



GI HEPATOLOGY ECHO OF SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA — ESTABLISHED 2020 —

Nutrition, Feeding incl Refeeding Syndrome

Supervisor Dr Ramonate

Presenter Dr Mahlasela

Outline

- Overview of Nutrition
- Definition
- Rationale for nutritional therapy "A Mixed Bag"
- Nutritional Assessment
- Nutritional Access
- Feeding
- Monitoring
- Complications
- Refeeding Syndrome
- Questions





Iron, folic acid, vitamin A, zinc, iodine below healthy thresholds |AFFECTING 2 BILLION PEOPLE

Diabetes, heart disease, and cancers **1 IN 12 PEOPLE WORLDWIDE HAS DIABETES**

Adapted from International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), 2016 and 2017.





Adapted from: https://doi.org/10.1172/JCI25102

G-ECHO GI HEPATOLOGY ECHO OF SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA ESTABLISHED 2020



Adapted from: https://www.vistafortifoods.com/solution.php

 $(\mathbf{\hat{x}})$

in

1

f

From 1990 to 2020, the number of children under 5 years suffering from chronic malnutrition has decreased from 253 million to 144 million – that means that an additional 109 million children could reach their full potential.

It is estimated that COVID-19 will result in an additional 2.6 million chronically malnourished children by 2022, reversing the decreasing curve for the first time in 3 decades.

Sources:

UNICEF

As the COVID-19 crisis continues to spread across the world with a heavy toll on human lives and livelihoods, the pandemic's effect on millions of people who are already suffering from hunger and malnutrition is devastating.





More facts and figures.pdf

GI HEPATOLOGY ECHO GI HEPATOLOGY ECHO OF SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Reference: https://www.unitlife.org/impact-of-covid-19-on-malnutrition



Food Security

Digestion Absorption



Why does it matter

- Increased hospital stay
- Increased complication rate
- Increased ICU days



Why does it Matter?

- 2010 Uk report "A Mixed Bag"
 - Good Practice was in 19% of cases (171/877)
 - Inadequate consideration was given to enteral nutrition in a third
 - 30% received PN for an inadequate indication
 - Need for PN recognized late in 16% (121)
 - Delay in administration in 9% (71)
 - Deficiencies in monitoring and assessment of 54% (399)
 - Metabolic complications in 40% of which half of these were avoidable
 - Poor documentation of nutritional notes



Who Needs Nutritional Intervention?

- Patients at high nutritional risk
 - Hospitalized patients that are at greatest need for nutritional therapy and would have clinical improvement with aggressive nutritional therapy.





- ESTABLISHED 2020 -

Adapted from: Clinical Nutrition 2019 3848-79DOI: (10.1016/j.clnu.2018.08.037)

Nutritional Assessment

- General Clinical Assessment:
 - Unintentional weight loss
 - Baseline or deterioration thereof prior to admission
 - Body composition
 - Muscle mass and strength
- Malnutrition:
 - BMI < 18.5
 - Unintentional weight loss >10% or >5% in last 3 months



Nutritional Assessment

The NUTRIC Score is designed to quantify the risk of critically ill patients developing adverse events that may be modified by aggressive nutrition therapy. The score, of 1-10, is based on 6 variables that are explained below in Table 1. The scoring system is shown in Tables 2 and 3.

Table 1: NUTRIC Score variables Variable Range Points <50 Age 0 50 - <75 1 2 >75 APACHE II <15 0 15 - <20 1 20-28 2 >28 3 SOFA <6 0 6 - <10 1 2 >10 Number of Co-morbidities 0-1 0 >2 1 Days from hospital to ICU admission 0 - <1 0 >1 1 IL-6 0 - <400 0 > 400 1

Table 2: NUTRIC Score scoring system: if IL-6 available

| Sum of points | Category | Explanation |
|------------------|------------|---|
| 5-10 | High Score | Associated with worse clinical outcomes (mortality, ventilation). These patients are the most likely to benefit from aggressive nutrition therapy. |
| 0-5 | Low Score | These patients have a low malnutrition risk. |
| | | |

