medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.06.22273454; this version posted April 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

TITLE: Impact of a Multidisciplinary Nutritional Support Team (MNST) on Quality Improvement in Home Parenteral Nutrition (HPN)

SUBTITLE: Report of the Amerita, Inc. Quality Improvement Project for HPN Patients (QIP-PN)

Authors: Michael M. Rothkopf, MD[1]; Mohan D. Pant, PhD, Pstat[2]; Rebecca Brown, RDN, CNSC[3]; Jamie Haselhorst, RDN, LD, CNSC[3]; Francine Gagliardotto, RPh[3]; Allison Tallman, MS, RD, CNSC[3]; Debbie Stevenson, MS, RDN[3], Andrew DePalma[3], Michael Saracco[4], Dan Rosenberg[3], Vladimir Proudan, MD[5], Kishwar Shareef, MD[5], Nudrat Ayub, MD[5]

1. Rutgers/New Jersey Medical School, Newark, NJ
2. Eastern Virginia Medical School, Norfolk, VA
3. Amerita, Inc, Greenwood Village, CO
4. Sea Meadows, LLC, Brick, NJ
5. Morristown Medical Center, Morristown, NJ

Corresponding Author: Michael M. Rothkopf, MD, 1500 Pleasant Valley Way, Suite 302, West Orange, NJ, 07052, 973-610-0489 (cell), mmrothkopf@gmail.com

Conflicts of Interest. Dr. Rothkopf and Mr. Saracco are consultants for Amerita, Inc. Ms. Brown, Haselhorst, Gagliardotto, Tallman, Stevenson, Mr. DePalma and Rosenberg are employees of Amerita, Inc.

Sources of funding: None

Data Sharing: Data described in the manuscript will be made available upon request to the first author, pending application and approval.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.06.22273454; this version posted April 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Abstract

Introduction: HPN is essential for patients requiring long term nutritional support. This Quality Improvement Project for HPN Patients (QIP-PN) studied the effect of a Physician Nutrition Expert (PNE)-led multidisciplinary nutritional support team (MNST) on HPN care.

Objective: To test the effect of an MNST on adherence to protocols, outcomes and QOL in HPN.

Methods: Data review was conducted in phases 1a and 1b, observation in phase 2 and intervention in phase 3. In Phase 3 the MNST made recommendations to treating physicians. All long-term HPN patients were offered study participation. 75 signed consent forms. Treating physician study participation agreements were signed for 42 patients (the study group). A random sample of 30 long-term HPN patients comprised the case-matched control group (control). Data were collected on demographics, treating physicians PNE status, HPN care variables, recommended interventions, quality-of-life assessment, adverse outcomes and hospitalizations. Independent samples t-test was used for continuous data between study group and control group. Paired t-test was used for phase 2 and phase 3 patient data. Comparison between the study and control group utilized a negative binomial regression model. Statistical analysis utilized R (https://www.r-project.org/).

Results: 34 patients were reviewed retrospectively in phase 1a and 197 prospectively in phase 1b . 40 study patients completed phase 2 and progressed into phase 3, of whom 30 completed ≥60 therapy days. Improvements in weight, BMI and QOL were seen in the study patients during intervention. Recommendations made and accepted by treating physicians differed based on PNE status. Study patients had fewer adverse

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.06.22273454; this version posted April 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

outcomes and related hospitalizations than case matched controls.

Conclusion: MNST recommendations improved clinical, biochemical parameters and patients' self-reported overall health. It reduced adverse outcomes, hospitalization and hospital length of stay. MNST input could have a significant impact on the quality and cost of HPN care.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.06.22273454; this version posted April 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Introduction

Home parenteral nutrition (HPN) is a life-sustaining therapy for patients who require long term nutritional support for intestinal failure (IF) (1). It is estimated that more than 25,000 patients receive HPN annually in the US alone (79 patients/million inhabitants) (2).

HPN patients are generally unable to maintain metabolic balance, making parenteral nutrition (PN) essential for survival (3). Outpatient infusion therapy permits these individuals to continue functional lifestyles without hospital confinement (4). HPN patients return to their homes, performing self-care or receiving assistance from family members (5). Based on quality adjusted life-years (QALY) studies, HPN reduces the cost of caring for patients with IF by as much as 65% (6).

HPN risks include catheter-related bloodstream infections (CRBSIs), venous thrombosis, metabolic imbalances, bone disease, kidney stones, and liver disease (7-10). These complications often lead to emergency department visits and hospital re-admission (11). In addition, the personal burden of performing home infusion therapy can impact patients' psychosocial status and quality of life (QOL) (12-15).

To facilitate the HPN process, most US patients are managed by a home infusion provider and remotely monitored by a homecare team. The infusion provider supplies the PN formulation, infusion pump, tubing, dressings, etc. to facilitate the homecare infusion process. A homecare nurse visits regularly to examine the patient, record vital signs, check the catheter site and obtain specimens for monitoring.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.06.22273454; this version posted April 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

An HPN nutrition support team (NST) is typically comprised of homecare specialists in pharmacology, nutrition, and nursing. At centers like the Mayo Clinic, NSTs may include physician nutrition experts (PNE) (16). In other settings, home infusion providers coordinate HPN with the patient's physician. The input of a PNE is not required for home infusion companies to provide HPN (17). Utilization of HPN standards (21-24) often depends upon the expertise of the treating physicians (18-20). This is concerning because our data shows that roughly 60% of HPN patients are managed by physicians without certification as nutrition specialists (21).

Despite widespread HPN use, data is lacking on both the adherence to established protocols and the QOL of HPN consumers (22-25). This investigator-initiated study explored opportunities for quality improvement (QI) in HPN. Our objective was to test the effect of a multidisciplinary NST (MNST), which included PNE input, on adherence to protocols, outcomes of HPN care variables and QOL in HPN. The primary hypothesis was that MNST intervention would improve HPN care variables. Another hypothesis was that the MNST intervention would decrease adverse events such as unplanned hospitalizations. In this report, we detail our findings on a QI project for HPN management guided by a MNST.

Methods

A quality improvement project for HPN patients (QIP-PN) was established by Amerita, Inc., a national home infusion organization (Amerita). A MNST was created, consisting of a PNE and certified nutrition support clinicians (CNSC; RD, RN, RPh) and administrators. A QIP-PN study protocol was developed to examine multiple aspects of care for all HPN patients serviced by the organization. The protocol was

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.06.22273454; this version posted April 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

granted Institutional Review Board (IRB) exemption under NIH guidelines (45CFR 46.104(d)(2)) by the Western IRB on September 4, 2019.

