IMPORTANT COPYRIGHT NOTICE: This electronic article is provided to you by courtesy of Ferring Pharmaceuticals. The document is provided for personal usage only. Further reproduction and/or distribution of the document is strictly prohibited.

Title:

Meta-analysis: randomized controlled trials of 4-L polyethylene glycol and sodium phosphate solution as bowel preparation for colonoscopy

Authors:

R. Juluri, G. Eckert and T.F. Imperiale

Journal:

Alimentary Pharmacology and Therapeutics 2010

DO NOT REMOVE THIS STATEMENT
Copyright Agency Limited (CAL) licensed copy.
To copy this document, please contact CAL.

Meta-analysis: randomized controlled trials of 4-L polyethylene glycol and sodium phosphate solution as bowel preparation for colonoscopy

R. Juluri*, G. Eckert† & T. F. Imperiale*,‡,§

*Department of Medicine, Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Indiana University School of Medicine, Indianapolis, IN, USA.
†Division of Biostatistics, Indiana University School of Medicine, Indianapolis, IN, USA.
‡Clarian/Indiana University Digestive Disease Center, Indianapolis, IN, USA.
§Regenstrief Institute, Inc, Indianapolis, IN, USA.

Correspondence to:
Dr R. Juluri, Indiana University School of Medicine, Regenstrief Health Center, Room 6509, 1050 Wishard Blvd, Indianapolis, IN 46202-2859, USA.
E-mail: rjuluri@iupui.edu

Publication data
Submitted 29 September 2009
First decision 16 October 2009
Resubmitted 22 March 2010
Accepted 5 April 2010
Epub Accepted Article 7 April 2010

As part of AP&T's peer-review process, a technical check of this meta-analysis was performed by Dr. P. Collins.

SUMMARY

Background
Randomized controlled trials (RCTs) comparing polyethylene glycol (PEG) with sodium phosphate (NaP) are inconsistent.

Aim
To compare the efficacy of and tolerance to PEG vs. NaP for bowel preparation.

Methods
We used MEDLINE and EMBASE to identify English-language RCTs published between 1990 and 2008 comparing 4-L PEG with two 45 mL doses of NaP in adults undergoing elective colonoscopy. We calculated the pooled odds ratios (ORs) for preparation quality and proportion of subjects completing the preparation.

Results
From 18 trials (n = 2792), subjects receiving NaP were more likely to have an excellent or good quality preparation than those receiving PEG (82% vs. 77%; OR = 1.43; 95% CI, 1.01–2.00). Among a subgroup of 10 trials in which prep quality was reported in greater detail, there were no differences in the proportions of excellent, good, fair or poor preparation quality. Among nine trials that assessed preparation completion rates, patients receiving NaP were more likely to complete the preparation than patients receiving 4-L PEG (3.9% vs. 9.8% respectively did not complete the preparation; OR = 0.40; CI, 0.17–0.88).

Conclusion
Among 18 head-to-head RCTs of NaP vs. 4-L PEG, NaP was more likely to be completed and to result in an excellent or good quality preparation.

Aliment Pharmacol Ther 2010; **32**: 171–181

© 2010 Blackwell Publishing Ltd
doi:10.1111/j.1365-2036.2010.04326.x

INTRODUCTION

It is estimated that 14 million colonoscopies were performed in the United States in 2002.[1] Adequate preparation of the bowel is necessary for optimal visualization of the colonic mucosa.[2] Patients often state that preparation (prep) for colonoscopy (CY) is the worst part of entire process.[3, 4] The difficulty with preparation may be related to taste and/or volume of the prep, resulting side effects or use of adjunctive medications.

Of the commercially available preps, PEG and NaP are most commonly used.

Introduced in 1980, polyethylene glycol (PEG) (NuLYTELY, and GoLYTELY; Braintree Laboratories, Inc, Braintree, MA, USA; Colyte; Schwarz Pharma, Milwaukee, WI, USA) is an orally administered isotonic solution.[5] As PEG is nondigestible and non-absorbable, it cleanses the colon by washout of intraluminal contents.[6] As it is iso-osmolar with plasma, the large volume of PEG does not result in significant fluid shifts. It has been shown to be highly effective when taken as instructed (4-L of PEG solution).[7, 8] However, the efficacy of standard 4-L PEG outside clinical trials is compromised by poor patient compliance. The large volume and taste are the main factors that contribute to poor patient compliance and tolerability,[9, 10] which led to development of reduced PEG volume solutions with or without laxatives, a sulphate-free version, and flavoured PEG solutions (HalfLytely or 2-L PEG, NuLYTELY, TriLite) in an attempt to reduce the sulphate odour and improve taste.[11, 12] Despite these improvements, nausea and abdominal discomfort commonly result in poor prep quality, the need for repeat procedures and higher costs.[13]

