9.2a Composition of Parenteral Nutrition: Glutamine Supplementation

Question: Compared to standard parenteral nutrition (PN), does glutamine-supplemented PN result in improved clinical outcomes in critically ill patients?

Summary of Evidence: There were 33 studies on IV glutamine supplementation included that were done in ICU patients ranging from pancreatitis, trauma, burns to sepsis. While in majority of the studies the intervention and control groups received parenteral nutrition/amino acids progressing to enteral nutrition, in three studies patients only received enteral nutrition (Palmese 2006, Ozgultekin 2008, and Eroglu 2009). In one study, the dosage of glutamine was questionably lower than the other studies (0.002 gm/kg/day, Yang 2007), while another only reported on data from a subgroup (Goeters 2002), hence these were not included in the meta-analyses. Additionally, we explored the effect of glutamine in trials where IV glutamine was given to patients who primarily were given EN vs. where the IV glutamine was given in the context of PN. Finally, we explored the treatment effect observed in multi-center trials compared to single center trials.¹

Overall Mortality: Of the 30 studies that reported mortality, when the data from the 28 studies were aggregated, IV glutamine supplementation was associated with a trend towards a reduction in overall mortality (RR 0.87, 95% CI 0.75, 1.01, p =0.06, heterogeneity I²=0%; figure 1) in patients on EN or PN. The following subgroup analyses were done:

EN vs PN: In the studies in which patients received IV glutamine plus PN, glutamine supplementation was associated with a trend in the reduction in overall mortality (RR 0.86, 95% CI 0.73, 1.01, p=0.07, heterogeneity I²=0%; figure 1). When the studies in which patients received IV glutamine and enteral nutrition (Palmese 2006, Luo 2008, Ozgultekin 2008, Eroglu 2009, Wischmeyer 2001) were aggregated, glutamine supplementation had no effect on overall mortality (RR 0.89, 95% CI 0.58, 1.38, p=0.61, heterogeneity I²=0%; figure 1). The test for subgroup differences was not significant (p=0.88).

Single vs Multi Centre: In the 22 studies that were completed at a single centre, IV glutamine supplementation was associated with a significant reduction in overall mortality (RR 0.74, 95% CI 0.60, 0.92, p=0.006, heterogeneity I²=0%; figure 2). In the 6 multi-centre studies, IV glutamine supplementation had no effect (RR 1.00, 95% CI 0.81, 1.23, p=0.98, heterogeneity I²=0%; figure 2). Therefore, the signal towards reduced overall mortality in the glutamine supplemented group may be driven by the single centre studies. There was a trend in subgroup differences (p=0.05).

¹ We have explored the effects of free glutamine vs. dipeptides and isonitrogenous vs. non isonitrogenous feeding on outcomes but no differences were found and we have not included these data in this report. Data available upon request.

Hospital Mortality: In the 16 studies that reported hospital mortality, a significant reduction in hospital mortality was seen when the data were aggregated (RR 0.69, 95% CI 0.52, 0.90, p=0.007, heterogeneity I²=0%; figure 3). The following subgroup analyses were done:
 EN vs. PN: IV glutamine supplementation in the PN based studies was associated with a significant reduction in hospital mortality (RR 0.70. 95% CI 0.53, 0.92, p=0.01, test for heterogeneity I²=0%; figure 3). Only one of the two EN based trials had any deaths and there was no effect on mortality (RR 0.29, 95% CI 0.04, 2.27, p=0.24, figure 3). The test for subgroup differences was not significant (p=0.41).

Single vs Multi Centre: In the 13 studies that were completed at a single centre, IV glutamine supplementation was associated with a significant reduction in hospital mortality (RR 0.65, 95% CI 0.48, 0.89, p=0.006, heterogeneity I²=0%; figure 4). In the 3 multi-centre studies, IV glutamine supplementation had no effect (RR 0.85, 95% CI 0.46, 1.55, P=0.59, heterogeneity I²=0%; figure 4). Therefore, the signal towards reduced hospital mortality in the glutamine supplemented group may be driven by the single centre studies. The test for subgroup differences was not significant (p=0.45).

Infections: When the 17 studies which reported infectious complications were aggregated, glutamine supplementation was associated with a trend towards a reduction in infectious complications (RR 0.89, 95% CI 0.79, 1.01, p=0.08, heterogeneity $I^2 = 27\%$; figure 5). The following subgroup analyses were explored:

EN vs. PN: For the subgroup of studies in which patients received IV glutamine plus PN, glutamine supplementation had no effect on infectious complications (RR 0.91, 95% CI 0.79, 1.04, p=0.18, heterogeneity $I^2 = 33\%$; figure 5). However, for the subgroup of studies in which patients received IV glutamine and were on enteral nutrition (Palmese 2006, Eroglu 2009. Wischmeyer 2001), glutamine supplementation was associated with a trend towards a reduction in infectious complications (RR 0.75, 95% CI 0.53, 1.06, p=0.11, heterogeneity $I^2=0\%$; figure 5). The test for subgroup differences was not significant (p=0.32).

Single vs Multi Centre: In the 12 studies that were completed at a single centre, IV glutamine supplementation was associated with a significant reduction in infections (RR 0.81, 95% CI 0.68, 0.96, p=0.01, heterogeneity I²=10%; figure 6). In the 5 multi-centre studies, IV glutamine supplementation had no effect (RR 0.99, 95% CI 0.84, 1.17, p=0.92, heterogeneity I²=34%; figure 6). Therefore, the signal towards reduced hospital mortality in the glutamine supplemented group may be driven by the single centre studies. The test for subgroup differences was consistent with a trend (p=0.09).

Pneumonia: When the 8 studies which reported pneumonia were aggregated, overall glutamine supplementation showed a trend towards a reduction (RR 0.83, 95% CI 0.64, 1.08, p=0.17, heterogeneity I²=0%; figure 7). The following subgroup analyses were explored:

EN vs. PN: Glutamine supplementation had no effect on pneumonia in PN fed patients (RR 0.86, 95% CI 0.66, 1.11, p=0.25, heterogeneity I²=0%; figure 7) or EN fed patients (RR 0.44, 95% CI 0.11, 1.67, p=0.23, heterogeneity I²=0%; figure 7). The test for subgroup differences was not significant (p=0.33).

Single vs Multi Centre: IV glutamine supplementation had no effect on pneumonia in the single centre trials (RR 0.83, 95% CI 0.57, 1.22, p=0.34, heterogeneity I²=0%; figure 8) or multicentre trials (RR 0.81, 95% CI 0.50, 1.29, p=0.37, heterogeneity I²=39%; figure 8). The test for subgroup differences was not significant (p=0.92).

ICU LOS: Fifteen studies reported ICU length of stay as a mean ± standard deviation and when the studies were aggregated, glutamine supplementation was associated with a significant reduction in ICU LOS (WMD -2.10, 95% CI -4.10,-0.11, p=0.04, heterogeneity I²=91%; figure 9). The following subgroup analyses were explored:

EN vs. PN: Glutamine supplementation was associated with a trend towards a reduction in ICU LOS for the subgroup of studies in which patients received IV glutamine plus PN (WMD -2.60, 95% CI -5.59, 0.39, p=0.09, heterogeneity I²=88%; figure 9) but had no effect in patients on EN (WMD -0.47, 95% CI -1.84, 0.90, p=0.50, heterogeneity I²= 68%; figure 9). The test for subgroup differences was not significant (p=0.21).

Single vs Multi Centre: There were 12 single centre studies that reported ICU LOS and when statistically aggregated, they showed a significant reduction in ICU LOS (WMD -2.60, 95% CI -4.65, -0.54, p=0.01, heterogeneity I²=91%; figure 10). Only 1 multicentre study reported on ICU LOS as mean ± standard deviation (Zeigler 2013) and suggested a trend towards increased ICU LOS (WMD 3.90, -0.10, 7.90, p=0.06; figure 10). The test for subgroup differences was significant (p=0.005).

Hospital LOS: When the 12 studies that reported hospital length of stay as a mean ± standard deviation were aggregated, glutamine supplementation was associated with a significant reduction in hospital LOS (WMD -2.72, 95% CI -4.31, -1.13, p=0.0008, heterogeneity I^{2 =} 62%; figure 11). The following subgroup analyses were explored:

EN vs. PN: Only one of the 6 studies in which patients only received enteral nutrition reported on hospital LOS and showed no effect of glutamine supplementation (RR 0.00, 95% CI -7.36, 7.36, p=1.0; figure 11). IV glutamine supplementation was associated with a significant reduction in hospital LOS when the data from the PN based studies were aggregated (RR -2.83, 95% CI -4.47, -1.18, p=0.0008, test for heterogeneity I²=65%; figure 11). Test for subgroup differences was not significant (p=0.46). **Single vs Multi Centre:** There were 11 single centre studies that reported hospital LOS and when statistically aggregated, they showed a significant reduction in hospital LOS (WMD -2.95, 95% CI -4.54, -1.37, p=0.0003, heterogeneity I²=63%; figure 12). Only 1 multicentre study reported on hospital LOS as mean ± standard deviation (Zeigler 2013) and glutamine supplementation had no effect on hospital LOS (WMD 3.90, -3.98, 11.78, p=0.33; figure 12). The test for subgroup differences was p=0.09.

Mechanical Ventilation: When the data from the 11 studies that reported on mechanical ventilation were aggregated, glutamine supplementation was associated with a significant reduction in the duration (WMD -2.16, 95% CI -3.89, -0.43, p=0.01, test for heterogeneity $1^2 = 86\%$; figure 13). The following subgroup analyses were explored:

EN vs. PN: IV glutamine supplementation was associated with trend towards a reduction in mechanical ventilation duration in the studies in which patients were fed via PN (WMD -3.10, 95% CI -6.32, 0.11, p=0.06, test for heterogeneity I² =86%; figure 13). IV glutamine supplementation had no effect on mechanical ventilation in the studies of EN fed patients (WMD -0.46, 95% CI -1.94, 1.03, p=0.55, test for heterogeneity I² =76%; figure 13). There was a trend towards a difference between the subgroups (p=0.14).

Single vs Multi Centre: None of the 11 studies that reported on mechanical ventilation were multicentre, hence a subgroup analysis was not done.

Quality of Life: Powell Tuck et al asked patients about their perceived morbidity and quality of life at entry in the trial and when PN stopped. Though all modalities improved within each group (p<0.0001), there was no statistical difference between groups. Andrews et al completed the SF-12 physical and mental composite scale score and the EQ-5D instrument at 3 and 6 months with survivors and found no significant different between scores.

Conclusions:

1) IV glutamine supplementation may be associated with a reduction in overall mortality, infectious complications, ICU and hospital length of stay but the observed treatment effect is observed exclusively in small, single center studies.

2)There is no difference between IV glutamine supplementation given as free glutamine vs dipeptides or isonitrogenous vs. non isonitrogenous feeding.

3) IV glutamine supplementation has no effect on quality of life in the critically ill.

