Table 1 Characteristics of patients pre- and post-intervention to improve inpatient colonoscopy bowel preparation

| | Pre-intervention | Post-intervention | p-value |
|--|----------------------|----------------------|---------|
| | (n=120) | (n=129) | |
| Individual factors | | | |
| Age, mean (sd) | 58.8 (17.34) | 57.8 (17.5) | 0.65 |
| Male | 61 (50.8) | 63 (48.8) | 0.75 |
| Race, non-white | 58 (48.3) | 76 (58.9) | 0.10 |
| Primary team medicine service | 113 (94.2) | 113 (87.6) | 0.07 |
| Indication | | | 0.85 |
| Diarrhea, colitis | 20 (16.7) | 25 (19.4) | |
| Fecal transplant | 1 (0.8) | 3 (2.3) | |
| Abdominal pain | 2 (1.7) | 4 (3.1) | |
| Anemia | 16 (13.3) | 18 (14.0) | |
| Colon cancer | 14 (11.7) | 14 (10.9) | |
| Constipation | 2 (1.7) | 0 | |
| Gastrointestinal bleeding | 55 (45.8) | 54 (41.9) | |
| Inflammatory bowel disease | 10 (8.3) | 11 (8.5) | |
| Systems factors | | | |
| Hourly inpatient occupancy, mean (range) | 86.75 (85.61, 87.97) | 90.32 (88.88, 90.88) | < 0.001 |

Data are presented as Number (%) unless otherwise noted Sd: standard deviation

Table 2 Estimates from generalized linear model for adequate bowel preparations and length of stay before and after the intervention in unadjusted and adjusted models

| Study Outcome | Pre vs. Post | Unadjusted Model Relative Risk (Pre/Post) [95% Confidence Interval] | Adjusted Model Relative Risk (Pre/Post) [95% Confidence Interval] |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| Good [♯] ICBP | 60.8% vs. 74.4% | 1.873* [1.093,3.211] | 1.947* [1.025,3.697] |
| Ideal [‡] ICBP | 53.3% vs. 69.0% | 1.947* [1.160,3.266] | 1.901* [1.024,3.531] |
| | | Ratio of Means (Pre/Post) [95% Confidence Interval] | Ratio of Means (Pre/Post) [95% Confidence Interval] |
| Mean Length of Stay, Days | 8 vs. 6 | 0.759 [0.538,1.069] | 0.852 [0.617,1.179] |

Adjusted model includes average weekly occupancy. ICBP: inpatient colonoscopy bowel preparations.

Good: Colonoscopy delayed and adequate bowel preparation when performed.

Ideal: Colonoscopy not delayed and adequate bowel preparation when performed. * p<0.05

 Table 3
 Potential problems and solutions at patient, nurse, physician and system

 level for the bowel preparation process for inpatient colonoscopy

| Level | Potential Problems | Potential Solutions |
|-----------|--|--|
| Patient | Poor palatability | Switch to Polyethylene glycol-electrolyte solution with flavor packets of 4 flavors attached to bottle and no sulfur taste Chill bowel preparation |
| | | Mix with flavor powders or non-red juice |
| | Unable to drink fast enough due to volume or nausea | Anti-emetics |
| | (assuming obstruction not suspected) or altered mental status (i.e. delirium or dementia) | |
| | 27 . 6 27 | Nasogastric Tube |
| | Not following instructions | Patient education handout Family involvement |
| | Inpatient status ± underlying risk factors for poor bowel preparation | Consider 6-L bowel preparation |
| | inpatient status ± underlying risk factors for poor bowel preparation | Consider 2-day bowel preparation |
| | Flushes bowel movement before nurse evaluating | Nursing places toilet hat when close to ready |
| Nursing | Floor nurse protocol cannot require bedside checks more frequently than every 4 h $$ | Encourage family to help |
| | than every 4 h | Recruit medical assistant participation |
| | | Use of technology for reminders |
| | Unclear importance of bowel preparation and instructions highly variable | Standardize instructions |
| | | Nursing education sessions Endoscopy and floor nurses discuss day prior to procedure |
| | Original nurse communication with instructions acknowledged by day shift nurse and not viewed by night shift nurse Variable reporting of readiness for procedure | Instructions in medication order so viewable when administering Orderset with timed instructions Nursing education and picture of readiness on patient education |
| | | Toilet hat Endoscopy and floor nurses discuss morning of procedure |
| | | |
| Physician | Preparation recommended by gastroenterology highly variable leading to confusion | Create protocol for standardization |
| | Instructions from gastroenterology not clear and/or written in notes | Electronic note templates for easy use in gastroenterology notes |
| | Due to nature of complex inpatient consult service, decision-to- scope communicated late (i.e., after 6 pm) to primary team | Set mutually agreed upon expectation for early communication by gastroenterology with a set latest time (i.e., 4 pm) |
| | Ordering suppositories and enemas as "rescue" in the morning leads to false sense patient is clear when right side of colon is not | Using more bowel preparation instead of suppositories and enemas |
| | to laise sense patient is clear when right side of colon is not | Conversion to 2-day preparation |
| | Boston Bowel Preparation Score not properly documented. This | Scoring education |
| | could be knowledge gap or due to busy inpatient consult service | Document score in Brief-Op note immediately post-procedure for |
| | while scoping. Procedure notes written at end of day leading to memory and bias | reference later when writing procedure note |
| | Primary team orders differently than gastroenterology | Primary team education |
| | recommendations | Orderset |
| System | Amount of bowel preparation consumed not documented | Fellow or nurse go to bedside to document amount drank Educate nursing day prior to document in medical record |
| | Lag time between order and administration | Stock bowel preparation in pyxis on specific floors |
| | Long chain of communication: GI, primary team, day nurse, night nurse | Set protocol for communication expectations, note templates, ordersets |
| | Dietary keeps flavor mix packs and nursing unable to get after certain hour | Stock flavor packs on floor or use Polyethylene glycol-electrolyte solution with flavor packets of 4 flavors attached to bottle |