

Critically ill patients and gut motility: Are we addressing it?

Alfredo Vazquez-Sandoval, Shekhar Ghamande, Salim Surani

Alfredo Vazquez-Sandoval, Shekhar Ghamande, Scott and White Medical Center, Texas A and M University, Aransas Pass, TX 78336, United States

Salim Surani, Department of Medicine, Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care, Texas A and M University, Aransas Pass, TX 78336, United States

Author contributions: Vazquez-Sandoval A, Ghamande S and Surani S was involved in design, research; Vazquez-Sandoval A and Surani S wrote the manuscript; all authors reviewed the final article.

Conflict-of-interest statement: None of the authors have conflicts of interest to disclose regarding this article.

Open-Access: This article is an open-access article which was selected by an in-house editor and fully peer-reviewed by external reviewers. It is distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited and the use is non-commercial. See: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Manuscript source: Invited manuscript

Correspondence to: Salim Surani, MD, MPH, MSHM, FACP, FCCP, Clinical Associate Professor, Department of Medicine, Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care, Texas A and M University, Aransas Pass, TX 78336, United States. surani@medicine@tamhsc.edu
Telephone: +1-361-8857722
Fax: +1-361-8507563

Received: January 18, 2017

Peer-review started: January 20, 2017

First decision: May 3, 2017

Revised: May 18, 2017

Accepted: July 14, 2017

Article in press: July 15, 2017

Published online: August 6, 2017

Abstract

Gastrointestinal (GI) dysmotility is a common problem

in the critically ill population. It can be a reflection and an early sign of patient deterioration or it can be an independent cause of morbidity and mortality. GI dysmotility can be divided for clinical purposes on upper GI dysmotility and lower GI dysmotility. Upper GI dysmotility manifests by nausea, feeding intolerance and vomiting; its implications include aspiration into the airway of abdominal contents and underfeeding. Several strategies to prevent and treat this condition can be tried and they include prokinetics and post-pyloric feeds. It is important to note that upper GI dysmotility should be treated only when there are clinical signs of intolerance (nausea, vomiting) and not based on measurement of gastric residual volumes. Lower GI dysmotility manifests throughout the spectrum of ileus and diarrhea. Ileus can present in the small bowel and the large bowel as well. In both scenarios the initial treatment is correction of electrolyte abnormalities, avoiding drugs that can decrease motility and patient mobilization. When this fails, in the case of small bowel ileus, lactulose and polyethylene glycol solutions can be useful. In the case of colonic pseudo obstruction, neostigmine, endoscopic decompression and cecostomy can be tried when the situation reaches the risk of rupture. Diarrhea is also a common manifestation of GI dysmotility and the most important step is to differentiate between infectious sources and non-infectious sources.

Key words: Gut motility; Gut dysmotility; Intensive care unit; Gastrointestinal issues in intensive care unit; Ileus

© The Author(s) 2017. Published by Baishideng Publishing Group Inc. All rights reserved.

Core tip: This manuscript presents the case for a cautious look at the gastrointestinal (GI) system during critical illness. GI dysfunction can be an early sign of decompensation, but unfortunately is often overlooked due to the natural tendency to gravitate towards the cardiovascular, respiratory and renal systems when looking for decompensation signs. It is our intention to bring attention to this system and help the clinician in using the GI tract as an early marker for decompensation and also to identify and treat potential GI complications common in

this population.

Vazquez-Sandoval A, Ghamande S, Surani S. Critically ill patients and gut motility: Are we addressing it? *World J Gastrointest Pharmacol Ther* 2017; 8(3): 174-179 Available from: URL: <http://www.wjgnet.com/2150-5349/full/v8/i3/174.htm> DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4292/wjgpt.v8.i3.174>

INTRODUCTION

The **gastrointestinal** tract is a **vast organ system** with many key functions during normal state and physiology. Its functions include digestion and absorption of nutrients, **immunomodulation**, excretion of fluids, electrolyte balance and **hormonal** control^[1]. These functions are integral for maintenance of homeostasis in health, adaptation in sickness and also as a source of disease.

Acute gastrointestinal injury (AGI) can occur as the result of the gastrointestinal tract been a **bystander** during periods of critical illness with possible grim consequences. The mechanisms responsible of this injury are diverse and include cytokines and ischemia-reperfusion injury. Observational studies have linked AGI with increased mortality and longer ICU-LOS^[2].

