



# Usage Patterns and Clinician-Reported Outcomes of Patients Using a Plant-Based, Organic, Calorically Dense Peptide Formula

---

## **AUTHOR:**

Vanessa Carr<sup>1</sup> MS, RDN, LDN, DCNc

## Abstract

---

### **PURPOSE:**

Interest in plant-based nutrition continues to increase. While research on the benefits of a plant-based diet for the general population is mounting, limited data exists on the use of plant-based formulas for those with a feeding tube. No data exists on the use or outcomes of those using a plant-based peptide formula. While research is mounting on the benefits of a plant-based diet for the general population, limited data exists on the use of plant-based formulas for those with a medical need, including individuals using feeding tubes. No data exists on the usage patterns or outcomes of these patients who are using a plant-based peptide formula.

### **METHODS:**

To better understand usage patterns of those with a medical need for nutritional formula, primary diagnosis and method of administration from 244 de-identified prescriptions (issued from April through September 2018) were collected on pediatric and adult patients who had been prescribed a plant-based, organic, calorically dense peptide formula (Kate Farms® Peptide 1.5 or Pediatric Peptide 1.5).

A separate national electronic survey was conducted in April 2018 and sent to 1011 healthcare professionals. Data on reported patient outcomes was collected from 92 eligible\* healthcare professionals who recommended one of the above formulas.

*\*Eligible respondents were healthcare professionals who recommend commercial formula for oral or tube feeding and have recommended one of the above formulas in at least one patient over the last year.*

### **RESULTS:**

The four primary diagnoses of patients using a plant-based, organic, calorically dense peptide formula is shown below:

Cancer (n=50), Dysphasia (n=24), Malnutrition (n=19), Gastroparesis (n=18)

Method of administration differed by medical diagnosis. Patients diagnosed with dysphasia, cancer or gastroparesis had the highest reported usage of the formula via feeding tube (91.6%, 85.4% and 90%, respectively).

A total of 38% of patients who had been prescribed the formula used the formula by mouth. The highest reported use for the formula by mouth was by those diagnosed with malnutrition (84%).

In the national survey of healthcare professionals (Registered Dietitians [N=71], Physicians [N=11], Registered Nurses [N=6], and not specified [N=4]), primary reasons cited for prescribing a plant-based, organic, calorically dense peptide formula included product ingredient profile and management of food allergy or intolerance (Table 1).

The majority of clinicians (95%) surveyed described positive outcomes in their patients using the plant-based peptide formula. Reported positive outcomes included:

- Decreased gastrointestinal (GI) symptoms of intolerance\*
- Weight gain or linear growth
- Improved nutritional status

A total of 87% of clinicians who prescribed the formula to a patient with symptoms of GI intolerance reported that most or all of their patients experienced improved symptoms of GI intolerance after using the formula.

*\*GI symptoms of intolerance: vomiting, gagging and/or retching, bloating, abdominal pain, diarrhea, constipation.*

### CONCLUSIONS:

This is the first data, to the authors' knowledge, that describes usage patterns and outcomes of patients using a calorically dense plant-based formula. The clinical outcomes reported by healthcare professionals suggest that this type of formula may support improved outcomes for patients using the formula via tube feeding or as an oral nutrition supplement. The usage patterns suggest that the formula can be used for a variety of patients with a wide range of medical diagnoses and methods of administration (tube feeding and oral). Additional further research is needed in the form of a randomized, controlled trial to better understand the clinical impact of a plant-based peptide formula.

**TABLE 1:**

Reasons for Prescribing (Select all that apply)	%	N
Plant-based	77.01	67
Food allergy or intolerance	64.37	56
Organic, non-GMO	58.62	51
Taste profile	35.63	31
Covered by insurance	29.89	26
Inadequate growth on previous formula	28.74	25
Other (please specify)*	18.39	16
Viscosity	11.49	10

*\*Some examples: gluten and dairy free; patient interest to avoid high fructose high corn syrup; ideal ingredient list; high caloric and high protein content of peptide; no carrageenan; 1.5 kcal/mL; better tolerated than standard formula; failure with blenderized formulas; improved diarrhea; improved pro/kcal malnutrition.*

Carr, V. (2019). Usage Patterns and Clinician-Reported Outcomes of Patients Using a Plant-Based, Organic, Calorically Dense Peptide Formula [Abstract]. *ASPEN Nutrition Science & Practice Conference Supplement.*, 43(3).