AWMF online

Arbeitsgemeinschaft der
Wissenschaftlichen
Medizinischen
Fachgesellschaften

Leitlinien der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Ernährungsmedizin
ESPEN Guidelines on Enteral Nutrition

AWMF-Leitlinien-Register	073/008e	Entwicklungsstufe:	3

Liver Disease

Keywords: guideline, clinical practice, evidence-based, enteral nutrition, oral nutritional supplements, tube feeding, liver cirrhosis, ASH, NASH, acute liver failure, undernutrition, BCAA

Summary

Enteral nutrition (EN) by means of oral nutritional supplements (ONS) and tube feeding (TF) offers the possibility to increase or to insure nutrient intake in case of insufficient oral food intake.
The present guideline is intended to give evidence-based recommendations for the use of ONS and TF in patients with liver disease (LD). It was developed by an interdisciplinary expert group in accordance with officially accepted standards and is based on all relevant publications since 1985. The guideline was discussed and accepted in a consensus conference.
EN by means of ONS is recommended for patients with chronic LD in whom undernutrition is very common. ONS improve nutritional status and survival in severely malnourished patients with alcoholic hepatitis. In patients with cirrhosis, TF improves nutritional status and liver function, reduces the rate of complications and prolongs survival. TF commenced early after liver transplantation can reduce complication rate and cost and is preferable to parenteral nutrition. In acute liver failure TF is feasable and used in the majority of patients.
Full version of this article is available at www.espen.org. (externer Link)

Abbreviations and Terms

Normal food: Normal diet of an individual as offered by the catering system of a hospital including special diets e.g. gluten-free, lactose free etc. diets
ASH = alcoholic steatohepatitis
BCAA = branched chain amino acids
BIA = bioelectric impedance analysis
EN = enteral nutrition. This is used as a general term to include both ONS and tube feeding. When either of these modalities is being discussed separately this is specified in the text.
LC = liver cirrhosis
NASH = non-alcoholic steatohepatitis
ONS = oral nutritional supplements
SGA = subjective global assessment
TF = tube feeding

Alcoholic steatohepatitis

Subject	Recommendations	Level of recommen-dation	Statement Number
General	Use simple bedside methods such as the Subjective Global Assessment (SGA) or anthropometry to identify patients at risk of undernutrition.	C	1.1

	Recommended energy intake: 35-40 kcal*kgBW^{-1}*d^{-1} (147-168 kJ BW* kg^{-1}*d^{-1})	C	1.3
	Recommended protein intake: 1.2-1.5 g* kgBW^{-1}*d^{-1}	C	1.3
Application	Use supplementary enteral nutrition when patients cannot meet their caloric requirements through normal food.	A	1.2
	In general, oral nutritional supplements are recommended.	B	1.3
Route	Use tube feeding if patients are not able to maintain adequate oral intake (even when oesophageal varices are present)	A	1.3
	PEG placement is associated with a higher risk of complications and is not recommended	C	1.3
Type of formula	Whole protein formulae are generally recommended	C	1.3
	Consider using more concentrated high energy formulae in patients with ascites.	C	1.3
	Use BCAA-enriched formulae in patients with hepatic encephalopathy arising during enteral nutrition.	A	1.3

Liver cirrhosis

Subject	Recommendations	Level of recommen-dation	Statement Number
General	Use simple bedside methods such as the Subjective Global Assessment (SGA) or anthropometry to identify patients at risk of undernutrition.	C	2.1
	Use phase angle or body cell mass measured by bioelectric impedance analysis (BIA) to quantitate undernutrition, despite some limitations in patients with ascites.	B	2.1
	Recommended energy intake: 35-40 kcal*kg BW^{-1}*d^{-1} (147-168 kJ* kg BW^{-1}*d^{-1})	C	2.3
	Recommended protein intake: 1.2-1.5 g* kg^{-1}*d^{-1}	C	2.3
Application	Use supplementary enteral nutrition when patients cannot meet their caloric requirements through oral food despite adequate individualizes nutritional advise.	A	2.2
Route	If patients are not able to maintain adequate oral intake from normal food, use • Oral nutritional supplements or • Tube feeding (even in the presence of oesophageal varices)	 C A	 2.3 2.3
	PEG placement is associated with a higher risk of complications and is not recommended.	C	2.3
Type of formula	Whole protein formulae are generally recommended	C	2.3
	Consider using more concentrated high energy formulae in patients with ascites.	C	2.3
	Use BCAA-enriched formulae in patients with hepatic encephalopathy arising during enteral nutrition.	A	2.3

Outcome	Enteral nutrition improves nutritional status and liver function, reduces complications and prolongs survival in cirrhotics and is therefore recommended.	A	2.4

