8 e 9 MARZO 2019 BERGAMO HOTEL EXCELSIOR SAN MARCO Piazza della Repubblica, 6

Responsabile Scientifico: Fabio Pace

Come preparare al meglio il paziente per la colonscopia

Franco Radaelli UOC Gastroenterologia Ospedale Valduce, Como

Bowel Prep and Quality colonoscopy

PubMed 1990 – 2015:



no high-quality bowel prep = no high-quality colonoscopy

ESGE Colonoscopy key performance domains



Kaminski MF, et al. Endoscopy , 2017



Bowel preparation for colonoscopy: European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ESGE) Guideline



Effectiveness of bowel preparation:



Effectiveness of bowel preparation:



Efficacy Safety Tolerance

Education Motivation [Compliance]

Effectiveness of bowel preparation:





Bowel preparation for colonoscopy: European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ESGE) Guideline

2019 Updating (in press)

ESGE recommends split dosing for elective colonoscopy. For patients undergoing afternoon colonoscopy, a same day regimen in an acceptable alternative (Strong recommendation, high quality evidence)

ESGE recommends to take the last dose of bowel prep within 5 hours of colonoscopy and to complete it at least 2 hours before the start of the procedure (Strong recommendation, moderate quality evidence)













Split vs. day-before regimens for bowel prep: meta-analysis of RCTs

Martel M, Gastroenterology 2015

1. Adequate bowel cleansing

Bowel cleanliness	Numbers of trials ^a	ITT patients	OR (95% Cl) or WMD (95% Cl)	Heterogeneity P value	l ²	P value Eggers	P value Beggs
Split-dose vs day-before							
Split-dose of any product vs day-before of any product	32	8199	2.51 (1.86-3.39)	<.01	84.8%	.51	.33
PEG split-dose vs PEG day-before	10	2923	2.60 (1.46-4.63)	<.01	88.3%	.11	27
NaP split-dose vs NaP day-before	4	1018	9.34 (2.12-41.11)	<.01	87.7%	.73	.32
PICO split-dose vs PICO day-before	1	250	3.54 (1.95-6.45)	-	-	-	-

2. Willingness to repeat the same prep:

14 trials (4377 pts) Split dose vs. any regimen: = OR 1.90 (95% CI 1.05-3.46)

Split-dose preparation in screening colonoscopies increases ADR

Gut. 2016; 66(2):270-77

Multicenter RCT, Italy

- 690 FIT+ve screening subject
- 2L PEG-Asc (Moviprep®) Split-Dose vs. Day-Before
- Primary study end-point: ADR



ADR variation and risk of Interval Cancer:

Corley DA et al., N Engl J Med 2014; 370: 1298-803

314,872 colonoscopies136 endoscopists (ADR 7.3% - 55.5%)712 interval cancers (6 months – 10 years)



Each 1% ADR increase = 3% decrease in cancer risk +13% ADR = 50% reduction of IC risk

Split dose uptake in the *real-world*:



Split dose uptake in the *real-world*:

2014 Survey284 Italian endoscopy centers



Paggi S et al., Digestive Liver Disease 2016

Barriers against split-dose adoption for bowel prep

Gut 2017; 66(8):1428-1433

- 1.447 patients
- 8 AM-2 PM colonoscopies
- 4L-PEG
- Written instructions (split dose 3L+1L, day-before regimen)

Before *vs.* after 10AM: 33.4 % *vs.* 78.2% (P<0.01)



Split dose regimen uptake according to the time of colonoscopy appointment:

How to overcome barriers against split dosing?

Education

Organization

Endoscopists PCPs Pharmacists

8:00 – 10:00 EGDS 8:00 – 10:00 Inpatients Motivation Comunication

Getting Ready for **Your Colonoscopy**

One and Done

Let's do this once and let's do it right!

Inside you will find: • How to prepare for your colonoscopy • Information about your colonoscopy • Answers to commonly asked questions

Spiegel BM et al., Am J Gastroenterol 2011





Educational strategies for colonoscopy bowel prep overcome barriers against split-dosing: A randomized controlled trial

United European Gastroenterology Journal 2018, Vol. 6(2) 283-289 © Author(s) 2017 Reprints and permissions: sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav DOI: 10.1177/2050640617717157 journals.sagepub.com/home/ueg

Andrealli A et al., UEG Journal 2018







Bowel preparation for colonoscopy: European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ESGE) Guideline

2019 Updating (in press)

ESGE recommends verbal and written information for bowel preparation, plus enhanced instruction* (Strong recommendation, moderate quality evidence)

* phone call, telephone SMS, cartoon visual aid, newly designed booklet, smartphone apps, social media app

Enhanced instructions improve the quality of bowel prep: Meta-analysis of RCTs

Guo X et al. Gastrointest Endosc 2017; 85: 90-97.

