

# Comparing two types of tube feeding in patients with severe swallowing difficulties

<b>Submission date</b> 28/12/2021	<b>Recruitment status</b> No longer recruiting	<input type="checkbox"/> Prospectively registered <input type="checkbox"/> Protocol
<b>Registration date</b> 04/01/2022	<b>Overall study status</b> Completed	<input type="checkbox"/> Statistical analysis plan <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results
<b>Last Edited</b> 01/03/2023	<b>Condition category</b> Signs and Symptoms	<input type="checkbox"/> Individual participant data

## Plain English summary of protocol

### Background and study aims

In patients suffering from severe and chronic dysphagia (swallowing difficulties), a feeding gastrostomy (a special tube placed directly into the stomach) can provide nutritional support. At present, two different types are in clinical use, one type placed by gastroscopy (percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy [PEG], using a thin, flexible tube called an endoscope) and another type placed using x-ray vision (radiologically inserted gastrostomy [RIG]). The selection of patients to PEG or RIG is often based on rather poorly defined patient factors. The aim of this study is to compare PEG and RIG concerning overall complications, divided into major and minor complications as well as changes in patient-scored health status.

### Who can participate?

Patients referred for a feeding gastrostomy and eligible for both methods

### What does the study involve?

Participants are randomly allocated to undergo PEG or RIG and are followed up at 10 days in the out-patient department as well as by questionnaire at 30 days after surgery.

### What are the possible benefits and risks of participating?

Benefits include an extended and standardised follow up. There are no added risks as both procedures are performed in routine care.

### Where is the study run from?

Uppsala University Hospital (Sweden)

### When is the study starting and how long is it expected to run for?

March 2013 to December 2022

### Who is funding the study?

Uppsala University Hospital (Sweden)

Who is the main contact?  
Prof. Magnus Sundbom  
magnus.sundbom@surgsci.uu.se

## Contact information

### Type(s)

Scientific

### Contact name

Prof Magnus Sundbom

### Contact details

Dept of Surgical Sciences  
Uppsala University  
Uppsala  
Sweden  
SE-75185  
+46 (0)705432989  
magnus.sundbom@surgsci.uu.se

### Type(s)

Principal investigator

### Contact name

Prof Magnus Sundbom

### Contact details

Dept of Surgical Sciences  
Uppsala University  
Uppsala  
Sweden  
SE-75185  
+46 (0)705432989  
magnus.sundbom@surgsci.uu.se

### Type(s)

Public

### Contact name

Prof Magnus Sundbom

### Contact details

Dept of Surgical Sciences  
Uppsala University  
Uppsala  
Sweden

SE-75185  
+46 (0)705432989  
magnus.sundbom@surgsci.uu.se

## **Additional identifiers**

### **Clinical Trials Information System (CTIS)**

Nil known

### **ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT)**

Nil known

### **Protocol serial number**

PEG/RIG 2014-281

## **Study information**

### **Scientific Title**

A prospective randomized trial comparing percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy to radiologically inserted percutaneous gastrostomy

### **Acronym**

PEG-RIG

### **Study objectives**

Percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy (PEG) is superior to radiologically inserted gastrostomy (RIG) based on overall complications

### **Ethics approval required**

Old ethics approval format

### **Ethics approval(s)**

Approved 21/09/2014, the Regional Ethics Committee of Uppsala (Etikprövningsmyndigheten, Box 2110, SE-750 02 Uppsala, Sweden; +46 (0)8 4587070; [registrator@etikprovning.se](mailto:registrator@etikprovning.se)), ref: Dnr: 2014-281

### **Study design**

Randomized controlled trial

### **Primary study design**

Interventional

### **Study type(s)**

Treatment

### **Health condition(s) or problem(s) studied**

Severe dysphagia

### **Interventions**

Participants are randomly allocated 1:1 in blocks of 10 with closed envelopes to undergo percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy (PEG) or radiologically inserted gastrostomy (RIG) and are followed up at 10 days in the out-patient department as well as by questionnaire at 30 days after surgery.

### **Intervention Type**

Procedure/Surgery

### **Primary outcome(s)**

Overall complication rate and major and minor complications occurring early (within 10 days) or late (11-30 days) after gastrostomy placement. Major complications are defined as conditions in potential need of reoperation or cardiovascular support, e.g., gastrointestinal perforations, intrabdominal bleeding, aspiration pneumonia or myocardial infarction, while local and self-limiting problems are to be classified as minor.

### **Key secondary outcome(s)**

Patient-scored health status measured by EQ-5D (EuroQol Research Foundation) at baseline and at 10 and 30 days postoperatively

### **Completion date**

31/12/2022

## **Eligibility**

### **Key inclusion criteria**

Patients referred to the department for a feeding gastrostomy due to severe dysphagia, and eligible for both methods (PEG/RIG)

### **Participant type(s)**

Patient

### **Healthy volunteers allowed**

No

### **Age group**

Adult

### **Sex**

All

### **Key exclusion criteria**

Inability to perform an endoscopy due to pharyngo-esophageal obstruction, total or subtotal gastrectomy, other major upper-abdominal surgery, peritoneal carcinosis or ascites

### **Date of first enrolment**

01/10/2014

### **Date of final enrolment**

31/12/2021

# Locations

## Countries of recruitment

Sweden

## Study participating centre

**Uppsala University Hospital**

Dept of Surgical Sciences

Uppsala University

Uppsala

Sweden

SE-75185

# Sponsor information

## Organisation

Uppsala University Hospital

## ROR

<https://ror.org/01apvbh93>

# Funder(s)

## Funder type

Hospital/treatment centre

## Funder Name

Akademiska Sjukhuset

## Alternative Name(s)

Uppsala University Hospital

## Funding Body Type

Private sector organisation

## Funding Body Subtype

Universities (academic only)

## Location

Sweden

# Results and Publications

## Individual participant data (IPD) sharing plan

The datasets generated during and/or analysed during the current study are not expected to be made available due to patient confidentiality

## IPD sharing plan summary

Not expected to be made available

## Study outputs

Output type	Details	Date created	Date added	Peer reviewed?	Patient-facing?
<a href="#">Results article</a>	results	28/02/2023	01/03/2023	Yes	No
<a href="#">Participant information sheet</a>	Participant information sheet	11/11/2025	11/11/2025	No	Yes