Level 1 study: if all of the following are fulfilled: concealed randomization, blinded outcome adjudication and an intention to treat analysis. Level 2 study: If any one of the above characteristics are unfulfilled

Study	Dopulation	Methods	Intervention	Mortality # (%)†	Infections # (%)‡	Length of stay (days)	Length of Ventilation
Study	Population	(score)	Dose of Lglutamine gm/kg/day	Experimental vs. Control	Experimental vs. Control	Experimental vs. Control	(days) Experimental vs. Control
1) Griffiths 1997 & 2002	Single-centre, mixed ICU patients N=84	C.Random: yes ITT: yes Blinding: double (11)	PN and 0.26 IV L- glutamine vs. PN Isocaloric, isonitrogenous	Hospital 18/42(43) vs. 25/42(60)	28/42 (67) vs. 26/42 (62)	ICU 10.5 (6-19)* vs. 10.5 (6-24)*	NR
2) Powell-Tuck 1999	Single-centre, mixed ICU/hospital patients N=168	C.Random: yes ITT: yes Blinding: double (8)	0.26 IV free glutamine mixed into PN vs. PN, isocaloric, non-isonitrogenous.	Hospital 14/83(17) vs. 20/85(24)	NR	Hospital 43.4 ± 34.1 (83) vs. 48.9 ± 38.4 (85)	NR
3) Wischmeyer 2001	Single-centre, critically ill burns N=31	Random: not sure ITT: no Blinding double (8)	0.57 IV L-glutamine and EN or EN+PN vs. AAcids + PN or EN or EN+PN Non isonitrogenous, isocaloric	Hospital 1/12 (8) vs. 4/14 (29)	7/12 (58) vs. 9/14 (64)	Hospital 40 ± 10 (12) vs. 40 ± 9 (14)	NR
4) Goeters 2002*	Single-centre, surgical ICU patients N=68	C.Random: not sure ITT: no Blinding: no	0.2 IV L-alanyl-L- glutamine + PN or EN or EN+PN vs PN or EN or EN+PN. Non-isonitrogenous.	ICU 7/33 (21)* vs.10/35 (29)* 30-day 7/33 (21)* vs. 11/35 (31)* 6-month 11/33 (33)* vs. 21/35 (60)*	NR	ICU (avg) 21.3 ± 13.5 (33)* vs. 20.8 ± 9.1 (35)* Hospital (avg) 46 ± 49.1 (33)* vs. 39.4 ± 31.1 (35)*	NR

Table 1. Randomized studies evaluating glutamine (PN) in critically ill patients

5) Carrol 2004	Single center, N=19	C. Random: no ITT: yes Blinding: no (9)	PN with IV gln (L- glutamine 0.4 g/kg/d) vs standard PN. Isocaloric, non- isonitrogenous.	Hospital 0/7 vs. 0/7 ICU 0/7 vs. 0/7	NR	NR	NR
6) Fuentes- Oroczo 2004	Single-centre, secondary peritonitis requiring TPN N=33	C.Random: yes ITT: yes Blinding: double (11)	PN with added 0.27 L-alanyl-L-glutamine vs. PN, isocaloric, isonitrogenous	Hospital 2/17 (12) vs.3/16 (19)	4/17 (23) vs. 12/16 (75)	$\begin{tabular}{l} \label{eq:loss} $ & $ ICU \\ $ 7.2 \pm 9.2 (17) $ vs. $ 7.3 \pm 4.5 (16) $ \\ $ & $ Hospital $ \\ $ 16.5 \pm 8.9 (17) $ vs. $ 16.7 \pm 7 (16) $ \\ \end{tabular}$	4.88 ± 8.2 (17) vs. 4.47 ± 4.4 (16)
7) Zhou 2004	Single-centre Severe burns N=30	C.Random: yes ITT: yes Blinding: double (11)	0.35 IV glutamine (given as 0.5 g/kg/d L-alanyl-L- glutamine) + PN vs. PN, isocaloric, isonitrogenous.	NR	3/15 (20) vs. 4/15 (26)	Hospital 42 ± 7.0 (15) vs. 46 ± 6.6 (15)	NR
8) Xian-Li 2004	Single-centre, severe acute pancreatitis N=69	C.Random: yes ITT: no Blinding: no (5)	0.4 IV L-alanyl-L- glutamine + PN vs. PN. Nonisonitrogenous	Hospital 0/20 (0) vs. 3/21 (14)	# Complications 4/20 vs. 11/21	Hospital 25.3 \pm 7.6 (20) vs. 28.6 \pm 6.9 (21)	NR
9) Dechelotte 2006	Multi-centre, Multiple trauma, surgery,sepsis, pancreatitis from 16 ICUs N=114	C.Random: NR ITT: yes Blinding: double (N/A)	0.35 IV glutamine (given as 0.5 g/kg/d L-alanyl-L- glutamine) + PN vs. PN + L-alanine and L-proline. isocaloric, isonitrogenous.	Hospital 2/58 (3) vs. 2/56 (3) 6-month 16/58 (28) vs. 9/56 (16)	All 23/58 (40) vs. 32/56 (58) Pneumonia 10/58 (17) vs. 19/56 (34)	ICU 12.5 (1-430) vs. 11.5 (3-121) Hospital 30 (1-560) vs. 26 (4-407)	NR
10) Palmese 2006	Single-centre, mixed ICU N=84	C.Random: yes ITT: yes Blinding: outcomes assessors (10)	0.14 IV free glutamine + EN with FOS vs. EN without FOS. Unable to tell if isonitrogenous with glutamine.	ICU 6/42 (14) vs. 8/42 (19)	All 13/42 (31) vs. 21/42 (50) Pneumonia 2/42 (5) vs. 6/42 (14)	ICU 12 ± 4.6 (42) vs. 13 ± 3.4 (42)	6 ±1.7 (42) vs. 5 ±2.5 (42)

11) Tian 2006	Single-centre, MODS N=40	C.Random: not sure ITT: yes Blinding: no (6)	PN + 0.27 IV glutamine (given as 0.4 g/kg/d L-alanyl- L-glutamine) vs PN. Nonisonitrogenous.	Unspecified 2/20 (10) vs.5/20 (25)	NR	NR	NR
12) Sahin 2007	Single-centre, acute pancreatitis N=40	C.Random: not sure ITT: yes Blinding: not sure (9)	0.3 L-alanyl-L- glutamine PN vs. PN, Non- isonitrogenous.	Hospital 2/20 (10) vs.6/20 (30)	NR	Hospital 14.2 ± 4.4 (20) vs. 16.4 ± 3.9 (20)	NR
13) Yang 2007α	Single-centre, Brain injury Neurosurgical ICU N=46	C.Random: not sure ITT: yes Blinding: no (6)	0.002 IV glutamine dipeptide + PN vs. PN. Unable to tell if isonitrogenous.	Hospital 5/23 (22) vs.9/23 (39)	NR	ICU 10 ± 3.5 (23) vs. 18 ± 5.6 (23)	NR
14) Zhang 2007	Single centre Emergency and neurosurgical ICU, pts requiring PN for >7 days N=44	C.Random: not sure ITT: yes Blinding: no (6)	EN and PN + IV glutamine (Chinese article, unable to tell) 0.4 g/kg/day vs EN and PN alone. Unable to tell if isonitrogenous	NR	NR	ICU 11.73 ±6.57 (22) vs. 13.39 ±5.08 (22)	5.27±1.78 (22) vs. 7.18 ±2.76 (22)
15) Cai 2008	Single-centre, elderly, severe sepsis N=110	C.Random: not sure ITT: yes Blinding: no (10)	PN or PN & EN with 0.19 IV L-alanyl-L- glutamine (10 g/d) Patients received vs PN or EN + PN non- isonitrogenous	28-day 17/55 (31) vs. 20/55 (36)	NR	ICU 22.1 \pm 4.9 (55) vs. 23.8 \pm 5.1 (55)	15.6±5.7 (55) vs. 17.2±5.9 (55)
16) Duska 2008 ∂	Single-centre, trauma N=30	C.Random: not sure ITT: yes Blinding: HCPs (8)	EN or EN & PN + 0.3 IV L-alanyl- Lglutamine vs. EN or EN+PN w normal saline + non-isonitrogenous	ICU 2/10 (20) vs.0/10 (0)	NR	ICU 23 (median) vs. 24 (median)	NR

17) Estivariz 2008	Single-centre, pancreatic and non pancreatic surgery N=63	C.Random: not sure ITT: no** Blinding: double (9)	0.5 L-alanyl-L- glutamine containing PN vs. Glutamine- free PN. isocaloric, isonitrogenous	Hospital 1/32 (3) vs. 6/31 (19)	Pneumonia 13/30 (43) vs. 16/29 (55)	ICU $12 \pm 2 (32)$ vs. $23 \pm 6 (31)$ Hospital $20 \pm 2 (32)$ vs. $30 \pm 6 (31)$	9±2 (15) vs.21±5 (12)
18) Fuentes- Oroczo 2008	Single-centre, Acute pancreatitis requiring admission N=44	C.Random: not sure ITT: yes Blinding: double (12)	0.4 g/kg/d L-alanyl- L-glutamine in PN vs. PN isocaloric, isonitrogenous	ICU 2/22 (9) vs. 5/22 (23)	9/22 (41) vs. 16/22 (73)	ICU 11 ± 11.7 (22) vs. 11.14 ± 7.41 (22) Hospital 30.18 ± 10.42 (22) vs. 26.59 ± 13.3 (22)	NR
19) Luo 2008***	Single-centre, medical surgical N=44	C.Random: not sure ITT: no Blinding: double (9)	0.50 g/kg/d IV L- alanyl-L-glutamine + EN vs. IV 15% Clinisol (placebo) +EN isocaloric, isonitrogenous	Hospital 0/11 (0) vs.0/9 (0)	NR	ICU 7.6 ± 0.7 (14) vs. 6.9 ± 0.9 (9)	5±1 (14) vs. 6±1 (9)
20) Perez- Barcena 2008	Single-centre, mixed ICU N=30	C.Random: not sure ITT: yes Blinding: outcomes assessors (10)	0.35 IV gln (given as 0.5 g/kg/d L-alanyl- L-glutamine) + PN vs. PN isocaloric, isonitrogenous	Hospital 3/15 (20) vs. 0/15 (0)	11/15 (73) vs. 13/15 (87)	ICU 22.9 \pm 20.6 (15) vs. 20.5 \pm 16.0 (15) Hospital 35.5 \pm 33.6 (15) vs. 42.9 \pm 28.8 (15)	14±10 (15) vs. 14±10 (15)
21) Ozgultekin 2008	Single-centre, CHI & GCS pts, ventilated, sedated, mean APACHE II 18-19 N=60	C.Random: not sure ITT: no Blinding: none (4)	EN + 0.2-0.4g/kg/d IV gln (given as 20 g L-alanyl-L- glutamine) vs. EN. Nonisonitrogenous	30-day 12/20 (60) vs. 12/20 (60)	NR	ICU 11.8 ± 5.9 (20) vs. 17.3 ± 16.4 (20)	10.1±4.4 (20) vs. 14.4 ±14 (20)

22) Yang 2008	Single-centre, severe pancreatitis N=61	C.Random: not sure ITT: no Blinding: single (4)	PN + IV L-alanyl-L- glutamine (dose unknown) vs PN + saline (Chinese article, unable to get further info)	Hospital 1/25 (4) vs. 3/25 (12)	NR	Hospital 13.48 ± 1.42 (25) vs. 15.18 ± 1.14 (25)	NR
23) Eroglu 2009	Single-centre, severe trauma, ISS>20 N=40	C.Random: yes ITT: yes Blinding: double (12)	EN + 0.5 g/kg/d IV L-alanyl-L-glutamine vs EN, saline. Nonisonitrogenous, nonisocaloric.	ICU 1/20 (5) vs. 1/20 (5)	Overall 8/20 (40) vs. 10/20 (50) VAP 1/20 (5) vs. 1/20 (5)	ICU 14 ± 2 (20) vs. 15 ± 2 (20)	8±3 (20) vs. 9±3 (20)
24) Perez- Barcena 2010	Single-centre, trauma pt ISS >12, requires PN based on ASPEN N=43	C.Random: not sure ITT: yes Blinding:Outcomes assessors (6)	PN, 0.35 g/kg/d IV glutamine (given as 0.5 g/kg/d L-alanyl- L-glutamine) vs PN. Isocaloric, isonitrogenous	ICU 4/23 (17) vs.2/20 (10) Hospital 4/23 (0) vs. 3/20 (5)	Pneumonia 11/23 (48) vs. 8/20 (40)	ICU 21 (17-25) vs. 21 (14-47) Hospital 31 (19-42) vs. 40 (24-80)	15.2±8.2 (23) vs. 18.9±11.1 (20)
25) Andrews 2011	Multi-centre, critically ill adults, 25% medical pts, from 10 centres N=502	C. Random: yes ITT: yes Blinding: double (13)	PN containing 0.2- 0.4 g/kg/day (20.2 g/day x 7 days) vs.PN isocaloric, isonitrogenous (unknown gln form)	ICU 88/250 (35) vs. 80/252 (32) 6-month 115/250 (46) vs. 106/252 (42)	134/250 (54) vs. 131/252 (52)	ICU 15 (7.9-28.4) vs. 13.4(8.2-23.9) Hospital 32.5 (14.7-55.6) vs. 28.2 (15.1-52.4)	NR
26) Cekman 2011	Single-centre, mixed surgical ICU, ISS ≥ 10, APACHE II >10 N=30	C.Random: yes ITT: yes Blinding: double (10)	PN containing 0.5 g/kg/d L-alanyl-L- glutamine vs PN (nonisonitrogenous)	ICU (presumed) 3/15 (20) vs. 6/15 (40)	NR	ICU 19.2 ± 12 (15) vs. 27.4 ± 12 (15)	NR

