

1 **Systematic Review Protocol of aetiology of mechanical bowel obstruction in**
2 **Low-and-middle income countries: Has anything changed in the last two**
3 **decades?**

4 Yakubu Kevin Kwarshak^{1*}, Mohammed Nakodi Yisa², Oghenegare Asheaba
5 Kigbu³, Daniel Akut John⁴, Nankam David Jimwan⁵, Karen Chineme Ubabuike⁶,
6 Peter Mkurtar Yawe⁷

7

8 ^{1,4} Department of Surgery, Jos University Teaching Hospital, Jos, Nigeria

9 ² Medica Research Council (MRC) Unit, The Gambia at London School of
10 Hygiene and Tropical Medicine.

11 ³ Aberdeen Royal Infirmary, Forester hill Health Complex, Aberdeen, UK

12 ⁵ Médecins Sans Frontiers (MSF) Spain, Abuja, Nigeria

13 ^{6,7} Jos University Teaching Hospital, Jos, Plateau State, Nigeria

14 *Corresponding author

15 Dr Yakubu Kevin Kwarshak

16 Kwarshak87.kk@gmail.com

17

18 **ABSTRACT**

19 **Background:** Despite various causes of mechanical obstruction, there appears
20 to be a great deal of variation depending on geographical location and age.
21 Geographically, postoperative adhesions and hernia have been documented as
22 the most common aetiology of mechanical bowel obstruction in high-income
23 and low-and-middle-income countries, respectively. Whether there has been a

24 change in this trend in low- and middle-income countries is a matter of
25 speculation in the surgical community. Therefore, to fill this knowledge gap,
26 this study aims to systematically review the existing literature on the aetiology
27 of mechanical bowel obstruction with a focus on understanding the most
28 common cause of mechanical bowel obstruction in low- and middle-income
29 countries in both paediatric and adult populations to guide surgical practice.

30 **Methodology and Analysis:** This protocol was designed and written according
31 to the guidelines of the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and
32 Meta-analysis Protocol 2015 (PRISMA-P 2015) statement. However, the results
33 of the systematic review will be reported in accordance with the Preferred
34 Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-analysis (PRISMA) statement.
35 We will consider studies published in English and French between 2002 and
36 2022 that reported on the aetiology of mechanical bowel obstruction in any
37 age group in low- and middle-income countries. We will conduct a literature
38 search using Ovid MEDLINE, Ovid Embase, CINAHL on EBSCO and Web of
39 Science databases employing relevant subject headings, keywords and
40 synonyms, which will be combined using Boolean operators to refine the
41 search results. A hand search of references of retrieved literature will be
42 conducted. The retrieved articles will be imported into Zotero for de-
43 duplication. The resulting set of titles and abstracts will be uploaded to Rayyan
44 (an AI-assisted online systematic review tool), where they will be double-
45 checked to identify articles eligible for inclusion. Two independent reviewers
46 will screen articles to be included and disagreement will be resolved by
47 discussion or by a third reviewer as a tie-breaker. Also, data extraction will be
48 done by one reviewer and confirmed by another. Critical appraisal to assess
49 the quality of the included studies will be carried out by two independent
50 reviewers using the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) tools. We anticipate that the

51 eligible studies will be quite heterogeneous in terms of their design, outcomes
52 of interest, populations and comorbidities. Therefore, results may be
53 synthesised descriptively without meta-analysis using charts, graphs and
54 tables. Where possible, we will conduct a sub-analysis using conceptual
55 frameworks based on age, WHO regions and continents.

56 **Ethics and Dissemination:** No ethical approval will be sought because the
57 required data is already in the public domain. Findings will be published in
58 peer-reviewed journals.

