Title: Long Term Outcomes of The PEPuP Protocol

Authors: Kelsey Stone, Jane Fleming, RD, LD, CNSC, Kelley Martin, MPH, RDN, LD
Medical University of South Carolina Dietetic Internship, Charleston, SC

Objective: This study analyzed clinical outcomes of the PEPuP Protocol, a volume-based enteral feeding protocol, on inpatient length of stay (LOS), 30-day readmission rate, and mortality.

Design: A cross-sectional pilot study compared patients placed on the PEPuP Protocol (intervention) compared to those who received standard-of-care hourly rate orders (control).

Methods and Instruments: All patients were admitted to a Medical-Surgical ICU, ventilated, and placed on enteral nutrition support within 48-hours of admission. Prospectively, clinical outcomes including LOS, readmission rates, and mortality rates corresponding with the appropriate inpatient admission were collected via the electronic medical record in 13 intervention patients. The same outcomes were collected retrospectively prior to PEPuP in 14 control patients. One outlier in this group was removed based on severe complications skewing results, leaving a sample of 13 for comparison.

Results: The control group mean ± standard deviation LOS was 12.07 days±5.5 compared to intervention group of 10.3±6.0 days. All mortality rates between both groups were 69% in the control group vs. 53% in the intervention. Among survivors, 30-day readmission rate was 25% in the control group and 17% in the intervention group.

Conclusion: Based on results, there was a favorable advantage to the PEPuP protocol in terms of improved LOS, all-mortality rate, and 30-day readmission rate. However this pilot study was of small sample size preventing a statistical analysis between groups. Moreover, one outlier was removed from the intervention group. This pilot lays the groundwork for a higher-powered study to substantiate statistical and clinical relevancy.

Conflict of interest: None.

Funding Disclosure Statement: Not applicable; no funding used for this project.

1. Body:
    a. Objective1 sentence
    b. Design: 1-2 sentences
    c. Methods and Instruments: 2-3 sentences;
    d. Results: 3-5 sentences; report as averages ±SD, or as p-value, or as r correlation if possible
    e. Conclusions: 1-2 sentences
2. Conflict of Interest: list "none"
3. Funding disclosure statement: list "not applicable; no funding used for this project"

Abstract Formatting

- Margins: **one inch** margins on all sides
- Font: Arial font, size 11 for the entire abstract
- Word Count: no more than **250 words** for abstract body (this does not include title and author/institution)
- Tables and Images: A maximum of 2 tables and 2 images
- Any abstracts that contain significant typographical or grammatical errors may be disqualified

B. How to stay concise?

1. *Think of ways to decrease # of words if listing several times in results.*

    - Ex1 : instead of Hispanic woman (2 words), label this group as HW. Do this by saying "The Hispanic women group (HW) consumed …….". Then use HW throughout rest of the abstract if using it a lot. HW = 1 word; Hispanc women = 2 words

2. *Think of ways to reword results if using repetitive phrases:*

    - **Ex 1**: Results indicate that children consumed an average of 1.5 more servings of fruit ($p<0.005$) and 1.0 more servings of vegetables ($p<0.05$) after the intervention was implemented.
    - Furthermore, older children (age range 10-15) demonstrated a higher increase in fruits and vegetables than the younger children (age range 5-10). 44 words

    **Change to:* *Results indicate that children consumed an average of 1.5 more servings of fruit and 1.0 more servings of vegetables ($p<0.05$) after the intervention. Children in age range 10-15 years showed more improvement in intake than those ages 5-10 years.* *39 words*

- **Ex 2:** Results indicate that HW consumed an average of 65 grams of dietary fat (± st dev of 20 grams) compared to CW who consumed an average of 50 grams of fat (± standard deviation of 18 grams). The difference was statistically significant with $p<0.005$. 38 words

  ***Change to:** Results (indicated by mean ± SD) are as follows: HW consumed more dietary fat than CW (65 g ± 20 g vs. 50 g ± 18g; $p<0.05$). 27 words