

Peptide-Based Preparations May Invert Colonoscopy Risk Profile

Written by The Life Science Feed Editorial Team · Published 19 June 2026 · Edited by William Lopes

Inadequate bowel preparation remains a significant impediment to effective colonoscopy, leading to missed lesions, repeat procedures, and increased healthcare costs. Current osmotic laxative regimens, while effective, are often associated with poor patient adherence due to large volumes and unpleasant taste. Emerging peptide-based preparations offer a potential solution by reducing preparation volume and improving tolerability, thereby enhancing the quality of colonoscopic examination and potentially altering the risk landscape for patients.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- **The Pivot:** Peptide-based preparations aim to improve patient adherence and bowel cleansing quality by reducing preparation volume.
- **The Data:** While specific trial data are pending, the mechanism of action suggests improved tolerability and efficacy compared to traditional osmotic laxatives.
- **The Action:** Clinicians should monitor ongoing trials for peptide-based preparations as they may represent a future standard for colonoscopy bowel preparation.

Colonoscopy is the gold standard for colorectal cancer screening and surveillance. Its efficacy, however, is directly dependent on the quality of bowel preparation. Suboptimal preparation, defined as inadequate visualisation of the mucosal surface, occurs in approximately 20% to 25% of colonoscopies. This rate of inadequate preparation contributes to a significant proportion of interval cancers and necessitates repeat procedures, imposing additional burdens on both patients and healthcare systems.

Traditional bowel preparation regimens, primarily based on high-volume polyethylene glycol (PEG) solutions or sodium phosphate, achieve their effect through osmotic action, drawing water into the bowel lumen to induce purgation. While generally effective when completed, these preparations are frequently associated with adverse events such as nausea, vomiting, abdominal discomfort, and electrolyte disturbances. Patient dissatisfaction with the volume, taste, and duration of these regimens is a primary driver of non-adherence, which directly correlates with suboptimal cleansing. The clinical dilemma lies in balancing effective cleansing with patient tolerability to maximise adherence and, consequently, the diagnostic yield of the procedure.

Colorectal cancer (CRC) remains a leading cause of cancer-related mortality globally, underscoring the critical importance of effective screening strategies. The incidence and mortality of CRC vary geographically, but early detection through screening colonoscopy significantly improves prognosis. However, the effectiveness of screening programs is inherently limited by patient participation and the technical quality of the procedure. Inadequate bowel preparation not

only increases the risk of missing adenomas or early-stage cancers but also prolongs procedure times and increases healthcare costs due to the need for repeat preparations and colonoscopies. This issue is particularly pronounced in certain patient populations, such as the elderly, those with comorbidities, or individuals with a history of poor preparation, who may find traditional regimens even more challenging to complete.

Peptide-Based Preparations: A New Approach

Peptide-based preparations represent an investigational class of agents designed to address the limitations of traditional osmotic laxatives. These preparations typically involve orally administered peptides that act locally within the gastrointestinal tract to modulate fluid secretion and motility. For instance, certain peptides may activate guanylate cyclase-C (GC-C) receptors on the intestinal epithelium, leading to increased intracellular cyclic guanosine monophosphate (cGMP) and subsequent activation of the cystic fibrosis transmembrane conductance regulator (CFTR) and other ion channels. This mechanism promotes chloride and bicarbonate secretion into the intestinal lumen, followed by passive water movement, resulting in increased stool frequency and consistency without requiring large volumes of ingested fluid.

The theoretical advantage of this mechanism is a significantly reduced preparation volume, potentially leading to improved patient tolerability and adherence. By mitigating the discomfort and logistical challenges associated with ingesting several litres of osmotic solution, peptide-based preparations aim to enhance the likelihood of achieving adequate bowel cleansing. This shift in the patient experience could invert the traditional risk profile, where the primary risk factor for an incomplete or ineffective colonoscopy often stems from the preparation itself, rather than the procedure or underlying pathology. If adherence improves, the rate of suboptimal preparation would decrease, thereby reducing the risk of missed adenomas and interval cancers, and the need for repeat colonoscopies.

The specific peptides under investigation for colonoscopy preparation often mimic endogenous ligands for the GC-C receptor, such as guanylin or uroguanylin. These peptides are designed to be minimally absorbed systemically, concentrating their action within the intestinal lumen. This localized effect contributes to a favorable safety profile by reducing the potential for systemic adverse events, such as significant electrolyte shifts or renal complications, which can be a concern with some hyperosmotic or stimulant laxatives, particularly in vulnerable patient groups. The reduced volume also simplifies the preparation process, potentially allowing for more flexible dosing schedules and improved patient convenience, which are crucial factors in adherence.

While specific large-scale clinical trial data for peptide-based colonoscopy preparations are still emerging, preliminary studies and the established mechanism of action suggest a favourable tolerability profile. The focus on local gastrointestinal action minimises systemic absorption and potential electrolyte imbalances, which are concerns with some traditional preparations. The potential for a more tolerable preparation regimen could expand access to colonoscopy for individuals who previously deferred screening due to the perceived burden of bowel preparation, thereby improving public health outcomes related to colorectal cancer detection and prevention.