Transplantation and Surgery

Subject	Recommendations	Level of recommen-dation	Statement Number
General	Use simple bedside methods such as the Subjective Global Assessment (SGA) or anthropometry to identify patients at risk of undernutrition.	C	3.1
	Use phase angle or body cell mass measured by bioelectric impedance analysis to quantitate undernutrition, despite some limitations in patients with ascites.	B	3.1
Indication -preoperative	Follow recommendations for cirrhosis.		3.2
-postoperative	Initiate normal food / enteral nutrition within 12-24 hours postoperatively.	B	3.2
	Initiate early normal food or enteral nutrition after other surgical procedures	B	3.2
Application - preoperative	Follow recommendations for cirrhosis.		
	For children awaiting transplantation consider BCAA administration.	B	3.3
- postoperative	Recommended energy intake: 35-40 kcal*kg BW^{-1}*d^{-1} (147-168 kJ* kg BW^{-1}*d^{-1})	C	3.3
	Recommended protein intake: 1.2-1.5 g* kg BW^{-1}*d^{-1}	C	3.3
Route - preoperative	Follow recommendations for cirrhosis.		
- postoperative	Use nasogastric tubes or catheter jejunostomy for early enteral nutrition.	B	3.3
Type of formula - preoperative	Follow recommendations for cirrhosis.		3.3
- postoperative	Whole protein formulae are generally recommended.	C	3.3
	In patients with ascites prefer concentrated high energy formulae for reasons of fluid balance.	C	3.3
	Use BCAA-enriched formulae in patients with hepatic encephalopathy arising during enteral nutrition.	A	3.3
Outcome - preoperative	An improvement of perioperative mortality or complication rate by preoperative tube feeding or oral nutritional supplements has not yet been shown.		
	However, a clear recommendation for nutritional therapy in undernourished patients with liver cirrhosis is supported by the statements concerning nutrition in LC made in statement 2.4	C	3.4
- postoperative	Early normal food or enteral nutrition is recommended for transplant and surgery patients with LC in order to minimize perioperative - in particular infectious - complications.	B	3.4

1. Alcoholic Steatohepatitis (ASH)

Preliminary remarks:
There are no randomised controlled trials available on nutritional therapy in non-alcoholic steatohepatitis (NASH). Unlike alcoholic steatohepatitis (ASH), NASH often is associated with overnutrition and insulin resistance. Therefore recommendations given for ASH cannot easily be applied to NASH despite remarkable similarities. Nutritional recommendations for NASH patients focus on the underlying disease (metabolic syndrome, other secondary causes).

1.1 Does nutritional status influence outcome in ASH? Which is the best widely applicable method to assess nutritional status?

The prognostic value of nutritional status in patients with alcoholic hepatitis has been demonstrated (III). Simple bedside methods such as the Subjective Global Assessment (SGA) or anthropometry are considered adequate for identifying patients at risk (C).

Comment:
Several publications from the American Veteran Affairs (VA) study report a higher rate of complications and mortality in undernourished ASH patients (1-3). In order to identify undernutrition, a scoring system consisting of variables such as actual/ideal weight, anthropometry, creatinine index, visceral proteins, absolute lymphocyte count, delayed type skin reaction was used in these studies. This composite scoring system includes unreliable variables such as plasma concentrations of visceral proteins or 24-h urine creatinine excretion and has been modified repeatedly, the most recent publication of the series also reported a prognostic significance of the variables absolute CD8+ count and hand grip strength (3). Moreover, a clear association between low intake of normal food and high mortality was found (2).

1.2 When is EN indicated or contraindicated?

Supplementary EN is indicated when ASH patients cannot meet their caloric requirements through normal food (A) and when there are no contraindications like ileus (C).

Comment:
These recommendations are based on six trials studying EN in 465 ASH patients (1-6), of which only three trials were randomised (4-6) (Ib).
The American VA studies compared the effects of anabolic steroids vs. placebo together with the effects of high energy and protein ONS enriched with branched chain-amino acids (BCAA) vs low energy and protein ONS (2,3). The publications from 1993/1995 contain a joint and summarizing evaluation of the VA studies #275 and #119 that had already been published separately (1), and the results of these publications are therefore difficult to interpret (1-3). They show, however, that a higher energy and protein intake can be achieved either by ONS or TF even in severely undernourished ASH patients. Although EN appears to be preferable to parenteral nutrition, there has been no large randomised trial comparing the two methods in ASH patients.
In summary, the results of these studies show, that supplementary EN ensures adequate energy and protein intake without the risk of complications such as hepatic encephalopathy (Ib).

1.3 How should EN be delivered?

- **which formula?**
- **which method of delivery?**
- **what dosage?**

Whole protein formulae are generally recommended (C). More concentrated high energy formulae are preferable in patients with ascites to avoid positive fluid balance (C).
BCAA-enriched formulae should be used in patients with hepatic encephalopathy arising during EN (A).
In general, ONS are recommended (B). If patients are not able to maintain adequate oral intake, TF is recommended (even when oesophageal varices are present) (A).
Placement of PEG is associated with a higher risk of complications (due to ascites or varices) and is not recommended (C).
An energy intake of 35-40 kcal*kgBW^{-1}*d^{-1} (147-168 kJ*kgBW^{-1}*d^{-1}) and a protein intake of

1.2-1.5 g*kgBW^{-1}*d^{-1} are recommended (C).