	EI	i Ri		Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M–H, Random, 95% Cl	M–H, Random, 95% Cl
Calderwood, 2011	432	477	438	492	17.2%	1.18 [0.78, 1.80]	→ -
Kang, 2015	318	353	266	352	17.0%	2.94 [1.92, 4.49]	
Lee, 2015	243	251	118	135	9.6%	4.38 [1.84, 10.43]	
Liu, 2014	249	305	211	300	17.9%	1.88 [1.28, 2.75]	-
Lorenzo, 2015	108	108	146	152	1.4%	9.63 [0.54, 172.74]	→
Modi, 2009	58	84	46	80	13.0%	1.65 [0.87, 3.13]	+
Spiegel, 2011	100	132	62	134	15.1%	3.63 [2.15, 6.12]	 -
Tae, 2012	95	102	80	98	8.9%	3.05 [1.21, 7.68]	
Total (95% CI)		1812		1743	100.0%	2.35 [1.65, 3.35]	•
Total events	1603	88.5%	1367	78.4 %	6		
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.14$; $Chi^2 = 19.10$, $df = 7$ (P = .008); $I^2 = 63\%$ Test for overall effect: Z = 4.75 (P < .00001)						0.01 0.1 1 10 100 Favors [RI] Favors [EI]	

Adequate bowel prep: Enhanced vs. Regular Instrctions:

EDITORIAL

Enhancing bowel preparation instructions: Is the bang worth the buck,* or are we stuck with the muck?

CrossMark

In 2014, the U.S. Multi-Society Task Force on Colorectal Cancer Screening recommended that the adequacy of bowel preparation should be measured routinely during colonoscopy and that at least 85% of examinations should have a preparation adequate to permit recommendation of a screening or surveillance interval consistent with published guidelines.¹ The Task Force went on to suggest that any time the adequacy rate falls below 85%, a quality improvement initiative should be undertaken. This raises the question of how to improve bowel preparation quality when this quality benchmark is not met.

In this month's issue of *Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*, Guo et al² present a meta-analysis of 8 randomized controlled trials examining the ability of enhanced patient instructions to improve the quality of bowel preparation. The primary endpoint of this well-performed meta-analysis was quality of bowel preparation, measured as adequate versus inadequate, with varying scales used to rate bowel preparation across the included studies. Secondary outcomes included cecal intubation rate, withdrawal time, polyp detection rate, and patient's willingness to repeat the bowel preparation process. The study concluded that enhanced instructions improve bowel preparation quality compared with routine (or what the authors call "regular") instructions.

The conclusion of this study certainly has face validity. No one can argue that, at least to some extent, more is probably better when it comes to helping patients understand and comply with the complex (and often feared) bowel preparation process.^{3,4} Bowel preparation instructions could fall on a spectrum between providing only a prescription and minimal directions to hiring a personal coach to accompany the patient through the preparation process. Given limited resources, however, the question we should ask is this: which method of enhanced instruction is going to give us the most bang for our buck? Furthermore, as this meta-analysis makes clear, not every included randomized trial demonstrated a benefit from enhanced instructions.

For a better understanding of the findings, it may be helpful to look more closely at the variations in baseline

Copyright © 2017 by the American Society for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy 0016-5107/\$36.00 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gie.2016.06.039 bowel preparation quality (the control group receiving routine instructions) and the magnitude of improvement by enhanced instructions in each of the studies included in this meta-analysis (Table 1).

The studies included in this meta-analysis varied in both the type of regular versus enhanced instructions and the baseline adequate bowel preparation rate. Although not all studies concluded that their methods of enhancing instructions resulted in improvements in bowel preparation adequacy, it is notable that those with a lower baseline rate of adequacy had the most dramatic benefit from the

There are some concrete suggestions that practices can take if they find their patients' bowel preparation adequacy rates falling below the suggested 85% benchmark. First, changing to split-dosing of the bowel purgative is an absolute must in 2016.

intervention and were more likely to have seen improvement when supplementing their standard instructions.

