Nutrition in acute pancreatitis: new concepts for an old problem
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Abstract

Nutrition management in acute pancreatitis has been a matter of debate worldwide. For many years, the concept of pancreatic rest was widespread and accepted to treat acute pancreatitis. However, current knowledge of early nutrition allows maintaining the intestinal barrier’s integrity, preventing the occurrence of infectious complications, which is associated with a shorter hospital stay, fewer complications, and better prognosis. This review presents the main advantages of early nutrition in acute pancreatitis, its safety, and the route of administration.
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INTRODUCTION

Acute pancreatitis (AP) is one of the most frequent gastrointestinal disorders; it is mainly caused by gallstones and alcohol consumption (1, 2).

According to the Atlanta classification, two or more of the following criteria must be met to reach an AP diagnosis: abdominal pain suggestive of AP, serum amylase or lipase level greater than three times the upper normal value, and characteristic imaging findings (3, 4).

80% of AP cases have a mild course of the disease, while 20% are moderately severe and severe AP cases. Of these, 33 % will present with infected necrosis, reaching a mortality rate of approximately 15 %-35 %, with sepsis being its main determinant. (5)

CONSEQUENCES OF FOOD RESTRICTION

Ivan Pavlov, a Russian scientist, was awarded the Nobel Prize in Medicine in 1904 for his work on animals regarding the physiology of digestion and the response to stimuli on the secretion of various glands. This work was extrapolated by other researchers, assuming that suppressing food stimulus would avoid the different phases of pancreatic secretion and, therefore, enzyme release and increased tissue damage. This theory was valid for several years, and many
physicians are still careful when it comes to the administration of food in AP (6).

The current understanding of the pathophysiology of AP has shown that the production of different proinflammatory substances, combined with food restriction, alters intestinal motility and the saprobic microbiota, causing bacterial overgrowth and alteration of the intestinal barrier. This allows bacteria to enter the systemic circulation through the lymph nodes, where bacterial endotoxins cause sepsis and multiple organ failure (7, 8). This is shown in more detail in Figure 1.

**Figure 1.** Consequences of stopping enteral nutrition. GALT: gut-associated lymphoid tissue; TLR-4: toll-like receptor 4; TNF-a: tumor necrosis factor alpha. Own elaboration.

**EARLY NUTRITION**

For several years, one of the basic pillars in the treatment of AP was food restriction, or the so-called digestive reset, while AP symptoms “improved” because it was thought that the stimuli produced by food would favor the release and activation of pancreatic enzymes and cause greater tissue damage (9). At present, there is no evidence to support this belief and several studies have shown that early initiation of enteral nutrition (i.e., within 24 to 48 hours of symptoms onset) improves nitrogen balance and reduces the incidence of infections, mortality, and hospital stay times, and exocrine pancreatic stimulation is minimal (10-12).

The high metabolic cost caused by AP, especially in severe pancreatitis cases, increases the need for nutrients responsible for maintaining immune system homeostasis and tissue regeneration (13). According to the guidelines published by the European Society for Clinical Nutrition and Metabolism (ESPEN), up to 80% of severe AP cases have a protein loss of 40 g/day, resulting in a negative nitrogen balance (14).

**ENTERAL NUTRITION VERSUS PARENTERAL NUTRITION**

Parenteral nutrition (PN) has been considered to be the best feeding route in AP patients for approximately 3 decades, mainly in severe cases, despite disadvantages such as increased risk of catheter infection, electrolyte imbalance, multiple organ failure, cost, and difficult placement (15, 16). In addition, hyperglycemia, which occurs in more than half of patients undergoing PN, should be considered because it is an additional risk factor for infection and mortality (17, 18).

Current knowledge of the role of the intestine in the pathophysiology of AP, as well as the safety and tolerability of enteral nutrition (EN) have caused PN to be replaced by EN (19). In the meta-analysis conducted by Al-Omran et al., which included 348 patients, it was found that EN was substantially superior to PN in terms of mortality, infection, multiple organ failure, and need for surgery (20). Two recent meta-analyses confirmed these findings. The first study included 348 people and reported that EN resulted in a substantial reduction in mortality and multiple organ failure rates (21). The second was conducted using data of 562 people and found that EN reduced the risk of infection and the need for surgery (22).

**EARLY FEEDING**

Recently, the American Association of Gastroenterology recommended starting the diet within 24 hours after the onset of symptoms since it promotes intestinal integrity and function, maintains intercellular bonds, and stimulates brush border enzymes, thus avoiding bacterial translocation (23).