Comment:
BCAA-enriched formulae were used in the American VA studies (1-3), whereas other studies used casein (5) or intact protein with additional BCAA as a nitrogen source (6).
A direct comparison between standard formula and BCAA enriched formula has not yet been made so that general recommendations cannot be made concerning the value of BCAA -enriched formulae in ASH patients.
Recommendations regarding the amount of nutrients are derived from those (1-3,5,6) given in published studies (Ib).
There is no evidence in the current literature (6-9) (Ib) that oesophageal varices pose any risk to the use of fine bore nasogastric tubes for TF.

1.4 Does EN improve nutritional status, liver function, and prognosis?

EN ensures adequate energy and protein intake without the risk of complications such as hepatic encephalopathy (Ib).
EN was as effective as steroids in patients with severe alcoholic hepatitis. However, survivors who had been treated with EN showed a lower mortality rate in the following year.

Comment:
The influence of EN on the clinical course of liver disease cannot be judged satisfactorily from the available data. In a randomised placebo-controlled trial no difference in 28-day-mortality was found between the groups receiving EN and those receiving steroids. In the latter however, the mortality rate due to infectious complications in the following year was higher (6) (Ib). A possible synergistic effect of the two treatments should be investigated.
In a pooled evaluation of the two American VA studies (only one randomised) a significant reduction in mortality was found in the subgroup of those severely undernourished patients who achieved an adequate intake of BCAA-enriched ONS (2). The subgroup of patients with moderate undernutrition, receiving the steroid oxandrolone and nutritional therapy, had a better outcome than the group receiving oxandrolone alone (2). These findings suggest that adequate nutritional intake is a prerequisite for a positive treatment effect of oxandrolone.
So far, there is no evidence that EN has any impact on liver function in ASH (2,6) (IIa).
Further evaluation of the VA database showed that, in ASH patients whose encephalopathy can be managed with standard treatment such as lactulose, a low protein intake was associated with a worsening of encephalopathy whereas a normal protein intake (1g*×kg^{-1}*×d^{-1}) was associated with an amelioration (8,10) (Ib).

2. Liver cirrhosis (LC)

2.1 Does nutritional status influence outcome in patients with LC? What is the best widely applicable method to assess nutritional status?

IUndernutrition adversely affects the prognosis in patients with LC (III).
Simple bedside methods such as the Subjective Global Assessment (SGA) or anthropometry are considered adequate to identify patients at risk (C).
In order to quantitate undernutrition the determination of phase angle a or body cell mass using bioelectrical impedance analysis (BIA) is recommended, despite some limitations in patients with ascites (B).

Comment:
Several descriptive studies report higher rates of complications and mortality for LC patients with severe undernutrition, as well as higher mortality following liver transplantation (11--20).
For the identification of undernutrition bedside methods, such as the SGA or anthropometry or measurement of handgrip strength (21) are considered adequate; the use of composite scores did not provide any additional value (22).
Accurate quantitative measurement of nutritional status is difficult in the presence of fluid overload or impaired hepatic protein synthesis (e.g. albumin) (23) and necessitates sophisticated methods such as total body potassium count, dual energy X-ray absorptiometry (DEXA), in vivo neutron activation analysis (IVNAA) and isotope dilution (22). Among bedside methods of measuring nutritional status in patients with cirrhosis, the determination of phase angle a or body cell mass (BCM) using BIA is considered superior to methods such as anthropometry and 24 hour creatinine excretion (24-26),

despite some limitations in patients with ascites (27,28).

2.2 When is EN indicated or contraindicated?

Supplemental EN is indicated when LC patients cannot meet their nutritional requirements from normal food despite adequate individualized nutritional counselling (A).

Comment:

LC patients should achieve an energy intake of 35-40 kcal*kgBW^{-1}*d^{-1} (147-168 kJ*kgBW^{-1}*d^{-1}) and a protein intake of 1.2-1.5 g*kgBW^{-1}*d^{-1} (18). If oral intake is not adequate despite nutritional counselling, then additional ONS or TF should be commenced. In severely undernourished patients with advanced LC supplemental EN, in addition to normal food ad libitum, is of documented value (7,8) (Ib). In patients with less advanced LC additional ONS yielded no better results than normal food combined with nutritional counselling (29) (Ib). When deciding the most suitable method of feeding patients with advanced encephalopathy, the risk of aspiration during TF must be weighed against the potential complications of parenteral nutrition.