Sodium phosphate (NaP) solution, a buffered saline laxative, gained popularity as an alternative method for colonic preparation largely as a result of its smaller volume. Containing monobasic sodium phosphate and dibasic sodium phosphate, NaP acts as an osmotic laxative, cleansing the colon by drawing fluids into the gastrointestinal tract. In addition, NaP tablets (Visicol, Salix Pharmaceuticals, Morrisville, NC, USA) were designed to improve the taste and reduce the volume required for bowel preparation. Several randomized trials comparing PEG and NaP suggest that NaP is safe, cost effective, better tolerated and equally effective as or more effective than PEG.[6, 14–17]

Previous meta-analyses comparing these two preps are either not current,[6] include paediatric trials and off-label doses of NaP[18] or include atypical doses of both preps.[19] The objective of this study was to use meta-analysis to compare the efficacy of and adherence to 4-L PEG vs. two 45 mL doses of NaP preps for elective colonoscopy in adults.

METHODS

Search strategy and selection criteria

We searched the medical literature from 1990 to 2008 using MEDLINE and EMBASE bibliographic databases to identify all relevant English language publications. The search strategy used the following MeSH search terms: (i) colonoscopy, (ii) polyethylene glycol, (iii) phosphates, (iv) cathartics and (v) bowel prep. We limited these sets of articles to diagnostics and therapeutic uses and to human studies published in English that compared 4-L PEG vs. two 45 mL doses of NaP in adults undergoing elective colonoscopy. In addition, we hand-searched the reference lists of every primary study for additional publications. The following criteria were used to select studies for inclusion: (i) study design: randomized controlled trials (RCTs), (ii) patient population: adult patients undergoing elective colonoscopy, (iii) dosing and frequency schedules of PEG and NaP. We excluded trials that were duplicate studies and those that lacked categorical data on both prep quality and adherence. We also excluded review articles, editorials, letters to editor and studies published only in abstract form. Decisions about study inclusion and exclusion were made independently by two authors (R.J., T.F.I), with disagreements resolved through discussion.

Quantitative analysis

Descriptive data were abstracted to determine clinical similarity of the trials. We abstracted quantitative data for each trial, including the number of subjects in each treatment group and those with each outcome. Data extraction was performed primarily by the first author, with random checks by the third author. Discrepancies in the data extraction process were resolved through discussion. Forest plots were used to summarize the treatment effect for each trial. In combining data from the trials, we assumed the presence of heterogeneity prior to pooling the data and accordingly used the random effects model developed by DerSimonian-Laird,[20] which allows adjustment for variability among trials by providing a more conservative estimate of the range of an effect through wider confidence intervals (CIs).

The treatment effect was computed using the pooled odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence limits for prep quality (excellent, good, fair and poor) and for the proportions of subjects completing the prep. Weighted

© 2010 Blackwell Publishing Ltd

proportions for each outcome were derived using the inverse of the variance for each trial. Statistical heterogeneity was assessed with Woolf's test.[21] Funnel plots, which plot the inverse of the standard error of the log-odds ratio against the log-odds ratio, were used to look for evidence of publication bias. All calculations were performed using R-META LIBRARY (version 2.14) for the statistical software R (version 2.5.1).

RESULTS

Descriptive and qualitative assessment

The MEDLIINE and EMBASE databases identified 174 abstracts from 1990 to 2008. We excluded 57 abstracts because they were trials where colonoscopy was not used ($n = 11$), were published in foreign language ($n = 8$), were not randomized trials ($n = 13$) or were trials published prior to 1990 ($n = 18$) and others ($n = 7$). Of the 117 abstracts that described randomized controlled trials, we excluded 98 trials that compared either PEG or NaP with other dosing regimens of the same prep. Of 19 trials included for full text review, we excluded one trial[22] because it contained no data on either prep quality or patient adherence (Figure 1).

For analysis, we included 18 randomized controlled trials[9, 14–16, 23–36] involving 2792 patients. Descriptive data for each trial are shown in Table 1. Mean age and gender distribution were similar for the 4-L PEG and NaP solution groups. All trials were investigator-blinded and used comparable rating scales for bowel prep quality:[9] excellent, small volume of clear liquid or greater than 95% of surface seen; good, large volume of clear liquid covering 5–25% of the surface, but greater than 90% of surface seen; fair, some semi-solid stool that could be suctioned or washed away but greater than 90% of surface seen; poor, semi-solid stool that could not be suctioned or washed away and less than 90% of surface seen. Of the 18 trials, 10 trials described prep quality in a greater detail or in finer gradations (excellent, good, fair, poor) rather than just reporting it as a cumulative measure (excellent/good and fair/poor).