Study groups: All HPN patients treated by Amerita branches were considered for the study. To achieve the desired patient enrollment, 7 branches were selected as "study branches" based upon their volume of long-term HPN (>90 days of therapy) cases. The study was divided into 3 phases for data review (phases 1a and 1b), observation (phase 2) and intervention (phase 3) (Figure 1). All long-term HPN patients treated at study branches were offered study participation of whom 75 signed consent forms. Treating physician study participation agreements were signed for 42 patients who comprised the study group, 30 of whom completed phase 3 (Figure 1). A random sample of 30 long-term HPN patients treated at the study branches comprised the case-matched control group (control).

Study Timing: Phase 1a was a 90-day retrospective review of patient care, conducted from September 4, 2019 through October 15, 2019. Phase 1b was a prospective analysis of 4 outcome measures (access device events, adverse drug reactions, emergency department use and unplanned hospitalization), conducted from January 14, 2020 through February 2, 2021. Phase 2 was a 30-day observation period of the study group patients performed between January 14, 2020 and November 17, 2020. Phase 3 was a 60-90 day intensive review of each patient in the study group, conducted from February 11, 2020 through February 2, 2021.

Data Collection: In phase 1a, data on the study parameters (Table 1) were retrospectively collected on a random group of patients at the 7 study branches. In phase 1b, outcomes on access device events, adverse drug reactions, emergency department visits and unplanned hospitalization were monitored prospectively in study branch patients as part of the National Home Infusion Foundation (NHIF)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.06.22273454; this version posted April 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

benchmark reporting process. In phases 2 and 3, data on the study parameters (Table 1) were prospectively collected on enrolled patients during weekly virtual meetings of the MNST.

MNST Intervention: During phase 3, recommendations were made by the MNST for adjustments in management in accordance with established guidelines and monitored data. These recommendations for HPN care modification were provided to the patient's treating physician by an Amerita branch clinician.

Statistical analysis: For the comparison between the case-matched control group and the phase 3 study group, an independent samples t-test was used only when the outcome variable is assumed to have normal distribution in the population. Comparisons between phase 2 and phase 3 patient data were performed by paired t-test. This was possible because the same group of patients were used in both phases. Therefore, the study patients in the observation period (phase 2) served as their own controls for the intervention study (phase 3). Comparison between the study and case-matched control group utilized a negative binomial regression model for modeling outcome variable, rate of adverse events per 90-day period. A negative binomial regression model was needed for modeling rate of adverse events per 90-day period as it is a count variable. Statistical analysis was conducted using R *(https://www.r-project.org/)*.

PNE Status of treating physicians: Treating physicians were classified as being either PNE or non-PNE. PNE was defined as those physicians who were either board certified by the National Board of Physician Nutrition Specialists (NBPNE) or had CNSC designation from the American Society of Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition (ASPEN).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.06.22273454; this version posted April 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study instruments

Patient QOL assessment. The Euroquol 5 dimension, 3 level (EQ-5D-3L) quality-of-life instrument was chosen for its broad acceptance in the literature and prior application in HPN (31-33). The EQ-5D-3L system is comprised of five dimensions: mobility, self-care, usual activities, pain/discomfort and anxiety/depression. Each dimension has 3 levels: no problems, some problems, and extreme problems. The patient is asked to indicate their health state by selecting the choice corresponding to the most appropriate statement in each of the five dimensions. This decision results in a 1-digit number that expresses the level selected for that dimension. A sixth dimension records the patient's overall self-rated health on a 0-100 scale where the endpoints are labelled 'Best imaginable health state' and 'Worst imaginable health state'. The overall health state is a quantitative measure that reflects the patient's own perception of health. This component is scored as a visual analog scale (VAS).

The EQ-5D-3L was administered at the start of phase 2, start and end of phase 3. Due to COVID-19 restrictions on in-person contact, the EQ-5D-3L was administered via a telephone interview by an independent patient care coordinator who was not a member of the MNST. Such telephonic methodology is in accordance with the EQ-5D-3L guidelines (34). For this study we used VAS score as a proxy for QOL.

Measure of multi-morbidity and disease burden. We explored the use of multimorbidity scales for their application to HPN patients (35) and elected to measure disease burden on study and control patients by means of the Cumulative Illness Rating Scale (CIRS) (36). This method analyzes the multimorbidity of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.06.22273454; this version posted April 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

an individual patient by reviewing 14 body system categories which are graded from zero to four (37-39). The CIRS approach has been validated by numerous studies in the literature. This index can measure a chronic medical illness burden in individual patients and has been validated as a predictor of hospitalization and readmission for older adults and as a predictor of long-term mortality. The CIRS score can range from 0 to 56. Scores higher than 29 are associated with mortality during hospitalization.

Members of the MNST calculated co-morbidity and illness severity, using the CIRS, based on information available in each patient's Electronic Medical Records (EMR) chart. This included admission notes, medications, nursing notes, emergency department notes, imaging studies, physical and occupational therapy assessments, treatment/care plans, and discharge summaries.

Impact of COVID-19. The QIP study was underway when the COVID-19 pandemic struck the USA. HPN protocols and services were impacted in terms of personal interactions between patients and staff members. The duties of support personnel were moved to remote telecommuting conditions. Pharmacy and delivery schedules remained unchanged. However, deliveries of HPN supplies were converted from direct in-person transfers to doorstep deliveries. Patients were notified when drivers were en-route and again when the delivery was made. Drivers waited outdoors to confirm that the HPN supplies were received.

Some patients expressed reluctance at allowing home visits by the Amerita or agency RN due to COVID-19. Three (3) patients or 10% skipped routine labs at least once. Four (4) patients (13.3%) delayed specialized labs. One (1) patient delayed a physician visit. Many converted physician visits to telemedicine encounters.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.06.22273454; this version posted April 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Results

Phase 1a results: There were 34 patients in phase 1a, which validated our protocol parameters and instruments. The average age was 54.7 years. Twenty-one (21) of the patients were female, 13 were male. Eleven (11) patients were covered by a federally insured healthcare program.