27) Grau 2011	Multi-centre, mechanically ventilated, APACHE II >12, need TPN N=127	C.Random: not sure ITT: yes Blinding: double (11)	PN, 0.5 g/kg/d L- alanyl-L-glutamine IV glutamine vs PN. Isonitrogenous, isocaloric.	ICU 9/59 (15) vs. 13/68 (19) 6-month 16/59 (27) vs. 23/68 (34)	All 24/59 (41) vs. 31/68 (46) Surgical 13/59 (22) vs. 17/68 (25) Pneu (#/1000 vent days) 13.5 vs. 27.2 # infect/pt 1.5 vs. 2.4	ICU 12 (7-22) vs. 12 (7-24) Hospital 35 (23-56) vs. 31 (20-58)	NR
28) Wernerman 2011	Multi-centre, mixed ICU, APACHE II ≥10 N=413	C.Random: yes ITT: yes Blinding: double (11)	EN or PN, 0.28 g/kg/day IV glutamine (given as L-alanyl-L- glutamine) vs EN or PN, normal saline IV. Nonisocaloric, nonisonitrogenous	ICU 8/205 (4) vs. 11/208 (5) 28-day 14/205 (7) vs. 20/208 (10)	NR	NR	NR
29) Grintescu 2014	Single center, trauma pts N=97	C. Random: yes ITT: no Blinding: no (7)	EN + PN, L-alanyl- L-glutamine dipeptide (0.5 g/kg/day) vs EN + PN w standard amino acid solution (0.5 g/kg/day as Aminoven 10%; Fresenius Kabi). Isonitrogenous, isocaloric.	ICU 4/48 (8) vs. 4/49 (8)	All 10/41 (24) vs. 14/41 (34)	NR	NR
30) Koksal 2014***	Single centre, Septic, malnourished ICU patients N=60	C.Random: yes ITT: other Blinding: single (outcomes) (9)	30 g/day parenteral glutamine (dipeptides) + EN vs EN, no placebo, no supplemental glutamine	NR	NR	NR	13±12.2 (30) vs. 14.3±5.4 (30)

31) Perez- Barcena 2014	Multi-center, trauma ICU N=142	C. Random: yes ITT: yes Blinding: double (13)	EN or PN, L-alanyl- L-glutamine dipeptide (0.5 g/kg/d = 0.35 g of L- glutamine/kg /d) vs EN or PN w placebo. Non-isonitrogenous, non-isocaloric.	Hospital 4/71 (6) vs. 5/71 (7) ICU 3/71 (4) vs. 3/71 (4)	Any 45/71 (63) vs. 44/71 (62) Respiratory 37/71 (52) vs. 33/71 (47) Pneumonia 23/71 (32) vs. 21/71 (30)	ICU 14 (8-28) vs. 14 (7-24) Hospital 29 (17-47) vs. 27 (16-46)	9.0 (3-18) vs. 9.5 (5-18.5)
32) Ziegler 2016	Multi-center, N=150	C. Random: yes ITT: yes Blinding: double (12)	PN containing 0.5 gm/kg/day L-alanyl- L-glutamine vs. PN, isocaloric. Isonitrogenous.	Hospital 11/75 (15) vs. 13/75 (17)	Any 33/75 (44) vs. 24/75 (32) Pneumonia 10/75 (13) vs. 12/75 (16)	ICU 17.5 ± 14.6 (75) vs. 13.6 ± 10 (75) Hospital 33.6 ± 28 (75) vs. 29.7 ± 20.7 (75)	NR
33) Liu 2016	Single centre, acute pancreatitis requiring PN N=47	C. Random: not sure ITT: yes Blinding: no (4)	PN containing glutamine (dose not reported) vs. Standard PN Unclear if isonitrogenous, isocaloric or not	1/24 (4.2%) vs.4/23 (17.4%)	Pneumonia 3/24 (12.5%) vs. 5/23 (21.7%)	ICU 11.5 ± 2.0 (24) vs. 15.2 ± 2.0 (23) Hospital 20 ± 2.4 (24) vs. 23 ± 2.03 (23)	NR

† Hospital mortality unless stated otherwise

‡ Number of patients with infections unless stated otherwise

C.Random: Concealed randomization median (range)

EN: Enteral nutrition; TPN Total parenteral nutrition \pm (): Mean \pm Standard deviation (number)

ITT: Intent to treat NR: Not reported

* Data from a sub group, hence not included in meta-analysis ** Data for mortality is ITT, infections is non-ITT.

*** Data from EN glutamine group not shown here, appears in EN glutamine section

 α Unable to confirm the low dose from authors (0.002 gm/kg/day) hence data not included in the meta-analyses

 ∂ Data from growth hormone group not shown here

Ozgultekin 2008: data presented here only pertains to glutamine supplemented group and standard group, refer to section 9.1 Branched Chain Amino Acids (BCAA) for data pertaining to BCAA vs standard.

Table 2. QOL Outcomes

Study	QOL Outcomes										
2) Powell Tuck 1999		easured at entry into	re mood, sleep, energy, trial and when PN stop ı) but no statistical differe	bed							
25) Andrews 2011	Gin	GIn+Se SF-12 PC	Se S at 3 months	Neither							
	35.2 <u>+</u> 9.8 (49)	33.3 <u>+</u> 11.1 (50)		36.6 <u>+</u> 11.6 (59)							
	35.9 <u>+</u> 9.3 (45)	35.9 <u>+</u> 10.9 (43) SF-12 MC	36.3 <u>+</u> 10.0 (46) S at 3 months	39.9 <u>+</u> 10.5 (53)							
	420 <u>+</u> 11.8 (49)	40.3 <u>+</u> 12.0 (50)	41.9 <u>+</u> 11.9 (52) S at 6 months	42.2 <u>+</u> 12.2 (59)							
	43.4 <u>+</u> 11.9 (45)		44.1 <u>+</u> 11.6 (46) at 3 months	43.3 <u>+</u> 12.1 (53)							
	0.47 <u>+</u> 0.41 (52)		0.49 <u>+</u> 0.35 (55) at 6 months	0.56 <u>+</u> 0.34 (61							
	0.53 <u>+</u> 0.35 (49)	0.60 + 0.30 (51)	0.53 <u>+</u> 0.33 (47)	0.63 <u>+</u> 0.28 (55)							

Figure 1. Overall Mortality (EN vs PN)

Study or Subgroup	PN GI		Contr		Woight	Risk Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl	Voar	Risk Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl
2.11.1 Patients on PN	Events	Total	Events	Total	weight	M-H, Randolli, 95% Cl	Tear	M-n, Kalidolli, 95% Cl
	4.0		26		40.000	0 70 10 17 1 141	4007	
Griffiths	18	42	25	42	12.2%	0.72 [0.47, 1.11]		
Powell-Tuck	14	83	20	85	6.0%	0.72 [0.39, 1.32]		
Fuentes-Orozco 2004	2	17	3	16	0.8%	0.63 [0.12, 3.28]		
≪ian-Li	0	20	3	21	0.3%	0.15 [0.01, 2.73]		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
Carroll	0	7	0	7		Not estimable	2004	
Dechelotte	2	58	2	56	0.6%	0.97 [0.14, 6.62]	2006	
Tian	2	20	5	20	1.0%	0.40 [0.09, 1.83]	2006	
Bahin	2	20	6	20	1.0%	0.33 [0.08, 1.46]	2007	
Duska	2	10	0	10	0.3%	5.00 [0.27, 92.62]	2008	
Fuentes-Orozco 2008	2	22	5	22	1.0%	0.40 [0.09, 1.85]	2008	
Yang 2008	1	25	3	25	0.5%	0.33 [0.04, 2.99]		←
Cai	17	55	20	55	8.0%	0.85 [0.50, 1.44]		_
Estivariz	1	32	- 6	31	0.5%	0.16 [0.02, 1.26]		←
Perez-Barcena 2008	3	15	0	15	0.3%	7.00 [0.39, 124.83]		
Perez-Barcena 2008	4	23	3	20	1.2%			
		205	20	208	5.2%	1.16 [0.29, 4.57]		
Nernerman	14					0.71 [0.37, 1.37]		
Andrews	88	250	80	252	36.7%	1.11 [0.87, 1.42]		
Grau	9	59	13	68	3.7%	0.80 [0.37, 1.73]		
Cekman	3	15	6	15	1.6%	0.50 [0.15, 1.64]		
Ziegler	11	75	13	75	4.1%	0.85 [0.41, 1.77]		
Grintescu	4	48	4	49	1.3%	1.02 [0.27, 3.85]	2014	
Perez-Barcena 2014	4	71	5	71	1.4%	0.80 [0.22, 2.86]	2014	
_iu	1	24	4	23	0.5%	0.24 [0.03, 1.99]	2016	←
Subtotal (95% CI)		1196		1206	88.0%	0.86 [0.73, 1.01]		◆
Total events	204		246					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0	.00: Chi ² =	= 19.77	df = 21 (P = 0.5	(4): $ ^2 = 0\%$			
Fest for overall effect: Z	•							
		,						
2.11.2 Patients on EN								
Nischmeyer	1	12	4	14	0.5%	0.29 [0.04, 2.27]	2001	←
Palmese	. 6	42	8	42	2.4%	0.75 [0.28, 1.97]		
Ozgultekin	12	20	12	20	8.7%	1.00 [0.60, 1.66]		
_uo	12	11	0	20	0.7 %	Not estimable		
	_		-		0.20			
Erogiu Subtotal (05% CI)	1	20 105	1	20 105	0.3% 12.0%		2009	
Subtotal (95% CI)		105		105	12.0%	0.89 [0.58, 1.38]		
Fotal events	20		25					
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0	•			= 0.65);	I≝= 0%			
Test for overall effect: Z	= 0.51 (P	= 0.61)						
		1301		1311	100.0%	0.87 [0.75, 1.01]		◆
Total (95% CI)			271					
	224		271					
Total events		: 21.35		Έ = 0.6	(7) [,] I ² = 0%			<u> </u>
	.00; Chi ² =		df= 25 ((P = 0.6	i7); I² = 0%			0.1 0.2 0.5 1 2 5 1 Favours PN GLN Favours control

Figure 2. Overall Mortality (Single vs Multi Centre)