Table 3. NUTRIC Score scoring system: If no IL-6 available*

| Sum of points | Category | Explanation |
|------------------|------------|---|
| 5-9 | High Score | Associated with worse clinical outcomes (mortality, ventilation). These patients are the most likely to benefit from aggressive nutrition therapy. |
| 0-4 | Low Score | These patients have a low malnutrition risk. |

*It is acceptable to not include IL-6 data when it is not routinely available; it was shown to contribute very little to the overall prediction of the NUTRIC score.²



https://www.criticalcarenutrition.com/resources/nutric-score

Nutritional Risk Screening (NRS 2002)



Nutritional status

None O

Mild •

- Weight loss > 5% in 3 months or
- 50 75% of the normal food intake in the last week

Moderate ••

- Weight loss > 5% in 2 months or
- BMI 18.5 20.5 kg / m² and reduced general conditions or
- 25 50 % of the normal food intake in the last week

Severe •••

- Weight loss > 5 % in 1 month (>15% in 3 months) or
- BMI < 18.5 kg/m² and reduced general conditions or
- 0 25% of the normal food intake in the last week

Severity of the disease (stress metabolism)

None O

Mild •

Hip fracture, chronic disease especially with complications, e.g. liver cirrhosis, COPD, diabetes, cancer, chronic hemodialysis

Moderate ••

e.g. stroke, hematologic malignancy, severe pneumonia, extended abdominal surgery

Severe •••

e.g. head traumas, hematopoietic stem cell transplantation, intensive care patients (APACHE-II > 10)

Advanced age ● Age ≥ 70 years

3-7 points

0 – 2 points

Repeat screening weekly.

Patient is at nutritional risk. Nutritional care plan should be set up.



NRS 2002, Adapted from Kondrup et al.

Nutritional Assessment

- Co-morbid conditions
- Function of the gut
- Risk of aspiration, refeeding syndrome
- Discourage the use of:
 - Anthropometric measures
 - Biomarkers
- Recommend Indirect Calorimetry (IC) to accurately assess nutritional requirements
- In absence of IC then weight based equations or VO2 (O2 consumption) or VCO2 (CO2 production)
- Not all Macronutrients are equal







Note: The duodenum, jejunum and ileum make up the small intestine.

Enteral Access

- NGT should be first preference, confirm position with CXR
- Post pyloric tube should be used if ngt is inadequate or patient is high aspiration risk
- Small bowel feeding superior to Gastric feeding in patients with higher APACHE II score (>20)
- GI feeding vs Small Bowel for other patients
- PEG should be placed if patient will require feeding for more than a month



Enteral Access

- Placement of the PEG
 - Antrum
 - Right of midline close to Umbilicus
 - Use of T- Tacks to keep the tube in place.





Initiating Feeds

- Aim to initiate feeding early
- Continuous vs Bolus Feeding
- Establish tolerance then advance to goal within 72hrs
- Permissive Underfeeding
 - Obese
 - ALI/ARDS
 - PN on the first week
- An immune modulating formular should be used for post surgical and pts in surgical ICU but not routinely in pts in medical ICU



PN vs EN

- EN should be initiated early during hospital stay ideally within the first 24hrs.
- EN superior to PN with respect to
 - Infection
 - Complications
 - Length of Hospital Stay
 - Cost
 - Taste
- Early studies, now gap is narrowing
- PN should be considered as first option if there are CI to EN, or if patient cannot meet nutritional target with EN.



