

## **Nutrition Therapy in the Critically Injured Adult Patient: A Western Trauma Association Critical Decisions Algorithm**

Jennifer L. Hartwell<sup>1</sup>, Kimberly A. Peck<sup>2</sup>, Eric J. Ley<sup>3</sup>, Carlos V. Brown<sup>4</sup>,  
Ernest E. Moore, MD<sup>5</sup>, Jason L. Sperry<sup>6</sup>, Anne G. Rizzo<sup>7</sup>, Nelson G. Rosen<sup>8</sup>, Karen J. Brasel<sup>9</sup>,  
Jordan Weinberg<sup>10</sup>, Marc A. de Moya<sup>11</sup>, Kenji Inaba<sup>12</sup>, Ann Cotton<sup>13</sup>, Matthew J. Martin, MD<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Indiana University Department of Surgery, Indianapolis, IN; <sup>2</sup>Scripps Mercy Hospital, San Diego, CA; <sup>3</sup>Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles, CA; <sup>4</sup>Dell Medical School, Austin, TX;  
<sup>5</sup>Ernest E Moore Shock Trauma Center, Denver, CO; <sup>6</sup>University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA;  
<sup>7</sup>Inova Trauma Center, Falls Church, VA; <sup>8</sup>Cincinnati Children's Hospital, Cincinnati, OH;  
<sup>9</sup>Oregon Health Science University, Portland, OR; <sup>10</sup>St. Joseph's Medical Center, Phoenix, AZ;  
<sup>11</sup>Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, WI; <sup>12</sup>Keck School of Medicine, Los Angeles, CA;  
<sup>13</sup>IU Health, Methodist Hospital, Indianapolis, IN

Presented at the 51st Annual Western Trauma Association Meeting, Virtual Session, March 3, 2021.

*Conflicts of Interest:* The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare and have received no financial or material support related to this manuscript

---

This is the author's manuscript of the article published in final edited form as:

Hartwell, J. L., Peck, K. A., Ley, E. J., Brown, C. V., Moore, E. E., Sperry, J. L., Rizzo, A. G., Rosen, N. G., Brasel, K. J., Weinberg, J., de Moya, M. A., Inaba, K., Cotton, A., & Martin, M. J. (2021). Nutrition Therapy in the Critically Injured Adult Patient: A Western Trauma Association Critical Decisions Algorithm. *The Journal of Trauma and Acute Care Surgery*. <https://doi.org/10.1097/TA.0000000000003326>

*Disclaimer:* The results and opinions expressed in this article are those of the authors, and do not reflect the opinions or official policy of any of the listed affiliated institutions, the United States Army, or the Department of Defense (if military co-authors).

**Corresponding Author:**

Jennifer L. Hartwell, MD, CNSC

1604 N. Capitol Ave, B232

Indianapolis, IN 46202

[jhartwell@iuhealth.org](mailto:jhartwell@iuhealth.org)

Additional author affiliations and emails:

1. Jennifer L. Hartwell MD, Indiana University, Indianapolis, IN  
[jhartwell@iuhealth.org](mailto:jhartwell@iuhealth.org)
2. Kimberly A. Peck MD, Scripps Mercy Hospital, San Diego, CA  
[kpeckmd@gmail.com](mailto:kpeckmd@gmail.com)
3. Eric J. Ley MD, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles, CA  
[Eric.Ley@cshs.org](mailto:Eric.Ley@cshs.org)
4. Carlos V. Brown MD, Dell Medical School, Austin, TX  
[cvrbrown@seton.org](mailto:cvrbrown@seton.org)
5. Ernest E. Moore MD, Ernest E Moore Shock Trauma Center, Denver, CO  
[ernest.moore@dhha.org](mailto:ernest.moore@dhha.org)
6. Jason L. Sperry MPH MD, U of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA  
[sperryjl@upmc.edu](mailto:sperryjl@upmc.edu)

7. Anne G. Rizzo MS MD, Inova Trauma Center, Falls Church, VA  
anne.rizzo@inova.org
8. Nelson G. Rosen MD, Children's Hospital, Cincinnati, OH  
nelson.rosen@cchmc.org
9. Karen J. Brasel MPH MD, OR Health/Science U, Portland, OR  
brasel@ohsu.edu
10. Jordan Weinberg, MD, St. Joseph's Hospital and Medical Center, Phoenix, AZ  
jordanweinberg@creighton.edu
11. Marc A. de Moya, MD, Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, WI  
mdemoya@mcw.edu
12. Kenji Inaba MD, Keck School of Medicine, Los Angeles, CA  
Kenji.Inaba@med.usc.edu
13. Ann Cotton MS RD CNSC, IU Health Methodist Hospital, Indianapolis, IN  
acotton1@iuhealth.org
14. Matthew J. Martin MD, Scripps Mercy Hospital, San Diego, CA  
traumadoc22@gmail.com

Keywords: nutrition, critical illness, trauma, enteral nutrition, parenteral nutrition, malnutrition

## **INTRODUCTION**

This is a recommended evaluation and management algorithm from the Western Trauma Association (WTA) Algorithms Committee addressing the nutrition management of critically injured adult patients.