The methods of preparation of PEG and NaP were similar among the trials, with minor variation in the timing of prep consumption. Dietary recommendations on the day prior to colonoscopy varied from a regular diet to a clear liquid diet for lunch to a full clear liquid diet in the evening. In total, we found the trials to be similar enough in study design, study populations, interventions and outcomes to combine them quantitatively.

Quantitative assessment

There was statistically significant heterogeneity for the outcomes of prep quality and inability to complete the prep (*P* value for excellent/good prep quality = 0.0003; *P* value for inability to complete the prep <0.0001), indicating that there was greater-than-expected statistical variation among the trials for both outcomes.[37]

Subjects who received NaP were more likely to have an excellent or good quality prep than were those who received PEG (82% vs. 77%; OR = 1.43; 95% CI, 1.01–2.00). Among a subgroup of 10 trials in which prep quality was reported in greater detail between NaP and PEG, there were no significant differences in the proportions of patients with any specific level of prep quality:



Figure 1 | Flowchart of the studies identified for the meta-analysis.

© 2010 Blackwell Publishing Ltd

Table 1 | Patient demographics

No	Year/ 1st author/ ref. no	Study population	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria	Total number analysed	Prep	No. per group	Mean age	Male/ Female	Unable to complete prep (%)	Prep quality: Excellent (%)	Prep quality: Good (%)	Prep quality: Excellent/ Good (%)	Conclusions: Prep quality	Conclusions: Prep completion
1	Vanner 1990[14]	Consecutive patients for elective colonoscopy	Polyps 56%, IBD 12%, bleeding 3%, others 29%	Creatinine 2.3 mg/dL, symptomatic CHF, massive ascites, MI within 6 months	102	NaP sol	54	52	30/24	0	26	54	80	NaP better	NaP better
						4-L PEG	48	58	25/23	20	6	27	33		
2	Kolts 1993[15]	Consecutive out-patients	Polyps 45%, GI bleed 32%, anaemia 4%, diarrhoea 4%, constipation 4%, other 11%	Unstable CV status, MI, CVA < 2 months, creatinine >2 mg/dL, massive ascites, active IBD, active diverticulitis, delayed gastric emptying	72	NaP sol	34	52	7/27	1	38	41	79	NaP better	NaP = PEG
						4L PEG	38	58	20/18	5	32	29	61		
3	Marshall 1993[29]	Consecutive, non-emergent patients	Not stated	Symptomatic CHF, recent MI, creatinine ≥2.3 mg/dL, ascites	143	NaP sol	70	57.2	64/79 for both groups	13	39	30	69	NaP = PEG	NaP = PEG
						4-L PEG	73	57.2		18	47	23	70		
4	Cohen 1994[16]	Elective colonoscopy; age/sex-matched	Not stated	Not stated	422	NaP sol	143	66.5	74/69	3	65	25	90	NaP better	NaP better
						4-L PEG	279	66.7	141/138	28	43	25	68		
5	Golub 1995†[36]	Consecutive, ambulatory patients matched for age/sex/ indication	Polyps 62%, bleeding 15%, cancer 13%, family history 3%, other 8%	Not stated	230	NaP sol	106	58.4	NA	1	46	43	89	NaP = PEG	NaP better
						4-L PEG	124	58.4	NA	15	48	37	85		
6	Chia 1995[31]	Elective colonoscopy	Not stated	> 60 years of age, pregnant, history of renal or cardiac diseases, acute IBD and intestinal obstruction	79	NaP sol	39	47.7	20/19	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	85	NaP better	NaP = PEG
						4-L PEG	40	53.2	15/25				63		
7	Henderson 1995[32]	Out-patient, elective colonoscopies	Not stated	Symptomatic CHF, recent MI, creatinine > 2 mg/dL, ascites	157	NaP sol	51	51	107/111 for both groups	1	Not specified	Not specified	91	NaP = PEG	NaP better
						4-L PEG	106	51		10			92		

© 2010 Blackwell Publishing Ltd

Table 1 | (Continued)