There also may be a "ceiling effect" whereby simple enhancements, such as the inclusion of visual aids, additional verbal instruction, and booklets, fail to bring adequacy rates beyond the low 90% range. In fact, it seems unlikely that there is a simple magic bullet that can guarantee very high rates of adequacy. One recent publication described the experience of a multimodality intervention to improve bowel preparation adequacy.⁵ In this case, adequacy rates went from 91% to 96%, but only after standardization of bowel preparation instructions across all referring sites, conversion to split-dose preparations, the hiring of 2 patient navigators, and provision of feedback to referring practices. No single step caused a jump in adequacy rate. Rather, there was an incremental benefit from each of these interventions as they were initiated sequentially over several months.

Additionally, one needs to closely examine the definition of "adequate" in the studies included in this metaanalysis before assuming that all improvements in bowel preparation scores are meaningful. For example, 3 studies There are some concrete suggestions that practices can take if they find their patients' bowel preparation adequacy rates falling below the suggested 85% benchmark. First, changing to split-dosing of the bowel purgative is an absolute must in 2016.



Bowel preparation for colonoscopy: European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ESGE) Guideline

2019 Updating (in press)

ESGE recommends a split or same-day regimen of the high or low-volume PEG or non-PEG based agents for routine bowel preparation. In patients at risk for hydro-electolyte disturbances, the choice of laxative should be clinically driven (Strong recommendation, moderate quality evidence)

2L-PEG + Ascorbate	Moviprep®
2L PEG + Bisacodyl + Simethicone	LovolDyl-LovolEsse [®]
2L PEG + Citrate + Simethicone	Clensia®
1L PEG + Ascorbate (high conc.)	Plenvu [®]

Magnesium citrate + sodium picosulphate (MCSP)	Citrafleet [®] , Picoprep [®]
Oral Sulphate Solution (OSS, trisulfate)	lzinova [®]



Bowel preparation for colonoscopy: European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ESGE) Guideline

2019 Updating (in press)

ESGE advises against the routione use of oral sodium phospate because of safety concerns (Strong recommendation, low quality evidence)

4L PEG vs. Low-volume PEG plus Ascorbate: meta-analysis of RCTs

Xie Q et al. PLOSone 2016

Efficacy of bowel prep:

	low-volume PEG+AA		standard-volum	e PEG	Odds Ratio			Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	Year	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Clark 2007	139	145	145	149	2.2%	0.64 [0.18, 2.31]	2007	
Lee BC 2008	28	34	17	22	1.4%	1.37 [0.36, 5.20]	2008	
Ell, C.2008	136	153	147	155	6.1%	0.44 [0.18, 1.04]	2008	
Marmo, R 2010	91	218	95	215	21.0%	0.91 [0.62, 1.32]	2010	
Corporaal, S.2010	135	149	151	158	5.2%	0.45 [0.18, 1.14]	2010	
Jansen, Sita V 2011	149	188	141	182	11.2%	1.11 [0.68, 1.82]	2011	
Pontone, S. 2011	37	69	30	61	5.6%	1.19 [0.60, 2.38]	2011	
González-Méndez Y 2011	131	328	133	353	29.0%	1.10 [0.81, 1.50]	2011	
Valiante, F. 2012	129	166	104	166	8.7%	2.08 [1.28, 3.37]	2012	
Gentile, M. 2013	30	60	30	60	5.6%	1.00 [0.49, 2.05]	2012	
Ponchon, Thierry 2013	190	202	180	198	4.1%	1.58 [0.74, 3.38]	2013	
Total (95% CI)		1712		1719	100.0%	1.08 [0.92, 1.28]		•
Total events	1195		1173					
Heterogeneity: Chi ^z = 17.38	, df = 10 (P = 0.0)7); l² = 43	2%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.	95 (P = 0.34)							Standard-volume PEG Low-volume PEG +AA
Test for overall effect. $Z = 0$.	95 (P = 0.34)							Standard-volume PEG Low-volume PEG +AA

