11.2 Optimal glucose control: Carbohydrate restricted formula + insulin therapy

There are no new randomized controlled trials since the 2015 updates and hence there are no changes to the following summary of evidence.

Question: Does tight blood sugar control result in better outcomes in the critically ill adult patient?

Summary of evidence: There was one level 2 study reviewed that compared a carbohydrate restrictive enteral diet with insulin therapy (to maintain blood sugars <180 mmol/L) vs intensive insulin therapy to maintain blood sugars <150 mmol/L.

Mortality: Based on the single study, carbohydrate restricted formula plus insulin therapy aimed at higher blood sugar range (<180 mmol/L) had no effect on mortality when compared to intensive insulin therapy aimed at a tighter blood sugar of < 150 mmol/L (RR 1.10, 95% CI 0.75, 1.61, p=0.63)*.

Infections and length of stay: Based on the single study, carbohydrate restricted formula plus insulin therapy aimed at higher blood sugar range (<180 mmol/L) when compared to intensive insulin therapy aimed at a tighter blood sugar of < 150 mmol/L had no effect on incidence of pneumonia (RR 0.95, 95% CI 0.67, 1.35, p=0.78)* or ICU length of stay (p=0.9)*.

Hypoglycemia: Based on the single study, carbohydrate restricted formula plus insulin therapy aimed at higher blood sugar range (<180 mmol/L) was associated with a significant decrease in hypoglycemic events when compared to intensive insulin therapy aimed at a tighter blood sugar of < 150 mmol/L (RR 0.22, 95% CI 0.09, 0.52, p<0.001)*.

Conclusions:

1) Carbohydrate restricted formula plus insulin therapy aimed at blood sugar range (<180 mmol/L) vs intensive insulin therapy to maintain blood sugars < 150 mmol/L, has no effect on mortality, incidence of pneumonia or ICU length of stay in critically ill patients.

2) Carbohydrate restricted formula plus insulin therapy aimed at blood sugar range (<180 mmol/L) vs, vs intensive insulin therapy to maintain blood sugars < 150 mmol/L, is associated with a decrease in hypoglycemia in critically ill patients.

*Risk ratio, confidence interval, and p-value calculated using Review Manager 5.1.

Study	Population	Methods (score)	Intervention	Mortality # (%)		Infections # (%)	
1) de Azevedo 2010	Multidisciplinary ICU and trauma ICU N=351	C.Random: no ITT: no Blinding: no (6)	Carbohydrate restrictive EN with insulin therapy (to maintain BG <180) vs intensive insulin therapy (BG <150)	Carb Restriction ICU 42/169 (25)	Intensive Insulin ICU 38/168 (22.6)	Carb Restriction Pneumonia 44/169 (26) UTI 16/169 (9) Surgical 16/169 (9) Catheter-related 8/169 (5)	Intensive Insulin Pneumonia 46/168 (27) UTI 11/168 (7) Surgical 15/168 (9) Catheter-related 10/168 (6)

Table 1. Randomized studies evaluating carbohydrate restricted formula + insulin therapy in critically ill patients

Table 1. Randomized studies evaluating carbohydrate restricted formula + insulin therapy in critically ill patients (continued)

Study	LOS	days	Ventilator days		Other	
1) de Azevedo 2010	Carb Restriction ICU 8 (4-14)	Conventional Insulin ICU 7 (4-15)	Carb Restriction NR	Intensive Insulin NR	Carb Restriction Intensive Insulin Hypoglycemia 6/169 (4) 27/168 (16) Nutritional intake (%) requirement at day 3 80 (89) 97 (92)	
C. Random: concealed randomization ICU: intensive care unit UTI: urinary tract infection		ITT: intent to treat LOS: length of stay		NR: not reported EN: enteral nutrition		

References

Included Articles

1. de Azevedo JRA, de Araujo LO, da Silva WS, de Azevedo RP. A carbohydrate-restrictive strategy is safer and as efficient as intensive insulin therapy in critically ill patients. J Crit Care. 2010;25(1):84-9.

Excluded Articles

No other articles were found for this section