No	Year/ 1st author/ ref. no	Study population	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria	Total number analysed	Prep	No. per group	Mean age	Male/ Female	Unable to complete prep (%)	Prep quality: Excellent (%)	Prep quality: Good (%)	Prep quality: Excellent/ Good (%)	Conclusions: Prep quality	Conclusions: Prep completion
8	Thompson 1996[28]	Out-patient colonoscopy	Not stated	Ischaemic chest pain, MI, TIA/CVA in last 6 months, creatinine > 200 μg/L, ascites, CHF, colostomy, AMS	116	NaP sol 4-L PEG	61 55	72 70	47/14 38/17	3 2	20 15	46 44	66 58	NaP better	NaP better
9	Clarkston 1996[27]	Out-patient colonoscopy	Not stated	Severe CHF, creatinine ≥ 2.3 mg/dL, prior bowel resection	98	NaP sol 4-L PEG	49 49	57 57	22/27 12/37	4 27	45 31	36 50	81 81	NaP = PEG	NaP = PEG
10	Lee 1999[26]	Consecutive out-patients	Not stated	Not stated	159	NaP sol 4-L PEG	71 88	51.5 57.9	79/80 For all	4 11	40 43	31 31	71 74	NaP = PEG	NaP better
11	Aronchick 2000[9]	Out-patient colonoscopy	Not stated	CHF, chronic renal failure, megacolon, severe constipation, partial or subtotal colectomy, or pre-existing electrolyte abnormalities.	206	NaP sol 4-L PEG	106 100	60.3 58.8	46/60 52/48	1 12	77 66	9 16	86 82	NaP = PEG	NaP better
12	Arezzo 2000[30]	Consecutive patients	Not stated	Not stated	200	NaP sol 4-L PEG	100 100	61.9 60.5	45/55 52/48	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	68 50	NaP better	NaP = PEG
13	Seinela 2003[25]	Consecutive patients	Age > 80 years	Creatinine 2.3 mg/dL, CHF, massive ascites, MI, bowel resection	72	NaP sol 4-L PEG	37 35	84 84	1o/62 For all	Not specified	48 52	33 26	81 78	NaP = PEG	NaP = PEG
14	Law 2004*[24]	Elective colonoscopy	Age > 18 years	Intestinal obstruction, delayed gastric emptying, creatinine >0.2 mmol/L, CHF, MI in the last 6 months, massive ascites and pregnancy.	207	NaP sol 4-L PEG	101 106	58.1 58.1	NA NA	Not specified	15 12	50 47	65 59	NaP better	NaP better

© 2010 Blackwell Publishing Ltd

Table 1 | (Continued)

No	Year/ 1st author/ ref. no	Study population	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria	Total number analysed	Prep	No. per group	Mean age	Male/ Female	Unable to complete prep (%)	Prep quality: Excellent (%)	Prep quality: Good (%)	Prep quality: Excellent/ Good (%)	Conclusions: Prep quality	Conclusions: Prep completion
15	Hwang 2005[23]	Elective colonoscopy	Not stated	Symptomatic CHF, MI, creatinine >1.5 mg/dL, abnormal elevation of transaminases, ileus, bowel obstruction, gastric retention, uncontrolled HTN, unstable angina, pregnancy or breast feeding and severe constipation.	78	NaP sol	38	52.2	18/22	Not specified	58	21	79	NaP = PEG	NaP = PEG
						4-L PEG	40	52.4	25/15		55	28	83		
16	Bektas 2005[33]	Elective colonoscopy	Not stated	Creatinine > 2 mg/dL, pregnancy, bowel obstruction, symptomatic CHF, MI in last 3 months, emergent colonoscopy, acute IBD, ascites	97	NaP sol	61	56.7	29/32	Not specified	52	38	90	NaP = PEG	NaP better
						4-L PEG	36	54.3	13/23		47	44	91		
17	Huppertz-Hauss 2005*[34]	Consecutive out-patients for colonoscopy	Not stated	<18 years, creatinine >150 mmol/L, CHF, hepatic failure, electrolyte abnormalities,	160	NaP sol	84	58.6	43/41	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	85	NaP = PEG	NaP = PEG
						4-L PEG	76	57.4	29/47				81		
18	Rostom 2006†[35]	Elective colonoscopy	Patients 18–80 years old	Renal failure, unstable angina, acute coronary syndrome, CHF, ascites, megacolon, bowel obstruction, previous bowel resection and evaluation of diarrhoea	194	NaP sol	144	52	39/95	8	Data presented as mean scores	NaP better	NaP better		
						4-L PEG	50	55	16/34	21					

CHF, congestive heart failure; MI, myocardial infarction; ACS, acute coronary syndrome; HTN, hypertension; IBD, inflammatory bowel diseases; AMS, altered mental status; TIA, transient ischaemic attack; CVA, cerebrovascular accident.

* Trials not included in prep completion analysis as no data were available.

† Trials not included in prep quality analysis as the data were either presented as mean scores or not available.

© 2010 Blackwell Publishing Ltd

excellent (34% vs. 27%), good (30% vs. 30%), fair (17% vs. 17%) and poor (4.7% vs. 7.7%) (Table 2, Figure 2). Among the nine trials that assessed prep completion rates (Table 2, Figure 3), patients receiving NaP solution were more likely to complete the preparation than patients receiving 4-L PEG (3.9% vs. 9.8% respectively, did not complete the preparation; OR = 0.40; CI, 0.17–0.88). Serious adverse effects were not described for either prep among the trials. Funnel plots for both outcomes reveal no clear evidence of publication bias (Figures 4 and 5).