2.3 How should EN be delivered?

- **which formula?**
- **which method of delivery?**
- **what dosage?**

Whole protein formulae are generally recommended (C). More concentrated high energy formulae are preferable in patients with ascites in order to minimise fluid overload (C).
BCAA-enriched formulae should be used in patients with hepatic encephalopathy arising during EN (A).
Oral BCAA supplementation can improve clinical outcome in advanced cirrhosis (B).
If patients are not able to maintain adequate oral intake from normal food, ONS (C) or TF (A) (even in the presence of oesophageal varices) are recommended.
Placement of PEG is associated with a higher risk of complications, due to ascites or varices, and is not recommended (C).
An energy intake of 35-40 kcal*kgBW^{-1}*d^{-1} (147-168 kJ*kgBW^{-1}*d^{-1}) and a protein intake of 1.2-1.5 g*kgBW^{-1}*d^{-1} are recommended (C).

Comment:

The available data suggest that ensuring a quantitatively adequate nutrient intake should be the primary goal (3, 5, 7,8, 29-31). Until recently, it remained unclear whether a formula enriched in branched chain amino acids (BCAA) is superior to a standard whole protein formula, since the issue had only been investigated in a highly selected group of protein intolerant LC patients with encephalopathy (32). Findings from one older uncontrolled and two recent randomized trials including 174 and 646 patients suggest that long-term (12 and 24 months) nutritional supplementation with oral BCAA granulate as ONS is useful in slowing the progression of hepatic failure and prolonging event-free survival (33, 34, 35) (Ib).
Regarding the method of nutritional intervention, nutritional counselling alone (29) or in combination with ONS (3,5,31) will often prove successful. If energy requirements cannot be met, TF is required (7,8,30). Reservations concerning the placement of nasogastric tubes because of their potential to provoke gastrointestinal bleeding are not supported by the current literature (7-9) (Ib). Ascites, impairment of the coagulation system and porto-systemic collateral circulation due to portal hypertension have been reported as contraindications to PEG placement (36).
Available data on energy and protein requirements are surveyed and appropriate recommendations are made in a former ESPEN guideline paper (22). They are based on the investigation of protein requirement of LC patients (37) and on the amounts of energy and nitrogen given in intervention studies (3,5-8,30,31). A recently published randomized trial (38) demonstrates that diets containing 1.2 g of protein can safely be administered to patients with LC suffering from episodic encephalopathy and that - even transient - protein restriction does not confer any benefit to patients during an epsiode of encphalopathy [Ib].

2.4 Does EN improve nutritional status, liver function or prognosis?

EN improves nutritional status and liver function, reduces complications and prolongs survival in LC and is therefore recommended (A).

Comment:
This recommendation is based on the results of five randomised trials in 245 patients (5,7,8,29,31) (Ib) of which the majority were alcoholic cirrhotics. It had already been shown in individual trials with small sample size, that in LC patients EN improves liver function (7,8), nutritional status (29) and survival (7) (Ib). From these trials it appears that a decrease in mortality can be seen most readily when a low protein intake with normal food in the control group is compared with a high protein intake in the intervention group (37). After successful treatment of portal hypertension by transjugular intrahepatic stent-shunt (TIPS), LC patients on normal food (according to ESPEN recommendations) were able to improve their body composition (39,40).

3. Transplantation and Surgery (See also guidelines Surgery incl. Organ Transplantation)

3.1 Does nutritional status influence outcome? Which is the best widely applicable method of assessing nutritional status?

The prognostic value of preoperative nutritional status in liver transplant patients has been demonstrated (Ib).
Simple bedside methods such as subjective global assessment (SGA) or anthropometry are considered adequate to identify patients at risk (C). In order to quantitate undernutrition the determination of phase angle a or body cell mass using bioelectrical impedance analysis (BIA) is recommended, despite some limitations in patients with ascites (B).

Comment:
Data on patients with chronic liver disease undergoing surgery other than orthotopic liver transplantation are few.
In several descriptive studies higher rates of complications and mortality are reported in patients with preoperative undernutrition who undergo transplantation for terminal chronic liver disease (11-13,17-19,41). Undernourished LC patients are at higher risk of postoperative complications including higher mortality following abdominal surgery (42).
In order to identify undernutrition, simple bedside methods such as SGA or anthropometry are quite adequate. As a prognostic indicator, the combination of decreased BCM (less than 35% of actual body mass as assessed by BIA) and hypermetabolism (20,43) has received the most systematic evaluation. Hypermetabolism, however, can only be assessed by indirect calorimetry, which is not available in all hospitals. The use of other composite scores confers no additional prognostic value (22).

3.2 When is EN indicated or contraindicated?

Preoperative patients: As recommended for LC patients.
Postoperative patients: After liver transplantation, normal food and/or EN should be initiated within 12-24 hours postoperatively (B).
After other surgical procedures, patients with chronic liver disease should receive early normal food or EN like other patient groups (B). Postoperative nutrition yields superior results to the infusion of fluid and electrolytes only (Ib).
Organ donors: No specific recommendations can be made with regard to optimal organ donor conditioning.