Phase 1b results: In the study branches, 197 patients had received HPN for at least 90 days, and were evaluated in phase 1b. These patients had 203 outcomes reported during the study period. Sixty-seven (67) patients had more than 1 outcome recorded. Results for the comparison group in each outcome category were expressed in events per 1,000 days of homecare service (the NHIF standard) and events per patient (table 2).

Phase 2 results: There were 42 patients enrolled in the study. Forty (40) or 95% completed 30 days of observation in phase 2.

Phase 3 results: Thirty (30) or 75% of the completed 40 phase 2 patients completed phase 3 (60 days or more in phase 3). Patient data were collected according to the study monitoring parameters (Table 1).

A. Results among participants between phases 2 and 3 for monitored parameters (Tables 3-6).

1. Patient weight, BMI. The average weight at the end of phase 2 was 59.93 kg. The average weight at the end of phase 3 was 61.0 kg. Average weight increased slightly in the phase 3 patients by 1.07 kg. However, 3 of the phase 3 study patients were outliers which altered these results. One was non-

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.06.22273454; this version posted April 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

compliant to therapy. The other two were obese and sought to lose weight on parenteral nutrition (PN). After excluding data for these 3 patients, the study group had a statistically significant average weight gain of 1.78 kg, t(df = 26) = -3.88, p = .0006. The average patient BMI increased by 0.29 kg/m^2. This result was statistically significant t(df = 29) = -2.07, p = 0.047. When the 3 previously noted outlier patients were removed from the dataset, the BMI increase was 0.7 t(df = 26) = -3.88, p = 0.0006. The average ideal body weight (IBW) was 60.15 kg. The percentage of IBW increased by 2.22%. When the 3 previously noted outlier patients were removed from the dataset, the percentage of IBW increased by 3.66% t(df = 26) = -2.26, p = 0.0009 (Table 3).

2. Basic lab results (CBC, CMP, Magnesium, Phosphate, Triglycerides). Basic lab tests were performed on a regular basis for each patient. Twenty-one (21) of the 30 patients received PN lab work on a weekly schedule. Two (2) patients received lab work every 2 weeks. Seven (7) patients received lab work on a monthly basis. The frequency of lab work orders was based on the stability of the patient, but also varied by PNE status. The majority (5 of 7) of those receiving monthly PN labs were followed by a PNE.

3. Specialized lab results. Specialized lab data on micronutrient levels was obtained in 27 of the 30 phase 3 patients (90%). Micronutrient levels were obtained prior to phase 3 monitoring in 9 of the 30 patients (30%). Seven (7) of these patients were cared for by a PNE. During phase 3 monitoring, an additional 18 patients had micronutrient levels obtained. Three (3) patients did not have micronutrient levels obtained either prior to or during phase 3 monitoring.

4. PN Component Characteristics. The average PN component content at the beginning of phase 3 was evaluated based on quantity of total calories and non-protein calories, dextrose, lipids and amino acids in total and per kilogram of patient's actual body weight. Infusion rates and nutrient loads were

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.06.22273454; this version posted April 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

calculated (Table 3). The overall cost of PN components decreased by 1.31% during phase 3. MNST interventions lowered the cost of PN in 11 (36.7%) patients. The cost of PN was increased in 14 (46.7%) patients. Cost was unchanged in 5 (16.6%). Cost changes ranged from a decrease of 26.22% to an increase of 76.28% (Table 4). Costs were reduced when excess nutrients were found to be unnecessary (i.e. thiamine, ascorbic acid and zinc included in initial discharge orders). Costs increased when additional micromineral supplementation, (i.e. selenium, zinc, and other trace elements) was required. Unprecedented, industry-wide price increases in specific components confounded MNST interventions to reduce PN costs.

5. PN Order Modifications. Macronutrient orders were changed during the course of phase 3 intervention in 21 of 30 patients (70%). Macronutrient orders were changed either because of inadequate weight gain, liver enzyme elevations or excessive weight gain. Electrolytes and micronutrient orders were changed based on lab results (Table 5).

6. Patient QOL assessment. The average EQ-5D-3L VAS score of overall health was 59.41 before intervention. It rose to 71.65 by the end of the intervention period. This represents an increase of 12.24 points +/- 10.0, or an improvement of 20.6%. This result was statistically significant, $t(\text{df} = 28) = -4.10$, $p = 0.0003$ (Figure 3).

7. Recommended interventions. The MNST made recommendations for compliance to standards of care for each study patient to the treating physicians on a weekly basis. The treating physicians had final authority to either accept or reject the recommendations. A total of 157 recommendations were made for all 30 patients. The range of recommended interventions was 1-11, with a mean of 5.2. Recommendations were significantly lower if the treating physician was a nutritional expert. The mean

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.06.22273454; this version posted April 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

number of recommended interventions among PNE-treated patients was 3.09. The mean number of recommended interventions among non-PNE-treated patients was 5.86 (p=0.0001).

The total number of accepted recommendations for all 30 patients was 137 out of 157 recommendations made (87.2%). The range of accepted recommended interventions was 0-11, with a mean of 4.56. Recommendation acceptances were significantly lower if the treating physician was a nutritional expert. The mean number of accepted recommendations among PNE-treated patients was 2.36. The mean number of accepted recommendations among non-PNE-treated patients was 5.28 (p=0.0008) (Table 6).

B. Comparison between study patients and case-matched controls (Tables 7-11)

1. Patient characteristics. Twenty-two (22; 73.3%) of the study patients were female and 8 (26.7%) were male. The average age was 57.43 years. The mean time on HPN prior to phase 3 for study patients was 624.3 days. Nine (9) patients had short bowel syndrome (SBS). Four (4) had Crohn's disease – related intestinal failure, without SBS. Three (3) had pancreatic cancer. Five (5) had other gastrointestinal tract cancers (esophageal, gastric, anal). Three (3) had gastroparesis. Two (2) had chronic small bowel obstruction. One (1) had celiac disease. One (1) had colitis. In addition to their primary diagnosis, 7 patients had enteric fistulae. CIRS score among study patients ranged from 8-25. The mean score was 17.1. Seventeen (17) of the 30 study patients (56.7%) were covered by a federally supported insurance plan (Medicare, Medicare Advantage, Medicaid and Tricare) (Table 7).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.06.22273454; this version posted April 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Eleven (11) of the 30 phase 3 patients or 36.6% were treated by PNEs. Nineteen (19) patients or 63.4% were treated by physicians who were not PNEs. Fourteen (14) of the phase 3 patients visited with the prescribing physician on a monthly basis. Two saw their physician every other month. Nine patients saw their physicians quarterly. One patient saw the prescribing physician every four months and three patients every six months.