DISCUSSION

This meta-analysis of 18 randomized controlled trials comparing NaP solution with 4-L PEG shows that NaP solution is more likely than 4-L PEG both to be completed by patients and to result in an excellent or good quality prep. Although there were no differences in any specific level of prep quality between NaP solution and 4-L PEG among those trials in which prep quality was reported in finer detail, the trends in the data indicate a higher proportion of NaP patients with excellent quality prep and a lower proportion with poor quality prep.

The previous meta-analyses of head-to-head trials of PEG vs. NaP have reported that NaP is more effective, better tolerated and less costly than PEG.[6, 19] However, in 2007, a meta-analysis by Belsey *et al.* reported that no single bowel preparation was consistently superior to the others.[18] To incorporate all the available evidence, we included trials that were either not included in the previous analyses or that were more recently published.[9, 23, 30, 33, 35]

This analysis has several strong points. First, our literature search was comprehensive in scope and we identified all relevant studies. Second, we included only randomized trials, which are considered superior to non-randomized comparisons. Third, the trials were very similar in study population recruited, in how the interventions (i.e. preps) were administered and in the way outcomes were measured. Although the trials were statistically heterogeneous, they were clinically homogeneous from a qualitative standpoint. Fourth, we used a random effects model, which provides conservative quantitative results. Finally, we found no clear evidence of publication bias, as supported by funnel plots.

Limitations of this analysis deserve comment. The potential for statistical heterogeneity is always present when combining trials quantitatively, and to address this issue, we assessed the trials qualitatively and determined that they were clinically similar enough to perform



Figure 2 | Forest plot of prep quality among the trials.

Table 2 | Comparison of percent completion and prep quality: 4-L PEG vs. NaP

Outcome	Study No.	NaP	4-L PEG	Odds ratio (95% CI)	Heterogeneity *P*-value*
Unable to complete	9	3.90%	9.83%	0.40 (0.17–0.88)	<0.0001
Excellent/good quality	16	82.42%	77.03%	1.43 (1.01–2.0)	0.0003
Excellent quality	10	33.94%	26.86%	1.26 (0.94–1.7)	0.23
Good quality	10	30.44%	29.69%	1.12 (0.8–1.56)	0.065
Fair quality	10	16.60%	17.40%	0.78 (0.59–1.04)	0.671
Poor quality	9	4.70%	7.74%	0.67 (0.36–1.23)	0.046

* *P*-value from the Woolf's test for heterogeneity.

© 2010 Blackwell Publishing Ltd



Figure 3 | Forest plot of prep completion among the trials.



Figure 4 | Funnel plot of prep quality.



Figure 5 | Funnel plot of prep completion.

meta-analysis. We used a random-effects model in the analysis, which provides a more conservative result with wider confidence intervals. Several factors may contribute to clinical and/or methodological heterogeneity among trials. One factor is variation in timing of bowel prep. The time at which the bowel prep was started was not uniform among the trials ranging from 48 h[25] to 12 h before the scheduled procedure. This was an issue, particularly for patients undergoing the procedure in the afternoon, as it may have an effect on prep quality.[30, 36] Some of the trials did not provide information about timing of the prep.[34, 35]

Another factor potentially contributing to heterogeneity is variation in dietary instructions prior to and during the prep, which also were not uniform among the trials, and which ranged from a regular diet to a clear liquid diet for lunch and clear liquid diet in the evening. A third possible factor is the use of adjunctive liquids consumed during the prep.

In contrast to the previous meta-analyses on this topic,[6, 18, 19] we did not include an assessment of study quality. One reason for not doing so was that, based on our initial reading of the included trials, we thought they were very similar in design, with comparable study populations, interventions and outcomes. In this case, we would have expected little variation in study quality. Secondly, there is no consensus on how best to use study quality in the quantitative part of a systematic review. Choices are to exclude the lowest quality trials, weight each study's quantitative results by a factor reflective of its quality or stratify quantitative results based on a cut-point in the quality score. While it remains unproven, our impression is that assessing and incorporating study quality would probably have had little effect on the quantitative results.