Comment:
Preoperative patients: Although the prognostic relevance of undernutrition in transplant candidates has been demonstrated, it has not yet been shown that preoperative nutritional intervention improves clinically relevant outcomes. In patients with less advanced and predominantly cholestatic LC, there was no advantage of ONS over nutritional counselling and normal food (29) (Ib).
Postoperative patients: Postoperative nutrition in transplant recipients is superior to the infusion of fluid and electrolytes only with regard to time on the ventilator and length of stay in ICU (44) (Ib). EN started as early as 12 hours after the operation is associated with a lower rate of infections than parenteral nutrition (45) (Ib).
LC patients have a reduced rate of complications and improved nitrogen economy after abdominal surgery if they receive nutritional support instead of just fluid and electrolytes (46-48) (Ib). It may safely be assumed that EN in the early postoperative period yields even better results; however no studies have compared the two regimens in LC. There are data to suggest a beneficial effect on gut

permeability of sequential parenteral nutrition/EN (via jejunostomy) as compared to parenteral nutrition alone or no postoperative nutrition at all (48) (Ib).
Fatty liver is known to be a risk factor for primary graft malfunction. No data are available adressing the role of nutritional management of the organ donor.

3.3 How should EN be delivered?

- **which formula?**
- **which method of delivery?**
- **-what dosage?**

Preoperative patients: For adults, the recommendations for LC are applicable. For children awaiting transplantation, the administration of BCAA-enriched formulae should be considered (B, one randomized trial).
Postoperative patients: Whole protein formulae are generally recommended (C). Concentrated high energy formulae are preferable in patient with ascites for reasons of fluid balance (C). BCAA-enriched formulae should be used in patients with hepatic encephalopathy arising during EN (A).
For early EN the use of nasogastric tubes or catheter jejunostomy is recommended as in non-liver disease surgery (B) (see also guidelines Surgery incl. Organ Transplantion).
An energy intake of 35-40 kcal*kgBW^{-1}*d^{-1} (147-168 kJ*kgBW^{-1}*d^{-1}) and a protein intake of 1.2-1.5 g*kgBW^{-1}*d^{-1} are recommended (C).

Comment:
Preoperative patients: for adult patients the recommendations for LC apply. Paediatric transplant patients with predominantly cholestatic liver disease show a better increase in BCM if they receive BCAA-enriched formula (49) (Ib).
Postoperative patients: there are few studies addressing this topic. Whole protein formulae with (51) or without pre- and probiotics (45,50) or peptide-based formulae via catheter jejunostomy (52,53) have been used for early EN of adult liver transplant recipients. Formulae were administered via nasogastric or nasoduodenal tubes after endoscopic placement (50) or via catheter jejunostomy (48,52,53) placed during laparotomy.

3.4 Does EN improve nutritional status, liver function, and prognosis?

Preoperative patients: An improvement in perioperative mortality or complication rate by preoperative TF or ONS has not yet been shown. However, a clear recommendation for nutritional therapy in undernourished LC patients is supported by the statements concerning nutrition in LC made in statement 2.4 (C).
Postoperative patients: Early normal food or EN is recommended for transplant and surgery patients with LC in order to minimize perioperative - in particular infectious - complications (B).

Comment:
Preoperative patients: ONS improve anthropometric variables and muscle function, but not overall survival after transplantation, when compared with normal food combined with nutritional counselling (29). Since normal food and nutritional counselling lead to the same adequate intake as when ONS are added, both regimens are considered similarly effective (or ineffective). Moreover, in this study there was no control group without any intervention, since that would have been unethical on the basis of current knowledge.
Postoperative patients: Transplant patients who received early EN twelve hours after surgery developed fewer viral infections and had better nitrogen retention (45) (Ib). In comparison with parenteral nutrition, EN reduces complication rates and costs in transplant patients (50) (Ib).

4. Fulminant liver failure

Fulminant liver failure without treatment results in death within days. Stabilization of metabolism is mandatory and, in that phase of the disease, it is more important than nutritional therapy aimed at meeting daily requirements. Hypoglycaemia is a frequent metabolic disturbance and merits particular attention and therapy, such as (par)enteral glucose administration (C).

Patients with acute liver failure should receive EN via nasoduodenal tube (C). No recommendations concerning a disease specific composition of enteral formulae can currently be given (C).
The recommended amount of enteral formula is based on the dosage in critical illness (III). Due to severe liver failure, glucose, lactate, triglycerides and ammonia plasma levels should be monitored closely and used as surrogate markers of substrate utilisation (C).

Comment:
The scant available data preclude any clear recommendation. In recognition of this deficit, a survey was carried out in European hepatology centres on issues of parenteral nutrition in patients with fulminant liver failure (54). One important result was that centres with a high caseload favour nasoduodenal tube feeding, which could be carried out successfully in the majority of cases.