59

60

61

62 **INTRODUCTION**

63 Acute bowel obstruction is one of the most common surgical emergencies
64 encountered by surgeons (1), particularly by surgical trainees in the Emergency
65 Department (ED). It accounts for 3% of all emergency admissions and 15% of
66 cases of acute abdominal pain (1). More than two-thirds of bowel obstructions
67 are mechanical small bowel obstructions (2). Mechanical bowel obstruction is
68 an obstruction to the forward movement of bowel contents caused by a
69 variety of causes and is characterised by a combination of the sudden onset of
70 vomiting, abdominal pain, distension and constipation, with a high likelihood
71 of strangulation and/or gangrene if not diagnosed and treated promptly (1–5)
72 Therefore, this disease tends to be associated with high morbidity and
73 mortality, especially in low-and-middle-income countries (LMICs) where the
74 majority of patients are seen in secondary care settings. Several papers have
75 reported a mortality rate of 5-13.5% associated with this mechanical

76 obstruction, which is higher in LMICs (3,5,6). Preventing this mortality requires
77 an up-to-date understanding of the common causes of this surgical pathology
78 so that surgeons and trainees can make a correct and timely diagnosis and take
79 appropriate therapeutic measures.

80 Mechanical bowel obstruction has many causes. Post-operative adhesions
81 have been reported as one of the most common aetiologies. They are reported
82 to occur in approximately 93% of patients who have undergone
83 abdominopelvic surgery (1). The most commonly observed sources of
84 peritoneal adhesions are appendectomy, gynaecological surgery and colorectal
85 surgery (1,3). However, only 5% of these are symptomatic(1). Another
86 important and common cause of bowel obstruction is hernia, such as inguinal,
87 umbilical and incisional subtypes (4). Other aetiologies include volvulus,
88 intussusception, intestinal malignancy, vermiform impaction, Meckel's
89 diverticulum and intestinal tuberculosis (3,4,7).

90 Despite these various causes of mechanical obstruction, there appears to be a
91 great deal of variation depending on geographical location and age (8). In
92 terms of age, hernia and adhesion as well as anorectal malformation and
93 intussusception have been reported to be the most common causes in adults
94 and children, respectively (1,3,8,9). Geographically, postoperative adhesions
95 have been documented as the most common aetiology of mechanical bowel
96 obstruction in high-income countries (HICs). This may be due to the high
97 volume of abdominal surgery (8,9). In contrast, many studies have reported
98 hernias as the most common aetiology in LMICs (1,4,8,10).

99 Whether there has been a change in this trend in LMICs is a matter of
100 speculation in the surgical community. Although there are international
101 empirical studies that have evaluated the changing trend in the causes of

102 mechanical bowel obstruction in different countries of the LMICs, the results of
103 these studies are contradictory (2–5,7,10,11). While some showed that hernia
104 remained the most common cause in LMICs (1,3,4,8), others showed changing
105 patterns towards postoperative adhesions (2,5,11). As a result, this review
106 intends to draw together the overall body of evidence to guide safe surgical
107 practice. In addition, most of these empirical studies are retrospective and
108 characterised by a low level of evidence. They need to be reviewed to generate
109 higher-level evidence. To the best of our knowledge, no systematic review has
110 been conducted in all LMICs to assess the aetiological pattern of mechanical
111 bowel obstruction, leaving a lack of up-to-date evidence to guide surgical
112 trainees and surgeons in the prompt diagnosis and management of such an
113 important surgical emergency. Therefore, to fill this knowledge gap, this study
114 aims to systematically review the existing literature on the aetiology of
115 mechanical bowel obstruction with a focus on understanding the most
116 common cause of mechanical bowel obstruction in LMICs in both paediatric
117 and adult populations to guide surgical practice. Given the high morbidity and
118 mortality associated with this condition, understanding the common
119 aetiological pattern of mechanical bowel obstruction is critical to improving
120 overall outcomes, as this would help surgical trainees in the emergency
121 department to maintain a high index of suspicion and avoid delays in diagnosis,
122 referral or appropriate prompt intervention. This is particularly important
123 given the fragile health systems and low numbers of surgeons in LMICs.

124 **METHODOLOGY**

125 This protocol was designed and written according to the guidelines of the
126 Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-analysis Protocol
127 2015 (PRISMA-P 2015) statement(12). This framework prescribes best

128 practices for the development and reporting of systematic review protocols.
129 The review has been registered in PROSPERO, an international digital
130 repository for the pre-registration of systematic reviews, identified by
131 CRD42023468901. There are several benefits to registering the research
132 protocol, including avoiding redundant research efforts, reducing bias, and
133 increasing the overall transparency of the review process. The results of the
134 systematic review will be presented in accordance with the Preferred
135 Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-analysis (PRISMA)
136 statement(13). Should any deviations from the established protocol occur
137 during the conduct of the review, these will be duly accounted for in the final
138 publication.