Of the 30 case-matched controls, 24 (80.0%) were female and 6 (20.0%) were male. The average age was 54.9 years. The mean time on HPN was 586.8 days. Five (5) patients had short bowel syndrome (SBS). Four (4) had Crohn's disease – related intestinal failure. Four (4) had gastrointestinal tract cancers (small bowel, cholangiocarcinoma, colon). One (1) had fallopian tube cancer. Two (2) had gastroparesis. Four (4) had chronic small bowel obstruction. One (1) had celiac disease. One (1) had combined variable immune deficiency (CVID). CIRS score among case-matched control patients ranged from 9-24. The mean score was 16.7. Twenty-two (22) of the 30 case-matched control patients (73.33%) were covered by a federally supported insurance plan. Among the 30 case-matched control patients, 7 (23.33%) were treated by PNEs while 23 (76.67%) were treated by non-PNEs (Tables 7-8).

2. Catheter Characteristics. In the study group, 11 patients had infusion ports, 10 had tunneled catheters (i.e. Hickman® or Broviac®), 6 had peripherally inserted central catheter (PICC) lines and 3 had Groshong® catheters. Twenty-five (25) were visited by Amerita staff nurses. The remaining five were cared for by home health agency nurses in accordance with individual payor requirements. Patients were seen weekly in most cases. Twenty-five (25) patients had bio-occlusive catheter dressings. Five (5) had hypoallergenic dressings. Among the case-matched control patients, 9 had infusion ports, 5 had tunneled catheters and 16 had PICC lines. Eighteen (18) were cared for by agency RNs, 7 by Amerita RNs

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.06.22273454; this version posted April 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

and 5 by clinic staff. All but one patient in the case-matched control group had bio-occlusive dressings (Table 9).

3. PN order changes. Macronutrients were modified a total of 104 times among the study patients. This compares to 73 times for the case-matched controls (142.4% more often). Electrolytes were modified a total of 173 times among the study patients, compared to 178 times for the case-matched controls (97% as often). Micronutrients were modified a total of 42 times for study patients, compared to 12 times for case-matched controls (350% more often). Volume was changed 33 times in the study patients vs 24 in the controls (137.5% more often). Duration was changed 11 times in the study patients and 13 in the controls (84.6% as often). The total number of formula changes were 373 in the study group and 309 in the controls (a 120% increase) (Table 10).

4. Adverse Outcomes. There were 10 total outcomes reported among the phase 3 patients, or 0.33 per patient. There were 7 unplanned hospitalizations. Four (4) of the hospitalizations were felt to be unrelated to therapy. Three (3) hospitalizations were felt to be therapy related. There were 2 emergency department (ED) visits among the phase 3 patients during the study period.

When compared to the data from the 197 long term HPN patients at the 7 study branches, phase 3 patients had lower total adverse outcomes (3.64 vs 4.33), unplanned hospitalization (2.54 vs 3.65) and access device events (0.338 vs 0.432) per 1,000 therapy days. ED use was higher in the study patients (0.338 vs 0.299) per 1,000 therapy days.

There were 16 total adverse outcomes among the case-control patients, or 0.53 per patient. There were 14 unplanned hospitalizations. Eleven (11) of the unplanned hospitalizations were felt to be unrelated to

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.06.22273454; this version posted April 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

therapy. Three (3) hospitalization were felt to be therapy related. There were 2 ED visits among the case-control patients during the study period (Table 11).

5. Total Hospitalizations and Length of Stay (LOS). Study group patients were hospitalized a total of 11 times during phase 3. This produced a hospitalization rate of 0.37 admissions per patient during the 90-day study period. The total LOS for these admissions was 69 days. The average LOS for the study group was 6.27 days (hospital days/ number of hospitalizations). Among the 7 study patients hospitalized, 3 had only one hospitalization. Four (4) patients had a second hospitalization during the study period. None had a third hospitalization. Based on this data, the readmission rate of study group patients was 0.13 (number of readmissions/ number of patients).

Case-matched control group patients were hospitalized a total of 20 times during the 90-day review. This produced a hospitalization rate of 0.67 (number of hospitalization/ number of patients) admissions per patient during the study period. The total LOS for these hospitalizations was 153 days. The average LOS was 7.65 days (153 days / number of hospitalizations). Among the 13 case-matched control group patients who were hospitalized, 8 had only one hospitalization during the study period. Five (5) case-matched control group patients had a second hospitalization during the study period. Two (2) case-matched control group patients had a third hospitalization during the study period. Based on this data, the readmission rate of case-matched control group patients was 0.23 (number of readmissions/ number of patients) (Table 11).

6. Statistical Analysis of Phase 3 Study Patients and Case-Matched Controls. Comparison between the study and control group utilized a negative binomial regression model for modeling outcome variable, rate of adverse events per 90-day period, based on zero-inflated count data. We used a negative

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.06.22273454; this version posted April 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

binomial regression model to explain how this outcome is related with other possible predictors and to create a prediction model. Among the available count-data based predictors, 90-day related hospitalizations, 90-day access device events, and 90-day total change were chosen as possible predictors because of their low correlation with 90-day events and with each other.

Figure 2 shows the Spearman correlation among these variables. Additionally, we chose group (with case-matched control group as reference group), CIRS Score as other predictors. The results of negative binomial regression are displayed in Table 5. Based on the results, group, CIRS Score, and 90-day hospitalizations, were significant predictors of 90-day (adverse) events at 5% alpha level. Specifically, rate of 90-day adverse events was significantly higher (3.56 times) for the control group than that for study group, given all other predictors are in the model. Likewise, for a unit change in CIRS Score, the percent change in expected incident rate of total 90-day events is by 16.6% (i.e., e^(0.15350) - 1), given all other predictors are in the model. For a unit change in 90-day unplanned hospitalization - related to therapy (X90d_Related_Hosp), the percent change in expected incident rate of total 90-day events is by 393% (i.e., e^(1.59541) – 1), given all other predictors are in the model (Table 12).

Discussion

This study demonstrated that a PNE-led, multidisciplinary team produced quality improvements for long term HPN patients. Patients who received MNST interventions had improved nutritional status, fewer adverse outcomes, hospitalizations, hospital LOS and better quality-of-life index scores.