| | EEN | N I | EPI | N | | Risk Ratio | | Risk Ratio |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------|--------------------------|---------------------|------|---------------------------------------|
| dy or Subgroup | Events | Total | Events | Total | Weight | M-H, Random, 95% CI | Year | r M-H, Random, 95% CI |
| .1.1 ICU studies | | | | | | | | |
| (ompan 2004 | 9 | 27 | 16 | 25 | 9.5% | 0.52 [0.28, 0.96] | 2004 | |
| .am 2008 | 10 | 41 | 25 | 41 | 9.8% | 0.40 [0.22, 0.72] | 2008 | 3 |
| Itintas 2011 | 7 | 30 | 13 | 41 | 7.0% | 0.74 [0.33, 1.62] | 2011 | |
| usto Meirelles 2011 | 2 | 12 | 4 | 10 | 2.7% | 0.42 [0.10, 1.82] | 2011 | |
| larvey 2014 | 194 | 1197 | 194 | 1191 | 18.3% | 0.99 [0.83, 1.19] | 2014 | ; + |
| Reignier 2017 | 173 | 1202 | 194 | 1208 | 18.2% | 0.90 [0.74, 1.08] | 2017 | · |
| Subtotal (95% CI) | | 2509 | | 2516 | 65.6% | 0.75 [0.57, 0.98] | | ◆ |
| otal events | 395 | | 446 | | | | | |
| leterogeneity: Tau ² = (| 0.05; Chi ² | = 12.68 | 6, df = 5 (| P = 0.0 | 3); l ² = 61 | % | | |
| est for overall effect: 2 | Z= 2.14 (F | P = 0.03 |) | | | | | |
| 2.1.2 Studies with unc | lear prop | ortion | of ICU pa | tients | | | | |
| iko 2001 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 11 | 0.7% | 0.29 [0.01, 6.38] | 2001 | |
| ozzetti 2001 | 25 | 159 | 42 | 158 | 12.7% | 0.59 [0.38, 0.92] | 2001 | |
| Jupta 2003 | 1 | 8 | 2 | 9 | 1.3% | 0.56 [0.06, 5.09] | 2003 | |
| ckerwall 2006 | 3 | 23 | 0 | 25 | 0.8% | 7.58 (0.41, 139.32) | 2006 | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| Petrov 2006 | 11 | 35 | 27 | 34 | 11.1% | 0.40 [0.24, 0.66] | 2006 | · · · |
| Sun 2013 | 3 | 30 | 10 | 30 | 3.8% | 0.30 [0.09, 0.98] | 2013 | |
| Boelens 2014 | 4 | 61 | 8 | 62 | 4.1% | 0.51 [0.16, 1.60] | 2014 | · |
| Subtotal (95% CI) | - | 329 | - | 329 | 34.4% | 0.50 [0.37, 0.67] | | ◆ |
| otal events | 47 | | 90 | | | | | - |
| leterogeneity: Tau ² = (| 0.00; Chi ² | = 5.66. | df = 6 (P | = 0.46 |); I ² = 0% | | | |
| est for overall effect: 2 | Z= 4.49 (P | o < 0.00 | 001) | | | | | |
| otal (95% CI) | | 2838 | | 2845 | 100.0% | 0.63 [0.49, 0.82] | | • |
| otal events | 442 | | 536 | | | | | - |
| leterogeneity: Tau ² = (| 0.09; Chi ² | = 29.81 | 1. df = 12 | (P = 0 | 003); I ^z = I | 60% | | |
| est for overall effect: 2 | Z = 3.50 (P | P = 0.00 | 05) | ç | | | | 0.01 0.1 1 10 100 |
| est for subgroup diffe | rences: C | hi ² = 3. | 92, df = 1 | (P = 0) | .05), I ² = 7 | 4.5% | | Favours EEN Favours EPN |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

Adapted from: Clinical Nutrition 2019 3848-79DOI: (10.1016/j.clnu.2018.08.037)

Benefits of Early Enteral Nutrition

- Non Nutrient
 - GIT
 - Immune Response
 - Metabolic Responses
- Nutritional Benefits