139 *Eligibility*

140 We will consider studies published between 2002 and 2022 in low- and middle-
141 income countries (LMICs) that are either case series, case-control or cohort
142 studies reporting on the aetiology of mechanical small bowel obstruction in
143 any age group. Studies must be published in either English or French. We will
144 exclude animal studies, studies with different designs, those published in high-
145 income countries, those outside the specified date range, or those published in
146 languages other than English or French. Should our manuscript be accepted for
147 publication, an updated literature search will be conducted by employing the
148 peer review study methodology. This will prevent missing on important new
149 evidence.

150 *Data Sources*

151 We will conduct a literature search using Ovid MEDLINE, Ovid Embase, CINAHL
152 on EBSCO and Web of Science databases. Our search strategy will include the
153 use of relevant subject headings, keywords and synonyms, which will be

154 combined using Boolean operators to refine the search results. To focus our
155 search on low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), we will use the ScHARR
156 geographic filter (14) to exclude studies from non-LMIC countries. In addition,
157 we will manually search the reference lists of the included studies to find
158 additional relevant articles.

159 *Search Strategy*

160 A search strategy was developed using the key terms 'small bowel obstruction',
161 'lower-middle-income countries' and 'aetiology'. The MEDLINE search strategy,
162 adapted for other databases, is shown in Figure 1.

163 **Figure 1: MEDLINE search strategy**

164

165

166 *Study selection and data extraction*

167 The retrieved references will be imported into Zotero for de-duplication. The
168 resulting set of titles and abstracts will be uploaded to Rayyan (15) (an AI-
169 assisted online systematic review tool), where they will be double-checked to
170 identify articles eligible for inclusion. These will then be exported to Zotero for
171 reference management and full-text screening. Studies that do not meet the
172 eligibility criteria at this stage will be excluded, with reasons documented. This
173 process is carried out by two independent authors. Disagreement will be
174 resolved by discussion or by a third reviewer as a tie-breaker.

175 A data extraction form adapted from the JBI will be used for data extraction.

176 The variables to be extracted from the included studies are described in Table
177 1. The data extraction form will be pre-tested independently by two reviewers
178 using randomly selected articles. This will help to identify gaps that can then be
179 used to refine the form. Data extraction will be carried out by two reviewers;

180 reviewer A will extract the data, while reviewer B will check the accuracy of the
181 extracted data

182 **Table 1: List of items to be extracted from included studies.**

S/N	Item
1.	Author name(s)
2.	Year of publication
3.	Study design
4.	Country of publication
5.	Age range of the study population
6.	Sample size
7.	Reported causes of mechanical small bowel obstruction (up to five)

183

184

185 *Risk of bias assessment*

186 Critical appraisal to assess the quality of the included studies will be carried out
187 by two independent reviewers. We will use the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI)
188 tools (16) for each study design (case series, case-control, cohort) to be
189 included in the review. We chose the JBI tools because they provide tools for a
190 variety of study designs and are a widely used set of tools in systematic
191 reviews. The JBI score is used to rate the quality of each included study as
192 good, fair or poor. The quality rating would not be used to exclude a study
193 from the review.

194 *Data synthesis*

195 We anticipate that the eligible studies will be quite heterogeneous in terms of
196 their design, outcomes of interest, populations and comorbidities. Therefore,

197 results may be synthesised descriptively without meta-analysis. The
198 characteristics of the included studies will be presented in a detailed table. In
199 addition, important findings will be highlighted using charts and graphs. The
200 review synthesis will be based on the major categories of small bowel
201 obstruction aetiologies identified. Where possible, we will conduct a sub-
202 analysis using conceptual frameworks based on age, WHO regions and
203 continents.

204 **DISCUSSION**

205 The proposed systematic review aims to examine the existing literature on the
206 causes of mechanical bowel obstruction in LMICs from 2002 to 2022, with a
207 particular interest in the common aetiology to guide surgical practice.

