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Transanal irrigation for bowel dysfunction in chronic stage of spinal cord-injured patients
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ABSTRACT

Objective: To investigate the efficacy of transanal irrigation (TAI) for patients with spinal cord injury who experience subjective symptoms, such as abdominal distension, due to constipation that has not been well managed.

Methods: An irrigation kit was used to perform TAI on 8 patients with spinal cord injury (mean age, 44 years). The patients had the following injury sites: cervical spinal cord (2 patients), thoracic spinal cord (4 patients), lumbar spinal cord (1 patient), and sacral spinal cord (1 patient). Before and after the irrigation procedure, we assessed the time spent on defeacation, time interval between defeacations, constipation, diarrhea, fecal incontinence, defeacation management methods, and defeacation status using a visual analogue scale (VAS). At the last follow-up, we examined the usage of irrigation, constipation, diarrhea, fecal incontinence, and defeacation management methods.

Results: Irrigation was possible for all patients included in this study. No changes were observed in the time spent on defeacation or the interval between defeacations. However, we did observe a significant decrease in constipation and a significant improvement in VAS after the irrigation procedure. Four patients were continuing the use of irrigation at the last follow-up. Including the 2 patients who discontinued irrigation because their defeacation management improved, satisfactory results were observed in 6 patients.

Conclusion: Irrigation using an irrigation kit was effective for bowel dysfunction in patients with spinal cord injury.
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Introduction

Bowel dysfunction in the form of constipation and fecal incontinence causes a greater decline in the quality of life (QOL) of patients with spinal cord injury than urinary dysfunction or sexual dysfunction because it adds significant time, physical, and mental burdens to the patient’s life [1–3]. In many cases, bowel dysfunction cannot be fully managed through a regular diet; fluid intake; the establishment of regular defeacation habits; the use of laxatives, suppositories, or enema; or fecal disimpaction alone. Chronic constipation causes poor appetite due to the sensation of abdominal bloating and repetitive diarrhea from large doses of laxatives. Disimpaction of hardened feces runs the risk of injuring the rectal mucosa. Odor and hygiene are also major problems associated with fecal incontinence. However, because bowel dysfunction is almost completely unrelated to vital prognosis, this problem is not being actively treated or studied.

Chronic constipation in patients with spinal cord injury is caused by dysfunction of the descending colon distal to the splenic flexure, the sigmoid colon, and the rectum; therefore, feces pass normally through the intestines up to the splenic flexure [4–6]. Thus, if feces that are impacted in the rectum are removed regularly (every 2–3 days), marked delay of the transport of feces through the large intestine is not observed [7]. Irrigation is a commonly used method to remove impacted feces from the rectums of patients with spinal cord injury. When irrigation is used in conjunction with conventional defeacation control measures, impacted fecal matter can be regularly
removed. This allows fecal matter to pass through the large intestine more smoothly, which improves bowel dysfunction. Malone antegrade continence enema (MACE) [8-11] entails connecting the vermiform appendix to an opening in the abdominal wall. Consequently, antegrade irrigation can be performed by injecting irrigation fluid through this opening. Although feces are expelled following the same route as physiological intestinal circulation, this procedure is surgically invasive and is associated with problems, such as stenosis of the fistula and reflux through the fistula. As a result, transanal irrigation (TAI) is often utilized in unresponsive cases. There are several different procedures for TAI, which is a retrograde irrigation technique. The enema continence catheter (ECC) [8] method involves inserting a catheter into the anus and injecting tepid fluid into the rectum to induce defecation. Because the catheter is fixed within the rectum using a balloon, the procedure can be performed with minimal insertion-related manipulation. However, problems associated with this procedure include the fact that small amounts of hemorrhage in the rectum can occur, manipulation of the device requires assistance, fluid can leak from the site of catheter insertion and cause contamination, and the catheter can be expelled through the rectum during manipulation. Pulsed irrigation enhanced evacuation (PIEE) [12-14] involves the use of a tube for recovering the fluid, which increases the hygiene of the procedure by reducing fluid leakage. This procedure is easy to perform because the amount of fluid and the speed at which it is injected can be adjusted. However, it requires a large device and a full understanding of the operating procedure. The Peristeen anal irrigation system involves fixing a catheter within the rectum using a balloon; this system can be manipulated by a single person. A randomized controlled trial of the use of the Peristeen anal irrigation system on patients with spinal cord injury reported that compared to conservative treatment methods, TAI led to improvements in constipation, fecal incontinence, and QOL [15]. In addition to neurogenic intestinal dysfunctions, such as spinal cord injury, spina bifida, and multiple sclerosis, TAI is also indicated for fecal incontinence, disorders of fecal mobility, and post-lower anterior resection syndrome. However, TAI is contraindicated for anal and intestinal stenosis and for use during the active phase of intestinal inflammatory diseases, acute diverticulitis, and colorectal cancer. Perforation is the primary complication associated with TAI, but this occurs extremely rarely (0.0002%) [16]. Although the equipment required for TAI is expensive, its use lowers nursing care and urinary tract infection-related costs, and thus, the overall cost of TAI is comparatively low [17].