Historically, trauma surgeons have been leaders in researching and advancing the science of nutritional support in critically injured patients by establishing the metabolic response to injury and studying the clinical impacts of nutritional practices and targeted interventions (1-6). This seminal work helped to establish and provide evidentiary basis for many of the core nutritional principles for the injured patient, including early enteral feeding, establishing surgical feeding access when necessary, and criteria for the use of parenteral nutrition. Although there are now numerous high quality prospective randomized nutrition trials, many recent recommendations from these studies come from medical patients or mixed cohorts with only smaller subgroups of trauma patients included.

### *Algorithm Development*

Because there is a paucity of recent class I recommendations on nutrition in the critically injured patient population, the WTA Algorithms Committee set out to develop a practical guide to the approach of nutrition therapy for this cohort. After a literature search and group discussion, the authors established the key themes that should be addressed in the algorithm. These recommendations are based primarily on extrapolation of randomized trial data from non-trauma cohorts, review of published prospective and retrospective cohort studies in trauma populations, and expert opinion of the WTA Algorithms Committee and general members. The

final algorithm is the result of an iterative process including an initial internal review and revision by the WTA Algorithm Committee members, and then final revisions based on input during and after presentation of the algorithm to the full WTA membership.

## **BACKGROUND**

The immediate management of the critically injured adult patient includes hemorrhage control, coagulation homeostasis, volume resuscitation, reversal of shock, and intervention for life and limb threatening injuries. The provision of nutrition to these critically injured patients is appropriately not an initial priority, however once resuscitation is complete, attention should be turned to a thoughtful, evidence- based approach to adequate nutrition. The early period of critical injury is characterized by hypermetabolism from the acute phase response which contributes to significant lean body mass loss and impaired immunity. (7-10) Coupled with inadequate energy and protein provision, which is not uncommon in the critically injured and ill, the acute phase response effects can lead to longer hospital length of stay, discharge to a non-home destination (ie, skilled nursing, long term acute care facility) and higher infectious morbidity and mortality rates. (10-14) If more adequate energy and protein delivery can be achieved, the negative effect of injury on outcomes may be at least mitigated. (10, 15, 16) Despite this knowledge, a large proportion of critically ill patients still receive inadequate nutrition (10-14, 17) or suffer the consequences of excessive delivery of non-protein calories including increased length of hospital stay and ventilator days (10).

Nutrition therapy in critically injured adult patients is complicated by the numerous individual characteristics of the patient including the presence of any pre-injury comorbid

conditions or malnutrition, the unique constellation and severity of injuries, as well as clinician experience and local practice patterns. Clinicians face multiple decision points in the provision of nutrition to critically injured adults including timing, route, rate, and monitoring of adequacy. This algorithm is intended to bring together the best available literature and expert consensus to aid in the decision-making process to optimally provide nutrition therapy in this complex patient group.

The algorithm (Figure 1) and accompanying comments represent a safe and rational approach to the evaluation and management of nutrition therapy for the critically injured adult patient. We recognize that there will be multiple factors that may warrant or require deviation from any single recommended algorithm, and that no algorithm can completely replace expert bedside clinical judgment. We encourage institutions to use this as a general framework in the approach to these patients, and to customize and adapt the algorithm to better suit the specifics of that program or location.

## **ALGORITHM**

The following lettered sections correspond to the letters identifying specific sections of the algorithm shown in Figure 1. In each section we have provided a brief summary of the important aspects and options that should be considered at that point in the evaluation and management process.

## **A. Nutrition Risk and Needs Assessment**

After initial resuscitation, consideration of early (within 24-48 hours of admission) nutrition therapy should begin. Provision of nutrition therapy may be particularly complex in patients with polytrauma and/or pre-existing comorbidities. Depending on the experience of the treating team, early consultation with a nutrition support team or registered dietitian should be considered, which has been shown to improve outcomes in some cohorts of patients. (18)

The determination of malnutrition remains an area of international discussion and research without definitive definitions or scoring systems. (19) Despite this, there is consensus that objective criteria such as body mass index (BMI) and a detailed history of recent volitional intake or weight loss are predictors of nutritional risk and post-surgical complications and should be used to help stratify patients as “high” or “low” risk. (20) An initial assessment of malnutrition should be completed utilizing validated scoring systems such as the Nutrition Risk Assessment (NRS 2002) or Nutrition Risk in Critically Ill (NUTRIC) (21). The determination of baseline nutritional risk guides the initial prescription for nutrition therapy including total energy and protein goals.

For patients determined to have low or moderate nutritional risk, begin nutrition support at 70% of energy goals corresponding to 15 to 20kcal/kg/day over the initial 1 to 4 days (22, 23) following ICU admission. Limiting energy delivery to not greater than 70% of resting energy expenditure when initiating feeding early in critical illness or injury has demonstrated the lowest 60-day mortality compared to feeding at higher amounts of energy. (10, 22) However, for patients determined to be at high risk of malnutrition the progression to protein and energy goals

should be more aggressive. For energy and protein estimations, we suggest using actual body weight if BMI is  $\leq 30\text{kg/m}^2$  or a BMI of  $25\text{kg/m}^2$  if actual body weight is  $> \text{BMI of } 30\text{kg/m}^2$ . (24) Protein goals are calculated exclusive of total kcal needs; that is, total protein should be administered in addition to minimum kcal goals such that protein does not constitute all or most of the total kcal. Minimum protein needs should be estimated at least  $1.2\text{gm/kg/day}$  to  $1.3\text{gm/kg/day}$  and increased up to  $2\text{gm/kg/day}$  protein or higher in polytrauma or burn patients. Additionally, burn patients with 40% total body surface area or greater affected require at least  $25\text{kcal/kg/day}$  plus 40 kcal per percent total body surface area burn per day. (21, 23, 24)

