prone position and kept in this  
153 position until the end of the procedure. The CMC group used the Pentax  
154 endoscope's own waterjet system for visualizing the colon pathway, and  
155 the SC group used air for visualizing the colon pathway.

156

## 157 ***Polyps***

158 Polyps with a diameter  $\geq 5$  mm were removed by endoscopic mucosal  
159 resection or cold snare polypectomy. Polyps with a diameter  $<5$  mm were  
160 removed with biopsy forceps. All removed polyps were pathologically  
161 examined, and the number of adenomas was determined. In this study,  
162 we defined polyp detection rate (PDR) as the proportion of patients with  
163 at least one polyp and ADR as the proportion of patients with at least one  
164 adenoma.

165

## 166 ***Outcome measures and statistical analysis***

167 The principal outcome was the comparison of ADR between SC and CMC  
168 groups. The secondary outcome was the comparison of PDR and MAP.  
169 Proximal and distal colon MAP was also evaluated.

170 Statistical comparisons between the two groups were performed  
171 using the Student t-test, and ADR and PDR were analyzed using Fisher's  
172 exact test.  $P < 0.05$  was considered to indicate statistical significance.

173 Statistical analyses were performed using SPSS (version 12, IBM Corp.,  
174 Armonk, NY, USA).

175

## 176 **Results**

177

### 178 ***Patient characteristics***

179 Baseline characteristics were not significantly different between the two  
180 groups (Table 1). A total of 746 colonoscopies were evaluated. The study

181 population was composed predominantly of women (55.4%), and the  
182 mean age  $\pm$  SD was  $62.87 \pm 7.83$  years. The indications for colonoscopy  
183 were categorized into the following: first, FOBT-positive, financially  
184 supported by the National Health Insurance System; and second, FOBT  
185 negative or not undergoing the FOBT test, paying their own money for  
186 evaluating the presence of polyps or cancer. There was no significant  
187 difference in sex or study indication and age between the two groups.

188

### 189 ***Polyp detection rate***

190 A total of 536 people (71.8%) had >1 polyp: 232 (PDR: 59.8%) in the SC  
191 group and 304 (PDR: 84.9%) in the CMC group. The PDR was  
192 significantly higher in the CMC group ( $p < 0.001$ ).

193

### 194 ***Adenoma detection rate***

195 A total of 442 people (59.2%) had >1 adenoma: 191 (ADR: 49.2%) in the  
196 SC group and 251 (70.1%) in the CMC group. The ADR was significantly  
197 higher in the CMC group ( $p < 0.001$ ), and MAP was also significantly  
198 higher in the CMC group than that in the SC group ( $1.69 \pm 1.93$  vs.  $1.06$   
199  $\pm 1.59$ , respectively;  $p < 0.001$ ). Proximal MAP significantly increased  
200 than did distal MAP (Table 2).

201

202 Table 2. Quality indicators by colonoscopy methods

	Standard	Combined	Total	P-value
	colonoscopy	colonoscopy	(N =	

	(n = 338)	(n = 358)	746)	
Polyp detection	232 (59.8%)	304 (84.9%)	536 (71.8%)	<0.001*
Adenoma detection	191 (49.2%)	251 (70.1%)	442 (59.2%)	<0.001*
Total MAP <sup>a</sup>	1.06 ± 1.59	1.69 ± 1.93	1.36 ± 1.79	<0.001*
Proximal MAP <sup>b</sup>	0.55 ± 1.01	1.24 ± 1.63	0.88 ± 1.39	<0.001*
Distal MAP <sup>c</sup>	0.51 ± 1.02	0.46 ± 0.78	0.48 ± 0.91	0.405

203 <sup>a</sup>MAP: mean number of adenomas detected per procedure; <sup>b</sup>proximal  
 204 MAP: mean number of adenomas detected per procedure, proximal to the  
 205 splenic flexure; <sup>c</sup>distal MAP: mean number of adenomas detected per  
 206 procedure, distal to the splenic flexure.

