Trauma Surgery & Acute Care Open

Stressing over ulcer prophylaxis in the neurocritical trauma patient

Gena V Topper,¹ Purvi Pravinchandra Patel 💿 ,² Tanya Egodage 💿 ³

To cite: Topper GV, Patel PP, Egodage T. Stressing over ulcer prophylaxis in the neurocritical trauma patient. *Trauma Surg Acute Care Open* 2024;**9**:e001418. doi:10.1136/ tsaco-2024-001418



► http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/ tsaco-2023-001285

© Author(s) (or their employer(s)) 2024. Re-use permitted under CC BY-NC. No commercial re-use. See rights and permissions. Published by BMJ.

¹Department of Surgery, Cooper University Hospital, Camden, New Jersey, USA ²Division of Trauma, Surgical Critical Care & Burns, Department of Surgery, Loyola University Medical Center, Maywood, Illinois, USA ³Division of Trauma, Surgical Critical Care and Acute Care Surgery, Department of Surgery, Cooper University Hospital, Camden, NJ, USA

Correspondence to

Dr Tanya Egodage; egodagetanya@cooperhealth.edu Critically ill patients, particularly those with traumatic brain injury (TBI) or spinal cord injury (SCI) are at high risk for stress ulcer formation.^{1 2} Treatment algorithms have been developed to guide stress ulcer prophylaxis (SUP), yet data regarding optimal agent, duration, and risks demonstrate conflicting results.^{2–5} McGraw and colleagues retrospectively evaluated outcomes in critically ill patients with TBI and SCI at six institutions in an attempt to elucidate optimal SUP treatment protocols.⁶

The authors found that the majority of patients received SUP, generally with histamine receptor antagonists. Those receiving SUP demonstrated longer hospital and intensive care stays. Notably, clinically significant gastrointestinal bleeding (CSGIB) was rare, occurring exclusively in patients with severe TBI (Glasgow Coma Scale <9), and with increased incidence in older patients. Furthermore, there was no statistically significant difference between the rate of CSGIB with those receiving SUP versus those who did not, although a trend towards significance was noted. However, SUP did reduce CSGIB for those with severe TBI. No difference was noted in CSGIB between patients receiving enteral feeds versus those who did not, nor between TBI and SCI patients. In those with severe TBI, SUP was also associated with greater all-cause and ventilatorassociated pneumonia. Interestingly, Helicobacter pylori infection was not identified in any patient.

Prior literature demonstrated an incidence of stress ulcers up to 17% in patients with TBI.7 McGraw et al indicate that this number, and the incidence of CSGIB, may be far less. This is important in that hemodynamic changes and drops in hemoglobin may alter brain tissue oxygenation and worsen ischemia. Current guidelines broadly recommend prophylaxis for all patients sustaining TBI.6 Many studies, including McGraw et al, note that CSGIB occurs primarily in those with more severe TBI.3 4 The authors demonstrate that older patients show increased benefit from SUP, suggesting increased vigilance in this vulnerable population. They also question the protective effect of enteral feeding, although additional granular data are required to make a conclusion.

Despite the implications for practice, the authors were neither able to capture the duration or quantity of enteral feeding nor establish a causal relationship between SUP and pneumonia. They astutely identify no difference in antithrombotic use between the SUP and non-SUP groups, however, thrombocytopenia, shock, and pre-existing liver disease may confound ulcer formation and should be further investigated. Moreover, the agent of choice and duration of therapy remain undefined.

The authors add valuable data to the literature, and highlight the need for further study of SUP in neurocritical trauma patients, focusing on older patients and those with severe TBI.

Contributors Commentary design, literature review and writing was conducted by GVT and TE. Review and critical revisions were performed by GVT, PPP and TE.

Funding The authors have not declared a specific grant for this research from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Competing interests None declared.

Patient consent for publication Not applicable.

Ethics approval Not applicable.

Provenance and peer review Commissioned; internally peer reviewed.

Open access This is an open access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited, appropriate credit is given, any changes made indicated, and the use is non-commercial. See: http:// creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/.

ORCID iDs

Purvi Pravinchandra Patel http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6935-6572 Tanya Egodage http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7386-2926

REFERENCES

- Misra UK, Kalita J, Pandey S, Mandal SK. Predictors of gastrointestinal bleeding in acute intracerebral haemorrhage. *J Neurol Sci* 2003;208:25–9.
- 2 Schirmer CM, Kornbluth J, Heilman CB, Bhardwaj A. Gastrointestinal prophylaxis in neurocritical care. *Neurocrit Care* 2012;16:184–93.
- 3 Guillamondegui OD, Gunter O, Bonadies JA, et al. n.d. Practice management guidelines for stress ulcer prophylaxis. *East Assoc Surg Trauma*;2008:1–24.
- 4 Barletta JF, Mangram AJ, Sucher JF, Zach V. Stress ulcer prophylaxis in neurocritical care. *Neurocrit Care* 2018;29:344–57.
- 5 Brophy GM, Brackbill ML, Bidwell KL, Brophy DF. Prospective, randomized comparison of lansoprazole suspension, and intermittent intravenous famotidine on gastric pH and acid production in critically ill neurosurgical patients. *Neurocrit Care* 2010;13:176–81.
- 6 McGraw C, Briscoe A, Reynolds C, Carrick M, Palacio CH, Waswick W, Miller A, Trujillo L, Bar-Or D. Outcomes of patients with traumatic brain injury after stress ulcer prophylaxis: a retrospective multicenter study. *Trauma Surg Acute Care Open* 2024;9:e001285.
- 7 Kamada T, Fusamoto H, Kawano S, Noguchi M, Hiramatsu K, Masuzawa M, et al. Gastrointestinal bleeding following head injury: a clinical study of 433 cases. J Trauma Injury Infection Crit Care 1977;17:44–7.