	PN Gluta		Contr			Risk Ratio		Risk Ratio
tudy or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	Year	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
.12.1 Single-centre stu	Idies							
≽riffiths	18	42	25	42	12.2%	0.72 [0.47, 1.11]	1997	
owell-Tuck	14	83	20	85	6.0%	0.72 [0.39, 1.32]	1999	
Vischmeyer	1	12	4	14	0.5%	0.29 [0.04, 2.27]	2001	
uentes-Orozco 2004	2	17	3	16	0.8%	0.63 [0.12, 3.28]	2004	
arroll	0	7	0	7		Not estimable	2004	
ian-Li	0	20	3	21	0.3%	0.15 [0.01, 2.73]	2004	←
almese .	6	42	8	42	2.4%	0.75 [0.28, 1.97]	2006	
ïan	2	20	5	20	1.0%	0.40 [0.09, 1.83]	2006	
Bahin	2	20	6	20	1.0%	0.33 [0.08, 1.46]	2007	
.uo	0	11	0	9		Not estimable	2008	
stivariz	1	32	6	31	0.5%	0.16 [0.02, 1.26]	2008	
uentes-Orozco 2008	2	22	5	22	1.0%	0.40 [0.09, 1.85]	2008	
)uska	2	10	0	10	0.3%	5.00 [0.27, 92.62]		
'ang 2008	1	25	3	25	0.5%	0.33 [0.04, 2.99]		
>ai ¯	17	55	20	55	8.0%	0.85 [0.50, 1.44]	2008	— • —
)zgultekin	12	20	12	20	8.7%	1.00 [0.60, 1.66]	2008	
erez-Barcena 2008	3	15	0	15	0.3%	7.00 [0.39, 124.83]	2008	
roqlu	1	20	1	20	0.3%	1.00 [0.07, 14.90]	2009	
erez-Barcena 2010	4	23	3	20	1.2%	1.16 [0.29, 4.57]	2010	
ekman 🗧	3	15	6	15	1.6%	0.50 [0.15, 1.64]		
Frintescu	4	48	4	49	1.3%	1.02 [0.27, 3.85]		
iu	1	24	4	23	0.5%	0.24 [0.03, 1.99]		
Subtotal (95% CI)		583		581	48.3%	0.74 [0.60, 0.92]		•
otal events	96		138					
leterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.1	00: Chi ² =	15.07. 0	f = 19 (P	= 0.72)): I ² = 0%			
est for overall effect: Z =								
		,						
.12.2 Multi-centre stud	lies							
)echelotte	2	58	2	56	0.6%	0.97 [0.14, 6.62]	2006	
Vernerman	14	205	20	208	5.2%	0.71 [0.37, 1.37]		- _
ndrews	88	250	80	252	36.7%	1.11 [0.87, 1.42]		÷-
∂rau	9	59	13	68	3.7%	0.80 [0.37, 1.73]		
liegler	11	75	13	75	4.1%	0.85 [0.41, 1.77]		-
erez-Barcena 2014	4	71	5	71	1.4%	0.80 [0.22, 2.86]		
Subtotal (95% CI)		718	-	730	51.7%	1.00 [0.81, 1.23]	-	♦
otal events	128		133					
leterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.1		2.41, df).79); l ^a	'= 0%			
est for overall effect: Z =		1301		1311	100.0%	0.87 [0.75, 1.01]		◆
		1301						
est for overall effect: Z = otal (95% CI)	224	1301	271					
est for overall effect: Z = otal (95% CI) otal events	224 00: Chi ² =		271 if = 25 (P	= 0.67): I ≧ = 0%			· · · · · ·
est for overall effect: Z = otal (95% CI)	00; Chi² =	21.35, c		= 0.67)); I = 0%			0.01 0.1 1 10 100 Favours PN Glutamine Favours control

Figure 3. Hospital Mortality (EN vs. PN)

	PN G		Cont			Risk Ratio		Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	Year	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
2.5.1 Patients on PN								
∋riffīths	18	42	25	42	40.7%	0.72 [0.47, 1.11]	1997	_ ∎ +
Powell-Tuck	14	83	20	85	20.0%	0.72 [0.39, 1.32]	1999	
Carroll	0	7	0	7		Not estimable	2004	
(ian-Li	0	20	3	21	0.9%	0.15 [0.01, 2.73]	2004	←
uentes-Orozco 2004	2	17	3	16	2.7%	0.63 [0.12, 3.28]	2004	
Dechelotte	2	58	2	56	2.0%	0.97 [0.14, 6.62]	2006	
Bahin	2	20	6	20	3.4%	0.33 [0.08, 1.46]	2007	
'ang 2008	1	25	3	25	1.6%	0.33 [0.04, 2.99]	2008	·
'erez-Barcena 2008	3	15	0	15	0.9%	7.00 [0.39, 124.83]	2008	
stivariz	1	32	6	31	1.8%	0.16 [0.02, 1.26]	2008	←
'erez-Barcena 2010	4	23	3	20	4.0%	1.16 [0.29, 4.57]	2010	
liegler	11	75	13	75	13.8%	0.85 [0.41, 1.77]	2013	
'erez-Barcena 2014	4	71	5	71	4.6%	0.80 [0.22, 2.86]	2014	
iu	1	24	4	23	1.7%	0.24 [0.03, 1.99]	2016	← <u> </u>
Subtotal (95% CI)		512		507	98.2%	0.70 [0.53, 0.92]		◆
otal events	63		93					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0).00; Chi ^z :	= 8.90,	df = 12 (F	P = 0.71); I ^z = 0%			
Fest for overall effect: Z	:= 2.54 (P	= 0.01)						
2.5.2 Patient on EN								
Vischmeyer	1	12	4	14	1.8%	0.29 [0.04, 2.27]	2001	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
.uo	0	11	0	9		Not estimable	2008	
ubtotal (95% CI)		23		23	1.8%	0.29 [0.04, 2.27]		
otal events	1		4					
leterogeneity: Not app	licable							
Fest for overall effect: Z	:= 1.18 (P	= 0.24)						
fotal (95% CI)		535		530	100.0%	0.69 [0.52, 0.90]		•
	64		97					
Total events								
Fotal events Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0		= 9.61,	df = 13 (F	² = 0.73); I ² = 0%			
).00; Chi ² :			P = 0.73); I² = 0%			0.1 0.2 0.5 1 2 5 1 Favours PN GLN Favours control

Figure 4. Hospital Mortality (Single vs Multi Centre)

	PN Gluta	mine	Cont	ol		Risk Ratio		Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	Year	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
2.6.1 Single Centre stu	dies							
Griffiths	18	42	25	42	40.7%	0.72 [0.47, 1.11]	1997	
Powell-Tuck	14	83	20	85	20.0%	0.72 [0.39, 1.32]	1999	
Wischmeyer	1	12	4	14	1.8%	0.29 [0.04, 2.27]	2001	
Fuentes-Orozco 2004	2	17	3	16	2.7%	0.63 [0.12, 3.28]	2004	
Kian-Li	0	20	3	21	0.9%	0.15 [0.01, 2.73]	2004	←
Carroll	0	7	0	7		Not estimable	2004	
Sahin	2	20	6	20	3.4%	0.33 [0.08, 1.46]	2007	
Luo	0	11	0	9		Not estimable	2008	
rang 2008	1	25	3	25	1.6%	0.33 [0.04, 2.99]	2008	
Perez-Barcena 2008	3	15	0	15	0.9%	7.00 [0.39, 124.83]	2008	
Estivariz	1	32	6	31	1.8%	0.16 [0.02, 1.26]	2008	
Perez-Barcena 2010	4	23	3	20	4.0%	1.16 [0.29, 4.57]	2010	
Liu	1	24	4	23	1.7%	0.24 [0.03, 1.99]	2016	
Subtotal (95% CI)		331		328	79.5%	0.65 [0.48, 0.89]		•
Total events	47		77					
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0	•	•	= 10 (P =	: 0.52);	I² = 0%			
Test for overall effect: Z	= 2.73 (P =	= 0.006)						
2.6.2 Multi-center stud	ies							
Dechelotte	2	58	2	56	2.0%	0.97 [0.14, 6.62]	2006	
Ziegler	11	75	13	75	13.8%	0.85 [0.41, 1.77]		
Perez-Barcena 2014	4	71	5	71	4.6%	0.80 [0.22, 2.86]		
Subtotal (95% CI)		204		202	20.5%	0.85 [0.46, 1.55]		
Total events	17		20					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0	.00; Chi ² =	0.03, df	= 2 (P =	0.99); P	²= 0%			
Test for overall effect: Z	= 0.54 (P =	= 0.59)	-					
Total (95% CI)		535		530	100.0%	0.69 [0.52, 0.90]		◆
Total events	64		97					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0	.00; Chi ² =	9.61, df	= 13 (P =	0.73);	I² = 0%			
Test for overall effect: Z	•	•		//				0.01 0.1 1 10 11
Test for subaroun differ		,	df = 1/E	- 0.46	N IZ – ∩04			Favours PN Glutamine Favours control

Test for subgroup differences: $Chi^2 = 0.57$, df = 1 (P = 0.45), $l^2 = 0\%$

Figure 5. Infectious Complications (EN vs. PN)

	PN Gluta	mine	Contr	ol		Risk Ratio		Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	Year	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
2.1.1 Patients on PN								
Griffiths	28	42	26	42	9.8%	1.08 [0.78, 1.48]	1997	+
Fuentes-Orozco 2004	4	17	12	16	1.8%	0.31 [0.13, 0.77]	2004	
Zhou 2004	3	15	4	15	0.9%	0.75 [0.20, 2.79]	2004	
Dechelotte	23	58	32	56	7.5%	0.69 [0.47, 1.03]	2006	
Estivariz	13	30	16	29	4.8%	0.79 [0.46, 1.33]	2008	
Perez-Barcena 2008	11	15	13	15	8.3%	0.85 [0.59, 1.22]	2008	
Fuentes-Orozco 2008	9	22	16	22	4.3%	0.56 [0.32, 0.99]	2008	
Perez-Barcena 2010	11	23	8	20	3.0%	1.20 [0.60, 2.37]	2010	
Andrews	134	250	131	252	17.8%	1.03 [0.87, 1.22]	2011	_ + _
Grau	24	59	31	68	7.2%	0.89 [0.60, 1.34]		-
Ziegler	33	75	24	75	6.8%	1.38 [0.91, 2.09]		+
Grintescu	10	41	14	41	3.0%	0.71 [0.36, 1.42]		
Perez-Barcena 2014	45	71	44	71	12.7%	1.02 [0.79, 1.32]		_ _
Liu	3	24	5	23	0.9%	0.57 [0.15, 2.14]		
Subtotal (95% CI)		742		745	88.8%	0.91 [0.79, 1.04]		•
Total events	351		376					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.	.02: Chi ² =	19.30. c	lf = 13 (P	= 0.11)	: I ² = 33%	1		
Test for overall effect: Z	= 1.36 (P =	0.18)						
2.1.2 Patients on EN								
Nischmeyer	_							
///////////////////////////////////////	7	12	9	14	3.6%	0.91 [0.49, 1.68]	2001	
Palmese		12 42	9 21	14 42	3.6% 4.5%	0.91 [0.49, 1.68] 0.62 [0.36, 1.07]	2001 2006	
Palmese	7 13 8	42	9 21 10	14 42 20	4.5%	0.62 [0.36, 1.07]	2006	
^o almese Eroglu	13		21	42			2006	
Palmese Eroglu Subtotal (95% CI)	13	42 20	21	42 20	4.5% 3.0%	0.62 [0.36, 1.07] 0.80 [0.40, 1.60]	2006	
Palmese Eroglu Subtotal (95% CI) Total events	13 8 28	42 20 74	21 10 40	42 20 76	4.5% 3.0% 11.2%	0.62 [0.36, 1.07] 0.80 [0.40, 1.60]	2006	
Palmese Eroglu Subtotal (95% CI)	13 8 28 .00; Chi ² =	42 20 74 0.91, df	21 10 40	42 20 76	4.5% 3.0% 11.2%	0.62 [0.36, 1.07] 0.80 [0.40, 1.60]	2006	
Palmese Eroglu Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.	13 8 28 .00; Chi ² =	42 20 74 0.91, df	21 10 40	42 20 76).64); I²	4.5% 3.0% 11.2%	0.62 [0.36, 1.07] 0.80 [0.40, 1.60]	2006	
Palmese Eroglu Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0. Test for overall effect: Z:	13 8 28 .00; Chi ² =	42 20 74 0.91, df : 0.11)	21 10 40	42 20 76).64); I²	4.5% 3.0% 11.2% = 0%	0.62 [0.36, 1.07] 0.80 [0.40, 1.60] 0.75 [0.53, 1.06]	2006	
Palmese Eroglu Subtotal (95% CI) Fotal events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0. Fest for overall effect: Z Fotal (95% CI) Fotal events	13 8 28 .00; Chi ² = = 1.61 (P = 379	42 20 74 0.91, df 0.11) 816	21 10 40 = 2 (P = 0 416	42 20 76 0.64); I² 821	4.5% 3.0% 11.2% = 0% 100.0%	0.62 [0.36, 1.07] 0.80 [0.40, 1.60] 0.75 [0.53, 1.06] 0.89 [0.79, 1.01]	2006	
Palmese Froglu Subtotal (95% CI) Fotal events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0. Fest for overall effect: Z Fotal (95% CI)	13 8 .00; Chi ^z = = 1.61 (P = 379 .02; Chi ^z =	42 20 74 0.91, df 0.11) 816 21.86, c	21 10 40 = 2 (P = 0 416	42 20 76 0.64); I² 821	4.5% 3.0% 11.2% = 0% 100.0%	0.62 [0.36, 1.07] 0.80 [0.40, 1.60] 0.75 [0.53, 1.06] 0.89 [0.79, 1.01]	2006	0.1 0.2 0.5 1 2 5 Favours PN glutamine Favours control