In the present study, we utilized the procedure developed by Miyazaki et al. [18, 19], which is simple and minimally invasive using a simple intestinal irrigation kit. Here we report on the results obtained from its use in patients with chronic stage of spinal cord injury, whose bowel movement was not well managed.

**Methods**

We introduced an irrigation method using an intestinal irrigation set in 8 patients who complained of subjective symptoms, such as abdominal bloating with more than 4 days without defecation per time for at least one month, and whose defecation control was unsatisfactory despite defecation management by using laxatives, suppositories, enema, or disimpaction. Seven men and 1 woman with a mean age of 44 years (24-70 years) comprised the study population. Their primary illnesses were traumatic spinal cord injury (4 patients), radiation myelopathy (1 patient), epidural hematoma of the thoracic spinal cord (1 patient), myelitis (1 patient), and thoracic aortic aneurysm (1 patient). The injury sites were as follows: cervical spine (2 patients), thoracic spine (4 patients), lumbar spine (1 patient), and sacral spine (1 patient). The American Spinal Injury Association classifications were as follows: A in 4 patients, B in 2 patients, and D in 2 patients. The 2 cervical injury cases required nursing care for their defecation management. The mean period between the onset and the start of intestinal irrigation was 26 months (7-68 months) (Table 1). We utilized the Phycon Intestinal Irrigation Set (Fuji Systems Corporation) (Figure 1). This irrigation system involves injecting between 50 and 100 ml of tepid fluid using a catheter via the anus into the rectum, removing the catheter, and then expelling the fluid and feces. Repeating this process dozens of times results in the complete expulsion of all fecal matter. Intestinal irrigation was performed during hospitalization once every 2-3 days in accordance with each patient's defecation cycle. Each patient received guidance between 5 and 7 times during their hospital stay.

**Table 1. Patient characteristics.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Functional level</th>
<th>AIS</th>
<th>Time after onset (months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C6</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C7</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Th5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Th6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Th9</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Th10</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AIS, ASIA impairment scale.
We measured the following data items by questioning the patients one month prior to irrigation and again one month after discharge following the completion of irrigation: time required for defecation, time intervals between defecations, constipation, diarrhea, fecal incontinence, and defecation management methods used other than irrigation. Defecation status before and after irrigation was measured by asking the following question: “On a scale of 0–100, where the worst defecation status is 0 and the best is 100, how would you score your defecation status over the past month?” The patients evaluated their status by themselves using a visual analogue scale (VAS). Constipation was defined as at least 4 days without defecating and the presence of subjective symptoms, such as the feeling of abdominal bloating, while fecal incontinence was defined as fecal leakage when not undergoing treatment. We also questioned the patients regarding the mean amount of tepid fluid used in irrigation one month following discharge after completing the in-hospital irrigation procedure. Furthermore, at the last follow-up, we assessed whether the patients were still using the irrigation method, the presence or absence of constipation, diarrhea, fecal incontinence, and the methods of defecation management.

Statistical analyses were conducted using the Wilcoxon signed-rank test to assess the time required for defecation and the intervals between defecations. The paired t-test was used to assess the VAS. We compared patient status at pre-irrigation, post-irrigation, and the last follow-up using McNemar’s test for constipation, fecal incontinence, and defecation management methods (laxatives, suppositories, enema, and disimpaction). The level of significance was set at 5%. The statistical analyses were performed using JMP version 12 (SAS Institute, Inc., Cary, NC).

Results

The introduction of irrigation was completed in all patients within 2 weeks. The 2 patients with cervical spine injury required continued assistance with irrigation, but all other patients were able to perform irrigation on their own. The amount of tepid irrigation fluid utilized was $2.9 \pm 2.6$ L (mean ± SD). The median time required for defecation was 27.5 minutes pre-irrigation and 60 min post-irrigation, indicating that the time required increased; however, this increase was not statistically significant. The median interval between defecations was 3 days both pre- and post-irrigation, indicating no statistically significant difference. All patients had constipation prior to irrigation, but there was a significant decrease at post-irrigation in the patients suffering from constipation ($p=0.046$). Although 1 patient complained of diarrhea prior to irrigation, no patients had diarrhea after irrigation. The number of patients with fecal incontinence also decreased from 5 to 3, but this decrease was not statistically significant. An analysis of the method of defecation management indicated that the number of patients using laxatives decreased from 7 to 6, the number using suppositories decreased from 3 to 1, the number using enema decreased from 3 to 2, and the number using disimpaction decreased from 5 to 2. However, these decreases were not statistically significant. After introduction of irrigation, the patients who used suppositories or enema performed irrigation immediately after using suppositories or enema and then used disimpaction if any fecal matter remained. No patients used both suppositories and enema concomitantly after the introduction of irrigation. VAS improved in all cases. The mean score was 31 points pre-irrigation and 71 points post-irrigation, indicating significant improvement ($p<0.001$) (Table 2). After the initial irrigation, case 3 experienced abdominal pain, and case 5 experienced anal hemorrhage as complications, but these symptoms improved after completion of the introduction of irrigation; no recurrence of symptoms was observed thereafter.