207 \*P-value was statistically significant.

208

## 209 **Discussion**

210 Colonoscopic screening is widely used for preventing colorectal cancer.  
 211 The two important quality indicators of colonoscopy are ADR and MAP  
 212 [9,10]. Several methods, such as Endocuff, Endocuff Vision, or EndoRings,  
 213 have been studied for increasing the two quality indicators [15]. However,  
 214 in countries with a National Health Insurance System, private clinics  
 215 have limitations for adopting these methods. We, therefore, decided to

216 determine whether there is a possibility to increase the ADR by  
217 combining several simple methods, such as water-aided, prone position,  
218 and clear cap-assisted colonoscopy. In this study, we found that the PDR,  
219 ADR, MAP, and proximal MAP were significantly higher in the CMC  
220 group than those in the SC group. Several studies reported that each of  
221 the cap-assisted colonoscopy [11], water-aided colonoscopy [12], and  
222 prone 12 o'clock-position [13,14] could improve ADR compared to SC.  
223 However, to the best of our knowledge, this is the first study that  
224 achieved an ADR >70% in the general population. This study suggests  
225 that an endoscopist can detect more adenomas, especially in the  
226 proximal colon, because the combined method enables fewer polyps to be  
227 missed. To the best of our knowledge, no previous study has assessed the  
228 efficacy of CMC.

229 This study has some limitations. First, this was a single-center  
230 retrospective study with a small number of subjects. Second, because of  
231 the limitation of the retrospective study design, we could not investigate  
232 the patients' family history of colorectal cancer and body mass index  
233 [18,19]. Third, each doctor's study time could not be evaluated, thereby  
234 introducing potential selection bias.

235 In conclusion, ADR and MAP of CMC were significantly higher  
236 than those of SC, suggesting that CMC may be more useful than SC.  
237 Therefore, further multicenter randomized controlled trials on each  
238 combinable method should be conducted to assess possible synergistic  
239 effects.

240

241 **Acknowledgments**

242 We would like to thank Editage ([www.editage.co.kr](http://www.editage.co.kr)) for editing and  
243 reviewing this manuscript for English language.

244

245 **References**

246

247 1. Bray F, Ferlay J, Soerjomataram I, Siegel RL, Torre LA, Jemal A. Global  
248 cancer statistics 2018: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality  
249 worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. *CA Cancer J Clin.* 2018;68:  
250 394-424.

251 2. Rex DK, Boland CR, Dominitz JA, Giardiello FM, Johnson DA,  
252 Kaltenbach T, et al. Colorectal cancer screening: recommendations for  
253 physicians and patients from the U.S. multi-society task force on  
254 colorectal cancer. *Am J Gastroenterol.* 2017;112: 1016-1030.

255 3. Brenner H, Chang-Claude J, Jansen L, Knebel P, Stock C, Hoffmeister  
256 M. Reduced risk of colorectal cancer up to 10 years after screening,  
257 surveillance, or diagnostic colonoscopy. *Gastroenterology.* 2014;146:  
258 709-717.

259 4. Lieberman D, Moravec M, Holub J, Michaels L, Eisen G. Polyp size and  
260 advanced histology in patients undergoing colonoscopy screening:  
261 implications for CT colonography. *Gastroenterology.* 2008;135: 1100-  
262 1105.

263 5. Winawer SJ, Zauber AG, Ho MN, O'Brien MJ, Gottlieb LS, Sternberg  
264 SS, et al. Prevention of colorectal cancer by colonoscopic polypectomy.