Patient compliance:

	low-volume P	EG+AA	standard-volun	ne PEG		Odds Ratio			Odds Ratio			
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	Year		M-H, Fixe	d, 95% Cl		
Lee BC 2008	31	34	11	22	1.9%	10.33 [2.42, 44.06]	2008					+
EII, C.2008	113	155	82	155	35.4%	2.40 [1.49, 3.85]	2008					
Marmo, R 2010	210	218	206	215	12.1%	1.15 [0.43, 3.03]	2010		-		-	
Corporaal, S.2010	135	149	133	158	19.3%	1.81 [0.90, 3.64]	2010		10 .		-	
Jansen, Sita V 2011	162	188	136	182	30.5%	2.11 [1.24, 3.59]	2011				-	
Valiante, F. 2012	166	166	163	166	0.8%	7.13 [0.37, 139.09]	2012					
Total (95% CI)		910		898	100.0%	2.23 [1.67, 2.98]				-		
Total events	817		731									
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	7.15, df = 5 (P =	0.21); I ² =	: 30%								<u>+</u>	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 5.43 (P < 0.0	10001)						Standard	-volume PEG	Low-volun	ne PEG	10

Figure 3. Forest plot depicting better compliance with low-volume PEG plus ascorbic acid than with standard-volume PEG as bowel preparations for colonoscopy.

Split (2LPEG-Asc vs. 2LPEG-CS + Bisacodyl vs. 4L PEG). A non-inferiority trial in population-based screening programs in Italy

Zorzi M et al, Endoscopy 2016





Fig. 2 Difference in proportions of adequate bowel cleansing between PEG-A and PEG-CS vs. 4L PEG, with 95% confidence intervals and the noninferiority margin (intention-to-treat population). Grey dashed line at $\Delta = -3\%$ indicates noninferiority margin; light grey-tinted region to the right of $\Delta = -3\%$ indicates values for which PEG-A and PEG-CS would be considered noninferior to 4L PEG. PEG, polyethylene glycol; PEG-A, PEG plus ascorbate; PEG-CS, PEG with citrate and simethicone plus bisacodyl.

The new PEG-based bowel preps: PEG+Citrate+Simethicone (Clensia®)

Endosc Int Open. 2018 Aug;6(8):E907-E913. doi: 10.1055/a-0624-2266. Epub 2018 Aug 1.

Efficacy and safety of a new low-volume PEG with citrate and simethicone bowel preparation for colonoscopy (Clensia): a multicenter randomized observer-blind clinical trial vs. a low-volume PEG with ascorbic acid (PEG-ASC).

Kump P¹, Hassan C², Spada C^{3,4}, Brownstone E⁵, Datz C⁶, Haefner M⁷, Renner F⁸, Schoefl R⁹, Schreiber F¹.

Dig Liver Dis. 2017 Jun;49(6):651-656. doi: 10.1016/j.dld.2017.01.167. Epub 2017 Feb 3.

Evaluation of Clensia[®], a new low-volume PEG bowel preparation in colonoscopy: Multicentre randomized controlled trial versus 4L PEG.

<u>Spada C¹, Cesaro P², Bazzoli F³, Saracco GM⁴, Cipolletta L⁵, Buri L⁶, Crosta C⁷, Petruzziello L², Ceroni L³, Fuccio L³, Giordanino C⁴, Elia C⁴, Rotondano G⁵, Bianco MA⁵, Simeth C⁶, Consalvo D⁶, De Roberto G⁷, Fiori G⁷, Campanale M², Costamagna G⁸.</u>

The new PEG-based bowel preps: 1L PEG+ASC (Plenvu[®])





NER1006 Phase 3 registrative studies: MORA-NOCT-DAYB Design and endpoints

MORA Study - "Colon cleansing efficacy and safety with 1 L NER1006 versus 2 L polyethylene glycol + ascorbate: a randomized phase 3 trial". Bisschops R et al. 2018 Endoscopy

NOCT Study - "Novel 1 L polyethylene glycol-based bowel preparation **NER1006** for overall and right-sided colon cleansing: a randomized controlled phase 3 trial **versus trisulfate**". DeMicco et al., 2018 Gastrointest Endoscopy

DAYB Study - "Colon cleansing efficacy and safety with 1 L NER1006 versus sodium picosulfate with magnesium citrate: a randomized phase 3 trial." Schreiber S et al. 2018 Endoscopy

- RCTs, phase III, Multicenter
- Single blinded Score by central readers/ colonoscopist (HCS, BBPS)
- Non-inferiority (superiority)
- Lab-tests (screening, colonoscopy, day+2, day+7)
- mFAS (ITT), PP analysis
- Primary Endpoints Central Readers
 - % patients with successful bowel cleansing (HCS grade A or B)
 - % patients with excellent + good cleansing in the ascending colon (HCS 3 or 4)