Nutrients

- Protein 1.3g/kg/day
- Carbohydrates 5mg/kg/day
- Lipids 1.5g/kg/day
- Glutamine
- Micronutrients
 - Nutritional aspects
 - Anti-oxidant aspects



Monitoring Tolerance and Adequacy of EN

- Daily Clinical Examination
- Determination of Caloric need and Caloric deficit
- Cautious feeding of patients at risk of refeeding syndrome
- Nursing Driven Protocols
- GRV measurement is not recommended
- Monitor Electrolytes



Complications

- Diarrhoea
 - Common and usually self-limiting
 - May result in dehydration, electrolyte imbalances, skin breakdown, wound contamination
 - Most commonly related to sorbitol containing medication, Infections such as C Diff,
 - Add non fermentable soluble fibre to feed
- Aspiration Pneumonia
 - Position patient higher up
 - Continuous feeding
 - Lower position of the ET
 - Initiating prokinetic agents
 - Chlorhexidine mouthwash
 - Simultaneous aspiration/decompression of the stomach with small bowel feeding



Complications

- Tube site clean and ensure correct positioning
- Tube Blockage
- Inadvertent dislodging of Enteral Tube
- Increased drainage, leaking from EN site
- Fungal Infection



Contra-Indications to EN

- Critically ill patients with uncontrolled shock
- Uncontrolled hypoxemia and acidosis
- Uncontrolled UGIB
- Gastric Aspirate >500mls/ 6hr
- Bowel Ischemia
- Bowel Obstruction
- Abdominal Compartment Syndrome
- High Output fistula without distal feeding access



Parenteral Nutrition

- Patients at low nutritional risk do not require feeding in the first week in hospital
- Peripheral PN should not be used
- High nutritional risk patients that cannot tolerate EN, should be started on PN.
- Patients on EN not meeting target should get supplemental PN
- Permissive Underfeeding for first 7-10 days
- Peripheral PN should not be used
- PN should be stopped when EN provides 60% of nutrients



Nutritional Therapy at End of Life

- Ethical issue
- PN is strongly discouraged
- Gastrostomy is preferred method of feeding
- Nutrition should not be denied



Refeeding Syndrome





Shane Daly ② September, 2020

"They were put on a rich diet and began to recover and put weight on but then they died suddenly." -Laurie Pettit

Refeeding syndrome for many centuries was an unknown entity and remained somewhat of a myth until the liberation of the Nazi concentration camps in 1945; it is also possibly the least talked about cause of fatality in the Second World War.

Soviet soldiers upon the liberation of WWII camps were met by thousands of men, women and children who had been in a state of medical starvation for months on end. The well-meaning soldiers – met at the gates of the camps by POWs with their ribs and sternum protruding from their bodies and chests and obviously in need of medical care – took food such as biscuits and chocolate bars from their own government-issued ration supplies and gave them to the prisoners, not knowing that it would lead to their almost immediate death. It is estimated that 500 POWs from Auschwitz concentration camp and as many as 14,000 from the Belsen concentration camp – most famously known as the site where Anne Frank's family died upon capture – died of refeeding syndrome.





Definition

- Refeeding syndrome can be described as a syndrome:
 - Occurs in the Undernourished
 - Potentially fatal fluid and electrolyte shifts including K, but more importantly Phosphate
 - Changes are driven by Nutrition whether enteral or parenteral
- This definition does not:
 - Include other Vitamin Deficiencies,
 - Role of Hormones
 - Weigh the different features



Incidence

- Depends on Population Group
- In 10197 hospitalized patients the incidence was 0.43%
- In critically ill patients in the ICU the incidence was found to be 34%
- In a local study they looked at 200 patients admitted to the Surgical ICU although 146 of these patients needed electrolyte supplementation, the incidence was 12.5%



Pathophysiology





Adapted from: https://www.revistanefrologia.com/en-hydroelectrolytic-disorders-secondary-refeeding-syndrome-articulo-X2013251413002771