- 265 The National Polyp Study Workgroup. *N Engl J Med*. 1993;329: 1977-  
266 1981.
- 267 6. Nishihara R, Wu K, Lochhead P, Liao X, Qian ZR, Inamura K, et al.  
268 Long-term colorectal-cancer incidence and mortality after lower  
269 endoscopy. *N Engl J Med*. 2013;369: 1095-1105.
- 270 7. Chen SC, Rex DK. Endoscopist can be more powerful than age and  
271 male gender in predicting adenoma detection at colonoscopy. *Am J*  
272 *Gastroenterol*. 2007;102: 856-861.
- 273 8. Rabeneck L, Paszat LF, Saskin R. Endoscopist specialty is associated  
274 with incident colorectal cancer after a negative colonoscopy. *Clin*  
275 *Gastroenterol Hepatol*. 2010;8: 275-279.
- 276 9. Kaminski MF, Regula J, Kraszewska E, Polkowski M, Wojciechowska U,  
277 Didkowska J, et al. Quality indicators for colonoscopy and the risk of  
278 interval cancer. *N Engl J Med*. 2010;362: 1795-1803.
- 279 10. Denis B, Sauleau EA, Gendre I, Exbrayat C, Piette C, Dancourt V, et  
280 al. The mean number of adenomas per procedure should become the gold  
281 standard to measure the neoplasia yield of colonoscopy: a population-  
282 based cohort study. *Dig Liver Dis*. 2014;46: 176-181.
- 283 11. Nutalapati V, Kanakadandi V, Desai M, Olyae M, Rastogi A. Cap-  
284 assisted colonoscopy: a meta-analysis of high-quality randomized  
285 controlled trials. *Endosc Int Open*. 2018;6: E1214-E1223.
- 286 12. Hafner S, Zolk K, Radaelli F, Otte J, Rabenstein T, Zolk O. Water  
287 infusion versus air insufflation for colonoscopy. *Cochrane Database Syst*  
288 *Rev*. 2015 May 26. CD009863.  
289 doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD009863.pub2.

- 290 13. De Silva AP, Kumarasena RS, Perera Keragala SD, Kalubowila U,  
291 Niriella M, Dassanayake AS, et al. The prone 12 o'clock position reduces  
292 ileal intubation time during colonoscopy compared to the left lateral 6  
293 o'clock (standard) position. *BMC Gastroenterol.* 2011 Aug 4. 11:89.  
294 doi:10.1186/1471-230X-11-89.
- 295 14. Yang MH, Cho J, Rampal, Choi EK, Choi YH, Lee JH, et al. The  
296 association between cecal insertion time and colorectal neoplasm  
297 detection. *BMC Gastroenterol.* 2013;13: 124.
- 298 15. Gkolfakis P, Tziatzios G, Spartalis E, Papanikolaou IS, Triantafyllou K.  
299 Colonoscopy attachments for the detection of precancerous lesions  
300 during colonoscopy: a review of the literature. *World J Gastroenterol.*  
301 2018;24: 4243-4253.
- 302 16. Barret M, Boustiere C, Canard JM, Arpurt JP, Bernardini D, Bulois P,  
303 et al. Factors associated with adenoma detection rate and diagnosis of  
304 polyps and colorectal cancer during colonoscopy in France: results of a  
305 prospective, nationwide survey. *PLoS One.* 2013;8: e68947.
- 306 17. Forbes N, Boyne DJ, Mazurek MS, Hilsden RJ, Sutherland RL, Pader J,  
307 et al. Association between endoscopist annual procedure volume and  
308 colonoscopy quality: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin*  
309 *Gastroenterol Hepatol.* 2020;S1542-3565: 30423-30427.
- 310 18. Henrikson NB, Webber EM, Goddard KA, Scrol A, Piper M, Williams  
311 MS, et al. Family history and the natural history of colorectal cancer:  
312 systematic review. *Genet Med.* 2015;17: 702-712.
- 313 19. Anderson JC, Messina CR, Cohn W, Gottfried E, Ingber S, Bernstein G,  
314 et al. Factors predictive of difficult colonoscopy. *Gastrointest Endosc.*

315 2001;54: 558-662.