Figure 6. Infectious Complications (Single vs. Multicentre)

	PN Gluta		Contr			Risk Ratio		Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	Year	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
2.2.1 Single Centre tria	als							
Griffiths	28	42	26	42	9.8%	1.08 [0.78, 1.48]	1997	_
Wischmeyer	7	12	9	14	3.6%	0.91 [0.49, 1.68]	2001	
Fuentes-Orozco 2004	4	17	12	16	1.8%	0.31 [0.13, 0.77]	2004	
Zhou 2004	3	15	4	15	0.9%	0.75 [0.20, 2.79]	2004	
Palmese	13	42	21	42	4.5%	0.62 [0.36, 1.07]	2006	
Estivariz	13	30	16	29	4.8%	0.79 [0.46, 1.33]	2008	
Perez-Barcena 2008	11	15	13	15	8.3%	0.85 [0.59, 1.22]	2008	
Fuentes-Orozco 2008	9	22	16	22	4.3%	0.56 [0.32, 0.99]	2008	
Eroglu	8	20	10	20	3.0%	0.80 [0.40, 1.60]	2009	
Perez-Barcena 2010	11	23	8	20	3.0%	1.20 [0.60, 2.37]	2010	
Grintescu	10	41	14	41	3.0%	0.71 [0.36, 1.42]	2014	
Liu	3	24	5	23	0.9%	0.57 [0.15, 2.14]	2016	
Subtotal (95% CI)		303		299	48.0%	0.81 [0.68, 0.96]		•
Total events	120		154					
Test for overall effect: Z								
		0.01)						
2.2.2 Multicentre trials			32	56	7 5%	0.69 (0.47, 1.03)	2006	
2.2.2 Multicentre trials Dechelotte	23	58	32 131	56 252	7.5% 17.8%	0.69 [0.47, 1.03] 1 03 [0 87 - 1 - 27]		
2.2.2 Multicentre trials Dechelotte Andrews	23 134	58 250	131	252	17.8%	1.03 [0.87, 1.22]	2011	
2.2.2 Multicentre trials Dechelotte Andrews Grau	23 134 24	58 250 59	131 31	252 68	17.8% 7.2%	1.03 [0.87, 1.22] 0.89 [0.60, 1.34]	2011 2011	
2.2.2 Multicentre trials Dechelotte Andrews Grau Ziegler	23 134 24 33	58 250 59 75	131 31 24	252 68 75	17.8% 7.2% 6.8%	1.03 [0.87, 1.22] 0.89 [0.60, 1.34] 1.38 [0.91, 2.09]	2011 2011 2013	
2.2.2 Multicentre trials Dechelotte Andrews Grau Ziegler Perez-Barcena 2014	23 134 24	58 250 59 75 71	131 31	252 68 75 71	17.8% 7.2% 6.8% 12.7%	1.03 (0.87, 1.22) 0.89 (0.60, 1.34) 1.38 (0.91, 2.09) 1.02 (0.79, 1.32)	2011 2011 2013	
2.2.2 Multicentre trials Dechelotte Andrews Grau Ziegler Perez-Barcena 2014 Subtotal (95% CI)	23 134 24 33 45	58 250 59 75	131 31 24 44	252 68 75	17.8% 7.2% 6.8%	1.03 [0.87, 1.22] 0.89 [0.60, 1.34] 1.38 [0.91, 2.09]	2011 2011 2013	
2.2.2 Multicentre trials Dechelotte Andrews Grau Ziegler Perez-Barcena 2014 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events	23 134 24 33 45 259	58 250 59 75 71 513	131 31 24 44 262	252 68 75 71 522	17.8% 7.2% 6.8% 12.7% 52.0%	1.03 (0.87, 1.22) 0.89 (0.60, 1.34) 1.38 (0.91, 2.09) 1.02 (0.79, 1.32)	2011 2011 2013	
2.2.2 Multicentre trials Dechelotte Andrews Grau Ziegler Perez-Barcena 2014 Subtotal (95% CI)	23 134 24 33 45 259 0.01; Chi ^z =	58 250 59 75 71 513 6.07, df	131 31 24 44 262	252 68 75 71 522	17.8% 7.2% 6.8% 12.7% 52.0%	1.03 (0.87, 1.22) 0.89 (0.60, 1.34) 1.38 (0.91, 2.09) 1.02 (0.79, 1.32)	2011 2011 2013	
2.2.2 Multicentre trials Dechelotte Andrews Grau Ziegler Perez-Barcena 2014 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0 Test for overall effect: Z	23 134 24 33 45 259 0.01; Chi ^z =	58 250 59 75 71 513 6.07, df	131 31 24 44 262	252 68 75 71 522 0.19); I ²	17.8% 7.2% 6.8% 12.7% 52.0%	1.03 (0.87, 1.22) 0.89 (0.60, 1.34) 1.38 (0.91, 2.09) 1.02 (0.79, 1.32)	2011 2011 2013	
2.2.2 Multicentre trials Dechelotte Andrews Grau Ziegler Perez-Barcena 2014 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0	23 134 24 33 45 259 0.01; Chi ^z =	58 250 59 75 71 513 6.07, df :0.92)	131 31 24 44 262	252 68 75 71 522 0.19); I ²	17.8% 7.2% 6.8% 12.7% 52.0% = 34%	1.03 (0.87, 1.22) 0.89 (0.60, 1.34) 1.38 (0.91, 2.09) 1.02 (0.79, 1.32) 0.99 (0.84, 1.17)	2011 2011 2013	
2.2.2 Multicentre trials Dechelotte Andrews Grau Ziegler Perez-Barcena 2014 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0 Test for overall effect: Z Total (95% CI) Total events	23 134 24 33 45 259 0.01; Chi ^z = := 0.10 (P = 379	58 250 59 75 71 513 6.07, df 0.92) 816	131 31 24 44 262 = 4 (P = 0 416	252 68 75 71 522 0.19); F 821	17.8% 7.2% 6.8% 12.7% 52.0% = 34%	1.03 [0.87, 1.22] 0.89 [0.60, 1.34] 1.38 [0.91, 2.09] 1.02 [0.79, 1.32] 0.99 [0.84, 1.17]	2011 2011 2013	
2.2.2 Multicentre trials Dechelotte Andrews Grau Ziegler Perez-Barcena 2014 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0 Test for overall effect: Z Total (95% CI)	23 134 24 33 45 259 0.01; Chi ^z = := 0.10 (P = 379 0.02; Chi ^z =	58 250 59 75 71 513 6.07, df 0.92) 816 21.86, d	131 31 24 44 262 = 4 (P = 0 416	252 68 75 71 522 0.19); F 821	17.8% 7.2% 6.8% 12.7% 52.0% = 34%	1.03 [0.87, 1.22] 0.89 [0.60, 1.34] 1.38 [0.91, 2.09] 1.02 [0.79, 1.32] 0.99 [0.84, 1.17]	2011 2011 2013	0.1 0.2 0.5 1 2 5 1 Favours PN glutamine Favours control

Figure 7. Ventilator Associated Pneumonia (EN vs. PN)

2.3.1 Patients on PN Dechelotte Estivariz Perez-Barcena 2010 Ziegler Perez-Barcena 2014 Liu Subtotal (95% CI)	10 13 11 23 3 70	58 30 23 75 71 24 281	Events 19 16 8 12 21 5 81	Total 56 29 20 75 71 23 274	14.9% 24.4% 14.3% 11.1% 27.7% 3.9%	0.79 [0.46, 1.33] 1.20 [0.60, 2.37] 0.83 [0.38, 1.81] 1.10 [0.67, 1.79]	2006 2008 2010 2013 2014	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
Dechelotte Estivariz Perez-Barcena 2010 Ziegler Perez-Barcena 2014 Liu Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.10$ 2.3.2 Patients on EN Palmese Eroglu Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.20$	13 11 10 23 3 70	30 23 75 71 24 281	16 8 12 21 5	29 20 75 71 23	24.4% 14.3% 11.1% 27.7% 3.9%	0.79 [0.46, 1.33] 1.20 [0.60, 2.37] 0.83 [0.38, 1.81] 1.10 [0.67, 1.79]	2008 2010 2013 2014	
Estivariz Perez-Barcena 2010 Ziegler Perez-Barcena 2014 Liu Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.10$ 2.3.2 Patients on EN Palmese Eroglu Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.27$	13 11 10 23 3 70	30 23 75 71 24 281	16 8 12 21 5	29 20 75 71 23	24.4% 14.3% 11.1% 27.7% 3.9%	0.79 [0.46, 1.33] 1.20 [0.60, 2.37] 0.83 [0.38, 1.81] 1.10 [0.67, 1.79]	2008 2010 2013 2014	
Perez-Barcena 2010 Ziegler Perez-Barcena 2014 Liu Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.10$ 2.3.2 Patients on EN Palmese Eroglu Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.20$	11 10 23 3 70	23 75 71 24 281	8 12 21 5	20 75 71 23	14.3% 11.1% 27.7% 3.9%	1.20 [0.60, 2.37] 0.83 [0.38, 1.81] 1.10 [0.67, 1.79]	2010 2013 2014	
Ziegler Perez-Barcena 2014 Liu Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.10$ 2.3.2 Patients on EN Palmese Eroglu Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.20$	10 23 3 70	75 71 24 281	12 21 5	75 71 23	11.1% 27.7% 3.9%	0.83 [0.38, 1.81] 1.10 [0.67, 1.79]	2013 2014	
Perez-Barcena 2014 Liu Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.10 2.3.2 Patients on EN Palmese Eroglu Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.27	23 3 70	71 24 281	21 5	71 23	27.7% 3.9%	1.10 [0.67, 1.79]	2014	
Liu Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.10 2.3.2 Patients on EN Palmese Eroglu Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.27	3 70	24 281	5	23	3.9%	• • •		_
Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.10 2.3.2 Patients on EN Palmese Eroglu Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.20	70	281	-			0 57 10 4 5 0 4 41		
Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.10 2.3.2 Patients on EN Palmese Eroglu Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.20		1.00	01		96.3%	0.57 [0.15, 2.14] 0.86 [0.66, 1.11]	2016	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.10 2.3.2 Patients on EN Palmese Eroglu Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.27		4.00						•
Eroglu Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.2	6 (F	' = 0.25))					
Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.2 ²	2	42	6	42	2.8%	0.33 [0.07, 1.56]	2006	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.2	1	20 62	1	20 62	0.9% 3.7%	1.00 [0.07, 14.90] 0.44 [0.11, 1.67]	2009	
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.2	3		7					
Total (95% CI)		•		= 0.49); I² = 0%			
		343		336	100.0%	0.83 [0.64, 1.08]		•
Total events			88					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.3 Test for subgroup differences	73	= 0.17))				L0.0	12 0.1 1 10 50 Favours PN GLN Favours control

Figure 8. Ventilator Associated Pneumonia (Single vs. Multicentre)

