1	Educational Virtual Reality Videos in Improving Bowel Preparation
2	Quality and Satisfaction of Outpatients Undergoing Colonoscopy:
3	Protocol of A Randomized Controlled Trial
4	
5	Design
6	The trial is a prospective, randomized, controlled, single-blinded, single-center trial.
7	Outpatients arranged to undergo a conscious colonoscopy (i.e., without sedation) for
8	screening or diagnostic purposes for the first time will be randomized to the control
9	group or the VR intervention group. This study, compared with conventional patient
10	education methods, aims to explore whether VR videos can improve the bowel
11	preparation quality, increase patient adherence and satisfaction, and reduce
12	pre-procedure anxiety.
13	
14	
15	Study Population
16	All patients who have the indications for colonoscopy screening presenting to Peking
17	Union Medical College Hospital, a tertiary hospital in Beijing, China, will be assessed
18	for eligibility during the appointment.
19	
20	Inclusion criteria
21	• Outpatients indicated for elective colonoscopy: 1) For screening purposes:
22	asymptomatic patients with average or high risk for colorectal cancer; 2) For
23	diagnostic purposes: patients presented with abnormal imaging or lower
24	gastrointestinal symptoms including bloody stool, chronic diarrhea and abdominal
25	pain
26	No prior colonoscopy
27	• Age 18-75 years
28	Written informed consent
29	
30	Exclusion criteria
31	Patient who meets any of the following criteria will be excluded:
32	History of bowel surgery
33	• Diagnosed with severe comorbidities (e.g., ascites, congestive heart failure, chronic
34	renal failure, coronary artery disease within the last six months)
35	 On constipation, laxatives, or anti-diarrheal medications
36	• Pregnant
37	 Severe constipation (<3 bowel movement/week)
38	• Inflammatory bowel disease (IBD)
39	Contradictions for colonoscopy
40	• Unable to watch VR videos (e.g., blindness)
41	

42

Randomization

- 43 After the colonoscopy is scheduled and written informed consent obtained, patients
- 44 will be randomized with 1:1 ratio to the coventional education method or the
- conventional education plus VR video. The randomization process will be run using
- 46 the R software (open source, www.r-project.org) in random blocks of four.

47

- 48 General bowel preparation requirement
- 49 Diet restriction: Low-residue diet until the evening on the day before colonoscopy
- 50 Colon cleansing regimens:
- The first dose: 2L laxatives (polyethylene glycol) used on the evening of the day
- 52 before colonoscopy (after dinner)
- The second dose: 1L laxatives used 3-4 hours before colonoscopy

54

- 55 The control group: conventional patient education methods
- Patients in the control group will only receive routine patient education on bowel
- 57 preparation of colonoscopy. A well-trained nurse or a doctor will provide oral
- instructions on bowel preparation (including definition, significance, correct steps as
- 59 well as dietary limitations). Written instructions are also provided to patients to take
- away, which have the same contents as the oral instructions.

61

- The intervention group: conventional methods plus VR videos
- In addition to the routine patient education methods mentioned above, patients in the
- 64 intervention group will watch a VR video for about 6 minutes. Videos will give
- 65 instructions on bowel preparation step by step, emphasize on points for attention
- before and after the procedure, and give brief introductions to the procedures of
- 67 colonoscopy and a to-do list after a therapeutic procedure (e.g., polypectomy).

68 69

Primary endpoint

- 70 The primary endpoint is the quality of bowel preparation measured by the Boston
- bowel preparation score evaluated during the procedure. Endoscopists are blinded to
- 72 the grouping of patients.

73 74

Secondary endpoints

- We also hypothesize that VR videos can increase patient motivation and deepen their
- understanding of colonoscopy, which is likely to increase the detection rate of
- abnormity, reduce anxiety, and improve patient experiences. We set secondary
- 78 endpoints as follows:
- Polyp detection rate (PDR).
- Adenoma detection rate (ADR).
- Cecal intubation rate.
- Patient compliance with bowel preparation (diet restriction and laxatives use).
- Withdrawal time.
- Pre-procedure anxiety (measured by self-rated sleep quality before the procedure).