1L PEG + Asc phase 3 studies: Timing and mode of administration



1L PEG + Asc phase 3 studies: Efficacy end-point

	MORA (N2D)	MORA (N1 D)	DAYB	NOCT					
Study product, regimen	NER1006, split	NER1006, same day	NER1006, day before	NER1006, split					
Comparator, regimen	PEG 2L+Asc, split	PEG 2L + Asc, split	SP+MC, day before	Trisulfate, split					
Primary end points									
 Successful overall colon cleansing, HCS A + B (ITT) 	noninferior*	noninferior*	noninferior*	noninferior*					
 Successful overall colon cleansing, HCS A + B (PP) 	superior**	noninferior*	superior* *	noninferior*					
 High-quality cleaning in the right colon, HCS score 3+4 (ITT) 	superior* *	superior**	noninferior*	noninferior*					
 High-quality cleaning in the right colon, HCS score 3+4 (PP) 	superior* *	superior**	superior**	noninferior*					

Table 1 Summary of efficacy primary end points in NER1006 Phase 3 trials.

HCS, Harefield Cleansing Scale; ITT, intention-to-treat analysis; N2D, 2-day evening/morning split-dose regimen; N1D, 1-day morning-only regimen; PEG, polyethylene glycol; PP, per-protocol analysis; SP+MC, sodium picosulfate + magnesium citrate.

* Noninferiority demonstrated.

** Superiority demonstrated.

1L PEG + Asc phase 3 studies: Efficacy end-point

	MORA (N2D)	MORA (N1 D)	DAYB	NOCT					
Study product, regimen	NER1006, split	NER1006, same day	NER1006, day before	NER1006, split					
Comparator, regimen	PEG 2L+Asc, split	PEG 2L + Asc, split	SP+MC, day before	Trisulfate, split					
Primary end points			62.0% <i>vs</i> .53.8%						
 Successful overall colon cleansing, HCS A + B (ITT) 	noninferior*	noninferior*	noninferior*	noninferior*					
 Successful overall colon cleansing, HCS A + B (PP) 	superior** 97.3%	noninferior* 92.7%	superior* *	noninferior*					
 High-quality cleaning in the right colon, HCS score 3+4 (ITT) 	superior* *	superior**	noninferior*	noninferior*					
 High-quality cleaning in the right colon, HCS score 3+4 (PP) 	superior* *	superior**	superior**	noninferior*					

Table 1 Summary of efficacy primary end points in NER1006 Phase 3 trials.

HCS, Harefield Cleansing Scale; ITT, intention-to-treat analysis; N2D, 2-day evening/morning split-dose regimen; N1D, 1-day morning-only regimen; PEG, polyethylene glycol; PP, per-protocol analysis; SP+MC, sodium picosulfate + magnesium citrate.

* Noninferiority demonstrated.

** Superiority demonstrated.



Only split (same day)!!

🛞 Thieme

The paradox of the novel 1 L polyethylene glycol bowel preparation: efficacy, not tolerability, is the great new!

Referring to Bisschops R et al. p. 60–72 and Schreiber S et al. p. 73–84

MORA: Transient and non clinically significant modifications in the lab tests

Potassio SD

6.0 155₇ Grade 2 5.5mmol/L (mean+/- SD) 150-UL 5 Grade 1 4.5 UL 145 4.0 140 LL 3,5 Grade 1/2 135-3.0-·LL 132 2.5 130-1ine Visit³ lisit lisitA jiêjî

Sodio SD

Recommend water intake to minimize hypernatremia

Bowel prep for chromo-endoscopy?

Efficacy of Per-oral Methylene Blue Formulation for Screening Colonoscopy

Repici A, Gastroenterology 2019 (in press)





(including TSA/SSA) or carcinoma (ADR)

Odds Ratio (95% CI)	1.41 (1.09, 1.81)
Relative Risk (95% CI)	1.18 (1.04, 1.33)

and without any other adenoma or carcinoma

Odds Ratio (95% CI)	2.38 (1.20, 4.75)
Relative Risk (95% CI)	2.30 (1.19, 4.48)

MB-MMX 200 mg. Patients received an oral dose of 8 tablets of 25 mg MB-MMX: 3 tablets (75 mg) after 2 L of bowel preparation 3 tablets (75 mg) after 3 L

2 tablets (50 mg) after all 4 L







8 e 9 MARZO 2019 BERGAMO HOTEL EXCELSIOR SAN MARCO Pizza della Repubblica, 6



European Society of ESGE Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Bowel preparation for colonoscopy: European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ESGE) Guideline