With appropriate monitoring for refeeding syndrome, no less than 80% of energy and protein goals should be achieved within 48 to 72 of ICU admission when possible. (21, 25) A minimum of  $1.5\text{g/kg/day}$  of protein and  $25\text{-}30\text{kcal/kg/day}$  should be initiated. (21, 26) Caution must be exercised, however, when initiating nutrition in patients at risk for malnutrition and they must be monitored for the development of refeeding syndrome (RS). RS is defined as the constellation of metabolic and electrolyte disturbances resulting from rapid reintroduction of protein and energy to a patient after a prolonged period of decreased or absent intake. Hypophosphatemia is the traditional hallmark of RS and frequent measurement of electrolyte panels is paramount in patients at risk for RS to prevent life threatening complications from these derangements. (27) Those patients most likely to be at risk for RS includes those with a history of anorexia nervosa, bariatric or extensive bowel resection surgery, alcohol and substance use disorder, diseases associated with malabsorption (eg, celiac), some mental health diagnoses, malignancy, and in patients whose social situation places them at risk for food insecurity (27).



## **B. Decision for Enteral Versus Parenteral Nutrition**

Once a nutritional risk and needs assessment has been completed, the route of nutrition delivery must be decided. Enteral nutrition (EN) is nearly always preferred to parenteral nutrition (PN) (10, 21) and should be started after resuscitation goals have been met (eg, normal or down trending lactate level, no longer needing large volume fluid or blood product resuscitation, adequate urine output, etc) so long as there are no contraindications. If vasopressor support continues to be required despite adequate resuscitation, EN can be initiated when the vasopressor dose is deescalating or stable. (28) The need for ongoing vasopressor support is not an absolute contraindication to the initiation of EN or an indication for PN. (discussed below in Section C)

There are relatively fewer contraindications to EN than historically believed and we advocate for a trial of EN in most patients including those with an open abdomen after damage control laparotomy (17, 29, 30), newly created ostomy (31), those who require prone positioning (32-34) neuromuscular blockade infusions (34, 35), and in patients with traumatic brain injury (TBI) (36, 37). Previous studies have not only shown EN to be safe, but even advantageous for these patients. Specifically, patients with an open abdomen who receive EN derive benefits such as fewer overall complications, earlier fascial closure, (29) and decreased mortality (30). Additionally, early EN has been demonstrated to reduce length of hospital stay in TBI patient (37) and is associated with improved survival and Glasgow Coma Score (GCS) recovery (38).

Contraindications to the use of EN include intestinal obstruction (eg, extrinsic compression from hematoma, adhesions, anastomotic stricture, etc), intestinal discontinuity after damage control laparotomy, high-output enterocutaneous fistula (39, 40), high dose vasopressor

requirements (41), intestinal ischemia (42), or documented intolerance (discussed below in Section D) to trials of EN (43). If a patient has these contraindications, consideration should be given to the initiation of PN.

### **C. Initiation of Enteral Nutrition**

Once the decision has been made to start EN, gastric access should be established and confirmed by radiograph. It is acceptable, and likely faster, to begin EN via the stomach (21). It is recommended that EN begin in the first 24-48 hours after hospital admission and after resuscitation goals have been met (10, 21). There are numerous commercial enteral nutrition (EN) products available that vary in caloric density, inclusive of protein and non-protein calories, (1.0-2.0 kcal/mL), fiber content, macronutrient source, as well as specialized products designed for patients with specific dietary restrictions or allergies, and finally disease specific formulas (44). EN is available in polymeric formulas, in which the whole milk protein is intact, or hydrolyzed formula in which the milk proteins are partially broken down to aid in digestion. The various formulas vary in cost but nearly all are less than \$10 USD/1000kcal, which is substantially less expensive than 500mL of parenteral nutrition (PN), estimated to cost \$173 USD (45). Disease specific formulas are available but are used infrequently and only in specialized situations beyond the scope of this review. (21) In the immediate perioperative period (within 5 days pre-op or post-op), an immunomodulating formula should be started (21, 26, 46), but should be discontinued in the setting of sepsis, though it should be noted that the data for these formulas in the trauma patient population is less robust than in medical patients. If there is no surgery planned, a high protein polymeric formula should be used. (46) It is recommended that EN begin at a rate of 20ml/hour to assess tolerance (discussed below) and advanced to a goal

rate over the following 12-24 hours unless there is some contraindication to advancement. Patients should receive 70-80% of their energy needs over the first one to four days and achieve 100% of protein and calorie goals by day five. (21, 23) Consideration should be given to implementing volume-based feeding protocols, which have been shown to safely increase the protein and energy delivered although there has been little evidence of a positive impact on clinical outcomes. (47)

