

# iCAHE JC Critical Appraisal Summary

## Journal Club Details

---

<b>Journal Club location</b>	Repatriation General Hospital
<b>JC Facilitator</b>	Caroline Bartle
<b>JC Discipline</b>	Dietetics

## Background

Literature that shows energy and protein requirements for adults with cachexia

## Article/Paper

Van Dijk et al. (2015). Effects of oral meal feeding on whole body protein breakdown and protein synthesis in cachectic pancreatic cancer patients. *Journal of Cachexia, Sarcopenia and Muscle*; 6: 212–221

*Please note: due to copyright regulations CAHE is unable to supply a copy of the critically appraised paper/article. If you are an employee of the South Australian government you can obtain a copy of articles from the [DOHSA librarian](#).*

**Article Methodology:** Case Control

Click [here](#) to access critical appraisal tool



University of  
South Australia

International Centre for  
Allied Health Evidence

iCAHE

A member of the Sansom Institute

Ques No.	Yes	Can't Tell	No	Comments
1	✓			<p><b>Did the study address a clearly focused issue?</b></p> <p>This study aimed to investigate the effect of protein meal feeding on whole body protein turnover, protein synthesis, and protein breakdown in cachectic pancreatic cancer patients compared with non-oncologic surgical control patients by using established methods of primed continuous infusions of stable isotope-labelled amino acids.</p>
2	✓			<p><b>Did the authors use an appropriate method to answer their question?</b></p> <p>A matched case-control study design was used. Given the aims of this study this was an appropriate design.</p> <p><b>Is it worth continuing?</b> Yes</p>
3		✓		<p><b>Were the cases recruited in an acceptable way?</b></p> <p>No information on case subject recruitment was reported.</p>
4		✓		<p><b>Were the controls selected in an acceptable way?</b></p> <p>Limited information was provided on the recruitment of controls.</p>
5	✓			<p><b>Was the exposure accurately measured to minimise bias?</b></p> <p>The study protocol for the exposure was very accurately administered to both the subjects and controls.</p>
6		✓		<p><b>What confounding factors have the authors accounted for?</b></p> <p>No confounders were reported.</p> <p><b>Have the authors taken account of the potential confounding factors in the design and/or in their analysis?</b></p> <p>Discuss this in your Journal Club</p>

**CONTACTS**

www.unisa.edu.au/cahe  
iCAHE@unisa.edu.au  
Telephone: +61 8 830 22099  
Fax: +61 8 830 22853

University of South Australia  
GPO Box 2471  
Adelaide SA 5001  
Australia

CRICOS Provider Number  
00121B



University of  
South Australia

International Centre for  
Allied Health Evidence

iCAHE

A member of the Sansom Institute

7			<p><b>What are the results of this study?</b></p> <p>Baseline protein breakdown and protein synthesis were higher in cachectic patients compared with the controls (breakdown: 67.1 (48.1–79.6) vs. 45.8 (42.6–46.3) <math>\mu\text{mol/kg}</math> lean body mass/h, <math>P = 0.049</math>; and synthesis: 63.0 (44.3–75.6) vs. 41.8 (37.6–42.5) <math>\mu\text{mol/kg}</math> lean body mass/h, <math>P = 0.021</math>). During feeding, protein breakdown decreased significantly to 45.5 (26.9–51.1) <math>\mu\text{mol/kg}</math> lean body mass/h (<math>P = 0.012</math>) in the cachexia group and to 33.7 (17.4–37.1) <math>\mu\text{mol/kg}</math> lean body mass/h (<math>P = 0.018</math>) in the control group. Protein synthesis was not affected by feeding in cachectic patients: 58.4 (46.5–76.1) <math>\mu\text{mol/kg}</math> lean body mass/h, but was stimulated in controls: 47.9 (41.8–56.7) <math>\mu\text{mol/kg}</math> lean body mass/h (<math>P = 0.018</math>). Both groups showed a comparable positive net protein balance during feeding: cachexia: 19.7 (13.1–23.7) and control: 16.3 (13.6–25.4) <math>\mu\text{mol/kg}</math> lean body mass/h (<math>P = 0.908</math>).</p>
8			<p><b>How precise are the results?</b></p> <p>Not reported</p>
9	Discuss this in your Journal Club		<p><b>Do you believe the results?</b></p>
10			<p><b>What do the study findings mean to practice (i.e. clinical practice, systems or processes)?</b></p>
11			<p><b>What are your next steps? (e.g. evaluate clinical practice against evidence-based recommendations; organise the next four journal club meetings around this topic to build the evidence base; organize training for staff, etc.)</b></p>
12			<p><b>What is required to implement these next steps?</b></p>

**CONTACTS**

www.unisa.edu.au/cahe  
iCAHE@unisa.edu.au  
Telephone: +61 8 830 22099  
Fax: +61 8 830 22853

University of South Australia  
GPO Box 2471  
Adelaide SA 5001  
Australia

CRICOS Provider Number  
00121B



University of  
South Australia

International Centre for  
Allied Health Evidence

iCAHE

A member of the Sansom Institute