



FOR YOUR GI-IMPAIRED PATIENTS

why better nutrition starts with Peptamen®

Better GI Tolerance and Glycemic Control is associated with use of Peptamen® Formula in Mechanically Ventilated, Enterally Fed Critically Ill Patients

Mechanically ventilated enterally fed patients who receive Peptamen® formulas have significantly lower prevalence of GI and glucose intolerance, as compared to those who receive standard formulas & other peptide-based formulas

As compared to the use of **standard formulas**, mechanically ventilated patients who receive Peptamen® formulas experience significantly better outcomes:

**20%
LOWER** odds of GI intolerance

**15%
LOWER** odds of **GLUCOSE** intolerance

As compared to the use of **other peptide-based formulas**, mechanically ventilated patients who receive Peptamen® formulas experience significantly better outcomes:

**25%
LOWER** odds of GI intolerance

**47%
LOWER** odds of **GLUCOSE** intolerance

**24%
LOWER** odds of **MORTALITY**

USE UNDER MEDICAL SUPERVISION.

This information is for educational purposes only and is not intended as a substitute for medical advice.

To request samples and find out more information contact your Nestlé Health Science representative, call 1-800-422-ASK2 (2752), or visit www.NestleMedicalHub.com.

All trademarks are owned by Société des Produits Nestlé S.A., Vevey, Switzerland.
©2024 Nestlé.



why better.



Clinical Benefits Associated with Use of Peptide-Based Enteral Tube Feeding Formulas in Mechanically Ventilated Adult ICU Patients

Cynthia Lowen, RD, CNSC; Laura Schott, PhD; Amarsinh Desai, PhD, MS, B. Pharm, D.Pharm; Isabel Gomez, BA; Zhun Cao, PhD; Krysmaru Araujo Torres, MD

Journal of Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition 2023;47(Supp 2):S92-S93.

Poster Presentation at the 2023 ASPEN Nutrition Science and Practice Conference, Las Vegas, NV

Background:

More than 5 million patients are admitted to US intensive care units (ICUs) yearly, with approximately 38.9% requiring mechanical ventilation (MV). Critical Care Guidelines suggest enteral tube feeding (ETF) if duration of MV > 72 hours. Many of these patients experience gastrointestinal (GI) and/or glucose intolerance, associated with decreased ETF delivery and worsened clinical outcomes. Nutritionally complete hydrolyzed 100% whey protein ETF (WPBD) was developed for more efficient digestibility.

Objective:

The primary objective of this retrospective, cross-sectional real-world observational analysis was to compare characteristics and associations of ETF with clinical outcomes of GI and glucose intolerance in adult MV patients in the ICU receiving WPBD, other peptide-based formulas (OPBD) or intact standard ETF (SETF).

Methods:

Data of adult critically ill mechanically ventilated patients who received ETF at least 3 of 5 consecutive days was collected through PINC® AI Healthcare Data for the period of 2017-2021. Patient characteristics and clinical outcomes were compared between those who received WPBD (Peptamen® formulas), OPBD or SETF.

Results:

There were 12,887 patients from 53 US hospitals included in this study (3,004 WPBD, 3514 OPBD and 6369 SETF). Patients received ETF for a mean of 8.3 days and stayed in the ICU for a mean of 14.7 days. Comparing WPBD to OPBD: odds of GI intolerance was 25% lower, glucose intolerance 47% lower and mortality 24% lower for WPBD recipients (each $p < .0001$). Comparing WPBD to SETF, odds of GI intolerance were 20% lower ($p=.001$) and glucose intolerance 15% lower ($p=.06$) in the WPBD group.

Table 1: Clinical outcomes among mechanically ventilated adult ICU patients receiving ETF formulas

Results	GI Intolerance	Glucose Intolerance	Mortality
Prevalence (%)	WPBD: 12.9%	WPBD: 8.7%	WPBD: 29.5%
	OPBD: 18.0%*	OPBD: 15.9%*	OPBD: 35.0%*
	SETF: 14.7%†	SETF: 10.3%†	SETF: 19.8%†
Unadjusted OR (95% CI)	WPBD vs (ref OPBD): 0.68 (0.59 – 0.77)*	WPBD vs (ref OPBD): 0.50 (0.43 – 0.59)*	WPBD vs (ref OPBD): 0.78 (0.70 – 0.86)*
	WPBD vs (ref SETF): 0.86 (0.76 – 0.98)†	WPBD vs (ref SETF): 0.82 (0.71 – 0.96)†	WPBD vs (ref SETF): 1.70 (1.54 – 1.88)†
Adjusted OR (95% CI) ††	WPBD vs (ref OPBD): 0.75 (0.65 – 0.87)*	WPBD vs (ref OPBD): 0.53 (0.44 – 0.63)*	WPBD vs (ref OPBD): 0.76 (0.68 – 0.85)*
	WPBD vs (ref SETF): 0.80 (0.70 – 0.91)†	WPBD vs (ref SETF): 0.85 (0.72 – 1.01)	WPBD vs (ref SETF): 1.60 (1.43 – 1.78)†

Abbreviations:

Enteral Tube Feeding (ETF); 100% whey, peptide-based (WPBD); other peptide-based diets (OPBD); intact-protein standard ETF formulas (SETF); gastrointestinal (GI); odds ratio (OR); confidence interval (CI)

*WPBD vs OPBD, $p < .05$; †WPBD vs SETF, $p < .05$

††Adjusted for demographics, medications, hospital and clinical characteristics

¹ Adjusted OR from regressions including all 3 ETF cohorts in which OPBD is used as the reference group.

² Adjusted OR from regressions including all 3 ETF cohorts in which SETF is used as the reference group.

Conclusions:

- Better GI tolerance and glycemic control were associated with WPBD relative to OPBD and SETF usage in ICU patients on MV
- Use of 100% whey peptide-based formulas is a strategy to help minimize GI and glucose intolerance and may clinically benefit patients mechanically ventilated in the ICU, helping to facilitate adequate and optimal delivery of ETF

Journal Link to Abstract S92-S93:

<https://aspenjournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1002/jpen.2491>