208 Identifying the evidence for common causes of mechanical bowel obstruction
209 in the context of fragile health systems in LMICs over the last two decades is
210 critical to halting the unacceptably high mortality associated with this surgical
211 condition. This review has the potential to provide surgical trainees with
212 scientific evidence to raise a high index of suspicion for prompt diagnosis in
213 patients presenting with acute abdomen to the emergency department.

214 Making the correct diagnosis would enable surgeons to offer appropriate
215 interventions to patients in need, regardless of the limited diagnostic
216 modalities in LMICs.

217 The review would identify gaps that could potentially be explored through
218 further research by scientists to better understand the aetiology of mechanical
219 bowel obstruction in LMICs. In addition, the evidence to be synthesised may
220 also assist academics in communicating new knowledge, as well as
221 policymakers in formulating appropriate policies that could improve surgical
222 needs and outcomes.

223 The review will have some limitations. Because it is limited to LMICs, a real-
224 time comparison with the more recent common aetiology of mechanical bowel
225 in HICs would be difficult. However, the robust health systems in HICs,
226 including advanced diagnostic modalities, can prevent missed diagnoses and
227 prompt treatment. Furthermore, the aetiological pattern of mechanical bowel
228 obstruction in this setting is unlikely to have changed, given the recent
229 incontrovertible evidence from empirical studies. Furthermore, due to a lack of
230 funding, librarians could not be consulted for expert input, which may have
231 resulted in some important empirical studies being overlooked. Despite these
232 limitations, this review, when completed, has great potential to add to the
233 body of knowledge, particularly in the surgical community, to improve
234 outcomes. It will also shape future research in the gaps that remain to be
235 identified.

236

237 REFERENCES

- 238 1. Karakaş DÖ, Yeşiltaş M, Gökçek B, Eğin S, Hot S. Etiology, management,
239 and survival of acute mechanical bowel obstruction: Five-year results of a
240 training and research hospital in Turkey. *Ulus Travma ve Acil Cerrahi*
241 *Derg.* 2019;25(3):268–80.
- 242 2. Markogiannakis H, Messaris E, Dardamanis D, Pararas N, Tzertzemelis D,
243 Giannopoulos P, et al. Acute mechanical bowel obstruction: Clinical
244 presentation, etiology, management and outcome. *World J*
245 *Gastroenterol.* 2007;13(3):432–7.
- 246 3. Zangana AM. Causes of Intestinal Obstruction in Erbil Teaching Hospital
247 Province – North of Iraq. 2008;7(3):215–25.

- 248 4. Nakanwagi AM, Kijjambu SC, Rip PO, Stone T. Critical Care and
249 Emergency Medicine Aetiology and Presentation of Intestinal Obstruction
250 among Patients Presenting to a Tertiary Hospital in Uganda ClinMed. Int J
251 Crit Care Emerg Med. 2016;2(2):4–7.
- 252 5. Mthethwa MR, Aldous C, Madiba TE. Clinicopathological spectrum of
253 small bowel obstruction and management outcomes in adults -
254 Experience at a regional academic hospital complex. South African J Surg.
255 2021;59(3):118–23.
- 256 6. Rnal JOU, Pu COM, Rch E, Elo E V, En PM, An JI. Lar Ity Search Based O N
257 Shape Representat I on in T I M E - Ser les Data Sets. Electron Publ.
258 2000;12(1):1–8.
- 259 7. Fekadu G, Tolera A, Beyene Bayissa B, Merga BT, Edessa D, Lamessa A.
260 Epidemiology and causes of intestinal obstruction in Ethiopia: A
261 systematic review. SAGE Open Med. 2022;10.
- 262 8. Lawal OO, Olayinka OS, Bankole JO. Spectrum of causes of intestinal
263 obstruction in adult Nigerian patients. South African J Surg.
264 2005;43(2):34–6.
- 265 9. Ullah S, Khan M, Mumtaz N, Naseer A. Original Article Intestinal
266 Obstruction : a Spectrum of Causes. Tuberculosis. :188–92.
- 267 10. Ooko PB, Sirera B, Saruni S, Topazian HM, White R. Pattern of adult
268 intestinal obstruction at Tenwek hospital, in south-western Kenya. Pan
269 Afr Med J. 2015;20:2–7.
- 270 11. Tsegaye S, Osman M, Bekele A, Tsegaye S, Hospital L. East and Central
271 African Journal of Surgery Volume 12 Number 1 - April 2007. East Cent
272 African J Surg. 2007;12(1):53–7.