MNST recommendations produced HPN quality improvement through compliance to standards of care and attention to PN formula adaptation based on physical findings and biochemical parameters. PN

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.06.22273454; this version posted April 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

macronutrient changes resulted in clinical improvement, measured by weight gain and increased BMI. Improved biochemical parameters were seen in electrolyte balance, liver function, micronutrient balance and triglyceride levels. Study patients had significant improvement in QOL as measured by the EQ-5D-3L VAS.

An important aspect of the QIP-PN program was the difference of recommendations made and accepted by the treating physicians. The majority of HPN treating physicians were not nutrition specialists. Therefore, they relied upon the MNST to suggest changes that complied with standards or were indicated by HPN monitoring. The MNST made 157 recommendations for HPN management and 373 suggestions for formula changes during intervention. The vast majority (87.2%) of these recommendations were accepted by the treating physicians. Fewer recommendations for compliance were required if the patient's physician was a PNE. Physicians who were not PNEs were more willing to accept the MNST's recommendations.

We utilized the EQ-5D-3L QOL index to monitor study patients before and after intervention. Although other QOL indexes have been utilized in HPN, we found that the EQ-5D-3L index was better suited for the study because of its simplicity and patient acceptance. Other HPN QOL indexes employ up to 20 measured parameters compared to 5 for the EQ-5D-3L. In addition, we found that the VAS score provided a useful single point of reference for the patients overall perceived condition.

The study made use of a CIRS measure of multi-morbidity. We previously reviewed this and hypothesized its application in HPN research (35). To our knowledge this is the first real world

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.06.22273454; this version posted April 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

application of the approach in the HPN population. CIRS scores documented the complexity of HPN patients with a moderately high value in both the study patients and case-matched controls.

Total Hospitalizations and Length of Stay (LOS). We demonstrated fewer hospitalizations in study patients versus case-matched controls. The average length of stay was 1.38 days shorter in study patients and there were 84 fewer hospital days among study patients than controls. The study also demonstrated a reduced rate of readmission to the hospital for study patients. None of the study patients was readmitted more than twice, while two of the case-matched control patients were admitted three times. The reductions in hospitalization, LOS and re-hospitalization would be expected to have a significant impact in the overall cost of care for HPN patients.

Adverse Outcomes. When the phase 3 study patients were compared to the 90-day case-control patients for monitored adverse outcomes, statistically significant differences were found between the groups in total outcomes and unplanned hospitalizations. When 90-day outcomes for the phase 3 study patients were compared to the case-control patients, using a negative binomial regression analysis, statistically significant differences were found between the groups. CIRS Score, and 90-day therapy-related hospitalizations were significant predictors of total outcomes at the 5% alpha level.

Limitations. Our study group was small (30 patients and 30 case-matched controls) and the duration of the intervention period was short (60-90 days). Considering these limitations, additional research should be performed with a larger number of patients and longer timeframes of monitoring to affirm our favorable results.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.06.22273454; this version posted April 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Conclusion

This study demonstrated that a PNE-led, multidisciplinary nutrition support team produced measurable improvements in the care of long term HPN patients. The MNST made numerous recommendations for HPN management, most of which were accepted by the treating physicians. The QIP-PN process improved patients' self-assessed overall health, while reducing adverse outcomes, re-hospitalization and hospital LOS. If extended to the entire population of long-term HPN patients, we believe that MNST input would be expected to have a significant impact on the quality and cost of HPN care.

Brief Summary

We demonstrated that a physician nutrition expert (PNE)-led, multidisciplinary nutrition support team) MNST improved the care of long term HPN patients. MNST input can improve the quality and cost of HPN care.

Statement of authors' contributions to manuscript:

Dr. Rothkopf designed the study and served as principal investigator.

Dr. Pant reviewed the data and performed statistical analyses.

Ms. Brown collected data and participated on MNST weekly patient rounds and discussions.

Ms. Haselhorst collected data and participated on MNST weekly patient rounds and discussions.

Ms. Gagliardotto participated on MNST weekly patient rounds and discussions and communicated recommendations to patients' treating physicians.

Ms. Tallman participated on MNST weekly patient rounds and discussions and communicated recommendations to patients' treating physicians.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.06.22273454; this version posted April 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Ms. Stevenson participated on MNST weekly patient rounds and discussions and communicated recommendations to patients' treating physicians.

Mr. DePalma participated on MNST weekly patient rounds and discussions.

Mr. Saracco participated on MNST weekly patient rounds and discussions.

Mr. Rosenberg collected data for phase 1b of the study.

Dr. Proudan served on the Study Oversight and Safety Committee.

Dr. Shareef served on the Study Oversight and Safety Committee.

Dr. Ayub served on the Study Oversight and Safety Committee.

References

1. Irving MH. Ethical problems associated with the treatment of intestinal failure. Aust N Z J Surg 1986; 56: 425-7.

2. Mundi MS, Pattinson A, McMahon MT, Davidson J, Hurt RT. Prevalence of Home Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition in the United States. Nutr Clin Pract. 2017 Dec;32(6):799-805.

3. O'Hanrahan T, Irving MH. The role of home parenteral nutrition in the management of intestinal failure: report of 400 cases. Clinical Nutrition 1092; 11: 331-6.

4. Winkler, M.F. and Smith, C.E. (2014), Clinical, Social, and Economic Impacts of Home Parenteral Nutrition Dependence in Short Bowel Syndrome. Journal of Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition, 38: 32S-37S.

5. Huisman-de Waal G, Schoonhoven L, Jansen J, Wanten G, van Achterberg T. The impact of home parenteral nutrition on daily life: a review. *Clin Nutr*. 2007; **26**: 275– 288.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.06.22273454; this version posted April 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

6. Richards DM, Irving MH. Cost-utility analysis of home parenteral nutrition. British Journal of Surgery 1996,83, 1226-1229

7. Maki DG, Kluger DM, Crnich CJ. The risk of bloodstream infection in adults with different intravascular devices: a systematic review of 200 published prospective studies. *Mayo Clin Proc*. 2006; **81**: 1159– 1171.

8. Buchman AL. Complications of long-term home total parenteral nutrition: their identification, prevention and treatment. *Dig Dis Sci*. 2001; **46**: 1– 18.