AGI common manifestations include: Delayed gastric emptying, ileus, malabsorption, diarrhea, GI hemorrhage and GI bleed^[3]. Due to this GI dysmotility in the ICU should be addressed seriously and systematically since it could be the manifestation of GI tract failure as well as manifestation of disease.

For the purpose of this review we would like to divide the problem in **upper** GI dysmotility and **lower** GI dysmotility.

UPPER GI DYSMOTILITY

Upper GI dysmotility is usually manifested as **delayed gastric emptying**, regurgitation and ultimately aspiration. These are signs and symptoms that should never be disregarded since they point out at AGI; the difficult questions would be how aggressive should we be monitoring and treating delayed gastric emptying? What is the optimal method of monitoring? What is the optimal treatment?

GASTRIC EMPTYING

Delayed gastric emptying is a common occurrence in the critically ill^[4], multiple factors are associated to decreased gastric emptying (Table 1) and once develops there has been concern that this may be linked to aspiration pneumonia and worse outcomes^[5].

The challenge for the clinician is to find a way to monitor and prevent significant dysmotility leading to reflux and aspiration.

MONITORING GASTRIC EMPTYING

Multiple direct and indirect methods of measuring gastric emptying have been studied (Table 2). Scintigraphy is the gold standard but is not practical or readily available in the ICU setting. Unfortunately all of the other indirect methods have limitations and the availability is limited and we are left with an **imperfect surrogate** of gastric emptying **measurement**: The **gastric residual volume (GRV)**^[6], and also with a **promising alternative**: The **¹³C-octanoate breath test**.

Gastric residual volumes

The gastric residual volume has been used as an indirect surrogate of gastric emptying. Several **limitations** of using the **GRV** have been described. A normal patient's **endogenous secretions** can confuse this measurement since a patient **can produce up to 4500 mL a day** of **saliva**, **gastric secretions** and **duodenal reflux**^[7].

Other limitations are technical and they include^[8]: (1) a **lack of standardization** on the quantity of a **normal GRV**, **15 mL to 500 mL** has been described as an upper limit; (2) **location** of the **tip** of the tube; (3) different volumes depending on the bore of the catheter; and (4) **inconsistent frequency** of measurements.

Several small studies have looked into the correlation of different volumes of GRV (150-250 mL), and it has been shown to be a sensitive marker for delayed gastric emptying when compared to scintigraphy and **acetaminophen absorption test**, but, the **negative predictive** value was **low**, thus a lot of the patients with a **negative test** **still** had **abnormal gastric emptying**. More importantly having an **abnormal GRV** did **not correlate** to any significant **clinical outcome**^[9,10].

The clinical impact from **checking GRV** is **under-feeding** and early enteral nutrition has been shown to improve outcomes of critically ill patients, on the other hand **checking GRV has not been shown to decrease vomiting or aspiration**. In a 205 patients study, subjects were divided in two groups, one group had feedings held if a GRV were > 250 mL, the second group did not have GRV checked. Patients in the non GRV group achieved higher delivery of EN plus vomiting episodes and clinical aspiration events were not statistically different than the patient's in the GRV group^[11].

Based on this data **we do not recommend monitoring of GRV** in the critically ill patient, but this does not mean that we should not address gastric intolerance manifested as nausea and/or vomiting.

¹³C-octanoate breath test

The octanoate breath test has been developed as a non-invasive technique that is less cumbersome than scintigraphy since does not require patient transportation outside of the intensive care unit. It has been studied against scintigraphy in the critically ill population undergoing mechanical ventilation. In this test, carbon-13 (a **non-radioactive isotope**) is added to a test

Table 1 Factors associated with decreased gastric emptying

Factors associated with decreased gastric emptying
Hyperglycemia
Opiates
Elevated intracranial pressure
Electrolyte abnormalities
Ischemia
Hypoxia
Sepsis
Burns
Abdominal surgery
Hyperosmolar formulas

Adapted from Hurt RT, McClave SA. Gastric Residual Volumes in Critical Illness: What do They Really Mean? *Crit Care Clin* 2010; 26: 481-490.

meal of 100 mL of octanoic acid. ^{13}C -Octanoic acid is not absorbed in the stomach but is rapidly absorbed by the duodenum and then metabolized in the liver to produce $^{13}\text{CO}_2$. Once the test meal is given, the $^{13}\text{CO}_2$ enrichment of the exhaled air is measured with an isotope ratio mass spectrometer at standard times for 3 to 6 h; due to the properties of the isotope this measurement is reflective of gastric emptying. The biggest study to date showed that this test had an 89% sensitivity and a 67% specificity in identifying delayed gastric emptying when compared to scintigraphy, giving it a 92% PPV and a 57% NPV. Also the authors also concluded that the wide confidence interval (45%-88%) made it a good option to test gastric emptying in the research setting but not in a real life clinical setting^[12]. Other limitations include the high cost and size of spectrometer units^[13].