Who develops RFS

Table 2Patient characteristics that have been associated withincreased risk of developing refeeding syndrome

- Anorexia nervosa
- Chronic alcohol abuse
- Elderly patients, especially nursing home residents
- Poorly controlled diabetics (likely to be fluid and electrolyte depleted)
- Patients with chronic malnutrition (marasmus)
- Morbid obese patients with rapid/profound weight loss
- Chronic malabsorptive disease states such as Crohn's disease, cystic fibrosis, short bowel syndrome
- Chronic diseases associated with undernutrition such as cancer, severe obstructive airways disease, liver cirrhosis
- Long-term users of diuretics (electrolyte depleted)
- Long-term users of antacids (phosphate binders)



Adapted from: Walmsley, R.S. (2013), Refeeding syndrome in parenteral feeding. J Gastroenterol Hepatol, 28: 113-117. https://doi.org/10.1111/jgh.12345

Risk Factors

| Major risk factors | Minor risk factors | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| BMI < 16 kg/m² Unintentional weight loss > 15% in previous 3–6 months Little/no nutrient intake for > 10 days Low levels of potassium, phosphate, magnesium prior to any feeding | BMI < 18.5 kg/m² Unintentional weight loss > 10% in previous 3–6 months Little or no nutritional intake for > 5 days History of alcohol misuse or drugs, including insulin, chemotherapy, antacids, or diuretics | | | |

Table 3 Risk factors for developing refeeding syndrome

One major risk factor or two minor risk factors suggests that the patient is at a high risk.¹¹ BMI, body mass index. G-ECHO GI HEPATOLOGY ECHO OF SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA ESTABLISHED 2020

Adapted from: Walmsley, R.S. (2013), Refeeding syndrome in parenteral feeding. J Gastroenterol Hepatol, 28: 113-117. https://doi.org/10.1111/jgh.12345

Diagnosis



Refeeding

- Not without its complexities:
 - French cohort of patients with Anorexia Nervosa
 - 41 patients, average BMI was < 11.0
 - In this cohort 1 death, 2 AMI, 2 Pancreatitis, 5 Confusion
- Feeding should start at 10 kCal/kg/day increasing to full feeds over 4 days
- Thiamine should be supplemented 200mg 300mg per day
- Keep close eye on Electrolytes
- If RFS develops then stop nutrition and correct electrolytes and try again, slowly.





OF SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

- ESTABLISHED 2020

Adapted from: Clinical Nutrition 2019 3848-79DOI: (10.1016/j.clnu.2018.08.037)

References

- <u>https://aboutadietitian.wordpress.com/gastroenterology-and-nutrition/absorption-of-nutrients-across-intestines/</u>
- <u>https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/One-Step-Insertion-of-Low-Profile-Gastrostomy-in-vs-G%C3%B6thberg-Bj%C3%B6rnsson/26982e11ed385c24bf2d6d5a8611f1b6689d38a0</u>
- ESPEN Guideline: <u>https://www.clinicalnutritionjournal.com/article/S0261-5614(18)32432-4/fulltext</u>
- ASPEN Consensus Recommendations for Refeeding Syndrome. da Silva JSV, Seres DS, Sabino K, Adams SC, Berdahl GJ, Citty SW, Cober MP, Evans DC, Greaves JR, Gura KM, Michalski A, Plogsted S, Sacks GS, Tucker AM, Worthington P, Walker RN, Ayers P, Parenteral Nutrition Safety and Clinical Practice Committees, American Society for Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition SO Nutr Clin Pract. 2020;35(2):178. Epub 2020 Mar 2.
- Refeeding syndrome: what it is, and how to prevent and treat it. Mehanna HM, Moledina J, Travis J BMJ. 2008;336(7659):1495.
- Walmsley, R.S. (2013), Refeeding syndrome in parenteral feeding. J Gastroenterol Hepatol, 28: 113-117. https://doi.org/10.1111/jgh.12345

G-ECH