

IMPLANTATION OF A PERIOPERATIVE NUTRITIONAL SUPPORT PROGRAMME FOR PATIENTS SCHEDULED FOR MAJOR ELECTIVE LOWER GASTROINTESTINAL SURGERY

G. Mercadal¹, J. Lluch¹, I. Blasco¹, R. Romero¹, F. Alcaide², F. Garcia Olives²

¹Hospital Mateu Orfila, Pharmacy, Maó, Spain; ²Hospital Mateu Orfila, General and Digestive Surgery, Mahon, Spain

INTRODUCTION AND OBJECTIVES

Background

MATERIAL AND METHODS

A high-calorie/high-protein enteral formula was administered Perioperatively to the

Malnutrition is associated with high postoperative morbidity and mortality rates.

Purpose

This pilot study evaluated the effectiveness of a perioperative nutritional support program for patients who were about to undergo major elective lower gastrointestinal surgery.

group of patients at nutritional risk/with malnutrition (NR/MN), who were detected with the Mini Nutritional Assessment (MNA) test.

In order to assess the effectiveness of the preoperative nutritional intervention, we collect mortality, length of stay, re-entry, gastrointestinal complications after surgery, clinical complications (infections, sepsis, hyperglycaemia, renal failure, intestinal failure, fistula). The results were compared to a comparable (type of surgery, demographic and anthropometric data) retrospective control group.

RESULTS

63 patients were studied Statistically-significant differences were found between the prospective NR/MN supplemented group and the retrospective NR/MN non supplemented group in: wound infection (0% vs 24,6%; p= 0,001), hyperglycaemia (32,6% vs 59,6%; p= 0,001), death in hospital (4,7% vs 14,0%; p= 0,008), length of hospital stay (9,86 days vs 13,54; p= 0,006), time in ICU (0,55 days vs 3,21; p= 0,037) and administration of TPN (1,67 days vs 6,78; p= 0,000).

Table 3. Type digestive sur	gery			
Surgery	Group 1 (n= 25)	Group 2 (n= 15)	Group 3 (n= 23)	Total
Hemicolectomy	19 (76%)	6 (40%)	13 (56.5%)	38 (60.32%)
Bowel resection	0	2 (13.33%)	0	2 (3.18%)
Laparatomy	1 (4%)	0	0	1 (1.59%)
Colostomy	2 (8%)	2 (13.33%)	3 (13.04%)	7 (11.11%)
Gastrectomy	0	1 (6.66%)	3 (13.04%)	4 (6.35%)
lleostomy	2 (8%)	3 (20%)	3 (13.04%)	8 (12.7%)
Other digestive surgery	1 (4%)	1 (6.66%)	1 (4.35%)	3 (4.76%)
Data are given as mean (SD) c	or number of	patients (%)		
Table 4. Morbidity and mo	Gro	up 2	Group 3 Retrospective w	vith
	Group 2 Prospective with nutritional risk/malnutrition		Group 3 Retrospective w nutritional risk/malnutritie	D_ \/aluo
		mented	unsupplement	
Intestinal Failure	3 (7	′.0%)	6 (10.5%)	0.575
Fistula	0 (0%)	3 (5.3%)	0.305
Renal failure	3 (7	′.0%)	8 (14.0%)	0.235
Respiratory tract. infection	3 (7	′.0%)	9 (15.8%)	0.134
Urinary infection	0 (0%)	3 (5.3%)	0.070
Wound infection	0 (0%)	14 (24.6%)	0.001
Hyperglycemia	14 (3	32.6%)	34 (59.6%)	0.001
Death	2 (4	.7%)	8 (14.0%)	0.008
Intolerance diet	3 (7	′.0%)	9 (15.8%)	0.237

	, ,			
-	-			

Table 1. Automate	ed nutritio	onal filter (FA	NBAL)	
Parameters	Normal	Slight	Moderate	Serious
Albumin g/dl or	≥3.5	3-3,49	2.50-2.99	<2,5
total protein g/dl or	>6.4	5-6,3	4-4.9	< 4
prealbumin mg/dl	>18(0)	15-17,9 (2)	10-14.9 (4)	< 10 (6)
Cholesterol mg/dl	> 180 (0)	140-179 (1)	100-139 (2)	< 100 (3)
Lymphocites (%)	> 17 (0)	12-16.9 (1)	8-11,9 (2)	<8 (3)
Total points	0-1	2-4	5-8	9-12
Malnutrition alert	S	light	Moderate	Serious

Table 2. Demographic and anthropometric variables (n=63) Group 1: Prospective well nourished unsupplemented Group 2: Prospective with nutritional risk/malnutrition supplemented Group 3: Retrospective with nutritional risk/malnutrition unsupplemented

Parameters	GROUP 1	GROUP 2	GROUP 3	Vomit	3 (7.0%)	15 (26.3%)
(Media ±SD) (Media ±	(Media ±SD)) (Media ±SD)	Diarrhea	12 (27.9%)	11 (19.3%)	
Age	68.85 ±10,52	66.15 ±12,94	69.77 ±13,92	Sepsis	0 (0%)	3 (5.3%)
Current weight	76.52 ±13,35	74.11 ±19,63	66.35 ±11,92	Days of parenteral nutrition	1,67 (± 3.44)	6,78 (± 6.07)
Usual weight	79.39 ±13,16	81.14 ±26,00	68.42 ±11,62	Days of ICU stay	0,55 (± 1.80)	3,21 (± 8.07)
Body Mass Index	26.88 ±4,62	26.28 ± 7,06	25.13 ± 4,23	Hospital stay	9,86 (±3.13)	13,54 (±8.06)
				Data are given as mean (SD) or number of patients (%)		

CONCLUSIONS Postoperative progress was found to be better in the group of NR/MN patients supplemented preoperatively with an enteral nutrition formula.