References

1. Mendenhall CL, Tosch T, Weesner RE et al. VA cooperative study on alcoholic hepatitis. II: Prognostic significance of protein-calorie malnutrition. Am.J Clin.Nutr. 1986;43:213-8.
2. Mendenhall CL, Moritz TE, Roselle GA et al. A study of oral nutritional support with oxandrolone in malnourished patients with alcoholic hepatitis: results of a Department of Veterans Affairs cooperative study. Hepatology 1993;17:564-76.
3. Mendenhall CL, Moritz TE, Roselle GA et al. Protein energy malnutrition in severe alcoholic hepatitis: diagnosis and response to treatment. The VA Cooperative Study Group #275. J Parenter Enteral Nutr 1995;19:258-65.
4. Calvey H, Davis M, Williams R. Controlled trial of nutritional supplementation, with and without branched chain amino acid enrichment, in treatment of acute alcoholic hepatitis. J Hepatol. 1985;1:141-51.
5. Bunout D, Aicardi V, Hirsch S et al. Nutritional support in hospitalized patients with alcoholic liver disease. Eur.J Clin.Nutr. 1989;43:615-21.
6. Cabré E., Rodriguez-Iglesias, Caballeria J. et al. Short- and long-term outcome of severe alcohol-induced hepatitis treated with steroids or enteral nutrition: a multicenter randomized trial. Hepatology 2000;32:36-42.
7. Cabré E, González-Huix F, Abad A, Esteve M, Acero D, Fernández Bañares F et al. Effect of total enteral nutrition on the short-term outcome of severely malnourished cirrhotics: a randomized controlled trial. Gastroenterology 1990, 98:715-720
8. Kearns PJ, Young H, Garcia G et al. Accelerated improvement of alcoholic liver disease with enteral nutrition. Gastroenterology 1992;102:200-5.
9. DeLedinghen V, Beau P, Mannant PR et al. Early feeding or enteral nutrition in patients with cirrhosis after bleeding from esophageal varices? A randomized controlled study. Dig.Dis.Sci. 1997;42:536-41.
10. Morgan TR, Moritz TE, Mendenhall CL, Haas R. Protein consumption and hepatic encephalopathy in alcoholic hepatitis. VA Cooperative Study Group #275. J Am.Coll.Nutr. 1995;14:152-8.
11. Moukarzel AA, Najm I, Vargas J, McDiarmid SV, Busuttil RW, Ament ME. Effect of nutritional status on outcome of orthotopic liver transplantation in pediatric patients. Transplant.Proc. 1990;22:1560-3.
12. Pikul J, Sharpe MD, Lowndes R, Ghent CN. Degree of preoperative malnutrition is predictive of postoperative morbidity and mortality in liver transplant recipients. Transplantation 1994;57:469-72.
13. Harrison J, McKiernan J, Neuberger JM. A prospective study on the effect of recipient nutritional status on outcome in liver transplantation. Transpl.Int. 1997;10:369-74.
14. Caregaro L, Alberino F, Amodio P et al. Malnutrition in alcoholic and virus-related cirrhosis. Am.J Clin.Nutr. 1996;63:602-9.
15. Alberino F, Gatta A, Amodio P et al. Nutrition and survival in patients with liver cirrhosis. Nutrition 2001;17:445-50.
16. Merli M, Riggio O, Dally L. Does malnutrition affect survival in cirrhosis? PINC (Policentrica Italiana Nutrizione Cirrosi). Hepatology 1996;23:1041-6.
17. Selberg O, Bottcher J, Tusch G, Pichlmayr R, Henkel E, Muller MJ. Identification of high- and low-risk patients before liver transplantation: a prospective cohort study of nutritional and metabolic parameters in 150 patients. Hepatology 1997;25:652-7.
18. Harrison J, McKiernan J, Neuberger J. A prospective study on the effect of recipient nutritional status on outcome in liver transplantation. Transpl Int 1997, 10:369-374
19. Figueiredo F, Dickson ER, Pasha T, Kasparova P, Therneau T, Malinchoc M, DiCecco S, Francisco-Ziller N, Charlton M. Impact of nutritional status on outcomes after liver transplantation. Transplantation 2000, 70:1347-1352
20. Selberg O, Bottcher J, Pirlich M, Henkel E, Manns MP, Muller MJ. Clinical significance and correlates of whole body potassium status in patients with liver cirrhosis. Hepatol.Res. 1999;1999:36-48.
21. Figueiredo F, Dickson ER, Pasha TM, Porayko MK, Therneau T, Malinchoc M, DiCecco S, Francisco-Ziller N, Kasparova P, Charlton M. Utility of standard nutritional parameters in detecting body cell mass depletion