9. Compher CW, Kinosian BP, Evans-Stoner N, Huzinec J, Buzby GP. Hyperhomocysteinemia is associated with venous thrombosis in patients with short bowel syndrome. *JPEN J Parenter Enteral Nutr*. 2001; **25**: 1– 7, discussion 7–8.

10. Xu ZW, Li YS. Pathogenesis and treatment of parenteral nutrition-associated liver disease. *Hepatobiliary Pancreat Dis Int*. 2012; **11**: 586– 593.

11. Burden, Sorrel et al. The impact of home parenteral nutrition on the burden of disease including morbidity, mortality and rate of hospitalisations. Clinical Nutrition ESPEN, Volume 28, 222 - 227

12. Huisman-de Waal G, Schoonhoven L, Jansen J, Wanten G, van Achterberg T. The impact of home parenteral nutrition on daily life: a review. *Clin Nutr*. 2007; **26**: 275– 288.

13. Winkler MF, Hagan E, Wetle T, Smith C, Maillet JO, Touger-Decker R. An exploration of quality of life and the experience of living with home parenteral nutrition. *JPEN J Parenter Enteral Nutr*. 2010; **34**: 395– 407.

14. Baxter JP, Fayers PM, McKinlay AW. A review of the quality of life of adult patients treated with long-term parenteral nutrition. *Clin Nutr*. 2006; **25**: 543– 553.

15. Winkler MF. Quality of life in adult home parenteral nutrition patients. *JPEN J Parenter Enteral Nutr*. 2005; **29**: 162– 170.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.06.22273454; this version posted April 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

16. Hurt RT, Steiger E. Early History of Home Parenteral Nutrition: From Hospital to Home. Nutr Clin Pract. 2018 Oct;33(5):598-613.

17. Accreditation Commission for Health Care, Accreditation Standards -- DMEPOS and Pharmacy, 2-1-2021.

18. Dudrick SJ, Wilmore, DW, Vars HM, Rhoads JE. Long-termed parenteral nutrition with growth, development, and positive nitrogen balance. Surgery 1968; 64: 134-142.

19. Wateska LP, Sattler LL, Steiger E. Cost of a home parenteral nutrition program. JAMA 1980; 244: 2303-4.

20. Howard L, Ament M, Fleming CR, Shike M, Steiger E. Current use and clinical outcome of home parenteral and enteral nutrition therapies in the United States. Gastroenterology. 1995;109(2):355-365.

21. Internal data of Amerita, Inc HPN patient prescribing physicians

22. Pironi, Loris et al. ESPEN guideline on home parenteral nutrition. Clinical Nutrition, Volume 39, Issue 6, 1645 – 1666.

22. American Society for Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition. Guidelines for the use of parenteral and enteral nutrition in adult and pediatric patients. ABO Directors - JPEN J. Parenter. Enter. Nutr, 2002

23. Gillanders L, Angstmann K, Ball P, Champan-Kiddell C, Hardy G, Hope J, et al. AuSPEN clinical practice guideline for home parenteral nutrition patients in Australia and New Zealand. Nutrition 2008;24:998e1012.

24. NICE guidelines. Nutrition support for adults: oral nutrition support, enteral tube feeding and parenteral nutrition. February 2006. Last updated: August 2017, https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg32/chapter/1- Guidance#parenteral-nutrition-in-hospital-and-the-community.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.06.22273454; this version posted April 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

25. Dreesen M, Foulon V, Vanhaecht K, De Pourcq L, Hiele M, Willems L. Guidelines recommendations on care of adult patients receiving home parenteral nutrition: a systematic review of global practices. Clin Nutr 2012;31:602e8.

26. Wengler A, Micklewright A, Hebuterne X, Bozzetti F, Pertkiewicz M, Moreno J, et al. Monitoring of patients on home parenteral nutrition (HPN) in Europe: a questionnaire based study on monitoring practice in 42 centres. Clin Nutr 2006;25:693e700.

27. Pironi L, Steiger E, Brandt C, Joly F, Wanten G, Chambrier C, et al. Home parenteral nutrition provision modalities for chronic intestinal failure in adult patients: an international survey. Clin Nutr 2020;39:585e91.

28. Ritchey C. Is My Patient Non-Compliant or Do They Have Low Literacy Skills? A Case Report (2021), Poster Abstracts. Journal of Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition, 45: S44-S240.

29. Kinnare K, et al. Parenteral Nutrition Clinical Interventions Made by a Home Infusion Nutrition Support Team (2021), Poster Abstracts. Journal of Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition, 45: S44-S240.

30. Cuaresma J, et al. A Multidisciplinary Approach to Reducing Errors in Total Parenteral Nutrition Management (2021), Poster Abstracts. Journal of Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition, 45: S44-S240.

31. B van Hout, et al. Interim Scoring for the EQ-5D-5L: Mapping the EQ-5D-5L to EQ-5D-3L Value Sets, Value in Health 15, 2012, 708-715).

32. Shaw JW, Johnson JA, Coons SJ. US valuation of the EQ-5D health states: development and testing of the D1 valuation model. Med Care. 2005 Mar;43(3):203-20.

33. *Holst M, Ryttergaard L, Frandsen L S, Vinter-Jensen L, Rasmussen HH (2018) Quality of Life in HPN Patients Measured By EQ5D-3L including VAS. J Clin Nutr Metab 2018, 2:1.*

34. Mulhern, B., O'Gorman, H., Rotherham, N. *et al.* Comparing the measurement equivalence of EQ-5D-5L across different modes of administration. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* **13,** 191 (2015).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.06.22273454; this version posted April 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

35. Rothkopf ZS, Rothkopf MM, Pant M, Brown R, Haselhorst J, Tallman A, Stevenson D. DePalma A, Saracco M. The use of multimorbidity indexes in patients receiving home TPN (HPN), in press

36. Hudon C, ET AL . Cumulative index rating scale was a reliable and valid index in a family practice context. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology 2005; 58: 603 - 8.

37. R. Nardi et al. The assessment of complexity in internal medicine patients. The FADOI Medicomplex Study European Journal of Internal Medicine 18 (2007) 283 – 287.

38. Kittai AS, Gordon MJ, Mian A, et al. Comorbidities predict inferior survival in patients receiving CAR T-cell therapy for relapsed/refractory DLBCL: a multicenter retrospective analysis.

