

iCAHE JC Critical Appraisal Summary

Journal Club Details

Journal Club	Royal Hobart Hospital
JC Facilitator	Kristine Fulton and Sarah Florisson
JC Discipline	Speech Pathology

Clinical Scenario

In people with motor neuron disease, what effect does the time of insertion of PEG has on quality of life?

Review Question/PICO/PECO

- P adults with motor neuron disease
- E PEG insertion (time)
- C other time
- O quality of life

Article/Paper

Katzberg HD & Benatar M (2011) Enteral tube feeding for amyotrophic lateral sclerosis/motor neuron disease. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, Issue 1. No.:CD004030.

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: Systematic Review

Journal club meeting on: 4 April 2011



University of
South Australia

iCAHE

International Centre for
Allied Health Evidence

A member of the Sansom Institute

CONTACTS

www.unisa.edu.au/cahe
 karen.grimmer-somers
 @unisa.edu.au
 Telephone (08) 8302 2769
 Facsimile (08) 8302 2766

University of South Australia
 GPO Box 2471
 Adelaide SA 5001
 Australia

CRICOS Provider Number
 001218



iCAHE

University of South Australia | International Centre for Allied Health Evidence

A member of the Sansom Institute

Ques No.	Yes	Can't Tell	No	Comments
1	✓			<p>Did the review ask a clearly-focused question?</p> <p>Yes it did.</p> <p><i>Population:</i> Patients who were diagnosed with definite, possible or probable amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, according to the El Escorial (or revised version) criteria <i>Intervention:</i> placement of PEG or other form of feeding tube at any time during the course of the condition <i>Outcome:</i> Primary-survival time; secondary-nutritional status, quality of life, safety of PEG</p>
2	✓			<p>Did the review include the right type of study?</p> <p>The researchers would have included randomised or quasi randomised controlled trials. Since no such studies were found, they opted to discuss the available prospective and retrospective controlled studies relevant to the question in the background and discussion section.</p> <p>Is it worth continuing? YES</p>
3	✓			<p>Did the reviewers try to identify all relevant studies?</p> <p>A range of electronic databases was searched, including Cochrane Neuromuscular Disease Group Specialised Register, MEDLINE, and EMBASE. Personal communication was made and references of relevant articles were checked for additional studies.</p>
4		NA		<p>Did the reviewers assess the quality of the included studies?</p> <p>The authors would have done critical appraisal of the included studies but since they did not find RCTs/quasi-randomised, controlled trials, no assessment was carried out.</p> <p>It would have been ideal if the quality of the lower level evidence (such as those included in this review) was appraised. However, with Cochrane reviews, only evidence from RCTs and controlled clinical trials are considered.</p>
5		NA		<p>If the results of the studies have been combined, was it reasonable to do so?</p> <p>A narrative summary of results for each outcome was presented.</p>

6			<p>How are the results presented and what is the main result?</p> <p>The results are presented using tables and narrative summaries.</p> <p><i>Bottom line results</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The best available evidence (in this case, from prospective and retrospective studies) suggests a benefit from enteral feeding in terms of survival and nutritional outcomes. The effect of enteral feeding on quality of life has not been shown. Timing of PEG insertion has not been well-studied, and therefore the best time for PEG placement cannot be determined based on research evidence.
7		✓	<p>How precise are these results?</p> <p>Precision of results could not be determined based on the analysis done in this systematic review.</p>
8	Journal Club to answer		<p>Can the results be applied to the local population?</p> <p>Were all important outcomes considered?</p> <p>Should policy or practice change as a result of the evidence contained in this review?</p>

CONTACTS
www.unisa.edu.au/cahe
karen.grimmer-somers@unisa.edu.au
 Telephone (08) 8302 2769
 Facsimile (08) 8302 2766

University of South Australia
 GPO Box 2471
 Adelaide SA 5001
 Australia

CRICOS Provider Number
 001218



University of South Australia



International Centre for Allied Health Evidence

A member of the Sansom Institute