Prevention and treatment of gastric dysmotility

Interventions to prevent and treat gastric dysmotility include: The use of continuous feeding vs intermittent bolus feeding, post-pyloric feeding and prokinetics.

Continuous infusions of enteral feeds have the theoretical advantage of decreasing the amount of regurgitation and aspiration compared to intermittent boluses, unfortunately the evidence is scant. Small trials^[14,15] suggest a decreased incidence of elevated gastric residuals and due to this more success in meeting caloric needs with the continuous methods but there is no difference in hard clinical outcomes. The current recommendations of the American Society of Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition (ASPEN) are to choose continuous feedings on those patients that are intolerant to bolus feeding and those that are high risk for aspiration^[16].

Another possible solution would be to place the enteral feeding tube past the pylorus to prevent regurgitation and aspiration of gastric contents. A recent meta-analysis showed that there was a decrease in the incidence of pneumonias, but there was no significant difference in nutritional outcomes, length of stay or hospital mortality^[17]. But, placing a post-pyloric tube can be technically difficult and delay initiation of enteral nutrition, due to that the ASPEN guidelines suggest to

Table 2 Methods of measuring gastric emptying

Methods of measuring gastric emptying
Scintigraphy
Paracetamol absorption
Carbohydrate absorption
Isotope breath test
Ultrasound and MRI
Gastric residual volumes

use the gastric route routinely and favor the post-pyloric route to patients at high risk of aspiration or those that showed intolerance.

The use of prokinetics has been associated with decreased GRV but no significant change in length of stay or mortality^[18]. The most commonly studied agents include erythromycin at a dose of 3-7 mg/kg per day and metoclopramide at a dose of 10 mg every 4 h. If one chooses to use these agents, we must be aware of the side effects that include QT prolongation and diarrhea with both agents and tardive dyskinesia in the case of metoclopramide.

LOWER GI DYSMOTILITY

Lower GI dysmotility can be manifested in the ICU as ileus, acute colonic pseudo obstruction and diarrhea.

Evaluation of lower GI dysmotility

Unfortunately none of the usual tests used in the outpatient setting to evaluate motility disorders has been validated or found useful in the intensive care unit setting. The clinician is left with his clinical exam acumen and the usual routine tests performed the critically ill, this is why is important to suspect these disorders and look for them on our daily exam. We will describe the most common clinical presentations.

Ileus

Ileus is defined as the absence of physiologic motility in the bowel, leading to a lack of progression of bowel contents through the gastrointestinal tract. A more specific definition has been described and this includes: Absence of a bowel movement for ≥ 3 d, treatment for constipation, and one of the following: (1) radiologic confirmed ileus; (2) feed intolerance; (3) abdominal distention; or (4) need for gastric decompression. This has to be differentiated from acute mechanical obstruction that may be a surgical emergency. It has been reported to occur in 20%-50% of the ICU population^[18]. The average duration of the episode is 6.5 d and is associated with longer ICU stays as well as underfeeding^[19].

Risk factors

The critically ill patient population is specially primed to develop ileus. Inflammation, narcotic use, vasopressor use and electrolyte imbalances makes them susceptible



Figure 1 Abdominal plain film showing small bowel ileus and colonic distension.

to a **disequilibrium** between **sympathetic** and **para-sympathetic forces**. Common clinical entities that predispose to ileus include: Abdominal surgery, sepsis, pancreatitis, peritonitis, narcotic use, anticholinergic use, **hypokalemia**, **hypomagnesemia**, **hyperglycemia**, acidosis, hypoxia, hypothermia, **renal failure** and mechanical **ventilation**^[20].