In the meta-analysis by Feng et al., which included 1007 patients, the benefit of EN was determined in the first 48 hours in terms of organ failure and development of systemic inflammatory response syndrome (SIRS), finding no difference regarding mortality and pancreatic necrosis (24).

A recent systematic review found that early feeding with EN in the first 48 hours reduced the risk of infected necrosis, organ failure, need for surgery, and mortality, compared with late EN and PN (25).

In turn, the meta-analysis conducted by Qi et al. found that EN within the first 24 hours was associated with a reduction of infectious complications and multiple organ failure in severe acute pancreatitis patients; however, no benefit was observed in mild and moderately severe pancreatitis cases (26).
Finally, a systematic study conducted in Spain found that the safest time to start food administration is when bowel sounds are present; additionally, they used a full caloric diet that was well tolerated, so the duration of hospital stay was shortened, and the course of AP was improved (27).

**NASOGASTRIC TUBE (NGT) VERSUS NASOJEJUNAL TUBE (NJT)**

A recent Cochrane review showed that there are no significant differences between the use of NGT and NJT because both can maintain intestinal barrier integrity, but the first has a better tolerability (28). The meta-analysis by Chang et al. found no differences between the use of NGT and NJT in terms of efficacy and safety (29).

NJT is reserved for use in cases of intolerance to NGT, gastric outlet obstruction, duodenal obstruction, and NGT-induced negative energy balance (30). In addition, it has been described that using NGT offers advantages such as reduced pain, reduced need for opioids and decreased oral intolerance (31).

**DIETARY COMPOSITION**

There is no general consensus on the ideal composition and type of diet, as current evidence is limited. Numerous studies have shown that patients who tolerate the oral route benefit from solid or liquid low-fat diets; this would represent an advantage because the process of gradually changing the consistency of the diet results in unnecessary increased of hospital stay (32-35).

In the study carried out by Endo et al. in 2018, no difference was found between using elemental, semi-elemental and polymeric formulas (36). Larino-Noia et al., in a study carried out in Spain, found no differences in diet tolerance, when starting feeding with a solid diet or progressive diet (37).

**USE OF DIETARY SUPPLEMENTS**

The use of different dietary supplements such as probiotics, prebiotics or synbiotics has been proposed due to their effect on the microbiota, as well as their protective, trophic, and metabolic role. Although their use may be associated with a decrease in hospital stay times, there is not enough evidence to prescribe them on a regular basis. (38, 39).

Regarding the use of amino acids such as arginine and glutamine, which in theory could offer some benefit in maintaining intestinal integrity, the American Society for Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition (ASPEN) guidelines do not recommend their routine use (40).

The routine use of Omega-3 fatty acids, antioxidants, and vitamins, all of which could offer benefits in AP patients due to their anti-inflammatory properties, has not been recommended since further research is required to support their use (41, 42). **Table 1** summarizes the key dietary guidelines in the management of AP.

### Table 1. Key dietary guidelines in the management of AP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obsolete concept</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Pancreatic rest”</td>
<td>Obsolete concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN vs. PN</td>
<td>EN is preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing of initiation of feeding</td>
<td>Within the first 24 to 48 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGT vs. NJT</td>
<td>Similar advantages, NGT is easier to place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietary progression</td>
<td>There are no differences between solid and progressive diet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietary composition</td>
<td>There is no difference between semi-elemental and polymeric formulas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of dietary supplements</td>
<td>None recommended (probiotics, vitamins, antioxidants, amino acids, or others)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contraindication for feeding</td>
<td>Absence of bowel sounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pain management</td>
<td>Opioids remain the first-line treatment. Early feeding reduces pain and improves tolerance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Own elaboration.

**CONCLUSIONS**

The concept of “pancreatic rest” is now obsolete. Early feeding does not cause additional pancreatic stimulation or damage. The beneficial effect of early feeding on the intestinal barrier is associated with lower bacterial translocation, lower risk of SIRS, and lower mortality. Enteral nutrition is far superior to Parenteral nutrition. There are no differences between the use of NGT and NJT, and if indicated, NGT is preferred because it is easier to place. Pain is not an indication for stopping oral intake of food, so it is necessary to optimize analgesia in order to continue feeding since it is associated with a reduced need for opioids and decreased pain intensity.
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