Despite the promising theoretical advantages, the widespread adoption of peptide-based preparations will depend on robust clinical evidence demonstrating non-inferiority or superiority in bowel cleansing efficacy compared to established regimens, alongside a confirmed superior tolerability and safety profile. Challenges may include optimizing peptide formulations for stability and delivery, determining appropriate dosing regimens, and ensuring cost-effectiveness. Furthermore, the efficacy of these preparations in specific patient populations, such as those with chronic constipation,

inflammatory bowel disease, or a history of prior failed preparations, requires careful evaluation. Addressing these considerations will be crucial for integrating peptide-based preparations into routine clinical practice and ultimately improving the overall quality and accessibility of colonoscopy.

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

The prospect of peptide-based bowel preparations offers a compelling shift in how we approach colonoscopy. For years, the efficacy of this vital screening tool has been undermined by the very preparation required for it. Clinicians have routinely navigated patient complaints regarding taste, volume, and the overall unpleasantness of osmotic laxatives, often resorting to counselling on adherence rather than offering genuinely better options. If these peptide preparations deliver on their promise of reduced volume and improved tolerability, the primary barrier to high-quality colonoscopy, patient non-adherence, could be substantially mitigated.

This development could have a profound impact on patient engagement with colorectal cancer screening. Many individuals, particularly those with comorbidities or a history of poor tolerance to previous preparations, delay or avoid colonoscopy due to the perceived burden. A more patient-friendly option could increase screening rates, leading to earlier detection of adenomas and colorectal cancer. This would not only improve individual patient outcomes but also reduce the societal cost associated with advanced disease and repeat procedures, a significant economic consideration for healthcare systems.

From an industry perspective, the introduction of effective peptide-based preparations could disrupt the established market for bowel cleansing agents, currently dominated by generic osmotic laxatives. Companies developing these novel agents would need to demonstrate clear superiority in adherence and cleansing quality, supported by robust Phase III data, to justify a potentially higher price point. Guideline bodies, such as the American College of Gastroenterology, would likely integrate these new options into their recommendations once sufficient evidence accumulates, further solidifying their place in clinical practice. The inversion of risk, where the preparation itself becomes less of a hurdle and more of an enabler, represents a significant step forward in gastroenterology.

EDITORIAL & AI STANDARDS

AI tools are used solely to structure and summarise evidence from peer-reviewed primary sources. No AI-generated conclusions appear in The Life Science Feed without editor verification against the primary source.

REFERENCES

1. Shaikat A, et al. ACG Clinical Guidelines: Colorectal Cancer Screening 2021. *Am J Gastroenterol*. 2021;116(3):458-479. doi:10.14309/ajg.0000000000001122
2. Shaikat A, et al. Current and future colorectal cancer screening strategies. *Nat Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol*. 2022;19(8):521-531. doi:10.1038/s41575-022-00612-y
3. Ladabaum U, et al. Strategies for Colorectal Cancer Screening. *Gastroenterology*. 2020;158(2):418-432. doi:10.1053/j.gastro.2019.06.043
4. Gupta S. Screening for Colorectal Cancer. *Hematol Oncol Clin North Am*. 2022;36(3):393-414. doi:10.1016/j.hoc.2022.02.001

5. 5. Jacobsson M, et al. Screening for Colorectal Cancer. Surg Clin North Am. 2024;104(3):595-607. doi:10.1016/j.suc.2023.11.009
6. 6. Jiang H, et al. Compliance With Bowel Preparation and Its Influencing Factors in Patients Undergoing Colonoscopy: Cross-Sectional Study. Interact J Med Res. 2025;14:e77189. doi:10.2196/77189
7. 7. Wonggom P, et al. Effectiveness of bowel preparation innovative technology instructions (BPITIs) on clinical outcomes among patients undergoing colonoscopy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Sci Rep. 2023;13(1):10783. doi:10.1038/s41598-023-37044-w
8. 8. Nett A, et al. Quality bowel preparation for surveillance colonoscopy in patients with inflammatory bowel disease is a must. Gastrointest Endosc Clin N Am. 2014;24(3):379-92. doi:10.1016/j.giec.2014.03.004

LICENCE & RIGHTS

© 2026 The Life Science Feed. All rights reserved. This content is produced for medical education purposes. It may not be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted without prior written permission from The Life Science Feed.

MEDICAL DISCLAIMER

This content is intended for healthcare professionals only and does not constitute medical advice. Clinical decisions must be made by qualified practitioners based on individual patient circumstances.

FOLLOW THE LIFE SCIENCE FEED

Instagram @lifesciencefeed **LinkedIn** linkedin.com/company/thelifesciencefeed

thelifesciencefeed.com