39. Ritt M, Ritt JI, Sieber CC, Gaßmann KG. Comparing the predictive accuracy of frailty, comorbidity, and disability for mortality: a 1-year follow-up in patients hospitalized in geriatric wards. *Clin Interv Aging*. 2017;12:293-304.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.06.22273454; this version posted April 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.06.22273454; this version posted April 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Tables and Figures

Table 1. Study parameters examined in patients during phases 1a, 2 and 3.

1. Hospital – name & initial discharge dates
2. PN Prescriber Characteristics - degree, specialty, nutrition certification
3. Patient Demographics – age, gender, diagnoses, reason for Home PN, CIRS score
4. Patient QOL assessment - questionnaire
5. PN Characteristics – macronutrients, osmolarity, infusion cycle
6. Catheter Information -
    a. Catheter type
    b. Dressing type
    c. Insertion date
    d. Reinsertion date(s), reason
    e. Infection – type, dates
    f. Occlusions – type, dates
    g. Other complications
7. Nursing visit frequency
8. Lab draw frequency
9. Physician office visit frequency
10. Formula adjustment frequency
11. Visits to ED – name, dates & reasons
12. Re-hospitalizations – name, dates & reasons
13. Payor(s)
14. Cost of PN Bags – daily, weekly, monthly
15. Cost of ED, re-hospitalization – estimated
16. Were recommended changes in the home PN formula and/or regimen implemented – yes/no
17. Patient satisfaction survey data
18. Qualitative assessment of benefit (grounded theory)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.06.22273454; this version posted April 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

19. Outcomes - access device events, adverse drug reactions, emergency department use and

Characteristic	Phase 2 (M ± SD), n=40	Phase 3 (M ± SD), n=30

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.06.22273454; this version posted April 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Weight (kg)	59.93 ± 17.16	61.0 ± 16.85
Weight with Outliers Removed (kg)	52.77 ± 17.24	54.55 ± 17.18*
BMI	20.20 ± 5.27	20.49 ± 5.31**
BMI with Outliers Removed	18.9 ± 5.23	19.6 ± 5.23*
IBW	60.15 ± 9.66	60.15 ± 9.66
%IBW	99.47 ± 23.84	101.69 ± 24.57
%IBW with Outliers Removed	98.72 ± 23.78	102.38 ± 24.30***
PN Formulation		
- Total Kcal/d	1412 ± 355.47	1405 ± 387.10
- Total Kcal/Kg/d	25.10 ± 8.56	24.91 ± 10.04
- Non-protein Kcal/d	1084 ± 329.75	1074.37 ± 363.71
- Non-protein Kcal/Kg/d	19.35 ± 7.43	19.21 ± 8.88
- Dextrose gm/d	218.14 ± 81.88	218.95 ± 79.87
- Dextrose gm/Kg/d	3.83 ± 1.63	3.85 ± 1.77
- Amino Acids gm/d	82.07 ± 20.98	82.85 ± 21.01
- Amino Acids gm/Kg/d	1.44 ± 0.46	1.42 ± 0.44
- Lipid gm/d	34.25 ± 16.70	32.99 ± 17.61
- Lipid gm/Kg/d	0.63 ± 0.41	0.62 ± 0.41
- PN Total Volume	1648.48 ± 519.98	1611.43 ± 530.22
- PN Infusion Duration (hrs)	13.20 ± 3.56	12.86 ± 3.06
- Infusion rate ml/hr	130.41 ± 47.59	129.41 ± 45.89
- Osmolarity (mOsm)	1569.63 ± 338.63	1613 ± 356.48
- Osmolar infusion rate mOsm/hr	124.83 ± 47.59	131.39 ± 41.42
- Dextrose infusion rate gm/hr	17.22 ± 7.28	17.79 ± 7.47
- Amino Acid infusion rate gm/hr	6.55 ± 2.20	6.79 ± 2.55
- Lipid infusion rate gm/hr	2.69 ± 1.37	2.65 ± 1.20

Table 3. Descriptive statistics of continuous variables for patients in phases 2 and 3.

Note. Descriptive Statistics for Continuous Variables. Nutritional parameters and PN formulation characteristics in study patients during phases 2 and 3. Nutritional parameters are presented with all study patients and with removal of 3 outlier patients (see text). PN intakes are express as gm/d, gm/kg/d and infusion rate. Note: BMI = body mass index, IBW = ideal body weight, PN = parenteral nutrition, * p=0.0006, ** p=0.047, *** p=0.0009.

Table 4. Characteristic of study group patients in the context of PN cost.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.06.22273454; this version posted April 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

PN Formulation Cost	Number and Percentage of Study Group Patients, n= 30
Decreased	11 Patients (36.7%)
Unchanged	5 Patients (16.6%)
Increased	14 Patients (46.7%)
Range	-26.22% to +76.28%
Overall impact	-1.31%

Note. Differences noted in cost of study patient PN therapy between the observation (phase 2) and intervention (phase 3). Costs were reduced when excess nutrients (i.e. thiamine, ascorbic acid and zinc) were shown to be unnecessary. Costs increased when micronutrients (i.e. selenium, zinc, and others) were deficient and required additional supplementation. Unprecedented, industry-wide price increases in PN components confounded the impact of MNST interventions intended to reduce PN costs. Note: PN = parenteral nutrition.

Table 5. PN order changes in study patients during phase 3.

PN Order Changes	Number and Percentage of Study Group Patients, n= 30	Total Modifications, n=30
Macronutrients	21 (70%)	104
Electrolytes	15 (50%)	173
Micronutrients	25 (83.3%)	42
- Thiamine	5	
- Ergocalciferol	5	
- Ascorbic acid	1	
- Cyanocobalamin	1	
- Zinc	10	
- Chromium	5	
- Selenium	5	
- Manganese	6	
- Copper	2	
Volume	17 (56.6%)	33
Infusion Rate	6 (20%)	11
Total	27	373

Note. Macronutrient orders were changed either because of inadequate weight gain, liver enzyme elevations or excessive weight gain. Electrolytes and micronutrient orders were changed based on lab results. Note: PN = parenteral nutrition.