Clinical manifestations

Ileus is usually manifested as **inability to tolerate feeds**, nausea, vomiting, abdominal **distension**, **constipation** and **obstipation**. The imaging studies show the presence of gas distension of bowel loops and air fluid levels within them (Figure 1). When severe enough it can develop into abdominal compartment syndrome, which is a life threatening emergency.

TREATMENT

The basic management of ileus includes the correction of electrolyte abnormalities, avoidance of opioid agonists, **avoidance of anticholinergic drugs**, **mobilization** and **early enteral** feedings when possible.

Other therapies may include the use of **gastric decompression**, **osmotic laxatives**, opioid antagonists and promotility agents.

A double blinded study comparing the use of placebo vs **polyethylene glycol** vs **lactulose** in ICU patients with 3 or more days without a bowel movement showed that, **both** lactulose and polyethylene glycol are **better** in promoting defecation than placebo. Patients receiving **polyethylene glycol** had a **lower** incidence of acute intestinal **pseudo obstruction**. Early defecation was associated to a decreased LOS. Based on these findings is reasonable to start osmotic laxatives in this patient population^[21].

The use of **promotility** agents in ileus seems more **controversial**. Erythromycin has been tried due to the theoretical effect on the **motilin receptor**. Despite this theoretical mechanism the trials have consistently failed to show any positive effect and its use comes with **risk** of a **prolonged QT** and **arrhythmias**. So we recommend **against** its use^[22]. **Metoclopramide** has also been tried

but **results** have been **conflicting** and no clear role exists for its use.

Acute colonic pseudo obstruction (Ogilvie's syndrome)

Acute colonic pseudo obstruction is a **potentially fatal** condition defined as an **acute dilatation** of the colon **without a mechanical obstruction**. Clinically is characterized by abdominal distension, **commonly constipation**, but **flatus** or **stools may pass** as well, an abdominal **exam** that **may be benign** but also it can present with exquisite abdominal tenderness, especially at the level of the cecum. The most feared complication would be perforation that usually happens in the cecum^[23].

The **pathophysiology** is thought to be an **imbalance** between the **parasympathetic/sympathetic** signals. Clinical **factors predisposing** to this condition are **multiple** and include medications, surgery, critical illness, neurologic factors and metabolic factors (Table 3).

Differential diagnosis

The most important alternative diagnosis to **rule out** is **toxic megacolon** and **mechanical obstruction**. Mechanical obstruction can be easily **ruled out** by the presence of **gas on all colonic segments** on an abdominal **plain film**. If there is doubt a **CT of the abdomen and pelvis** with **oral contrast** can clarify the situation. **Differentiating** between **Ogilvie's** and **toxic megacolon** can be more **difficult**. In the general population the most common cause of toxic megacolon is inflammatory bowel disease, in the critically ill the most common cause is **C. difficile infection**^[24]. A thorough history and physical is warranted, other diagnostic tools include **stools** samples to test for **C. difficile toxins** or **C. difficile PCR**, CT abdomen pelvis and limited endoscopy with biopsies.

Treatment

The first step in management include treating underlying conditions, managing **electrolyte** abnormalities, avoid opiates, **early mobilization** when feasible and **early enteral** nutrition.

When this therapy **fail** after 24-48 h and the risk of **rupture** is present, defined as **cecum diameter > 12 cm**^[25]. We must proceed with other options that include neostigmine use, **endoscopic decompression**, **percutaneous cecal decompression** or **surgical** management.

Neostigmine is **successful** in achieving decompression in **more than 88%** of cases^[26]. The drug is used at a dose of **2 mg intravenously** given slowly **over 5 min** with monitoring of vital signs continuously for at least 30 min. Side effects include bradycardia, hypotension, nausea, vomiting and abdominal cramping.

Endoscopic decompression is **less commonly** used due to the **risk of perforation**, when performed this should be followed by the placement of a **decompression tube** since this increases the **success** rate from **50% to 80%**^[27]. In patients in whom these therapies fail, the next step according to the American Society of Gastroenterology

Table 3 Factors predisposing to Ogilvie's syndrome

Factors predisposing to Ogilvie's syndrome
Medications
Opiates
Anticholinergics
Vasopressors
Calcium channel blockers
Cardiovascular factors
Shock
Heart failure
Critical illness
Severe sepsis
Pancreatitis
Mechanical ventilation
Hypoxemia
Post-operative state
Abdominal surgery
Peritonitis
Pelvic or hip fracture surgery
Metabolic factors
Hypokalemia
Renal failure
Hyperglycemia
Neurologic
Spinal cord lesions
Stroke

and Endoscopy guidelines should be either percutaneous cecostomy or surgical management^[28].