Trophic feeding has been advocated for its promotion in the maintenance of gut integrity, positive influence on the immune system, and the stimulation of insulin sensitivity, among other benefits (10, 48). Special consideration for obese patients ( $\text{BMI} > 30 \text{ kg/m}^2$ ) includes reduction of protein and energy goals to 11-14kcal/kg/day and 2.0-2.5g/kg/day of protein based on actual body weight. (21) Patients with a diagnosis of acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS)/acute lung injury (ALI) may also benefit from trophic (<50% calculated protein and energy requirements) to promote feeding tolerance with equivalent ventilator-free and mortality outcomes by maintaining the provision of protein but limiting the excessive production of CO<sub>2</sub>. (34, 49)

Controversy remains regarding the administration of EN while patients require continuous administration of vasopressors, with some studies demonstrating concern about gastrointestinal complications without a mortality benefit or reduction in infections. (50) Two studies, however, have realized a mortality benefit when EN was administered with vasopressors. (51, 52) Another study demonstrated the safety and efficacy of EN delivery to patients on vasopressors, with concomitant improvements in protein and energy delivery. (53)

The SCCM/ASPEN guidelines recommend withholding EN in patients on “high-dose” vasopressors (21), but the exact definition of “high-dose” remains elusive. Some studies reveal the safety and benefit to early trophic feeding to patients requiring vasopressors. (54) Additional randomized, controlled trials will be required to answer this question, but with the available evidence, we recommend that beginning trophic rate EN (10-20ml/hour) with slow advancement (to goal rate over the following 24-48hr) (21) is safe and tolerated in patients receiving the equivalent of 12.5mcg/min of norepinephrine or less, or up to 0.3µg/kg/min. (28, 52, 53) Patients should not have escalating vasopressor requirements, including the need for the addition of a second or third vasopressor agent even at “low dose”, or rising lactate levels. (28) The gastric route of delivery is preferred and vigilance is required to assess for signs of feeding intolerance or bowel ischemia such as abdominal distention, emesis, or peritonitis. (28)

#### **D. Monitoring and Maintenance of Enteral Nutrition**

After initiation of EN, daily assessments for tolerance and readiness for volitional intake should ensue, tempered by the risk of potential aspiration in the debilitated critically injured adult. Tolerance of EN is a clinical decision and should not be determined by gastric residual volume (GRV) assessment alone. (21) The routine use of GRV is discouraged as this practice has been demonstrated to yield unreliable and variable quantities of residual tube feeds (55) and leads to unnecessary and prolonged periods of *nil per os* (NPO). (21, 56) Clinician discretion is recommended in using GRV as an adjunct for monitoring critically ill patients whose physical exam is unreliable (eg, neuromuscular blockade, severe TBI) when concern about tolerance arises. (28) When the decision is made to use GRV for monitoring, we recommend a threshold of >500ml to hold EN. (21, 28)

Though standard pre-procedural practice is to make patients NPO for a period of 8-12 hours, we recommend against this historical practice, particularly for the critically ill patient with a protected airway (endotracheal tube or tracheostomy appliance). In a 2020 consensus statement, the authors conclude, “Current concerns about aspiration are out of proportion to the actual risk”. (57) Frequent interruptions of EN for procedures contributes to failures to meet protein and energy delivery goals and has been shown to propagate an ileus. (21, 58) For patients undergoing a non-aerodigestive tract procedure and who have a protected airway, we recommend continuing EN until the time of the procedure. As most studies excluded patients who will be in the prone position for the procedure, we recommend caution in continuing EN until the time of these procedures. (21, 56, 58, 59)

Monitoring for tolerance includes evaluation for abdominal distention, pain, emesis, obstipation, radiographic evidence of obstruction or severe ileus, or clinical decompensation. (21, 28, 60) As previously stated, ileus may be propagated, not mitigated, by NPO periods. (56, 58) In the event a patient receiving EN via the gastric route demonstrates an ileus causing emesis or distention, and there is concern for gastroparesis and subsequent aspiration, an attempt should be made to place nasojejunal access prior to abandoning EN altogether. At this point, prokinetic medications such as metoclopramide or erythromycin may be added. (21)

If the patient appears to be tolerating full dose EN, it should be maintained and consideration given to the expected duration of EN. If it is expected that even after resolution of the critical illness, oral intake will not be reasonable (eg, severe TBI), consideration should be given to placement of durable enteral access after 7-14 days. (60) Once it appears a patient can

be extubated and safely consume >60% predicted protein and energy of their own volition, EN may be discontinued. (61)

### **E. Parenteral Nutrition**

As previously noted, PN is more costly than EN, requires central venous access, and does not confer the aforementioned benefits of using the GI tract (10). Therefore, PN is reserved for the patient who cannot safely meet protein and energy goals via EN, as EN is the preferred route of nutrition delivery. (21) In fact, recent studies have demonstrated that PN administered to critically ill patients within 5 days has detrimental effects (10, 21) For patients with a high risk of malnutrition, such as those with a pre-admission BMI of  $\leq 18.5 \text{ kg/m}^2$ , unintended weight loss 10% body weight over the previous three months, or <75% energy intake in seven days prior to admission, should be considered for PN within the first 24-48 hours if EN cannot safely be started. (62) Patients who do not meet these high-risk criteria should be reassessed for EN adequacy daily up to seven days prior to the initiation of PN. (10, 21) The initial PN prescription should provide full protein requirements and energy delivery should be increased over a period of five days to reach the calculated goals. (21) Hypocaloric prescriptions should be used for patients at risk of refeeding syndrome while maintaining protein delivery. (21, 27)