	PN GL	N	Contr	ol		Risk Ratio		Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	Year	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
2.4.1 Single Centre tria	ls							
Palmese	2	42	6	42	2.8%	0.33 [0.07, 1.56]	2006	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Estivariz	13	30	16	29	24.4%	0.79 [0.46, 1.33]	2008	
Eroglu	1	20	1	20	0.9%	1.00 [0.07, 14.90]	2009	← →
Perez-Barcena 2010	11	23	8	20	14.3%	1.20 [0.60, 2.37]	2010	
Liu Subtotal (95% CI)	3	24 139	5	23 134	3.9% 46.3%	0.57 [0.15, 2.14] 0.83 [0.57, 1.22]	2016	
Total events	30		36					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0	.00; Chi ^z	= 2.88,	df = 4 (P	= 0.58); I ^z = 0%			
Test for overall effect: Z	= 0.96 (P	= 0.34)					
2.4.2 Multicentre trials								
Dechelotte	10	58	19	56	14.9%	0.51 [0.26, 1.00]	2006	
Ziegler	10	75	12	75	11.1%	0.83 [0.38, 1.81]	2013	
Perez-Barcena 2014 Subtotal (95% CI)	23	71 204	21	71 202	27.7% 53.7%	1.10 [0.67, 1.79] 0.81 [0.50, 1.29]	2014	-
Total events	43		52					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0	.07; Chi ²	= 3.28,	df = 2 (P	= 0.19); I² = 399	6		
Test for overall effect: Z	-	-	-					
Total (95% CI)		343		336	100.0%	0.83 [0.64, 1.08]		◆
Total events	73		88					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0	.00; Chi ^z	= 6.14,	df = 7 (P	= 0.52); I ² = 0%			
Test for overall effect: Z		-						0.1 0.2 0.5 1 2 5 10 Favours PN GLN Favours control

Figure 9. ICU LOS (EN vs. PN)

	PI	N GLN		C	ontrol			Mean Difference		Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	Year	r IV, Random, 95% CI
2.4.1 Patients on PN										
Fuentes-Orozco 2004	7.2	9.2	17	7.3	4.5	16	6.6%	-0.10 [-5.00, 4.80]	2004	\$
Zhang	11.73	6.57	22	13.39	5.08	22	8.3%	-1.66 [-5.13, 1.81]	2007	
Perez-Barcena 2008	22.9	20.6	15	20.5	16	15	1.9%	2.40 [-10.80, 15.60]	2008	3 ← >
Cai	22.1	4.9	55	23.8	5.1	55	10.1%	-1.70 [-3.57, 0.17]	2008	3
Fuentes-Orozco 2008	11	11.7	22	11.14	7.41	22	5.7%	-0.14 [-5.93, 5.65]	2008	3
Estivariz	12	2	32	23	6	31	9.7%	-11.00 [-13.22, -8.78]	2008	3 ←
Cekman	19.2	12	15	27.4	12	15	3.6%	-8.20 [-16.79, 0.39]	2011	
Ziegler	17.5	14.6	75	13.6	10	75	7.6%	3.90 [-0.10, 7.90]	2013	3
Liu	11.5	2	24	15.2	2	23	10.6%	-3.70 [-4.84, -2.56]	2016	j —
Subtotal (95% CI)			277			274	64.2%	-2.60 [-5.59, 0.39]		
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.4.2 Patients on EN			-,							
Palmese	12	4.6	42	13	3.4	42	10.2%	-1.00 [-2.73, 0.73]	2006	;
Ozgultekin	11.8	5.9	20	17.3	16.4	20	4.2%	-5.50 [-13.14, 2.14]	2008	3 +
Luo	7.6	0.7	11	6.9	0.9	9	10.9%	0.70 [-0.02, 1.42]	2008	3
Eroglu Subtotal (95% CI)	14	2	20 <mark>93</mark>	15	2	20 91	10.6% 35.8%	-1.00 [-2.24, 0.24] - 0.47 [-1.84, 0.90]	2009	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1. ² Test for overall effect: Z =	•		•	(P = 0.0	03); I²:	= 68%				
restion overall ellett. Z -	- 0.07 (F	- 0.0	0)							
Total (95% CI)			370			365	100.0%	-2.10 [-4.10, -0.11]		•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 9. Test for overall effect: Z = Test for subgroup differe	= 2.06 (F	P = 0.0	4)							-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours PN GLN Favours control

Figure 10. ICU LOS (Single vs. Mu	Iticentre trials)
-----------------------------------	------------------	---

	PI	N GLN		C	ontrol			Mean Difference		Mean Difference		
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	Year	IV, Random, 95% CI		
2.7.1 Single trials												
Fuentes-Orozco 2004	7.2	9.2	17	7.3	4.5	16	6.6%	-0.10 [-5.00, 4.80]	2004			
Palmese	12	4.6	42	13	3.4	42	10.2%	-1.00 [-2.73, 0.73]	2006			
Zhang	11.73	6.57	22	13.39	5.08	22	8.3%	-1.66 [-5.13, 1.81]	2007			
Ozgultekin	11.8	5.9	20	17.3	16.4	20	4.2%	-5.50 [-13.14, 2.14]	2008			
Luo	7.6	0.7	11	6.9	0.9	9	10.9%	0.70 [-0.02, 1.42]	2008	-		
Perez-Barcena 2008	22.9	20.6	15	20.5	16	15	1.9%	2.40 [-10.80, 15.60]	2008			
Cai	22.1	4.9	55	23.8	5.1	55	10.1%	-1.70 [-3.57, 0.17]	2008			
Fuentes-Orozco 2008	11	11.7	22	11.14	7.41	22	5.7%	-0.14 [-5.93, 5.65]	2008			
Estivariz	12	2	32	23	6	31	9.7%	-11.00 [-13.22, -8.78]	2008			
Eroglu	14	2	20	15	2	20	10.6%	-1.00 [-2.24, 0.24]	2009	-		
Cekman	19.2	12	15	27.4	12	15	3.6%	-8.20 [-16.79, 0.39]	2011			
Liu	11.5	2	24	15.2	2	23	10.6%	-3.70 [-4.84, -2.56]	2016	÷.		
Subtotal (95% CI)			295			290	92.4%	-2.60 [-4.65, -0.54]		•		
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 9.	19; Chi <mark>²</mark>	= 124	.65, df:	= 11 (P	< 0.00	001); I ^z	= 91%					
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 2.47 (F	P = 0.0	1)									
2.7.2 Multicentre trials												
Ziegler	17.5	14.6	75	13.6	10	75	7.6%	3.90 [-0.10, 7.90]	2013			
Subtotal (95% CI)			75			75	7.6%	3.90 [-0.10, 7.90]		◆		
Heterogeneity: Not appli	cable											
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 1.91 (F	P = 0.0	6)									
Total (95% CI)			370			365	100.0%	-2.10 [-4.10, -0.11]		◆		
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 9.	39; Chi ^z	= 130	.95, df:	= 12 (P	< 0.00	001); I ^z	= 91%					
Test for overall effect: Z =	•		•							-20 -10 0 10 20 Favours PN GLN Favours control		
	· ·									Eavolus Produty Eavolus Control		

Figure 11. Hospital LOS (EN vs. PN)

	PN 0	Glutamii	ie	C	ontrol			Mean Difference		Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	Year	IV, Random, 95% CI
2.8.1 PN based trials										
Powell-Tuck	43.4	34.1	83	48.9	38.4	85	1.9%	-5.50 [-16.48, 5.48]	1999	←
Zhou 2004	42	7	15	46	6.6	15	7.2%	-4.00 [-8.87, 0.87]	2004	
Fuentes-Orozco 2004	16.5	8.9	17	16.7	7	16	6.1%	-0.20 [-5.65, 5.25]	2004	
Xian-Li	25.3	7.6	20	28.6	6.9	21	8.1%	-3.30 [-7.75, 1.15]	2004	
Sahin	14.2	4.4	20	16.4	3.9	20	13.9%	-2.20 [-4.78, 0.38]	2007	
Yang 2008	13.48	1.42	25	15.18	1.14	25	21.1%	-1.70 [-2.41, -0.99]	2008	+
Estivariz	20	2	15	30	6	12	10.5%	-10.00 [-13.54, -6.46]	2008	
Fuentes-Orozco 2008	30.18	10.42	22	26.59	13.3	22	4.1%	3.59 [-3.47, 10.65]	2008	
Perez-Barcena 2008	35.5	33.6	15	42.9	28.8	15	0.5%	-7.40 [-29.80, 15.00]	2008	• •
Ziegler	33.6	28	75	29.7	20.7	75	3.4%	3.90 [-3.98, 11.78]	2013	
Liu	20	2.4	24	23	2.03	23	19.3%	-3.00 [-4.27, -1.73]	2016	
Subtotal (95% CI)			331			329	96.2%	-2.83 [-4.47, -1.18]		◆
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 3.	.14; Chi²	= 28.75	i, df = 1	0 (P = 0	.001);	$l^2 = 65^{\circ}$	%			
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 3.37 (F	P = 0.00	08)							
2.8.2 EN based trials										
Wischmeyer	40	10	12	40	9	14	3.8%	0.00 [-7.36, 7.36]	2001	
Subtotal (95% CI)			12		_	14	3.8%	0.00 [-7.36, 7.36]		
Heterogeneity: Not appli	icable									
Test for overall effect: Z =		P = 1.00))							
Total (95% CI)			343			343	100.0%	-2.72 [-4.31, -1.13]		•
· · · ·	~~ ~. ~				0000	$\mathbf{z} = c \mathbf{n}$	N N			
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 2.	.98; Chi*	= 29.10	l. df = 1	1 (P = U	1.UUZI:	1 = 02	70			
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 2. Test for overall effect: Z =				1 (P = U	1.002);	1- = 62	70			-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours PN Glutamine Favours control

Figure 12. Hospital LOS (Single vs. Multicentre trials)

	PN G	Hutamir	ie	C	ontrol			Mean Difference		Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	Year	IV, Random, 95% CI
2.9.1 Single centre										
Powell-Tuck	43.4	34.1	83	48.9	38.4	85	1.9%	-5.50 [-16.48, 5.48]	1999	·
Wischmeyer	40	10	12	40	9	14	3.8%	0.00 [-7.36, 7.36]	2001	
Fuentes-Orozco 2004	16.5	8.9	17	16.7	7	16	6.1%	-0.20 [-5.65, 5.25]	2004	
Xian-Li	25.3	7.6	20	28.6	6.9	21	8.1%	-3.30 [-7.75, 1.15]	2004	
Zhou 2004	42	7	15	46	6.6	15	7.2%	-4.00 [-8.87, 0.87]	2004	
Sahin	14.2	4.4	20	16.4	3.9	20	13.9%	-2.20 [-4.78, 0.38]	2007	
Yang 2008	13.48	1.42	25	15.18	1.14	25	21.1%	-1.70 [-2.41, -0.99]	2008	-
Estivariz	20	2	15	30	6	12	10.5%	-10.00 [-13.54, -6.46]	2008	
Fuentes-Orozco 2008	30.18	10.42	22	26.59	13.3	22	4.1%	3.59 [-3.47, 10.65]	2008	
Perez-Barcena 2008	35.5	33.6	15	42.9	28.8	15	0.5%	-7.40 [-29.80, 15.00]	2008	• •
Liu	20	2.4	24	23	2.03	23	19.3%	-3.00 [-4.27, -1.73]	2016	
Subtotal (95% CI)			268			268	96.6%	-2.95 [-4.54, -1.37]		◆
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 2.	80; Chi ^z	= 26.79	, df = 1	0 (P = 0	.003);	l ^z = 63 ^o	%			
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 3.65 (F	P = 0.00	03)							
2.9.2 Multicentre trials										
Ziegler	33.6	28	75	29.7	20.7	75	3.4%	3.90 [-3.98, 11.78]	2013	
Subtotal (95% CI)			75			75	3.4%	3.90 [-3.98, 11.78]		
Heterogeneity: Not appli	cable									
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 0.97 (F	P = 0.33))							
Total (95% CI)			343			343	100.0%	-2.72 [-4.31, -1.13]		◆
		- 20 10	df = 1	1 (P = 0)	0025	l² = 62°	×.	_		
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 2.	98, UNE	- 23.10	, ar — T	-1 $(1 - 2)$			/v			
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 2. Test for overall effect: Z =	•		•	10-0						-10 -5 Ó Ś 10 Favours PN Glutamine Favours control