The median follow-up period was 39.5 months. No serious complications were observed at the last follow-up. Four patients discontinued irrigation at the last follow-up, but 2 of them did not have to use it because of good defecation control; case 1 used laxatives and enema, while case 6 laxatives alone. Therefore, cases 1–6 were able to control their defecation cycle, but cases 7 and 8, who experienced spinal cord injury in the lower segments, were unable to achieve good control and they discontinued irrigation. Constipation was observed in only 1 patient at the last follow-up, which was a significant decrease compared to pre-irrigation ($p=0.008$). Fecal incontinence was also observed in only 1 patient, indicating a significant
Table 2. Comparison between pre and post transanal irrigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Follow-up period (months)</th>
<th>Use of transanal irrigation</th>
<th>Constipation</th>
<th>Diarrhea</th>
<th>Fecal incontinence</th>
<th>Defecation management</th>
<th>Visual analog scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre Post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre Post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre Post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre Post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre Post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre Post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre Post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre Post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre Post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

post-irrigation decrease ($p=0.046$). No patients complained of diarrhea. No patients used suppositories, and only 1 patient used disimpaction, indicating a significant decrease at the last follow-up ($p=0.046$) (Table 3).

Discussion

In this study, we found that the use of irrigation led to significant improvement in VAS scores and significant decreases in constipation. At the last follow-up, fecal incontinence and the use of disimpaction also significantly decreased. Good outcomes were obtained in 6 out of 8 patients, including 2 patients in whom irrigation was discontinued because satisfactory defecation control was achieved. Therefore, we assume that irrigation contributes to improved QOL in patients with spinal cord injury. In particular, the number of patients who utilized disimpaction, which often leads to injury of the rectal mucosa, decreased from 5 patients prior to the introduction of irrigation to only 1 patient at the last follow-up. We believe this result is highly significant. No change was observed in the time required for defecation and the interval between defecations, and at the last follow-up, 6 patients, excluding the 2 whose injury was located in the lower segments of the spinal cord, were able to self-manage their defecation cycle; 4 of those patients were continuing to use irrigation. Irrigation provides stimulus to the anus and rectum through the use of the catheter: the injected fluid dilates and stimulates the rectum, and moisture is added to the hardened feces, all of which promote defecation. Because irrigation utilizes the body’s natural defecation response, we believe it is better tolerated than intestine-stimulating laxatives. TAI led to improvement in constipation in 60% of patients and fecal incontinence in 67% of patients who suffered from spinal cord injury or cauda equina injury and who underwent ECC [8]. Moreover, it has been reported that the use of the Peristeen anal irrigation system led to significantly better improvement in constipation and fecal incontinence than conventional defecation management techniques [17]. The Peristeen anal irrigation system has recently been utilized in Japan. A prospective multi-institutional study of its use in intractable bowel dysfunction is being conducted, and the short-term results have already been published. The VAS of 25 patients who utilized the system for over 10 weeks showed the same significant improvements as that in the present study. However, in 3 patients (9.4%), large bowel perforation occurred, which was a notably higher percentage than those indicated in past reports. Large bowel perforation in 2 out of 3 patients was ostensibly due to over-dilation of the balloon, which is a serious complication; therefore, this issue requires further study [20]. The system we utilized uses a stopper instead of a balloon, and consequently, large bowel perforation cannot occur due to over-dilation of the balloon. There have been no reports of large bowel perforation in studies using the same system [18, 19], but because large bowel perforation is a serious complication, continued care is required.
In a longer-term study, the use of TAI was found to have been discontinued by half the subjects after 3 years [16]. In the present study, 4 of 8 patients had discontinued the use of TAI at the last follow-up. However, 2 of the patients who discontinued irrigation did so because their constipation and fecal incontinence disappeared and they were able to self-manage their defecation cycle. Thus, the introduction of irrigation was successful in these patients. The 2 patients with spinal cord injuries in the lower segments discontinued irrigation because they could not achieve sufficient defecation control. However, because few patients were included in this study, we were unable to identify whether the effectiveness of irrigation was dependent on the level of spinal cord injury. Therefore, this issue requires further study. One major limitation of this study was the fact that the data were primarily collected through interviews with the patients. To reach a clearer conclusion, an objective assessment with larger numbers of patients is needed. The system utilized in this study is no longer commercially available, and serious complications associated with the Peristeen anal irrigation system have been reported in Japan. However, a safe irrigation system is effective when used in patients with spinal cord injury who find it difficult to achieve defecation control. Thus, we look forward to the development of safer and more effective irrigation equipment.
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