in patients with end-stage liver disease. Liver Transplantation 2000, 6:575-581
57. Plauth M, Merli M, Kondrup J, Ferenci P, Weimann A, Muller MJ. ESPEN guidelines for nutrition in liver disease and transplantation. Clin.Nutr. 1997;16:43-55.
58. Prijatmoko D, Strauss BJ, Lambert JR et al. Early detection of protein depletion in alcoholic cirrhosis: role of body composition analysis. Gastroenterology 1993;105:1839-45.
59. Pirlich M, Selberg O, Boker K, Schwarze M, Muller MJ. The creatinine approach to estimate skeletal muscle mass in patients with cirrhosis. Hepatology 1996;24:1422-7.
60. Pirlich M, Schutz T, Spachos T et al. Bioelectrical impedance analysis is a useful bedside technique to assess malnutrition in cirrhotic patients with and without ascites. Hepatology 2000;32:1208-15.
61. Selberg O, Selberg D. Norms and correlates of bioimpedance phase angle in healthy human subjects, hospitalized patients, and patients with liver cirrhosis. Eur J Appl Physiol 2002, 86:509-16
62. Guglielmi FW, Contento F, Laddaga L, Panella C, Francavilla A. Bioelectric impedance analysis: Experience with male patients with cirrhosis. Hepatology 1991; 13:892-895
63. Panella C, Guglielmi FW, Mastronuzzi T, Francavilla A. Whole-body and segmental bioelectrical parameters in chronic liver disease: Effect of gender and disease stages. Hepatology 1995; 21:352-358
64. Le Cornu KA, McKiernan FJ, Kapadia SA, Neuberger JM. A prospective randomized study of preoperative nutritional supplementation in patients awaiting elective orthotopic liver transplantation. Transplantation 2000;69:1364-9.
65. Smith J, Horowitz J, Henderson JM, Heymsfield S. Enteral hyperalimentation in undernourished patients with cirrhosis and ascites. Am.J Clin.Nutr. 1982;35:56-72.
66. Hirsch S, Bunout D, de la MP et al. Controlled trial on nutrition supplementation in outpatients with symptomatic alcoholic cirrhosis. JPEN J Parenter.Enteral Nutr. 1993;17:119-24.
67. Horst D, Grace ND, Conn HO et al. Comparison of dietary protein with an oral, branched chain-enriched amino acid supplement in chronic portal-systemic encephalopathy: a randomized controlled trial. Hepatology 1984;4:279-87
68. Yoshida T, Muto Y, Moriwaki H, Yamato M. Effect of long-term oral supplementation with branched-chain amino acid granules on the prognosis of liver cirrhosis. Gastroenterol Japon 1989, 24:692-698
69. Marchesini G, Bianchi G, Merli M, Amodio P, Panella C, Loguercio C, Rossi Fanelli F, Abbiati R and the Italian BCAA Study Group. Nutritional supplementation with branched-chain amino acids in advanced cirrhosis: a double-blind, randomized trial. Gastroenterology 2003, 124:1792-1801
70. Muto Y, Sato S, Watanabe A, Moriwaki H, Suzuki K, Kato A, Kato M, Nakamura T, Higuchi K, Nishiguchi S, Kumada H, for the LOTUS group. Effects of oral branched chain amino acid granules on event-free survival in patients with liver cirrhosis. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol 2005;3:705-713
71. Löser C, Folsch UR. [Guidelines for treatment with percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy. German Society of Digestive and Metabolic Diseases]. Z Gastroenterol. 1996;34:404-8.
72. Kondrup J, Muller MJ. Energy and protein requirements of patients with chronic liver disease. J Hepatol. 1997;27:239-47.
73. Córdoba J, López-Hellín J, Planas M, Sabín P, Sanpedro F, Castro F, Esteban R, Guardia J. Normal protein for episodic hepatic encephalopathy: results of a randomized trial. J Hepatol 2004;41:38-43
74. Allard JP, Chau J, Sandokji K, Blendis LM, Wong F. Effects of ascites resolution after successful TIPS on nutrition in cirrhotic patients with refractory ascites. Am J Gastroenterol 2001, 96:2442-7
75. Plauth M, Schütz T, Buckendahl DP, Kreymann G, Pirlich M, Grüngreiff S, Romaniuk P, Ertl S, Weiss M-L, Lochs H. Weight gain after TIPS is associated with improvement in body composition in malnourished patients with cirrhosis and hypermetabolism. J Hepatol 2004, 40:228-233
76. Muller MJ, Lautz HU, Plogmann B, Burger M, Korber J, Schmidt FW. Energy expenditure and substrate oxidation in patients with cirrhosis: the impact of cause, clinical staging and nutritional state. Hepatology 1992;15:782-94.
77. Garrison RN, Cryer HM, Howard DA, Polk HC, Jr. Clarification of risk factors for abdominal operations in patients with hepatic cirrhosis. Ann.Surg 1984;199:648-55.
78. Muller MJ, Loyal S, Schwarze M, Lobers J, Selberg O, Ringe B. Resting energy expenditure and nutritional state in patients with liver cirrhosis before and after liver transplantation. Clin.Nutr. 1994;13:145-52.
79. Reilly J, Mehta R, Teperman L et al. Nutritional support after liver transplantation: a randomized prospective study. JPEN J Parenter.Enteral Nutr. 1990;14:386-91.
80. Hasse JM, Blue LS, Liepa GU et al. Early enteral nutrition support in patients undergoing liver transplantation. JPEN J Parenter.Enteral Nutr. 1995;19:437-43.
81. Fan ST, Lo CM, Lai EC, Chu KM, Liu CL, Wong J. Perioperative nutritional support in patients undergoing hepatectomy for hepatocellular carcinoma. N Engl.J Med. 1994;331:1547-52.
82. Kanematsu T, Koyanagi N, Matsumata T, Kitano S, Takenaka K, Sugimachi K. Lack of preventive effect of branched-chain amino acid solution on postoperative hepatic encephalopathy in patients with cirrhosis: a randomized, prospective trial. Surgery 1988;104:482-8.
83. Hu Q-G, Zheng G-C. The influence of enteral nutrition in postoperative patients with poor liver function. World J Gastroenterol 2003, 9:843-846
84. Chin SE, Shepherd RW, Thomas BJ et al. Nutritional support in children with end-stage liver disease: a randomized crossover trial of a branched-chain amino acid supplement. Am.J Clin.Nutr. 1992;56:158-63.

