

# Is looped nasogastric tube feeding more effective than conventional nasogastric tube feeding in dysphagia after acute stroke?

<b>Submission date</b> 05/04/2006	<b>Recruitment status</b> No longer recruiting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prospectively registered <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Protocol
<b>Registration date</b> 13/04/2006	<b>Overall study status</b> Completed	<input type="checkbox"/> Statistical analysis plan <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results
<b>Last Edited</b> 30/07/2010	<b>Condition category</b> Circulatory System	<input type="checkbox"/> Individual participant data

**Plain English summary of protocol**  
Not provided at time of registration

## Contact information

**Type(s)**  
Scientific

**Contact name**  
Dr Simon Conroy

**Contact details**  
Senior Lecturer/Geriatrician  
Department of Medical Education  
University of Leicester School of Medicine  
Maurice Shock Medical Sciences Building  
PO Box 138  
Leicester  
United Kingdom  
LE1 9HN  
+44 (0)116 252 5878  
spc3@le.ac.uk

## Additional identifiers

**EudraCT/CTIS number**

**IRAS number**

**ClinicalTrials.gov number**

## Secondary identifying numbers

9.0

# Study information

## Scientific Title

### Study objectives

Does use of the looped nasogastric tube (LNGT) in dysphagic acute stroke patients result in a greater proportion of nutritional prescription received per patient over a two-week period than conventional nasogastric tube use?

### Ethics approval required

Old ethics approval format

### Ethics approval(s)

Ethics approval received from the Nottingham Research Ethics Committee 2 on the 22nd August 2006 (ref: 06/Q2404/60).

### Study design

Randomised controlled trial

### Primary study design

Interventional

### Secondary study design

Randomised controlled trial

### Study setting(s)

Hospital

### Study type(s)

Treatment

## Participant information sheet

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

Stroke

### Interventions

Please note that this trial has now closed and analysis is underway. The previous anticipated end date for this trial was 01/12/2008.

#### Interventions:

The intervention group will receive all usual care except that the looped nasogastric feeding tube will be used for feed delivery. Subjects will have the loop component of the LNGT sited as per manufacturers instructions. The loop will be sited by either the research fellow, stroke nurses or ward staff who will have been fully trained in placing the loop. A nasogastric tube (NGT) will be passed and once in place fixed using the loop, thus creating the looped nasogastric

tube. Upon confirmation that the NGT is correctly located, feeding will be commenced on an incremental fashion as per local protocols, which will vary between the centres.

## **Intervention Type**

Other

## **Phase**

Not Specified

## **Primary outcome measure**

Percentage of nutritional prescription received (amount delivered/amount intended as per dieticians prescription, including all feed and fluids) delivered in the two weeks from allocation or at the point NG feeding is stopped earlier on clinical grounds.

## **Secondary outcome measures**

1. Number of times tube re-sited in two weeks; treatment failure/completed treatment as specified (where treatment failure means any occasion where attempts at nasogastric tube feeding is ceased before normal oral intake is established, and includes multiple failed attempts at passing a tube, use of a percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy (PEG) (in first two weeks), death or deterioration such that feeding is considered unsafe or unwanted)
2. Mean volume of nasogastric feed delivered in the two weeks from allocation
3. Proportion of patients requiring early PEG insertions
4. The technical efficiency (that is whether the best outcome is being achieved within a given set of resources) of looped nasogastric feeding after stroke compared to ordinary nasogastric tubes will be assessed from an National Health Service (NHS) perspective to see if this new technology offers value for money. An intervention specific outcome will be used to estimate an incremental cost-effectiveness ratio in the form of a cost per change in percentage nutritional prescription received.
5. Change in Demiquet index from baseline to two weeks (weight in kilograms)
6. Tolerability or acceptability of technique by questionnaires to patients, families and nursing staff

## **Overall study start date**

01/06/2006

## **Completion date**

01/05/2008

# **Eligibility**

## **Key inclusion criteria**

Any adult (>18 years of age) with an acute clinically diagnosed stroke as defined by World Health Organisation (WHO) standards; managed on the stroke unit. A clinical decision to attempt nasogastric tube feeding according to usual protocols has been made by the attending clinical team.

## **Participant type(s)**

Patient

## **Age group**

Adult

**Lower age limit**

18 Years

**Sex**

Both

**Target number of participants**

110

**Key exclusion criteria**

1. Those not consenting to either nasogastric tube (NGT) placement or to entry into the trial
2. Those lacking capacity for whom NG feeding is determined not to be in their best interests
3. Pregnant women
4. Those with contraindications to NG feeding (nasal trauma/malignancies)

**Date of first enrolment**

01/06/2006

**Date of final enrolment**

01/05/2008

## **Locations**

**Countries of recruitment**

England

United Kingdom

**Study participating centre**

Senior Lecturer/Geriatrician

Leicester

United Kingdom

LE1 9HN

## **Sponsor information**

**Organisation**

University of Nottingham (UK)

**Sponsor details**

Research Support and Commercialisation Office

University of Nottingham

University Park

Nottingham  
England  
United Kingdom  
NG7 2RD

**Sponsor type**

University/education

**ROR**

<https://ror.org/01ee9ar58>

## **Funder(s)**

**Funder type**

Research organisation

**Funder Name**

Royal College of Physicians (UK)

**Alternative Name(s)**

RCP

**Funding Body Type**

Private sector organisation

**Funding Body Subtype**

Associations and societies (private and public)

**Location**

United Kingdom

**Funder Name**

Dunhill Medical Trust Fellowship (UK)

## **Results and Publications**

**Publication and dissemination plan**

Not provided at time of registration

**Intention to publish date**

**Individual participant data (IPD) sharing plan**

## IPD sharing plan summary

Not provided at time of registration

### Study outputs

Output type	Details	Date created	Date added	Peer reviewed?	Patient-facing?
<a href="#">Protocol article</a>	protocol	03/08/2007		Yes	No
<a href="#">Results article</a>	results	01/09/2010		Yes	No