DIARRHEA

Diarrhea in the ICU can be defined as > 3 loose stools a day^[29]. The incidence is around 20%^[30]. Diarrhea in the ICU can be divided as infectious and non-infectious. Due to its incidence and possible serious underlying conditions it should never be dismissed and proper workup should be sought.

Infectious diarrhea

Clostridium difficile infection is the most common cause of infectious diarrhea in the ICU been present in 44% of patient with either infectious or non-infectious diarrhea in the ICU^[31]. Other enteric pathogens include *Salmonella*, *C. perfringens*, *S. aureus* and *P. aeruginosa*. Antibiotic use is the most widely recognized risk factor for infectious diarrhea in the ICU; other risk factors include gastric acid suppression^[27], advanced age and illness severity. A review of *C. difficile* infection is beyond the scope of this review article.

Non-infectious diarrhea

The most common causes for non-infectious diarrhea in the ICU include antibiotic associated diarrhea, enteral feeding associated diarrhea and medications. Regarding antibiotic associated diarrhea, when *C. difficile* is not found the theory behind this condition is the reduction on the concentration of anaerobic organisms in the gut with subsequent reduction of carbohydrate fermentation leading to an osmotic diarrhea^[31].

Enteral feeding associated diarrhea is commonly

quoted as the cause of diarrhea during ICU rounds. Interestingly a recent meta-analysis comparing total parenteral nutrition vs enteral nutrition did not find a higher incidence of diarrhea in the enteral feeds group^[32]. A common sense approach would be to avoid high caloric density formulations due to their osmotic effects when possible. Fiber use to decrease diarrhea has been proven effective in the non-icu population, but this effects have not been reproduced in the ICU population. Probiotics also did not change its incidence^[33].

CONCLUSION

GI dysmotility is a common but often overlooked occurrence in the critically ill patients. By itself it may be the reflection of end organ damage and deterioration as well as a sign of a serious underlying disorder. The clinician should pay close attention to it and initiate the appropriate work up as soon as possible to prevent grim outcomes.

REFERENCES

1. Binder HJ. Organization of the Gastrointestinal System. In: Boron WE, Boulpaep E. Medical Physiology. 3rd ed. Philadelphia, PA: Elsevier, 2017: 852-862
2. Reintam A, Parm P, Redlich U, Tooding LM, Starkopf J, Köhler F, Spies C, Kern H. Gastrointestinal failure in intensive care: a retrospective clinical study in three different intensive care units in Germany and Estonia. *BMC Gastroenterol* 2006; **6**: 19 [PMID: 16792799 DOI: 10.1186/1471-230X-6-19]
3. Taylor RW. Gut Motility Issues in Critical Illness. *Crit Care Clin* 2016; **32**: 191-201 [PMID: 27016161 DOI: 10.1016/j.ccc.2015.11.003]
4. Khayyam U, Sachdeva P, Gomez J, Ramzan Z, Smith MS, Maurer AH, Fisher RS, Parkman HP. Assessment of symptoms during gastric emptying scintigraphy to correlate symptoms to delayed gastric emptying. *Neurogastroenterol Motil* 2010; **22**: 539-545 [PMID: 20082665 DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2982.2009.01454.x]
5. Mutlu GM, Mutlu EA, Factor P. GI complications in patients receiving mechanical ventilation. *Chest* 2001; **119**: 1222-1241 [PMID: 11296191]
6. Kar P, Jones KL, Horowitz M, Chapman MJ, Deane AM. Measurement of gastric emptying in the critically ill. *Clin Nutr* 2015; **34**: 557-564 [PMID: 25491245 DOI: 10.1016/j.clnu.2014.11.003]
7. DeLegge MH. Managing gastric residual volumes in the critically ill patient: an update. *Curr Opin Clin Nutr Metab Care* 2011; **14**: 193-196 [PMID: 21102316 DOI: 10.1097/MCO.0b013e328341ede7]
8. Hurt RT, McClave SA. Gastric residual volumes in critical illness: what do they really mean? *Crit Care Clin* 2010; **26**: 481-490, viii-viix [PMID: 20643301 DOI: 10.1016/j.ccc.2010.04.010]
9. Landzinski J, Kiser TH, Fish DN, Wischmeyer PE, MacLaren R. Gastric motility function in critically ill patients tolerant vs intolerant to gastric nutrition. *JPEN J Parenter Enteral Nutr* 2008; **32**: 45-50 [PMID: 18165446]
10. Goetze O, Nikodem AB, Wieczorek J, Banasch M, Przuntek H, Mueller T, Schmidt WE, Voitalla D. Predictors of gastric emptying in Parkinson's disease. *Neurogastroenterol Motil* 2006; **18**: 369-375 [PMID: 16629864 DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2982.2006.00780.x]
11. Poulard F, Dimet J, Martin-Lefevre L, Bontemps F, Fiancette M, Clementi E, Lebert C, Renard B, Reignier J. Impact of not measuring residual gastric volume in mechanically ventilated patients receiving early enteral feeding: a prospective before-after study. *JPEN J Parenter Enteral Nutr* 2010; **34**: 125-130 [PMID: 19861528 DOI: 10.1177/0148607109344745]
12. Nguyen NQ, Bryant LK, Burgstad CM, Chapman M, Deane A,