2018 Updating (in press)

ESGE recommends split dosing for both morning and afternoon colonoscopy A same day regimen in an acceptable alternative (Strong recommendation, high quality evidence)

ESGE recommends to take the last dose of bowel prep within 5 hours of colonoscopy and to complete it at least 2 hours before the start of the procedure (Strong recommendation, moderate quality evidence)



8 e 9 MARZO 2019 BERGAMO HOTEL EXCELSIOR SAN MARCO Plazza della Repubblica, 6







8 e 9 MARZO 2019 BERGAMO HOTEL EXCELSIOR SAN MARCO Pazza della Repubblica, 6



European Society of ESGE Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Bowel preparation for colonoscopy: European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ESGE) Guideline

2018 Updating (in press)

ESGE recommends verbal and written information for bowel preparation, plus enhanced instruction* (Strong recommendation, moderate quality evidence)

* phone call, telephone SMS, cartoon visual aid, newly designed booklet, smartphone apps, social media app



8 e 9 MARZO 2019 BERGAMO HOTEL EXCELSIOR SAN MARCO Piazza della Repubblica, 6



European Society of ESGE Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Bowel preparation for colonoscopy: European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ESGE) Guideline

2018 Updating (in press)

ESGE recommends a split or same-day regimen of the high or low-volume PEG or non-PEG based agents for routine bowel preparation. In patients at risk for hydro-electolyte disturbances, the choice of laxative should be clinically driven (Strong recommendation, moderate quality evidence)

2L-PEG + Ascorbate	Moviprep®	Magnesium citrate +	Citrafleet®, Picop	
2L PEG + Bisacodyl + Simethicone	LovolDyl-LovolEsse [®]	sodium picosulphate (MCSP)		
2L PEG + Citrate + Simethicone	Clensia®	Oral Sulphate Solution (OSS, trisulfate)	Izinova®	
1L PEG + Ascorbate (high conc.)	Plenvu®	(,,		



8 e 9 MARZO 2019 BERGAMO HOTEL EXCELSIOR SAN MARCO Pizza della Repubblica, 6

esponsabile Scientifico: Fabio Pace

ep®



European Society of ESGE Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Bowel preparation for colonoscopy: European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ESGE) Guideline

2018 Updating (in press)

ESGE advises against the routione use of oral sodium phospate because of safety

CONCERNS (Strong recommendation, low quality evidence)



8 e 9 MARZO 2019 BERGAMO HOTEL EXCELSIOR SAN MARCO Piezza della Repubblica, 6



NER1006 Phase 3 registrative studies: MORA-NOCT-DAYB Design and endpoints

MORA Study - "Colon cleansing efficacy and safety with 1 L NER1006 versus 2 L polyethylene glycol + ascorbate: a randomized phase 3 trial". Bisschops R et al. 2018 Endoscopy

NOCT Study - "Novel 1 L polyethylene glycol-based bowel preparation NER1006 for overall and right-sided colon cleansing: a randomized controlled phase 3 trial versus trisulfate". DeMicco et al., 2018 Gastrointest Endoscopy

DAYB Study - "Colon cleansing efficacy and safety with 1 L NER1006 versus sodium picosulfate with magnesium citrate: a randomized phase 3 trial." Schreiber S et al. 2018 Endoscopy

- RCTs, phase III, Multicenter
- Single blinded Score by central readers/ colonoscopist (HCS, BBPS)
- Non-inferiority (superiority)
- Lab-tests (screening, colonoscopy, day+2, day+7)
- mFAS (ITT), PP analysis
- Primary Endpoints Central Readers
 - % patients with successful bowel cleansing (HCS grade A or B)
 - % patients with excellent + good cleansing in the ascending colon (HCS 3 or 4)



8 e 9 MARZO 2019 BERGAMO HOTEL EXCELSIOR SAN MARCO Pazza della Repubblica, 6







8 e 9 MARZO 2019 BERGAMO HOTEL EXCELSIOR SAN MARCO Pazza della Repubblica, 6



Efficacy of Per-oral Methylene Blue Formulation for Screening Colonoscopy Repici A, Gastroenterology 2019 (in press)







8 e 9 MARZO 2019 BERGAMO HOTEL EXCELSIOR SAN MARCO Pazza della Repubblica, 6





8 e 9 MARZO 2019 BERGAMO HOTEL EXCELSIOR SAN MARCO Pazza della Repubblica. 6

