INTRODUCTION

Feeding patients with inability to swallow due to neurological/psychiatric disorders and coma has always been a problem. Nasoenteric feeding can be used for several weeks but is inconvenient and unstable and is probably often responsible for aspiration pneumonia.1 Surgical gastrostomy (devised to help such patients long term) require general anaesthesia and patients requiring it would usually be unfit for anaesthesia of such type. Since its introduction in 1980 as an alternative to surgical gastrostomy, percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy (PEG) has revolutionized the approach to enteral alimentation.2 It can be safely performed with mild sedation and local anaesthesia, using either, "The Russel or introducer method"3, "Push method or Sacks-Vine technique"4 or "Pull technique."5

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Patients who underwent percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy (PEG) during the period December 1999 to January 2008 at Al-Ibrahimi Hospital and Rehman Medical Institute, Peshawar, were included in the study. Patients with reduced life expectancy, oesophageal obstructive lesion, coagulopathy, ascites, gastric malignant disorder/subtotal gastrectomy and large hiatus hernia were excluded. The indications and procedure outcome were evaluated. Patients were admitted for 48 hours post-procedure. Feeding was started 12 hours after tube placement and care instructions were given to the care givers in all cases.

RESULTS: A total of 26 patients, 14 male and 12 female, underwent PEG tube placement. Patient age range was 22-79 years, mean age being 57.2 years. PEG tube placement was performed successfully in all patients. Mild infection at tube site was the only complication noted in 03 patients. This was managed satisfactorily with enteral antibiotics. All patients were followed up for a minimum period of one month. No complications were reported during this period. The longest follow up is in a patient with stroke, 5 years and 4 months to date.

CONCLUSION: Percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy is a safe procedure for providing nutritional support where indicated and can improve overall patient care.
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the abdominal wall. Position of the PEG tube was confirmed by check endoscopy. (Figure-4) Patients were admitted for 48 hours post-procedure. Feeding was started 12 hours after tube placement and care instructions were given to the care givers in all cases.

RESULTS

A total of 26 patients, 14 male (53.85%) and 12 female (46.15%), underwent PEG tube placement. Patient age range was 22-79 years, mean age being 57.2 years. Most of the patients were above 50 years age, with only three patients (11.54%) below age 50 years. Indications for gastrostomy are given in Table-1. PEG tube placement was performed successfully in all patients. Mild infection at tube site was the only complication noted (03 patients, 11.54%). This was managed satisfactorily with enteral antibiotics. All patients were followed up for a minimum period of one month. No complications were reported during this period. The longest follow up is in a patient with stroke (5 years and 4 months to date). Antral gastritis was noted in four patients (15.38%) when procedure was being done. Feeding through PEG tube was allowed 12 hours after the procedure with no adverse effects.

Table 1: Indications for PEG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indication</th>
<th>No. of patients</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stroke</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>76.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor neuron disease</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>3.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudobulbar palsy</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkinson’s disease</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>3.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dementia</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION

PEG tube was originally designed for enteral alimentation in patients unable to take food orally but its indications are expanding as physicians are now more aware of the critical importance of nutrition in their patients. The correction of protein-calorie malnutrition is vital in many critically ill and chronically debilitated patients. Interest in the procedure has broadened because construction of a gastrostomy is no longer restricted to general surgeons, but is now increasingly performed by gastrointestinal endoscopists. Since its advent PEG dramatically changed the approach to gastrostomy access. Though success rate for surgical gastrostomy is 100% (95.7% for PEG), it carries mortality rate of 2.5% (0.5% for PEG), and risk of major complication of 19.9% (9.4% for PEG). That is why PEG (minimally invasive procedure) is accepted widely and remains the most common form of gastrostomy access.

All patients in our series had neurological basis for PEG placement. Stroke was an indication in 76.9% patients, Pseudobulbar palsy in
7.69% patients, dementia in 7.69% patients and 3.85% patient (3.85%) each of motor neuron disease and Parkinson’s disease. Khokhar N et al11 reported 96% patients with cerebro-vascular accident, 2.75% with Parkinson’s disease and 1.25% with malignancy as indication for PEG. Sadik M et al12 had 80% patients with neurogenic cause as indications for PEG.

Male patients were 53.85% and female 46.15% in our study. 88.46% patients were above 50 years age and 11.54% patients were below 50 years. Khokhar N et al11 had 65% males and 35% female patients in their series. This predominance in male gender and older persons is probably due to more frequent strokes in this group, which is the most common indication for PEG.

PEG was successfully placed in all patients with no procedure related mortality, probably because we were more careful in selection of patients. Khokhar N et al11 reports successful completion of procedure in > 99% patients with no procedure related mortality.

All our patients were kept in hospital for 48 hours as we thought it was essential to educate the care givers in the care of the tube. Sadik M et al12 reports 90% inpatients and 4% outpatient procedure.

Major complications resulting from PEG tube placement include peritonitis, hemorrhage, aspiration, peristomal wound infection, buried bumper syndrome and gastrocolic fistula.13-15

We had 11.54% patients with peristomal infection which was treated successfully with enteral antibiotics. Sadik et al12 reported 16%, Schurink et al15 13% and Anis MK et al17 reported 3-15% peristomal infection.

Wolfsen HC et al18 reported endoscopic finding e.g. peptic ulcer disease and gastric outlet obstruction, in 36% patients going for PEG tube placement. Initial complete oesophago-gastro-duodenoscopy in our study, did not reveal any significant pathology except antral gastritis in 15.38% patients.

Most clinicians would not allow feeding through PEG for 12-24 hours after insertion,19 though feeding 3 hours20 or 4 hours21 after PEG placement is considered safe. We allowed the nursing staff and care givers to start feeding the patient through PEG tube, 12 hours after the procedure.

Survival benefits due to feeding through PEG have been noted in certain indications e.g. Acute stroke22 but not in all e.g. Dementia.23 While survival remains multifactorial in such patients, we believe that nutritional support through PEG improves care conveniently.

Acceptability of tube feeding by the patients and care givers has always been a challenge. Low JA et al24 reported 69% patients saying ‘No’ to nasogastric feeding, 71% saying ‘No’ to PEG feeding and 75% patients saying ‘yes’ to modified oral feeding despite the risk of aspiration. Anis MK et al17 reported 60% patient to be willing to have PEG again if required and 70% felt convenience in feeding.

PEG is certainly cheaper than surgical gastrostomy25 but expensive than nasogastric tube. The cost of PEG tube is around Pakistani Rs. 8000, while a simple nasogastric tube costs around Rs. 100. Cost, fear of failing to take care of PEG and lack of awareness both of the doctors and patients are few of the causes for not offering PEG tube to patients.

CONCLUSION

Percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy is a safe procedure for providing nutritional support where indicated and can improve overall patient care.
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