- Bellon M, Lange K, Bartholomeuz D, Horowitz M, Holloway RH, Fraser RJ. Gastric emptying measurement of liquid nutrients using the (13)C-octanoate breath test in critically ill patients: a comparison with scintigraphy. *Intensive Care Med* 2013; **39**: 1238-1246 [PMID: 23471513 DOI: 10.1007/s00134-013-2881-4]
- 13 **Siddiqui I**, Ahmed S, Abid S. Update on diagnostic value of breath test in gastrointestinal and liver diseases. *World J Gastrointest Pathophysiol* 2016; **7**: 256-265 [PMID: 27574563 DOI: 10.4291/wjgp.v7.i3.256]
 - 14 **Bonten MJ**, Gaillard CA, van der Hulst R, de Leeuw PW, van der Geest S, Stobberingh EE, Soeters PB. Intermittent enteral feeding: the influence on respiratory and digestive tract colonization in mechanically ventilated intensive-care-unit patients. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 1996; **154**: 394-399 [PMID: 8756812 DOI: 10.1164/ajrccm.154.2.8756812]
 - 15 **Ciocon JO**, Galindo-Ciocon DJ, Tiessen C, Galindo D. Continuous compared with intermittent tube feeding in the elderly. *JPEN J Parenter Enteral Nutr* 1992; **16**: 525-528 [PMID: 1494208]
 - 16 **McClave SA**, Taylor BE, Martindale RG, Warren MM, Johnson DR, Braunschweig C, McCarthy MS, Davanos E, Rice TW, Cresci GA, Gervasio JM, Sacks GS, Roberts PR, Compher C; Society of Critical Care Medicine; American Society for 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 for Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition (A.S.P.E.N.). *JPEN J Parenter Enteral Nutr* 2016; **40**: 159-211 [PMID: 26773077 DOI: 10.1177/0148607115621863]
 - 17 **Alkhwaja S**, Martin C, Butler RJ, Gwadry-Sridhar F. Post-pyloric versus gastric tube feeding for preventing pneumonia and improving nutritional outcomes in critically ill adults. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2015; **(8)**: CD008875 [PMID: 26241698 DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD008875.pub2]
 - 18 **Caddell KA**, Martindale R, McClave SA, Miller K. Can the intestinal dysmotility of critical illness be differentiated from postoperative ileus? *Curr Gastroenterol Rep* 2011; **13**: 358-367 [PMID: 21626118 DOI: 10.1007/s11894-011-0206-8]
 - 19 **Nguyen T**, Frenette AJ, Johanson C, Maclean RD, Patel R, Simpson A, Singh A, Balchin KS, Fergusson D, Kanji S. Impaired gastrointestinal transit and its associated morbidity in the intensive care unit. *J Crit Care* 2013; **28**: 537.e11-537.e17 [PMID: 23333042 DOI: 10.1016/j.jcrc.2012.12.003]
 - 20 **Adike A**, Quigley EM. Gastrointestinal motility problems in critical care: a clinical perspective. *J Dig Dis* 2014; **15**: 335-344 [PMID: 24673805 DOI: 10.1111/1751-2980.12147]
 - 21 **van der Spoel JI**, Oudemans-van Straaten HM, Kuiper MA, van Roon EN, Zandstra DF, van der Voort PH. Laxation of critically ill patients with lactulose or polyethylene glycol: a two-center randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Crit Care Med* 2007; **35**: 2726-2731 [PMID: 17893628 DOI: 10.1097/01.CCM.0000287526.08794.29]
 - 22 **Traut U**, Brügger L, Kunz R, Pauli-Magnus C, Haug K, Bucher HC, Koller MT. Systemic prokinetic pharmacologic treatment for postoperative adynamic ileus following abdominal surgery in adults. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2008; **(1)**: CD004930 [PMID: 18254064 DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD004930.pub3]