85. Wicks C, Somasundaram S, Bjarnason I et al. Comparison of enteral feeding and total parenteral nutrition after liver transplantation. Lancet 1994;344:837-40.
86. Rayes N, Seehofer D, Hansen S et al. Early enteral supply of lactobacillus and fiber versus selective bowel decontamination: a controlled trial in liver transplant recipients. Transplantation 2002;74:123-7.
87. Pescovitz MD, Mehta PL, Leapman SB, Milgrom ML, Jindal RM, Filo RS. Tube jejunostomy in liver transplant recipients. Surgery 1995;117:642-7.
88. Mehta PL, Alaka KJ, Filo RS, Leapman SB, Milgrom ML, Pescovitz MD. Nutrition support following liver transplantation: comparison of jejunal versus parenteral routes. Clin.Transplant. 1995;9:364-9.
89. Schütz T, Bechstein WO, Neuhaus P., Lochs H, Plauth M. Clinical practice of nutrition in acute liver failure - A European survey. Clin Nutr 2004, 23:975-82.
90. Schuetz T, Herbst B, Koller M. Methodology for the development of the ESPEN Guidelines on Enteral Nutrition. Clin Nutr 2006;25 (2):[please insert page number in current issue]
91. Lochs H, Allison SP, Meier R, Pirlich M, Kondrup J, Schneider St. Van den Berghe G, Pichard C. Introductory to the ESPEN Guidelines on Enteral Nutrition: Terminology, Definitions and General Topics. Clin Nutr 2006; 25 (2): [please insert page number of current issue]

Verfahren zur Konsensbildung

see: **Methodology for the development** of the ESPEN Guidelines on Enteral Nutrition

Corresponding author:

M. Plauth

Dept Internal Medicine, Staedtisches Klinikum, Dessau, Germany

fon: 0049-340-5011275, fax: 0049-340-5011210

e-mail: mathias.plauth@klinikum-dessau.de

E. Cabré, Dept of Gastroenterology, Hospital "Germans Trias i Pujol", Badalona, Spain
O. Riggio, Dept of Gastroenterology II, Universitá "La Sapienza", Roma, Italy
M. Assis-Camilo, Centre of Nutrition and Metabolism, Medical Faculty, University of Lisbon Lisbon, Portugal
M. Pirlich, Dept of Gastroenterology, CCM, Charité Universitätsmedizin, Berlin Germany
J. Kondrup, Clinical Nutrition Unit 5711, Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen, Denmark

DGEM: M.Plauth, P. Ferenci, E. Holm, S. vom Dahl, J. Kondrup, M.J. Müller, W. Nolte

* For further information on methodology see (231). For further information on definition of terms see (232).

Erstellungsdatum:

01/2003

Letzte Überarbeitung:

04/2006

Nächste Überprüfung geplant:

09/2009

Zurück zum Inhaltsverzeichnis ESPEN-Leitlinien
Zurück zum Index Leitlinien Ernährungsmedizin
Zurück zur Liste der Leitlinien

Die "Leitlinien" der Wissenschaftlichen Medizinischen Fachgesellschaften sind systematisch entwickelte Hilfen für Ärzte zur Entscheidungsfindung in spezifischen Situationen. Sie beruhen auf aktuellen wissenschaftlichen Erkenntnissen und in der Praxis bewährten Verfahren und sorgen für mehr Sicherheit in der Medizin, sollen aber auch ökonomische Aspekte berücksichtigen. Die "Leitlinien" sind für Ärzte rechtlich nicht bindend und haben daher weder haftungsbegründende noch haftungsbefreiende Wirkung.

Die AWMF erfasst und publiziert die Leitlinien der Fachgesellschaften mit größtmöglicher Sorgfalt - dennoch kann die AWMF für die Richtigkeit - **insbesondere von Dosierungsangaben - keine Verantwortung** übernehmen.

Stand der letzten Aktualisierung: 04/2006

Autorisiert für elektronische Publikation: AWMF online
HTML-Code optimiert: 14.04.2008; 09:59:44