



# Retrospective Descriptive Analysis of Demographic Characteristics of Patients Receiving Peptide-Based Diets (RAD Peptide Study)

M16

Aravind Reddy Kuchkuntla, M.B.B.S<sup>1</sup>, Saketh Reddy Velapati, M.B.B.S<sup>1</sup>, Ryan T. Hurt, MD, Ph.D<sup>1, 2, 3</sup>, Manpreet S. Mundi, MD<sup>1</sup>  
 1 - Division of Endocrinology, 2- General Internal Medicine, 3 - Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN, United States

Introduction	Results	Table 2: Tolerability of PBD	Discussion																																								
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With studies noting significant benefit to enteral nutrition in patients who are unable to meet their nutritional needs through oral intake, more than 400,000 Americans are estimated to receive home enteral nutrition (HEN).</li> <li>Unfortunately, a significant number of patients are unable to tolerate standard polymeric formulas, leading to significant GI distress, poor quality of life, and inability to meet protein and caloric goals.</li> <li>Compromised calorie delivery is associated with poor patient outcomes and increased mortality.</li> <li>Recent studies have shown that the use of peptide based (PBD) formulas are better tolerated than standard polymeric formulas and may be ideal in intolerant patients.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>During study period, 98 patients utilized PBD, with 55 patients being started directly on PBD and 43 switched to PBD from standard formula due to intolerance.</li> <li>Most common indication for PBD initiation was fat malabsorption (29%) followed by pancreatic insufficiency (24%) and post-operative chyle leak (20%).</li> <li>In patients placed on PBD due to intolerance, the overall number of GI symptoms were significantly reduced (Table 2).</li> <li>Health care resources including number of phone calls to HEN service, Emergency Room visits, and provider visits were reduced after transition to PBD (Table 3).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Table 2: Tolerability of PBD</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Characteristic</th> <th>On Standard Formula</th> <th>On PBD</th> <th>p-value</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Nausea/vomiting</td> <td>17 (40%)</td> <td>10 (23%)</td> <td>0.02</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Diarrhea</td> <td>20 (47%)</td> <td>10 (23%)</td> <td>0.01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Abdominal pain</td> <td>10 (23%)</td> <td>2 (5%)</td> <td>0.01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Distention</td> <td>4 (9%)</td> <td>1 (2%)</td> <td>0.17</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No symptoms</td> <td>9 (21%)</td> <td>20 (47%)</td> <td>&lt;0.01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gas/bloating</td> <td>0 (0%)</td> <td>1 (2%)</td> <td>1.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Calories tolerated/day (kcal)</td> <td>1495 ± 388</td> <td>1574 ± 489</td> <td>0.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Goal calories provided (%)</td> <td>97.2 ± 27.0</td> <td>102.6 ± 31.7</td> <td>0.33</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Goal Protein provided (%)</td> <td>105.2 ± 34.1</td> <td>110.1 ± 35.4</td> <td>0.45</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Characteristic	On Standard Formula	On PBD	p-value	Nausea/vomiting	17 (40%)	10 (23%)	0.02	Diarrhea	20 (47%)	10 (23%)	0.01	Abdominal pain	10 (23%)	2 (5%)	0.01	Distention	4 (9%)	1 (2%)	0.17	No symptoms	9 (21%)	20 (47%)	<0.01	Gas/bloating	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	1.00	Calories tolerated/day (kcal)	1495 ± 388	1574 ± 489	0.3	Goal calories provided (%)	97.2 ± 27.0	102.6 ± 31.7	0.33	Goal Protein provided (%)	105.2 ± 34.1	110.1 ± 35.4	0.45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PBD were well tolerated in HEN population and utilized directly in patients at risk for malabsorption such as those with pancreatic disease or GI surgery.</li> <li>PBD was also effectively utilized to reduce GI symptoms and increase % goal calories and % goal protein provided in patients who were intolerant to standard polymeric formulas.</li> <li>PBD also resulted in a reduction in the use of health care resources.</li> </ul>
Characteristic	On Standard Formula	On PBD	p-value																																								
Nausea/vomiting	17 (40%)	10 (23%)	0.02																																								
Diarrhea	20 (47%)	10 (23%)	0.01																																								
Abdominal pain	10 (23%)	2 (5%)	0.01																																								
Distention	4 (9%)	1 (2%)	0.17																																								
No symptoms	9 (21%)	20 (47%)	<0.01																																								
Gas/bloating	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	1.00																																								
Calories tolerated/day (kcal)	1495 ± 388	1574 ± 489	0.3																																								
Goal calories provided (%)	97.2 ± 27.0	102.6 ± 31.7	0.33																																								
Goal Protein provided (%)	105.2 ± 34.1	110.1 ± 35.4	0.45																																								
Methods		<p><b>Table 3:</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Characteristic</th> <th>On Standard Formula</th> <th>On PBD</th> <th>p-value</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Phone Calls</td> <td>1.8 ± 1.65</td> <td>1.1 ± 1.0</td> <td>0.005</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ER visits</td> <td>0.3 ± 0.6</td> <td>0.09 ± 0.3</td> <td>0.02</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Provider visits</td> <td>1.3 ± 1.3</td> <td>0.3 ± 0.5</td> <td>&lt;0.05</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Characteristic	On Standard Formula	On PBD	p-value	Phone Calls	1.8 ± 1.65	1.1 ± 1.0	0.005	ER visits	0.3 ± 0.6	0.09 ± 0.3	0.02	Provider visits	1.3 ± 1.3	0.3 ± 0.5	<0.05	<p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall, PBD were well tolerated in outpatient setting in HEN patients and can be an option in patients who are intolerant to standard polymeric formulas leading to decrease in utilization of health care resources.</li> <li>Large prospective clinical trials are recommended to delineate cost-effectiveness of this approach</li> </ul>																								
Characteristic	On Standard Formula	On PBD	p-value																																								
Phone Calls	1.8 ± 1.65	1.1 ± 1.0	0.005																																								
ER visits	0.3 ± 0.6	0.09 ± 0.3	0.02																																								
Provider visits	1.3 ± 1.3	0.3 ± 0.5	<0.05																																								
			<p><b>References</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mundi MS, Pattinson A, McMahon MT, Davidson J, Hurt RT. Prevalence of Home Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition in the United States. <i>Nutr Clin Pract.</i> 2017;32(6):799-805.</li> <li>Liu, M.Y., et al., <i>Peptide-based enteral formula improves tolerance and clinical outcomes in abdominal surgery patients relative to a whole protein enteral formula.</i> <i>World J Gastrointest Surg.</i> 2016. 8(10): p. 700-705.</li> <li>Alexander, D.D., et al., <i>Nutritional and health benefits of semi-elemental diets: A comprehensive summary of the literature.</i> <i>World J Gastrointest Pharmacol Ther.</i> 2016. 7(2): p. 306-19.</li> <li>Aganzo Yerves, M., et al., <i>[Nutritional management of functional chronic diarrhea associated to malnutrition with peptide diet: a case report].</i> <i>Nutr Hosp.</i> 2018. 35(3): p. 747-749.</li> </ul>																																								