For patients who have had a period of EN, but later are unable to tolerate EN due to severe ileus or a change in clinical status, PN should be considered. Evaluation and decision management can be made by returning to the beginning of the algorithm. Daily assessments should be performed to determine readiness for EN or volitional PO intake, as EN remains the preferred route of nutrition support for its evidence of gut mucosal integrity, ease of

administration, reduced complications, and lower cost compared to PN. (21) However, the evidence to support the benefit of a course of PN less than seven days is limited (21).

## **AREAS OF CONTROVERSY AND EXISTING KNOWLEDGE/RESEARCH GAPS**

Discussion among the membership of Western Trauma Association (WTA) revealed lack of consensus regarding the use of EN while patients require vasopressors. While there is agreement that EN should not be completely withheld in patients on stable, low dose vasopressors, defining “low dose” remains elusive.

There was robust consensus that limiting NPO periods is of paramount importance but clearly defining which patients can safely continue EN (gastric vs small bowel access, prone vs supine procedure positioning) was not achieved.

It is also important to note that there are many areas of this algorithm that lack high quality evidentiary support, and where further focused research is required. Table 1 provides a list of the most important specific topics or existing research “gaps” related to this topic that were identified by the authors during the development of this algorithm.

## **SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS**

In summary, based on the available evidence and the collective experience and expertise of the WTA membership, we provide these recommendations to promote the optimal delivery of nutrition therapy to this high-risk population: critically injured adults. Our algorithm aids the clinician in a step-wise approach to assessing patients for nutrition support therapy readiness and

guides a management pathway that puts nutrition delivery on par in importance with all other interventions and therapeutics we offer our critically ill patients, not simply an adjunct, starting on day one. This algorithm challenges historical practice patterns that withhold crucial protein and energy delivery required for healing, such as prolonged NPO periods for procedures, mild ileus, or the use of vasopressors. Early, adequate nutrition delivery has been demonstrated to improve patient outcomes and this algorithm will provide the clinician with a step-by-step decision tree to provide this crucial therapy.

ACCEPTED



## **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION**

All authors meet authorship criteria for this manuscript as described below. All authors have seen and approved the final manuscript as submitted. The first author (*JLH*) had full access to all data in the study and takes responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Conception and design: JLH, AC, MJM

Acquisition of data: all authors

Analysis and interpretation of data: N/A

Drafting of the manuscript: JLH, AC

Critical revision of the manuscript: all authors

Statistical expertise: N/A

Administrative, technical, or material support: MJM

Supervision: MJM

*Conflicts of Interest:* The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare and have received no financial or material support related to this manuscript

*Disclaimer:* The results and opinions expressed in this article are those of the authors, and do not reflect the opinions or official policy of any of the listed affiliated institutions, the United States Army, or the Department of Defense (if military co-authors).

## REFERENCES

1. Moore EE, Jones TN. Benefits of immediate jejunostomy feeding after major abdominal trauma--a prospective, randomized study. *J Trauma*. 1986;26(10):874-81.
2. Peterson VM, Moore EE, Jones TN, Rundus C, Emmett M, Moore FA, McCroskey BL, Haddix T, Parsons PE. Total enteral nutrition versus total parenteral nutrition after major torso injury: attenuation of hepatic protein reprioritization. *Surgery*. 1988;104(2):199-207.
3. Moore FA, Moore EE, Jones TN, McCroskey BL, Peterson VM. TEN versus TPN following major abdominal trauma--reduced septic morbidity. *J Trauma*. 1989;29(7):916-22.
4. Moore EE, Moore FA. Immediate enteral nutrition following multisystem trauma: a decade perspective. *J Am Coll Nutr*. 1991;10(6):633-48.
5. Kudsk KA, Croce MA, Fabian TC, Minard G, Tolley EA, Poret HA, Kuhl MR, Brown RO. Enteral versus parenteral feeding. Effects on septic morbidity after blunt and penetrating abdominal trauma. *Ann Surg*. 1992;215(5):503-11.
6. Moore FA, Moore EE, Kudsk KA, Brown RO, Bower RH, Koruda MJ, Baker CC, Barbul A. Clinical benefits of an immune-enhancing diet for early postinjury enteral feeding. *J Trauma*. 1994;37(4):607-15.
7. Dijkink S, Meier K, Krijnen P, Yeh DD, Velmahos GC, Schipper IB. Malnutrition and its effects in severely injured trauma patients. *Eur J Trauma Emerg Surg*. 2020;46:993-1004.