273 12. Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, Gherzi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al.
274 Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis
275 protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. *BMJ* [Internet].
276 2015 Oct 12;349:g7647. Available from:
277 <https://www.bmj.com/content/349/bmj.g7647>

278 13. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD,
279 et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting
280 systematic reviews. *BMJ* [Internet]. 2021 Oct 12;372:n71. Available from:
281 <https://www.bmj.com/content/372/bmj.n71>

282 14. Sutton A, Campbell F. The SchARR LMIC filter: Adapting a low- and
283 middle-income countries geographic search filter to identify studies on
284 preterm birth prevention and management. *Res Synth Methods*
285 [Internet]. 2022 Sep 19;13(4):447–56. Available from:
286 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/jrsm.1552>

287 15. Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, Elmagarmid A. Rayyan—a web
288 and mobile app for systematic reviews. *Syst Rev* [Internet]. 2016 Oct
289 12;5(1):210. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-016-0384-4>

290 16. JBI Critical Appraisal Tools | JBI [Internet]. 2023. Available from:
291 <https://jbi.global/critical-appraisal-tools>

292

293

Figure 1: MEDLINE search strategy

OVID MEDLINE SEARCH STRATEGY

- 1 Intestinal Obstruction/ or ("intestinal obstruction" or "small bowel obstruction" or "jejun* adj3 obstuction" or "duoden* adj3 obstuction" or "ileal adj3 obstuction" or "impedance").mp.
- 2 Risk Factors/ or ("risk factors" or aetiology or causes or "predispos* adj3 factors").mp.
- 3 1 and 2
- 4 Developing Countries.sh,kf. or (Africa or Asia or Caribbean or West Indies or South America or Latin America or Central America).hw,kf,ti,ab,cp,in. or (Afghanistan or Angola or Armenia or Armenian or Bangladesh or Benin or Bhutan or Bolivia or Burkina Faso or Burkina Fasso or Burundi or Cambodia or Central African Republic or Chad or Comoros or Congo or Cote d'Ivoire or Ivory Coast or Djibouti or Egypt or El Salvador or Eritrea or Ethiopia or Gambia or Gaza or Georgia or Ghana or Guatemala or Guinea or Guam or Haiti or Honduras or India or Indonesia or Kenya or Kiribati or Korea or Kosovo or Kyrgyzstan or Lao PDR or Lesotho or Liberia or Madagascar or Malawi or Mali or Mauritania or Moldova or Mongolia or Morocco or Mozambique or Myanmar or Myanma or Nepal or Nicaragua or Niger or Nigeria or Pakistan or Paraguay or Philippines or Philipines or Phillipines or Phillippines or Rwanda or Ruanda or Sao Tome or Senegal or Sri Lanka or Solomon Islands or Somalia or Sudan or Swaziland or Tajikistan or Tanzania or Timor-Leste or Tokelau or Togo or Tuvalu or Uganda or Ukraine or Uzbekistan or Vanuatu or Vietnam or Viet Nam or West Bank or Yemen or Zambia or Zimbabwe).hw,kf,ti,ab,cp,in. or ((developing or less* developed or under developed or underdeveloped or middle income or low* income or underserved or under served or deprived or poor*) adj (countr* or nation? or population? or world)).ti,ab. or ((developing or less* developed or under developed or underdeveloped or middle income or low* income) adj (economy or economies)).ti,ab. or (low* adj (gdp or gnp or gross domestic or gross national)).ti,ab. or (low adj3 middle adj3 countr*).ti,ab. or (Imic or Imics or third world or lami countr*).ti,ab. or transitional countr*.ti,ab. or ((high burden or high-burden or countdown) adj countr*).ti,ab.
- 5 3 and 4
- 6 limit 5 to (humans and yr="2002 -Current")

Figure