Figure 13. Mechanical Ventilation

-	PN G	lutami	ine	C	ontrol			Mean Difference		Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	Year	IV, Random, 95% CI
2.10.1 Patients on PN										
Fuentes-Orozco 2004	4.88	8.2	17	4.47	4.4	16	7.2%	0.41 [-4.04, 4.86]	2004	+
Zhang	5.27	1.78	22	7.18	2.76	22	12.6%	-1.91 [-3.28, -0.54]	2007	-
Perez-Barcena 2008	14	10	15	14	10	15	4.1%	0.00 [-7.16, 7.16]	2008	
Estivariz	9	2	15	21	5	12	9.7%	-12.00 [-15.00, -9.00]	2008	+
Cai	15.6	5.7	55	17.2	5.9	55	11.3%	-1.60 [-3.77, 0.57]	2008	*
Perez-Barcena 2010	15.2	8.2	23	18.9	11.1	20	5.3%	-3.70 [-9.61, 2.21]	2010	
Koksal Subtotal (95% CI)	13	12.2	30 177	14.3	5.4	30 170	6.7% 56.9%	-1.30 [-6.07, 3.47] - 3.10 [-6.32, 0.11]	2014	_+
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.10.2 Patients on EN	= 1.89 (F	° = 0.0	6)							
Palmese	6	1.7	42	5	2.5	42	13.2%	1.00 [0.09, 1.91]	2006	•
Ozgultekin	10.1	4.4	20	14.4	14	20	4.7%	-4.30 [-10.73, 2.13]		
Luo	5	1	14	6	1	9	13.3%	-1.00 [-1.84, -0.16]	2008	-
Eroglu Subtotal (95% CI)	8	3	20 <mark>96</mark>	9	3	20 91	11.9% 43.1%	-1.00 [-2.86, 0.86] - 0.46 [-1.94, 1.03]	2009	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1. Test for overall effect: Z =			•	3 (P = 0	.006);	l² = 76°	%			
Total (95% CI)			273			261	100.0%	-2.16 [-3.89, -0.43]		•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 5.	65; Chi ^z	= 73.9	1, df=	10 (P ≺	0.000	01); I ² =	86%			
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 2.45 (F	P = 0.0	1)							-100 -50 0 50 100 Favours PN dutamine Favours control
Test for subgroup differe	ences: C	≿hi² = 2	2.15. df	= 1 (P =	0.14)	, I ² = 53	.4%			ravours rivigiotamine ravours control

Included Studies

- I) Griffiths RD, Jones C, Palmer TE. Six-month outcome of critically ill patients given glutamine- supplemented parenteral nutrition. Nutrition Apr;13(4):295-302, 1997.
 ii) Griffiths RD, Allen KD, Andrews FJ, Jones C. Infection, multiple organ failure, and survival in the intensive care unit: influence of glutamine-supplemented parenteral nutrition on acquired infection. Nutrition 2002;18(7-8):546-52.
- 2. Powell-Tuck J, Jamieson CP, Bettany GE, Obeid O, Fawcett HV, Archer C, Murphy DL. A double blind, randomised, controlled trial of glutamine supplementation in parenteral nutrition. Gut. 1999 Jul; 45(1): 82-8.
- 3. Wischmeyer PE, Lynch J, Liedel J, Wolfson R, Riehm J, Gottlieb L, Kahana M. Glutamine administration reduces Gram-negative bacteremia in severely burned patients: a prospective, randomized, double-blind trial versus isonitrogenous control. Crit Care Med. 2001 Nov; 29(11): 2075-80.
- 4. Goeters C, Wenn A, Mertes N, Wempe C, Van Aken H, Stehle P, Bone HG. Parenteral L-alanyl-L-glutamine improves 6-month outcome in critically ill patients. Crit Care Med. 2002 Sep; 30(9): 2032-7.
- 5. Carroll PV, Jackson NC, Russell-Jones DL, Treacher DF, Sönksen PH, Umpleby AM. Combined growth hormone/insulin-like growth factor I in addition to glutaminesupplemented TPN results in net protein anabolism in critical illness. Am J Physiol Endocrinol Metab. 2004 Jan;286(1):E151-7.
- 6. Fuentes-Orozco C, Anaya-Prado R, Gonzalez-Ojeda A, Arenas-Marquez H, Cabrera-Pivaral C, Cervantes-Guevara G, Barrera-Zepeda LM. L-alanyl-L-glutaminesupplemented parenteral nutrition improves infectious morbidity in secondary peritonitis. Clin Nutr. 2004 Feb;23(1):13-21.
- 7. Zhou Ye-Ping et al. The effects of supplemental glutamine dipeptide on gut integrity and clinical outcomes after major escharectomy in severe burns: a randomized, double blind, controlled clinical trial. Clinical Nutrition Supplements 2004(1):55.
- 8. Xian-Li He et al. Effect of total parenteral nutrition (TPN) with and without glutamine dipeptide supplementation on outcome in severe acute pancreatitis (SAP). Clinical Nutrition Supplements 2004(1):43.
- 9. Dechelotte P, Hasselman M et al. L-Alanyl-L-glutamine dipeptide-supplemented totalparenteral nutrition reduces infectious complications and glucose intolerance in critically ill patients : The French controlled, randomized, double-blind, multicentre study. Crit Care Med 2006.
- 10. Palmese S et al. Early enteral nutrition enriched with FOS and intravenous glutamine supplementation in intensive care unit patients. Nutritional Therapy & Metabolism 2006;24(3):140-146.
- 11. Tian H, Wang KF, Wu TJ. [Effect of total parenteral nutrition with supplementation of glutamine on the plasma diamine oxidase activity and D-lactate content in patients with multiple organ dysfunction syndrome]. Zhongguo Wei Zhong Bing Ji Jiu Yi Xue. 2006 Oct;18(10):616-8. Chinese. PubMed PMID: 17038253.
- 12. Sahin H, Mercanligil et al. Effects of glutamine-enriched total parenteral nutrition on acute pancreatitis. Eur J Clin Nutr 2007;61:1429-1434.
- 13. Yang D, Xu J. Effect of dipeptide of glutamine and alanine on severe traumatic brain injury. Chin J Traumatology 2007;10(3):145-149.
- 14. Zhang Z, Qin HD, Ni HB, Xu Y, Wu HR, Cheng H, Wang SK. [Effect of early enriched parenteral alanyl-glutamine on heat shock protein 70 (HSP70) expression in critical patients]. Zhongguo Wei Zhong Bing Ji Jiu Yi Xue. 2007 Aug;19(8):481-4. Chinese. PubMed PMID: 17708846.
- 15. Cai G et al. Immunomodulatory effects of glutamine-enriched nutritional support in elderly patients with severe sepsis: a prospective, randomized, controlled study. J Organ Dysfunction 2008;4(31-37)
- 16. Duska F et al. Frequent intravenous pulses of growth hormone together with glutamine supplementation in prolonged critical illness after multiple trauma : Effects on nitrogen balance, insulin resistance, and substrate oxidation. Crit Care Med 2008;36(6):1707-1713.
- 17. Estivariz CF, Griffith DP, Luo M et al. Efficacy of parenteral nutrition supplemented with glutamine dipeptide to decrease hospital infections in critically ill surgical patients. JPEN J Parenter Enteral Nutr 2008;32(4):389-402.
- 18. Fuentes-Oroczo C, Cervantes-Guevara G et al. L-alanyl-L-glutamine-supplemented parenteral nutrition decreases infectious morbidity rate in patients with severe acute pancreatitis. JPEN J Parenter Enteral Nutr 2008;32(4):403-11.
- 19. Luo M, Barzargan N et al. Metabolic effects of enteral versus parenteral alanyl-glutamine dipeptide administration in critically ill patients receiving enteral feeding : A pilot study. Clin Nutr 2008;27:297-306.

- 20. Perez-Barcena J et al. Glutamine as a modulator of the immune system of critical care patients : Effects on toll-like receptor expression. A preliminary study. Nutrition 2008; 24:522-527.
- 21. Ozgultekin A, Turan G, Durmus Y, Dincer E, Akgun N. Comparison of the efficacy of parenteral and branched-chain amino acid solutions given as extra supplements in parallel to the enteral nutrition in head trauma. E-SPEN. 2008;3(5):e211-e216
- 22. Yang SQ, Xu JG. [Effect of glutamine on serum interleukin-8 and tumor necrosis factor-alpha levels in patients with severe pancreatitis]. Nan Fang Yi Ke Da Xue Xue Bao. 2008 Jan;28(1):129-31. Chinese. PubMed PMID: 18227044.
- 23. Eroglu A. The effect of intravenous alanyl-glutamine supplementation on plasma glutathione levels in intensive care unit trauma patients receiving enteral nutrition: the results of a randomized controlled trial. Anesth Analg. 2009 Aug;109(2):502-5.
- 24. Pérez-Bárcena J, Crespí C, Regueiro V, et al. Lack of effect of glutamine administration to boost the innate immune system response in trauma patients in the intensive care unit. Crit Care. 2010;14(6):R233. doi:10.1186/cc9388
- 25. Andrews PJ, Avenell A, Noble DW, et al. Randomised trial of glutamine, selenium, or both, to supplement parenteral nutrition for critically ill patients. BMJ. 2011;342:d1542. Published 2011 Mar 17. doi:10.1136/bmj.d1542
- 26. Çekmen N, Aydın A, Erdemli O. The impact of L-alanyl-L-glutamine dipeptide supplemented total parenteral nutrition on clinical outcome in critically patients. E Spen Eur E J Clin Nutr Metab. 2011 Mar 5;6(2):e64-e67. doi: 10.1016/j.ecInm.2011.02.001
- 27. Grau T, Bonet A, Miñambres E, et al. The effect of L-alanyl-L-glutamine dipeptide supplemented total parenteral nutrition on infectious morbidity and insulin sensitivity in critically ill patients. Crit Care Med. 2011;39(6):1263-1268. doi:10.1097/CCM.0b013e31820eb774
- 28. Wernerman J, Kirketeig T, Andersson B, et al. Scandinavian glutamine trial: a pragmatic multi-centre randomised clinical trial of intensive care unit patients. Acta Anaesthesiol Scand. 2011;55(7):812-818. doi:10.1111/j.1399-6576.2011.02453.x
- 29. Grintescu IM, Luca Vasiliu I, Cucereanu Badica I, Mirea L, Pavelescu D, Balanescu A, Grintescu IC. The influence of parenteral glutamine supplementation on glucose homeostasis in critically ill polytrauma patients-A randomized-controlled clinical study. Clin Nutr. 2015 Jun;34(3):377-82.
- 30. Koksal GM, Erbabacan E, Tunali Y, Karaoren G, Vehid S, Oz H. The effects of intravenous, enteral and combined administration of glutamine on malnutrition in sepsis: a randomized clinical trial. Asia Pac J Clin Nutr. 2014;23(1):34-40.
- 31. Pérez-Bárcena J, Marsé P, Zabalegui-Pérez A, et al. A randomized trial of intravenous glutamine supplementation in trauma ICU patients. Intensive Care Med. 2014;40(4):539-547. doi:10.1007/s00134-014-3230-y
- 32. Ziegler TR, May AK, Hebbar G, et al. Efficacy and Safety of Glutamine-supplemented Parenteral Nutrition in Surgical ICU Patients: An American Multicenter Randomized Controlled Trial. Ann Surg. 2016;263(4):646-655. doi:10.1097/SLA.00000000001487
- Liu X, Sun XF, Ge QX. The role of glutamine supplemented total parenteral nutrition (TPN) in severe acute pancreatitis. Eur Rev Med Pharmacol Sci. 2016 Oct;20(19):4176-4180.

