

Supplementary Table 1 Distribution of Confirmed Cases by Group

	Pathology- confirmed (n)	Follow-up- confirmed (n)	Total (n)
Cold water	17	16	33
Warm water	20	7	27
Hot water	26	11	37

All confirmed cases were validated by histopathology or at least 6 months of clinical follow-up (CT/MRI).

Supplementary Table 2 Diagnostic Performance by Water Temperature Group

	Sensitivity (%)	95% CI	Specificity (%)	95% CI
Cold water	100	83.9%–100%	80	54.8%–93.0%
Warm water	90.9	72.2%–97.5%	66.7	35.4%–87.9%
Hot water	68.7	51.4%–82.1%	57.1	38.5%–74.0%

The upper bound of CI for CG sensitivity is 100% due to zero false negatives.

Supplementary Table 3 Comparison of peristaltic grade in different parts before and after water infusion in the CG

		Peristaltic grade					Difference comparison		
		(n)							
		1	2	3	4	5	Mean score (95% CI)	P_1	P_D P_{CR}
Stomach									
Before infusion	water	17	20	7	0	0	2 (1, 2)	-	0.11 3 6
After infusion	water	36	8	0	0	0	1 (1, 1)	<0.001 *	0.31 6 2
Duodenum									
Before infusion	water	3	5	5	1	0	2 (1.75, 3)	-	0.95 1
After infusion	water	11	2	1	0	0	1 (1, 1)	0.020*	- 1.00 0
Colorectum									
Before infusion	water	5	10	6	1	0	2 (1.75, 3)	-	-
After infusion	water	18	3	1	0	0	1 (1, 1)	<0.001 *	-

* Statistically significant. CG: cold water group. P1: comparison before water infusion; PD: comparison with the duodenum; PCR: comparison with the colorectum.

Supplementary Table 4 MAP for each water temperature condition (mmHg)

Time point s	Cold water (n=80)	Warm water (n=80)	Hot water (n=80)	F	P	P1	P2	P3
T0	85.5±12.1	84.5±13.4	88.9±11.1	2.854	0.060	1.000	0.241	0.070
T1	77.0±11.6	78.0±12.0	79.6±12.7	0.934	0.394	1.000	0.532	1.000
T2	74.2±8.3	75.5±10.8	72.8±11.3	1.364	0.258	1.000	1.000	0.300
T3	73.5±7.7	73.7±9.5	69.9±10.8	4.274	0.015*	1.000	0.044*	0.030*
T4	73.0±8.5	73.1±9.6	69.3±6.6	4.496	0.012*	1.000	0.036*	0.025*
T5	77.6±9.8	78.4±10.3	80.3±11.2	1.481	0.229	1.000	0.288	0.705

MAP, mean arterial pressure; T0, at anaesthesia assessment; T1, endoscopy; T2, before water infusion; T3, at water infusion; T4, at the aspiration of all water; T5, wakefulness. * note statistical significance

According to the MAP of patients at different time points in repeated-measures ANOVA, spherical test result $P=0.00<0.05$, corrected by Grennhouse-Geisser, $F_{\text{intergroup}}=0.068$, $P=0.934$; $F_{\text{time}}=114.632$, $P<0.001^*$; $F_{\text{interaction}}=5.142$, $P<0.001^*$.

P1, comparison between the cold water and warm water groups.

P2, comparison between the cold water and hot water groups.

P3, comparison between the warm water and hot water groups.

Supplementary Table 5 Heart rate for each water temperature condition (beats/min)

Time points	Cold water (n=80)	Warm water (n=80)	Hot water (n=80)	F	P
T0	75.7±12.9	78.4±14.6	76.0±13.5	0.968	0.381
T1	76.0±12.7	77.1±12.7	75.3±13.3	0.365	0.694
T2	72.8±13.6	74.3±11.9	73.2±12.6	0.327	0.721
T3	72.6±13.6	74.3±11.7	72.1±11.7	0.683	0.506
T4	72.7±13.1	72.7±13.4	71.3±12.0	0.297	0.744
T5	72.3±12.0	72.7±11.8	72.8±9.8	0.051	0.950

T0, at anaesthesia assessment; T1, endoscopy; T2, before water infusion; T3, at water infusion; T4, at the aspiration of all water; T5, wakefulness. According to the heart rate of patients at different time points in the repeated-measures ANOVA, spherical test result $P=0.00<0.05$, corrected by Grenhouse-Geisser, $F_{intergroup}=0.421$, $P=0.657$; $F_{time}=16.472$, $P<0.001^*$; $F_{interaction}=0.614$, $P=0.755^*$.

Supplementary Table 6 SpO₂ for each water temperature condition (%)

Time points	Cold water (n=80)	Warm water (n=80)	Hot water (n=80)	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>
T0	98.8±1.0	98.7±1.1	97.6±1.0	1.118	0.329
T1	98.4±1.5	98.5±1.4	98.2±1.9	0.693	0.501
T2	98.4±1.2	98.5±1.2	98.0±2.0	2.899	0.057
T3	98.4±1.4	98.3±1.3	98.4±1.0	0.182	0.834
T4	98.6±1.1	98.5±1.1	98.2±1.3	1.829	0.163
T5	98.7±1.0	98.9±0.7	98.5±1.2	2.536	0.081

T0, at anaesthesia assessment; T1, endoscopy; T2, before water infusion; T3, at water infusion; T4, at the aspiration of all water; T5, wakefulness. According to the SpO₂ of patients at different time points in repeated-measures ANOVA, spherical test results $P < 0.05$, corrected by Grenhouse-Geisser, $F_{intergroup} = 12.838$, $P = 0.061$; $F_{time} = 0.709$, $P = 0.439$; $F_{interaction} = 0.745$, $P = 0.511$).

Supplementary Table 7 Comparison of the incidence of adverse events among the three groups (%)

	Cold water (n=80)	Warm water (n=80)	Hot water (n=80)	<i>P</i>
Overall	8 (10.0)	7 (8.8)	15 (18.8)	0.114
Choking	2 (2.5)	1 (1.3)	4 (5.0)	0.510
Hypotension	1 (1.3)	3 (3.8)	9 (11.3)	0.025*
Bradycardia	1 (1.3)	0 (0)	2 (2.5)	0.775
Tachycardia	4 (5.0)	3 (3.8)	0 (0)	0.167
Hypoxemia	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-
Bleeding, perforation, infection	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-

* Statistically significant.

Supplementary Table 8 Somatic and psychological feelings of patients after examination

	Cold (n=80)	water	Warm water(n=80)	Hot (n=80)	water	<i>P</i>
Somatic discomfort *	3 (3.8%)		3 (3.8%)	3 (3.8%)		0.60 2
Pain score	0		0	0		-
Comfort score	4.9±0.2		4.9±0.6	4.9±0.3		0.68 3
Satisfaction score	5.0±0.2		5.0±0.2	5.00±0.00		0.47 4

* Somatic discomfort included nausea, vomiting, bloating, cold, and anxiety.