In recent years, there have been case series of renal insufficiency attributable to nephrocalcinosis with the use of NaP for colonoscopy preparation. A total of 37 cases have been reported over a 4-year period, four of which progressed to end stage renal disease requiring dialysis.[38–41] The majority of these patients had one or more

© 2010 Blackwell Publishing Ltd

of the following co-morbid conditions: diabetes mellitus, hypertension treated with angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitor (ACE-I) or angiotensin receptor blocker (ARB) or diuretics, pre-existing renal insufficiency, older age; small bowel disease (that resulted in calcium and vitamin D malabsorption). Renal biopsies of many of the reported cases have shown nephrocalcinosis with intratubular deposition of calcium-phosphate. The term for this pathological condition is acute phosphate nephropathy (APN).The histopathology suggests that sodium phosphate ingestion leads to obstructive calcium-phosphate crystalluria followed by acute intratubular nephrocalcinosis. These reports raised concerns that led Food and Drug Administration (FDA)[42] to announce a safety alert in December 2008 stating that a Boxed Warning was to be added to the labelling on prescription of oral sodium phosphate preparations (Visicol and OsmoPrep). The FDA further recommended against the use of over-the-counter oral solution phosphate products for bowel preparation. Shortly after this announcement, all over-the-counter NaP products were voluntarily removed from the market, with a subsequent sharp decline in the use of NaP solution.

Despite the FDA's action and resulting reaction, the published data suggest that absolute risk of APN is very low.[43, 44] A recent systematic review and meta-analysis of seven controlled studies (patient $N = 14\,520$) of the effects of NaP vs. comparator on kidney function showed that there was significant clinical heterogeneity in the populations studied, study methods, definition of kidney injury and results.[45] Quantitatively, the pooled odds ratio for kidney injury among NaP-treated patients ranged from 1.08 (CI, 0.71–1.62) to 1.22 (CI, 0.77–1.92), neither of which is statistically significant. The investigators concluded that it was not possible to discern whether there is a true association between NaP and kidney injury. In addition, an appropriate dosing interval of 10–12 h in between doses of NaP may reduce the risk for APN.[46]

The results of this meta-analysis apply to patients undergoing elective colonoscopy who do not have a history of co-morbid conditions, such as renal insufficiency, recent myocardial infarction and congestive heart failure; particularly, NaP should not be used in patients suspected to have or patients with inflammatory bowel diseases because of the apthous ulcers it may cause resulting in complexity in interpreting endoscopic and histological findings.[47, 48] Physicians should be aware of the risk of acute kidney injury with NaP preparations and should avoid its use in elderly patients and in those with pre-existing renal insufficiency. In addition, NaP should be used with caution in patients on medications that can affect volume status or renal function (diuretics, ACE-I or ARBs). Furthermore, all patients should be encouraged to hydrate themselves adequately prior to and while using NaP preparations. With the recent FDA safety alert, over-the-counter OSPs should not be used for bowel preparation, although they are still available for treatment of constipation. Despite the current restriction on the use of NaP solution, up to nearly 75% of the patients undergoing elective colonoscopy are eligible to receive NaP preparation, given the fact that the tablet form is available by prescription.[49]

In conclusion, among 18 head-to-head randomized trials of NaP solution vs. 4-L PEG, NaP solution was more likely to be completed by patients and to result in excellent or good quality prep. If and when NaP solution is once again made available for bowel preparation, this analysis may have direct implications for patient care.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Declaration of personal interests: None. *Declaration of funding interests:* Supported in part by NIH grant # DK K24 02756 (TFI). Initial data analysis was undertaken by the authors listed. Authors have no relevant conflicts of interest to declare.

REFERENCES

1. Seeff LC, Richards TB, Shapiro JA, *et al.* How many endoscopies are performed for colorectal cancer screening? Results from CDC's survey of endoscopic capacity. *Gastroenterology* 2004; **127**: 1670–7.
2. Froehlich F, Wietlisbach V, Gonvers J-J, Burnand B, Vader J-P. Impact of colonic cleansing on quality and diagnostic yield of colonoscopy: the European Panel of Appropriateness of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy European multicenter study. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2005; **61**: 378–84.
3. Harewood GC, Sharma VK, de Garmo P, Harewood GC, Sharma VK, de Garmo P. Impact of colonoscopy preparation quality on detection of suspected colonic neoplasia. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2003; **58**: 76–9.
4. Nicholson FB, Korman MG, Nicholson FB, Korman MG. Acceptance of flexible sigmoidoscopy and colonoscopy for screening and surveillance in colorectal cancer prevention. *J Med Screen* 2005; **12**: 89–95.