8. Wischmeyer PE. Tailoring nutrition therapy to illness and recovery. *Crit Care*. 2017;21(Suppl 3):316-327.
9. Stoecklein VM, Osuka A, Lederer JA. Trauma equals danger – damage control by the immune system. *J Leukoc Biol*. 2012;92:539-551.
10. Patkova A, Joskova V, Havel E, Kovarik M, Kucharova M, Zadak Z, Hronek M. Energy, Protein, Carbohydrate and Lipid Intakes and Their Effects on Morbidity and Mortality in Critically Ill Adult Patients: A Systematic Review. *Adv Nurt*. 2017;8(4):624-634.
11. Hartwell JL, Cotton A, Wenos CD, Timsina L, Zarzaur BL, Rozycki G. Early Achievement of Enteral Nutrition Protein Goals by Intensive Care Unit Day 4 is Associated with Fewer Complications in Critically Injured Adults. *Ann Surg*. 2019; ePub ahead of print.
12. Dvir D, Cohen J, Singer P. Computerized energy balance and complications in critically ill patients. *Clin Nutr*. 2006;25(1):37-44.
13. Yeh DD, Fuentes E, Quraishi SA, Cropano C, Kaafarani H, Lee J, King D, deMoya M, Fagenholz P, Bulter K, et al. *J Parenter Enteral Nutr*. 2016;40:37-44.
14. Ortiz-Reyes LA, Change Y, Quraishi SA, Yu L, Kaafarani H, deMoya M, King DR, Fagenholz P, Velmahos G, Yeh DD. Early enteral nutrition adequacy mitigates the neutrophil lymphocyte ratio. *Nutr Clin Prac*. 2019;34:148-155.
15. Wade CE, Kozar RA, Dyer CB, Bulger EM, Mourtzakis M, Heyland DK. Evaluation of Nutrition Deficits in Adult and Elderly Trauma Patients. *J Parenter Enteral Nutr*. 2015; 39(4):449-455.

16. Alberda C, Gramlich L, Jones N, Day AG, Dhaliwal R, Heyland DK. The relationship between nutritional intake and clinical outcomes in critically ill patients: results of an international multicenter observational study. *Intensive Care Med.* 2009;35:1728-1737.
17. Marik P. Enteral Nutrition in the Critically Ill: Myths and Misconceptions. *Crit Care Med.* 2014;42:962-969.
18. Schuetz P, Fehr R, Baechli V, Geiser M, Deiss M, Gomes F, Kutz A, Tribolet P, Bregenzer T, Braun N, et al. Individualised nutrition support in medical inpatients at nutritional risk: a randomized clinical trial. *Lancet.* 2019;393(10188):2312-2321.
19. Keller H, de van der Schueren MAE for GLIM Consortium, Jensen GL, Barazzoni R, Compher C, Correia MITDC, Gonzalez MC, Jager-Wittenaar H, Pirlich M, Steiber A, et al. Global Leadership Initiative on Malnutrition (GLIM): Guidance on Validation of the Operational Criteria for the Diagnosis of Protein-Energy Malnutrition in Adults. *J Parenter Enteral Nutr.* 2020;44(6):992-1003.
20. Skeie E, Tangvik RJ, Nymo LS, Harthug S, Lassen K, Viste A. Weight loss and BMI criteria in GLIM's definition of malnutrition is associated with postoperative complications following abdominal resections-Results from a National Quality Registry. *Clin Nutr.* 2020;(39):1593-1599.
21. McClave SA, Taylor BE, Martindale RG, Warren MM, Johnson DR, Braunschweig C, McCarthy MS, Davanos E, Rice TW, Cresci GA, et al. and the Society of Critical Care Medicine and the American Society of Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition. Guidelines for the Provision and Assessment of Nutrition Support Therapy in the Adult Critically Ill

- Patient: Society of Critical Care Medicine (SCCM) and American Society of Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition (ASPEN). *J Parenter Enteral Nutr.* 2016;40(2):159-211.
22. Zusman O, Theilla M, Cohen J, Kagan I, Bendavid I, Singer, P. Resting energy expenditure, calorie and protein consumption in critically ill patients: a retrospective study. *Crit Care.* 2016;20:267-273.
  23. Van Zanten AHR, DeWaele E, Wischmeyer PE. Nutrition therapy and critical illness: practical guidance for the ICU, post-ICU, and long-term convalescence phases. *Crit Care.* 2109;23:368-378.
  24. Singer P, Blager AR, Berger MM, Alhazzani W, Calder PC, Casaer MP, Hiesmayr M, Mayer K, Montego JC, Pichark C, et al. ESPEN guideline on clinical nutrition in the ICU. *Clin Nutr.* 2019;38:48-79.
  25. Heyland DK, Stephens KE, Day AG, McClave SA. The success of enteral nutrition and ICU-acquired infections: a multicenter observational study. *Clin Nutr.* 2011;30:148-155.
  26. Yu K, Zhang X, Wang G, Li Y, Yu P, Yang M, Guo N, Ma X, Bu Y, Peng Y, et al. Immunonutrition versus standard nutrition for cancer patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Parenter Enteral Nutr.* 2020;44:742-761
  27. da Silva JSV, Seres DS, Sabino K, Adams SC, Berdahl GJ, Citty SW, Cober MP, Evan DC, Greaves JR, Gura KM, et al, and Parenteral Nutrition Safety and Clinical Practice Committees, American Society for Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition. ASPEN Consensus Recommendations for Refeeding Syndrome. *Nutr Clin Practice.* 2020;35(2):178-195.
  28. Wischmeyer P. Enteral Nutrition Can Be Given to Patients on Vasopressors. *Crit Care Med.* 2020;48(1):122-125.