Table 6. Recommendations and Acceptances by Treating Physicians.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.06.22273454; this version posted April 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Measurement	Recommendations Made to Treating Physicians (per patient, n=30)	Recommendation Acceptance (per patient, n=30)
Range	1-11	0-11
Mean	5.23 ± 2.20	4.56 ± 2.82
Mean if PNE	3.09 ± 1.92	2.36 ± 2.42
Mean if not PNE	5.86 ± 1.89*	5.28 ± 2.22**
Total	157	137 (87.2%)

Note. Study patient interventions recommended to and accepted by treating physicians. The MNST made recommendations for compliance to standards of care for study patients at weekly case review meetings. The treating physicians had final authority to either accept or reject the recommendations. Recommendations were significantly lower if the treating physician was a nutrition expert. Recommendation acceptances were significantly higher if the treating physician was not a nutrition expert. Note: PNE = physician nutrition expert, * p=0.0001, ** p=0.0008

Table 7. Demographic characteristics of study patients and case-matched controls.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.06.22273454; this version posted April 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Note. No significant demographic differences were identified between the groups. Note: CIRS =

Characteristic	Study Group, n=30	Case-Matched Controls, n=30
Male	26.7%	20%
Female	73.3%	80%
Age	57.4 ± 13.40	54.6 ± 19.48
Days on HPN Therapy	624.3 ± 1084.27	589.76 ± 1040.55
CIRS Score	17.4 ± 3.81	16.5 ± 3.82
Federal Payor	56%	73.33%
Prescriber PNE Status	36.6%	23.3%
Prescriber Non-PNE Status	63.4%	73.33%

cumulative illness rating scale, PNE = physician nutrition expert

Table 8. Diagnostic categories of study patients and controls.

Primary Diagnosis	Study Group, n=30	Case-Matched Controls, n=30
Intestinal Failure (IF)	23	24
-Short Bowel Syndrome (SBS)	9	6
-Crohn's Disease-Related Intestinal Failure (CDIF)	4	4
-Complication of Bariatric Surgery	3	2
-Gastroparesis	3	4
-Chronic Bowel Obstruction	2	6
-Celiac Disease	1	1
-Colitis	1	1
Enteric Fistula	7	4
Gastrointestinal Cancers	3	5
Pancreatic Cancer	3	0
Fallopian Tube Cancer	1	1

Note. Principal diagnosis listed in the electronic medical record (EMR) for study patients and case-matched controls. Most HPN patients in the study and case-matched control groups had intestinal failure as their reason for therapy (23). Intrabdominal/pelvic cancer accounted for the remainder.

Table 9. Catheter characteristics of study patients and controls.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.06.22273454; this version posted April 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Catheter Characteristics	Study Group, n=30	Case-Matched Controls, n=30
Type:		
- Infusion Port	11	9
- Tunneled Catheter	10	5
- PICC	6	16
- Groshong	3	0
Nursing Care		
- Amerita	25	7
- Home Health Agency Nurses	5	18
- Clinic Staff	0	5
Dressings		
- Bio-occlusive	21	29
- Hypoallergenic	5	1

Note. Catheter type and care characteristics of study patients and case-matched controls. Most patients received catheter care on a weekly basis. Note: PICC = peripherally inserted central catheter.

Table 10. PN Orders Changes in study patients and controls.

PN Order Changes	Study Group, n=30	Case-Matched Controls, n=30
Macronutrients	104	73
Electrolytes	173	178
Micronutrients	42	12
Volume	33	24
Infusion Rate	11	13
Total PN Order Changes	373	309

Note. PN orders for macronutrients were modified more often in study patients than in case-matched controls. Electrolytes, PN volume and duration were modified similarly among the study patients and case-matched controls. Micronutrients were modified in study patients more often than case-matched controls. The total number of PN formula changes were 20% higher in study patients than in case-matched controls. Note: PN = parenteral nutrition.

Table 11. Adverse Outcomes in study patients and controls.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.06.22273454; this version posted April 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Outcomes	Study Group, n=30	Case-Matched Controls, n=30
Total Adverse Outcomes	10	16
Access Device Occlusion	1	0
Emergency Room Visits	2	2
Unplanned Hospitalization	7	14
- PN-related Hospitalization	3	3
- PN-unrelated Hospitalization	4	11
Total Hospital Admissions	11	20
- Single Hospital Admission	3	8
- Double Hospital Admission	4	5
- Triple Hospital Admission	0	2
Readmission Rate	0.13	0.23
Hospitalization Rate per Patient	0.37	0.67
Total Hospital Length of Stay (LOS) Days	69	153
Average LOS Day	6.27	7.65

Note. Study patients had fewer total adverse outcomes and unplanned hospitalization than case-matched controls. Emergency department use was similar both groups. Study group patients had a lower hospitalization rate, readmission rate, total LOS and average LOS than case-matched controls. Note: LOS = length of stay, PN = parenteral nutrition.

Table 12. Results of modeling outcome variable, rate of adverse events per 90-day period, based on zero-inflated count data.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.06.22273454; this version posted April 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

	Estimate	Std. Error	z value	Pr(>|z|)
(Intercept)	-5.12102	1.56044	-3.282	0.00103 **
Group3	1.26868	0.61553	2.061	0.03929 *
CIRS_Score	0.15350	0.06872	2.234	0.02550 *
X90d_Related_Hosp	1.59514	0.48847	3.266	0.00109 **
X90d_Access_Dev	2.02450	1.40586	1.440	0.14986
X90d_Total_chng	0.02878	0.02795	1.030	0.30308

Note: '**' implies $p < 0.01$ and '*' implies $p < 0.05$.

Figure 1.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.06.22273454; this version posted April 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



Figure 1. Flowsheet of patient selection and participation in the Amerita QIP-PN Study

Figure 2. Correlation Plot

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.06.22273454; this version posted April 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



Figure 2. Correlation plot of Spearman correlation to show relationships of seven count variables in the data file (with only Study and Case Control Group patients). X90d_Events = total 90-day adverse events, X90d_Related_Hosp = 90-day hospitalizations related to therapy, X90d_Unrelated_Hosp = 90-day hospitalizations unrelated to therapy, X90d_Total_Hosp = 90-day total number of hospitalizations, X90d_ED_Visits = 90-day emergency department visits, X90d_Access_Dev = 90-day access device complications.

Figure 3. Boxplot of VAS scores

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.06.22273454; this version posted April 16, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



Figure 3. Boxplot representation of QOL EQ-5D 3L VAS scores before and after phase 3. QOL = quality of life, EQ-5D 3L = Euroquol 5 dimension, 3 level quality of life index, VAS = visual analog scale