© 2010 Blackwell Publishing Ltd

5. Davis GR, Santa Ana CA, Morawski SG, Fordtran JS. Development of a lavage solution associated with minimal water and electrolyte absorption or secretion. *Gastroenterology* 1980; **78**: 991–5.
6. Hsu CW, Imperiale TF. Meta-analysis and cost comparison of polyethylene glycol lavage versus sodium phosphate for colonoscopy preparation. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1998; **48**: 276–82.
7. DiPalma JA, Brady CE, 3rd, Stewart DL, *et al.* Comparison of colon cleansing methods in preparation for colonoscopy. *Gastroenterology* 1984; **86**: 856–60.
8. Thomas G, Brozinsky S, Isenberg JI. Patient acceptance and effectiveness of a balanced lavage solution (Golytely) versus the standard preparation for colonoscopy. *Gastroenterology* 1982; **82**: 435–7.
9. Aronchick CA, Lipshutz WH, Wright SH, Dufrayne F, Bergman G. A novel tableted purgative for colonoscopic preparation: efficacy and safety comparisons with Colyte and Fleet Phospho-Soda. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2000; **52**: 346–52.
10. Radaelli F, Meucci G, Imperiali G, *et al.* High-dose senna compared with conventional PEG-ES lavage as bowel preparation for elective colonoscopy: a prospective, randomized, investigator-blinded trial. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2005; **100**: 2674–80.
11. Fordtran JS, Santa Ana CA, Cleveland MvB. A low-sodium solution for gastrointestinal lavage. *Gastroenterology* 1990; **98**: 11–6.
12. Hayes A, Buffum M, Fuller D. Bowel preparation comparison: flavored versus unflavored colyte. *Gastroenterol Nurs* 2003; **26**: 106–9.
13. Rex DK, Imperiale TF, Latinovich DR, Bratcher LL. Impact of bowel preparation on efficiency and cost of colonoscopy. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2002; **97**: 1696–700.
14. Vanner SJ, MacDonald PH, Paterson WG, Prentice RS, Da Costa LR, Beck IT. A randomized prospective trial comparing oral sodium phosphate with standard polyethylene glycol-based lavage solution (Golytely) in the preparation of patients for colonoscopy. *Am J Gastroenterol* 1990; **85**: 422–7.
15. Kolts BE, Lyles WE, Achem SR, Burton L, Geller AJ, MacMath T. A comparison of the effectiveness and patient tolerance of oral sodium phosphate, castor oil, and standard electrolyte lavage for colonoscopy or sigmoidoscopy preparation. *Am J Gastroenterol* 1993; **88**: 1218–23.
16. Cohen SM, Wexner SD, Binderow SR, *et al.* Prospective, randomized, endoscopic-blinded trial comparing precolonoscopy bowel cleansing methods. *Dis Colon Rectum* 1994; **37**: 689–96.
17. Frommer D. Cleansing ability and tolerance of three bowel preparations for colonoscopy. *Dis Colon Rectum* 1997; **40**: 100–4.
18. Belsey J, Epstein O, Heresbach D. Systematic review: oral bowel preparation for colonoscopy. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2007; **25**: 373–84.
19. Tan JJ, Tjandra JJ, Tan JJY. Which is the optimal bowel preparation for colonoscopy - a meta-analysis. *Colorectal Dis* 2006; **8**: 247–58.
20. DerSimonian R. Combining evidence from clinical trials. *Anesth Analg* 1990; **70**: 475–6.
21. Woolf B. On estimating the relation between blood group and disease. *Ann Human Genet (London)* 1955; **19**: 251–3.
22. Kossi J, Kontula I, Laato M. Sodium phosphate is superior to polyethylene glycol in bowel cleansing and shortens the time it takes to visualize colon mucosa. *Scand J Gastroenterol* 2003; **38**: 1187–90.
23. Hwang K-L, Chen WT-L, Hsiao K-H, *et al.* Prospective randomized comparison of oral sodium phosphate and polyethylene glycol lavage for colonoscopy preparation. *World J Gastroenterol* 2005; **11**: 7486–93.
24. Law W-L, Choi H-K, Chu K-W, Ho JWC, Wong L. Bowel preparation for colonoscopy: a randomized controlled trial comparing polyethylene glycol solution, one dose and two doses of oral sodium phosphate solution. *Asian J* 2004; **27**: 120–4.
25. Seinela L, Pehkonen E, Laasanen T, Ahvenainen J. Bowel preparation for colonoscopy in very old patients: a randomized prospective trial comparing oral sodium phosphate and polyethylene glycol electrolyte lavage solution. *Scand J Gastroenterol* 2003; **38**: 216–20.
26. Lee J, McCallion K, Acheson AG, Irwin ST. A prospective randomised study comparing polyethylene glycol and sodium phosphate bowel cleansing solutions for colonoscopy. *Ulster Med J* 1999; **68**: 68–72.
27. Clarkston WK, Tsen TN, Dies DF, Schratz CL, Vaswani SK, Bjerregaard P. Oral sodium phosphate versus sulfate-free polyethylene glycol electrolyte lavage solution in outpatient preparation for colonoscopy: a prospective comparison. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1996; **43**: 42–8.
28. Thomson A, Naidoo P, Crotty B. Bowel preparation for colonoscopy: a randomized prospective trail comparing sodium phosphate and polyethylene glycol in a predominantly elderly population. *J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 1996; **11**: 103–7.
29. Marshall JB, Pineda JJ, Barthel JS, King PD. Prospective, randomized trial comparing sodium phosphate solution with polyethylene glycol-electrolyte lavage for colonoscopy preparation. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1993; **39**: 631–4.
30. Arezzo A. Prospective randomized trial comparing bowel cleaning preparations for colonoscopy. *Surg Laparosc Endosc Percutan Tech* 2000; **10**: 215–7.
31. Chia YW, Cheng LC, Goh PM, *et al.* Role of oral sodium phosphate and its effectiveness in large bowel preparation for out-patient colonoscopy. *J R Coll Surg Edinb* 1995; **40**: 374–6.
32. Henderson JM, Barnett JL, Turgeon DK, *et al.* Single-day, divided-dose oral sodium phosphate laxative versus intestinal lavage as preparation for colonoscopy: efficacy and patient tolerance. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1995; **42**: 238–43.
33. Bektas H, Balik E, Bilsel Y, *et al.* Comparison of sodium phosphate, polyethylene glycol and senna solutions in bowel preparation: a prospective, randomized controlled clinical study. *Dig Endosc* 2005; **17**: 290–6.
34. Huppertz-Hauss G, Bretthauer M, Sauar J, *et al.* Polyethylene glycol versus sodium phosphate in bowel cleansing for colonoscopy: a randomized trial. *Endoscopy* 2005; **37**: 537–41.
35. Rostom A, Jolicoeur E, Dube C, *et al.* A randomized prospective trial comparing different regimens of oral sodium phosphate and polyethylene glycol-based lavage solution in the preparation of patients for colonoscopy. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2006; **64**: 544–52.
36. Golub RW, Kerner BA, Wise WE Jr, *et al.* Colonoscopic bowel preparations – which one? A blinded, prospective, randomized trial. *Dis Colon Rectum* 1995; **38**: 594–9.
37. L'Abbe KA, Detsky AS, O'Rourke K. Meta-analysis in clinical research. *Ann Inter Med* 1987; **107**: 224–33.
38. Desmeules S, Bergeron MJ, Isenring P. Acute phosphate nephropathy and renal failure. *N Engl J Med* 2003; **349**: 1006–7.
39. Gonlusen G, Akgun H, Ertan A, *et al.* Renal failure and nephrocalcinosis associated with oral sodium phosphate bowel cleansing: clinical patterns and renal biopsy findings. *Arch Pathol Lab Med* 2006; **130**: 101–6.
40. Markowitz GS, Stokes MB, Radhakrishnan J, *et al.* Acute phosphate nephropathy following oral sodium phosphate bowel purgative: an underrecognized cause of chronic renal failure. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 2005; **16**: 3389–96.
41. Markowitz GS, Perazella MA. Acute phosphate nephropathy. *Kidney Int* 2009; **76**: 1027–34.
42. FDA Safety Alert: Oral Sodium Phosphate (OSP) Products for Bowel Cleansing (December) 2008. Available at: http://fda.gov/Drugs/DrugSafety/.../ucm103354.htm.