85 • Overall satisfaction with bowel preparation. 86 • Willingness to take another colonoscopy if indicated. 87 88 Sample size calculation 89 The sample size estimation was based on the test of 2 independent proportions with a 90 2-sided α =0.05 and a power probability of 90% (β =0.1). The rate of adequate 91 preparation (a score≥2 for all regions) in the control group is 70%[3], and we 92 assumed an increase of 15% for the VR Group. We calculated that at least 161 93 evaluable patients would be required per group for the study to achieve this power. 94 95 Data collection and follow-up Data collection will be performed by using a standardized case report form. DSMC 96 97 will verify all primary and secondary endpoints as well as at least 10% of data in case 98 report forms against on-site source data. Discrepancies detected by the committee will 99 be resolved through a consensus by two investigators unaware of the study group 100 assignment and not involved in patient care. 101 **Descriptive statistics** 102 103 For categorical data, frequencies will be presented. Quantitative data will be presented 104 as the mean and standard deviation or median and interquartile range. Baseline 105 characteristics (all prior to randomization) are: age, sex, body mass index, education 106 level, annual personal income, living habits (including smoking, drinking and 107 exercise), dietary habit (vegetarianism/meatatarian/balanced diet), past medical 108 history of comorbidity (hypertension, diabetes mellitus, bronchitis, asthma, 109 congestive heart failure, chronic renal failure, coronary artery disease, IBD, 110 malignancy), symptoms (chronic diarrhea, constipation, mucous stool or bloody stool), 111 family history of colorectal cancer or specific inherited syndromes. 112 113 **Analyses** 114 All data will be analyzed according to the intention-to-treat approach in which all 115 randomized patients are included. Occurrences of the primary and secondary 116 endpoints are compared between the two groups. Results are presented as risk ratios 117 with corresponding 95% confidence intervals. A two-tailed P< 0.05 is considered 118 statistically significant. 119 120 **Trial Management** A steering committee will manage the trial. Screening and recruitment will be 121 reviewed at monthly meetings. An independent data and safety monitoring committee 122 123 (DSMC) will meet regularly to ensure patient safety and data quality. After the 124 colonoscopy of the last patient in the trial has been performed, an adjudication

committee blinded for the treatment allocation will evaluate each patient using the 125 126 raw data. Disagreements will be resolved in a plenary consensus meeting. Relevant clinical and radiological data submitted to the steering committee will facilitate 127 128 duplicate blinded outcome adjudication. 129 130 **Termination of the trial** 131 An interim analysis will be conducted on the primary endpoint when 25%, 50%, and

75% of patients have been enrolled. The interim analysis is performed by an independent statistician, blinded for the treatment allocation. The statistician will report to the independent DSMC. The DSMC will have unrestricted access to all data and will discuss the results of the intention-to-treat analysis with the steering committee in a joint meeting. The steering committee decides on the continuation of the trial and will report to the central ethics committee. The Peto approach is used to terminate the trial when the intervention group has a significant benefit from the addition of VR to the patient education methods using symmetric stopping boundaries at P<0.001. The trial will not be stopped in case of futility unless the DSMC during safety monitoring advises otherwise. In this case, DSMC will discuss potential stopping for futility with the trial steering committee.

142 143 144

145 146

147

148 149

150

151

152

153 154

155 156

157

132

133

134 135

136

137

138 139

140

141

Safety

The DSMC will monitor the progress of the trial by examining safety variables quarterly. This evaluation is based on unblinded data, in the presence of the study coordinator when DSMC requires details of the study. After the full explanation of the data is presented, the study coordinator is dismissed, and the DSMC discusses the consequences of the data presented. Adverse events are defined as "any undesirable experience occurring to a subject during a clinical trial, whether or not considered related to the intervention," such as a sense of dizziness after watching VR videos. All participating physicians will be asked to report any potential adverse events. These adverse events will be listed and discussed with the DSMC. The outcome of the meeting of the DSMC will be discussed with the trial steering committee. The outcome will also be sent to our hospital institutional review board (IRB). The DSMC will evaluate the data of the deceased patients for the cause of death, and possible trial related severe adverse events.