29. Moore SM, Burlew CC. Nutrition Support in the Open Abdomen. *Nutr Clin Practice*. 2016;31(1):9-13.
30. Burlew CC, Moore EE, Cushieri J, Jurkovich GJ, Codner P, Nirula R, Millar D, Cohen MJ, Kutcher ME, Haan J, et al., and WTA Study Group. Who should we feed? Western Trauma Association multi-institutional study of enteral nutrition in the open abdomen after injury. *J Trauma Acute Care Surg*. 2012;73(6):1380-7.
31. Toledano S, Sackey J, Willcutts K, Parrott JS, Tomesko J, Al-Mazrou AM, Kiran RP, Brody RA. Exploring the Differences Between Early and Traditional Diet Advancement in Postoperative Feeding Outcomes in Patients with an Ileostomy or Colostomy. *Nutr Clin Practice*. 2019;34(4):631-638.
32. de la Fuente IS, de la Fuente JS, Estelles MDQ, Gigorro RG, Almanza LJT, Izquierdo JAS, Gonzales JCM. Enteral Nutrition in Patients Receiving Mechanical Ventilation in Prone Position. *J Parenter Enteral Nutr*. 2016;40(2):250-255.
33. Linn DD, Beckett RD, Foellinger K. Administration of enteral nutrition to adult patients in the prone position. *Int Crit Care Nursing*. 2015;31:38-43.
34. Al-Dorzi HM, Arabi YM. Enteral Nutrition Safety With Advanced Treatments: Extracorporeal Membrane Oxygenation, Prone Positioning, and Infusion of Neuromuscular Blockade. *Nutr Clin Practice*. 2021;36(1):88-97.
35. Ohbe H, Jo T, Matsui H, Fushimi K, Yasunaga H. Early Enteral Nutrition in Patients Undergoing Sustained Neuromuscular Blockade: A Propensity-Matched Analysis Using a Nationwide Inpatient Database. *Crit Care Med*. 2019;47(8):1072-1080.

36. Ohbe H, Jo T, Matsui H, Fushimi K, Yansunaga H. Early enteral nutrition in patients with severe traumatic brain injury: a propensity-score matched analysis using a nationwide inpatient database in Japan. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2020;111;378-384.
37. Chapple LS, Chapman MJ, Lange K, Deane AM, Heyland DK. Nutrition support practices in critically ill head-injured patients: a global perspective. *Crit Care.* 2016;20(6).
38. Chiang YH, Chao DP, Chu SF, Lin HW, Huang SY, Yeh YS, Lui TN, Binns CW, Chiu WT. Early enteral nutrition and clinical outcomes of severe traumatic brain injury patients in acute stage: a multi-center cohort study. *J Neurotrauma.* 2012;29(1):75-80.
39. Polk TM, Schwab CW. Metabolic and Nutritional Support of the Enterocutaneous Fistula Patient: A Three-Phase Approach. *World J Surg.* 2012;36:524-533.
40. Kumpf VJ, de Aguilar-Nasciomento JE, Diaz-Pizarro JI, Hall AM, Keever AM, Steiger E, Winkler MF, Compher CW. ASPEN-FELANPE Clinical Guidelines: Nutrition support of adult patients with enterocutaneous fistulas. *J Parenter Enteral Nutr.* 2017;41:104-112
41. Krejci V, Hildebrand LB, Sigurdsson GH. Effects of epinephrine, norepinephrine, and phenylephrine on microcirculatory blood flow in the gastrointestinal tract in sepsis. *Crit Care Med.* 2006;34(5):1456-1463.
42. McClave SA, Chang W. Feeding the Hypotensive Patient: Does Enteral Feeding Precipitate or Protect Against Ischemic Bowel? *Nutr Clin Practice.* 2003;18:279-284.
43. Gungabissoon U, Hacquoil K, Bains C, Irizarry M, Dukes G, Williamson R, Deane A, Heyland DK. Prevalence, Risk Factors, Clinical Consequences, and Treatment of Enteral Feed Intolerance During Critical Illness. *J Parenter Enteral Nutr.* 2015;39(4):441-448.

44. Malone A. Nutrition Issues in Gastroenterology, Series #28: Enteral Formula Selection: A Review of Selected Product Categories. *Pract Gastroenterol*. June 2005:44-74.
45. <https://www.drugs.com/price-guide/tpn-electrolytes> (last accessed 4/12/2021)
46. Mariette C. Immunonutrition. *J Visc Surg*. 2015;152:1:S14-S17.
47. Brierly-Hobson S, Clarke G, O’Keefe V. Safety and efficacy of volume-based feeding in critically ill, mechanically ventilated adults using the “Protein and Energy Requirements Fed for Every Critically Ill Patient Every Time” (PERFECT) protocol: a before-and-after study. *Crit Care*. 2019;23:105.
48. McClave SA, DiBaise JK, Mullin GE, Martindale RG. ACG Clinical Guideline: Nutrition Therapy in the Adult Hospitalized Patient. *Am J Gastroenterol*. 2016;111:315-334.
49. The National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS) Clinical Trials Network, Rice TW, Wheeler AP, Thompson BT, Steingrub J, Hite RD, Moss M, Morris A, Dong N, Rock P. Initial Trophic vs Full Enteral Feeding in Patients with Acute Lung Injury: The EDEN Randomized Trial. *JAMA*. 2012;307(8):795-803.
50. Reignier J, Boisrame-Helms J, Brisard L, Lascarrou JB, Hssain AA, Anguel N, Argard L, Asehoune K, Asfar P, Bellec F, et al, for the NUTRIREA-2 Trial Investigators and the Clinical Research in Intensive Care and Sepsis (CRICS) group. Enteral versus parenteral early nutrition in ventilated adults with shock: a randomised, controlled, multicentre, open-label parallel-group study (NUTRIREA-2). *Lancet*. 2018;391:133-143.