 - 23 **Ogilvie WH**. William Heneage Ogilvie 1887-1971. Large-intestine colic due to sympathetic deprivation. A new clinical syndrome. *Dis Colon Rectum* 1987; **30**: 984-987 [PMID: 3319452]
 - 24 **Lessa FC**, Mu Y, Bamberg WM, Beldavs ZG, Dumyati GK, Dunn JR, Farley MM, Holzbauer SM, Meek JI, Phipps EC, Wilson LE, Winston LG, Cohen JA, Limbago BM, Fridkin SK, Gerding DN, McDonald LC. Burden of *Clostridium difficile* infection in the United States. *N Engl J Med* 2015; **372**: 825-834 [PMID: 25714160 DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa1408913]
 - 25 **Johnson CD**, Rice RP, Kelvin FM, Foster WL, Williford ME. The radiologic evaluation of gross cecal distension: emphasis on cecal ileus. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 1985; **145**: 1211-1217 [PMID: 3877425 DOI: 10.2214/ajr.145.6.1211]
 - 26 **Ponec RJ**, Saunders MD, Kimmey MB. Neostigmine for the treatment of acute colonic pseudo-obstruction. *N Engl J Med* 1999; **341**: 137-141 [PMID: 10403850 DOI: 10.1056/NEJM199907153410301]
 - 27 **Geller A**, Petersen BT, Gostout CJ. Endoscopic decompression for acute colonic pseudo-obstruction. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1996; **44**: 144-150 [PMID: 8858319]
 - 28 **Eisen GM**, Baron TH, Dominitz JA, Faigel DO, Goldstein JL, Johanson JF, Mallory JS, Raddawi HM, Vargo JJ, Waring JP, Fanelli RD, Wheeler-Harbaugh J; Standards of Practice Committee of the American Society for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy. Acute colonic pseudo-obstruction. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2002; **56**: 789-792 [PMID: 12447286]
 - 29 **Manatsathit S**, Dupont HL, Farthing M, Kositchaiwat C, Leelakusolvong S, Ramakrishna BS, Sabra A, Speelman P, Surangsrirat S; Working Party of the Program Committ of the Bangkok World Congress of Gastroenterology 2002. Guideline for the management of acute diarrhea in adults. *J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2002; **17** Suppl: S54-S71 [PMID: 12000594]
 - 30 **Marcon AP**, Gamba MA, Vianna LA. Nosocomial diarrhea in the intensive care unit. *Braz J Infect Dis* 2006; **10**: 384-389 [PMID: 17420910]
 - 31 **Bartlett JG**. Clinical practice. Antibiotic-associated diarrhea. *N Engl J Med* 2002; **346**: 334-339 [PMID: 11821511 DOI: 10.1056/NEJMcp011603]
 - 32 **Gramlich L**, Kichian K, Pinilla J, Rodych NJ, Dhaliwal R, Heyland DK. Does enteral nutrition compared to parenteral nutrition result in better outcomes in critically ill adult patients? A systematic review of the literature. *Nutrition* 2004; **20**: 843-848 [PMID: 15474870 DOI: 10.1016/j.nut.2004.06.003]
 - 33 **Kamarul Zaman M**, Chin KF, Rai V, Majid HA. Fiber and prebiotic supplementation in enteral nutrition: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *World J Gastroenterol* 2015; **21**: 5372-5381 [PMID: 25954112 DOI: 10.3748/wjg.v21.i17.5372]

P- Reviewer: Kuribayashi S S- Editor: Gong ZM L- Editor: A
E- Editor: Lu YJ





Published by **Baishideng Publishing Group Inc**
7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
Help Desk: <http://www.f6publishing.com/helpdesk>
<http://www.wjgnet.com>