© 2010 Blackwell Publishing Ltd

43. Hookey LC, Depew WT, Vanner S. The safety profile of oral sodium phosphate for colonic cleansing before colonoscopy in adults. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2002; **56**: 895–902.
44. Singal AK, Rosman AS, Post JB, Bauman WA, Spungen AM, Korsten MA. The renal safety of bowel preparations for colonoscopy: a comparative study of oral sodium phosphate solution and polyethylene glycol. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2008; **27**: 41–7.
45. Brunelli SM, Brunelli SM. Association between oral sodium phosphate bowel preparations and kidney injury: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Am J Kidney Dis* 2009; **53**: 448–56.
46. Dominitz JA. Take two phosphasodas and scope them in the morning. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2006; **64**: 553–5.
47. Zwas FR, Cirillo NW, el-Serag HB, Eisen RN. Colonic mucosal abnormalities associated with oral sodium phosphate solution. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1996; **43**: 463–6.
48. Watts DA, Lessells AM, Penman ID, *et al.* Endoscopic and histologic features of sodium phosphate bowel preparation-induced colonic ulceration: case report and review. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2002; **55**: 584–7.
49. Imperiale TF, Sherer E, Balph JA, Cardwell J, Qi A. Safety and effectiveness of a computer-based decision tool (DT) for tailoring preparation for colonoscopy (CY). *JGIM* 2010; **S3**: 387.

© 2010 Blackwell Publishing Ltd