51. Khalid I, Doshi P, DiGiovine B. Early enteral nutrition and outcomes of critically ill patients treated with vasopressors and mechanical ventilation. *Am J Crit Care.* 2010;19:261-268.
52. Ohbe H, Matsui H, Fushimi K, Yasunga H. Differences in the effect of early enteral nutrition among ventilated adults with shock requiring low-, medium-, and high-dose vasopressors. *Clin Nutr.* 2020;39:460-467.
53. Mancl EE, Muzevich KM. Tolerability and Safety of Enteral Nutrition Critically Ill Patients Receiving Intravenous Vasopressor Therapy. *J Parenter Enteral Nutr.* 2013;37(5):641-651.
54. Patel JJ, Kozeniecki M, Biesboer A, Peppard W, Ray AS, Thomas S, Jacobs ER, Nanchal R, Kumar G. Early Trophic Enteral Nutrition is Associated with Improved Outcomes in Mechanically Ventilated Patients with Septic Shock: A Retrospective Review. *J Intensive Care Med.* 2016;7:471-477.
55. Ellis RJB, Fuehne J. Examination of Accuracy in the Assessment of Gastric Residual Volume: A Simulated Controlled Study. *J Parenter Enteral Nutr.* 2015;39(4):424-440.
56. Hartwell JL, Cotton A, Rozycki G. Optimizing Nutrition for the Surgical Patient: An Evidenced Based Update to Dispel Five Common Myths in Surgical Nutrition Care. *Am Surg.* 2018;84:831-835.
57. Green SM, LeRoy PL, Roback MG, Irwin MG, Andolfatto G, Babl FE, Barbi E, Costa LR, Absalom A, Carlson DW, et al., on behalf of the International Committee for the Advancement of Procedural Sedation. An international multidisciplinary consensus


- statement fasting before procedural sedation in adults and children. *Anaesthesia*. 2020;75:374-385.
58. Segaran E, Barker I, Hartle A. Optimising enteral nutrition in critically ill patients by reducing fasting times. *J Int Care Society*. 2016;17(1):38-43.
59. Pousman RM, Pepper C, Pandharipande P, Ayers GD, Mills B, Diaz J, Collier B, Miller R, Jensen G. Feasibility of Implementing a Reduced Fasting Protocol for Critically Ill Trauma Patients Undergoing Operative and Nonoperative Procedures. *J Parenter Enteral Nutr*. 2009;33(2):176-180.
60. Yorkgitis BK, Olufajo OA, Gurien LA, Kelly E, Salim A, Askari R. Risk factors for prolonged need for percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy (PEG) tubes in adult trauma patients: Experience of a level 1 trauma center. *Surgery*. 2018;164:1259-1262.
61. Boullata JJ, Carrera AL, Harvey L, Escuro AA, Hudson L, Mays A, McGinnis C, Wessel JJ, Bajpai S, Beebe ML, et al, and ASPEN Safe Practices for Enteral Nutrition Therapy Task Force, American Society of Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition. ASPEN Safe Practices for Enteral Nutrition. *J Parenter Enteral Nutr*. 2017;41(1):15-103.
62. Worthington P, Balint J, Bechtold M, Bingham A, Lingtak-Neander C, Durfee S, Jevonn AK, Malone A, Mascarenhas M, Robinson DT, Hocombe B. When is parenteral nutrition appropriate. *J Parenter Enteral Nutr*. 2017;41:324-377.

**Figure 1:** Western Trauma Association algorithm for the evaluation and management of nutrition therapy in critically injured patients. Circled letters correspond to sections in the associated manuscript.

**Table 1.** Top identified knowledge and research gaps related to nutrition therapy in the critically injured adult patient.

ACCEPTED

Figure 1



**Table 1.** Top identified knowledge and research gaps related to nutrition therapy in the critically injured adult patient.

<b>Topic or Research Gap</b>	<b>Algorithm Section</b>
1. Tailoring nutrition and changes in content and caloric delivery based on individual patient physiology and metabolism	A, C
2. Enteral nutrition in the periprocedural period	C
3. Enteral nutrition and the use of vasopressors	C
4. Role and impact of immunonutrition in the trauma population and in select subgroups (TBI, burn, major abdominal surgery, etc)	C
5. Role and criteria for hypocaloric versus full caloric nutrition delivery in the critically injured patient	C
6. Optimal timing for initiation of parenteral nutrition in high nutritional risk patients	E