METHODS

**Design:** 2 randomised controlled trials with similar designs (FOOD [Feed Or Ordinary Diet] trials).

**Allocation:** concealed.

**Blinding:** blinded [data collectors and outcome assessors].

**Follow up period:** 6 months.

**Setting:** 83 hospitals in 15 countries (study 1) and 47 hospitals in 11 countries (study 2).

**Patients:** patients who were admitted to hospital with recent stroke (<7 d before admission) and had dysphagia were enrolled in study 1 (n = 859, mean age 76 y, 46% men) if the clinician was certain about whether to use PEG or NG tube. Patients with subarachnoid haemorrhage were excluded.

**Intervention:** in study 1, ETF as soon as possible (early initiation) using the clinician’s preferred method (n = 429) or no tube feeding (only non-nutrition parenteral fluids) for ≥7 days (n = 430). In study 2, ETF by PEG (n = 162) or NG tube (n = 159) within 3 days.

**Outcomes:** death or a composite of death or poor outcome (defined as a Modified Rankin Scale score of 4–5; 0 = no symptoms to 5 = requiring constant attention).

**Patient follow up:** 100% (intention to treat analysis).

*Information provided by author.*

MAIN RESULTS

**Study 1:** early initiation of ETF did not reduce death or the composite of death or poor outcome more than no tube feeding for ≥7 days (table). **Study 2:** ETF by PEG did not reduce death or the composite of death or poor outcome more than ETF by NG tube (table).

**CONCLUSION**

In patients with recent stroke and dysphagia, early initiation of enteral tube feeding (ETF) did not differ from no tube feeding for ≥7 days for death or the combined outcome of death or poor outcome, and ETF by percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy did not differ from ETF by nasogastric tube for death or the combined outcome of death or poor outcome.

A modified version of this abstract appears in ACP Journal Club.

**Commentary**

There is no consensus on the timing and route of tube feeding in patients with stroke and dysphagia. ETF by NG tube or PEG is usually initiated within 7–10 days after recognition of insufficient oral intake. It is unclear whether the nutritional benefits of early feeding (ie, within the first 3–7 d) offset the potential complications of sustained ETF. Because of this uncertainty, tube feeding can sometimes be delayed for >2 weeks. Considerable uncertainty also exists, except in uncooperative or confused stroke patients, about whether PEG feeding is preferable to use of an NG tube.

The 2 trials by Dennis et al addressed these issues and showed a clinically significant advantage of NG tube feeding, either early (<7 d) or as an alternative to feeding by PEG. However, the trial results convey mixed messages for clinicians: patients receiving early NG tube feeding had better survival but in a more disabled state (study 1). Patients receiving feeding by NG tube rather than PEG had better survival, functioning, and overall quality of life, with fewer pressure sores (study 2). Furthermore, a greater incidence of gastrointestinal haemorrhages was observed in the NG tube groups in both trials, possibly because of direct trauma to the mucosa or from aspirin use. The authors recommend NG tube feeding within the first few days of admission and, in case of practical objections (eg, confusion or inability to tolerate a NG tube), within the first 2 or 3 weeks. Overall, the message is that NG tube feeding can be initiated early and maintained safely without increased risk of complications such as aspiration pneumonia.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Comparisons</th>
<th>Outcomes at 6 mo</th>
<th>Event rates</th>
<th>RRR (95% CI)</th>
<th>NNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Early initiation of ETF vs no ETF for ≥7 d</td>
<td>Death</td>
<td>42% vs 48%</td>
<td>12% (2 to 24)</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Death or poor outcome</td>
<td>79% vs 80%</td>
<td>1% (5 to 8)</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RRR (95% CI)</strong></td>
<td><strong>NNT</strong></td>
<td><strong>RRR (95% CI)</strong></td>
<td><strong>NNT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ETF by PEG vs ETF by NG tube</td>
<td>Death</td>
<td>49% vs 48%</td>
<td>2% (-19 to 28)</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Death or poor outcome</td>
<td>89% vs 81%</td>
<td>10% (-1 to 21)</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*PEG = percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy; NG = nasogastric. Other abbreviations defined in glossary; RRR, RRI, NNT, NNH, and CI calculated from data in article.*