Excluded Articles

#	Reason excluded	Citation
1	Elective surgery pts	O'Riordain MG, Fearon KC, Ross JA, Rogers P, Falconer JS, Bartolo DC, Garden OJ, Carter DC. Glutamine-supplemented total parenteral nutrition enhances T-lymphocyte response in surgical patients undergoing colorectal resection. Ann Surg. 1994 Aug;220(2):212-21.
2	Not ICU pts (excluded respiratory failure patients)	DeBeaux A, O'Riordain M, Ross J, et al. Glutamine supplemented total parenteral nutrition reduces blood mononuclear cell interleukin-8 release in severe acute pancreatitis. Nutrition 1998:14 (3):261-265.
3	Elective surgery pts	Morlion BJ, Stehle P, Wachtler P, Siedhoff HP, Köller M, König W, Fürst P, Puchstein C. Total parenteral nutrition with glutamine dipeptide after major abdominal surgery: a randomized, double-blind, controlled study. Ann Surg. 1998 Feb;227(2):302-8.
4	Elective surgery pts	Jacobi CA, Ordemann J, Zuckermann H, Döcke W, Volk HD, Müller JM. [The influence of alanyl-glutamine on immunologic functions and morbidity in postoperative total parenteral nutrition. Preliminary results of a prospective randomized trial]. Zentralbl Chir. 1999;124(3):199-205.
5	Elective surgery pts	Mertes N, Schulzki C, Goeters C, Winde G, Benzing S, Kuhn KS, Van Aken H, Stehle P, Fürst P. Cost containment through L-alanyl- L-glutamine supplemented total parenteral nutrition after major abdominal surgery: a prospective randomized double-blind controlled study. Clin Nutr. 2000 Dec;19(6):395-401.
6	Elective surgery pts	Spittler A, Sautner T, Gornikiewicz A, Manhart N, Oehler R, Bergmann M, Függer R, Roth E. Postoperative glycyl-glutamine infusion reduces mmunosuppression: partial prevention of the surgery induced decrease in HLA-DR expression on monocytes. Clin Nutr. 2001 Feb;20(1):37-42.
7	Couldn't get mortality information from authors	Hájek R, Hude P, Horky P, Baltusová E, Bosáková H, Řehořková D. Dipeptivan a ovlivněni inumitnich funkci u polytraumat. Anest noedkl Péče; 12(5):252-255, 2001.
8	Elective surgery pts	Neri A, Mariani F, Piccolomini A, Testa M, Vuolo G, Di Cosmo L. Glutamine-supplemented total parenteral nutrition in major abdominal surgery. Nutrition. 2001 Nov-Dec;17(11-12):968-9.
9	Elective surgery pts	Lin MT, Kung SP, Yeh SL, Lin C, Lin TH, Chen KH, Liaw KY, Lee PH, Chang KJ, Chen WJ. The effect of glutamine-supplemented total parenteral nutrition on nitrogen economy depends on severity of diseases in surgical patients. Clin Nutr. 2002 Jun;21(3):213-8.
10	Not ICU pts	Ockenga J, Borchert K, Rifai K, Manns MP, Bischoff SC. Effect of glutamine-enriched total parenteral nutrition in patients with acute pancreatitis. Clin Nutr 2002;21(5):409-16.
11	No significant outcomes	Umpleby AM, Carroll PV, Russell-Jones DL, Treacher DF, Jackson NC. Glutamine supplementation and GH/IGF-I treatment in critically ill patients: effects on glutamine metabolism and protein balance. Nutrition 2002;18(2):127-9.
12	Elective surgery pts	Exner R, Tamandl D, Goetzinger P, Mittlboeck M, Fuegger R, Sautner T, Spittler A, Roth E. Perioperative GLY-GLN infusion diminishes the surgery-induced period of immunosuppression: accelerated restoration of the lipopolysaccharide-stimulated tumor necrosis factor-alpha response. Ann Surg. 2003 Jan;237(1):110-5.
13	Cancer pts	Fläring UB, Rooyackers OE, Wernerman J, Hammarqvist F. Glutamine attenuates post-traumatic glutathione depletion in human muscle. Clin Sci (Lond). 2003 Mar;104(3):275-82.

14	Not ICU patients, No clinical outcomes	Hulsewé KW, van Acker BA, Hameeteman W, van der Hulst RR, Vainas T, Arends JW, van Kreel BK, von Meyenfeldt MF, Soeters PB. Does glutamine-enriched parenteral nutrition really affect intestinal morphology and gut permeability? Clin Nutr. 2004 Oct;23(5):1217-25.
15	Surgical pts	Jiang Z, Jiang H, Furst P. The impact of glutamine dipeptides on outcome of surgical patients: systematic review of randomized controlled trials from Europe and Asia. Clinical Nutrition Supplements 2004;1(1):17-23.
16	Not ICU pts	Jing-Xiang S, Xiao-Huang T, Lie W, Chen-Jin L. Glutamine dipeptide-supplemented parenteral nutrition in patients with colorectal cancer. Clinical Nutrition Supplements 2004, 1(1):49-53.
17	Intervention consisted of varying doses of glutamine	Tjäder I, Rooyackers O, Forsberg AM, Vesali RF, Garlick PJ, Wernerman J. Effects on skeletal muscle of intravenous glutamine supplementation to ICU patients. Intensive Care Med. 2004;30(2):266-275. doi:10.1007/s00134-003-2048-9
18	Preliminary study, replaced by Estivariz 2008	Ziegler TR, Fernandez-Estivariz C, Griffth P et al. Parenteral Nutrition Supplemented with alanyl-glutamine dipeptide decreases infectious morbidity and improves organ function in critically ill post-operative patients: results of a double-blind, randomized, controlled pilot study. Nutrition Week Abstracts 2004: 023: 52.
19	No clinical outcomes	Berg A, Rooyackers O, Norberg A, Wernerman J. Elimination kinetics of L-alanyl-L-glutamine in ICU patients. Amino Acids. 2005 Nov;29(3):221-8. Epub 2005 Aug 1.
20	Not ICU pts	Blijlevens NM, Donnelly JP, Naber AH, Schattenberg AV, DePauw BE. A randomised, double-blinded, placebo-controlled, pilot study of parenteral glutamine for allogeneic stem cell transplant patients. Support Care Cancer. 2005 Oct;13(10):790-6. Epub 2005 Mar 15.
21	Surgery pts	Lin MT, Kung SP, Yeh SL, Liaw KY, Wang MY, Kuo ML, Lee PH, Chen WJ. Glutamine-supplemented total parenteral nutrition attenuates plasma interleukin-6 in surgical patients with lower disease severity. World J Gastroenterol. 2005 Oct 21;11(39):6197-201.
22	Not ICU pts	Ockenga J, Borchert K, Stüber E, Lochs H, Manns MP, Bischoff SC. Glutamine-enriched total parenteral nutrition in patients with inflammatory bowel disease. Eur J Clin Nutr. 2005 Nov;59(11):1302-9.
23	Surgery pts	Yao GX, Xue XB, Jiang ZM, Yang NF, Wilmore DW. Effects of perioperative parenteral glutamine-dipeptide supplementation on plasma endotoxin level, plasma endotoxin inactivation capacity and clinical outcome. Clin Nutr. 2005 Aug;24(4):510-5.
24	Sub-group of earlier study already included	Ziegler TR, Ogden LG, Singleton KD et al. Parenteral glutamine increases serum heat shock protein 70 in critically ill patients. Intensive Care Med 2005;31(8):1079-86.
25	Meta-analyses	Avenell A. Glutamine in critical care: current evidence from systematic reviews. Proc Nutr Soc. 2006 Aug;65(3):236-41.
26	No clinical outcomes	Bakalar B, Duska F, Pachl J, Fric M, Otahal M, Pazout J, Andel M. Parenterally administered dipeptide alanyl-glutamine prevents worsening of insulin sensitivity in multiple-trauma patients. Crit Care Med. 2006 Feb;34(2):381-6.
27	Crossover study	Berg A, Bellander BM, Wanecek M, Gamrin L, Elving A, Rooyackers O, Ungerstedt U, Wernerman J. Intensive Intravenous glutamine supplementation to head trauma patients leaves cerebral glutamate concentration unaffected. Int Care Med. 2006 Nov;32(11):1741- 6. Epub 2006 Sep 23.
28	Elective surgery pts	Zheng YM, Li F, Zhang MM, Wu XT. Glutamine dipeptide for parenteral nutrition in abdominal surgery: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. World J Gastroenterol. 2006 Dec 14;12(46):7537-41.
29	Poor methodology	Kumar S, Kumar R, Sharma SB, Jain BK. Effect of oral glutamine administration on oxidative stress, morbidity and mortality in critically ill surgical patients. Indian J Gastroenterol. 2007 Mar-Apr;26(2):70-3.

30	Crossover study	Berg A, Bellander BM, Wanecek M, Norberg A, Ungerstedt U, Rooyackers O, Wernerman J. The pattern of amino acid exchange across the brain is unaffected by intravenous glutamine supplementation in head trauma patients. Clin Nutr. 2008 Dec;27(6):816-21. Epub 2008 Jul 22.
31	Duplicate of Zeigler 2004 RCT included	Luo M, Fernandez-Estivariz C, Jones DP, Accardi CR, Alteheld B, Bazargan N, Hao L, Griffith DP, Blumberg JB, Galloway JR, Ziegler TR. Depletion of plasma antioxidants in surgical intensive care unit patients requiring parenteral feeding: effects of parenteral nutrition with or without alanyl-glutamine dipeptide supplementation. Nutrition. 2008 Jan;24(1):37-44.
32	Not an RCT	Soguel L, Chioléro RL, Ruffieux C, Berger MM. Monitoring the clinical introduction of a glutamine and antioxidant solution in critically ill trauma and burn patients. Nutrition. 2008 Nov-Dec;24(11-12):1123-32.
33	Cancer pts	Sornsuvit C, Komindr S, Chuncharunee S, Wanikiat P, Archararit N, Santanirand P. Pilot Study: effects of parenteral glutamine dipeptide supplementation on neutrophil functions and prevention of chemotherapy-induced side-effects in acute myeloid leukaemia patients. J Int Med Res. 2008 Nov-Dec;36(6):1383-91. PubMed PMID: 19094450.
34	Elective surgery pts	Yeh CN, Lee HL, Liu YY, Chiang KC, Hwang TL, Jan YY, Chen MF. The role of parenteral glutamine supplement for surgical patient perioperatively: result of a single center, prospective and controlled study. Langenbecks Arch Surg. 2008 Nov;393(6):849-55. Epub 2008 Aug 20.
35	Not mechanically ventilated	Zhao L, Guan XD, Cheng YZ. [The influence of glutamine-enriched total parenteral nutrition on morbidity rate of lung infection in patients with severe craniocerebral injury]. Zhongguo Wei Zhong Bing Ji Jiu Yi Xue 2008; 20:695-696.
36	Elective surgery pts	Asprer JM, Llido LO, Sinamban R, Schlotzer E, Kulkarni H. Effect on immune indices of preoperative intravenous glutamine dipeptide supplementation in malnourished abdominal surgery patients in the preoperative and postoperative periods. Nutrition. 2009 Sep;25(9):920-5.
37	Elective surgery pts	Fan YP, Yu JC, Kang WM, Zhang Q. Effects of glutamine supplementation on patients undergoing abdominal surgery. Chin Med Sci J. 2009 Mar;24(1):55-9.
38	Not clinical outcomes	Cetinbas F, Yelken B, Gulbas Z. Role of glutamine administration on cellular immunity after total parenteral nutrition enriched with glutamine in patients with systemic inflammatory response syndrome. J Crit Care. 2010 Dec;25(4):661.e1-6.
39	No clinical outcomes & Not ICU patients	Mondello S, Italiano D, Giacobbe MS, Mondello P, Trimarchi G, Aloisi C, Bramanti P, Spina E. Glutamine-supplemented total parenteral nutrition improves immunological status in anorectic patients. Nutrition. 2010 Jun;26(6):677-81.
40	Meta-analyses, individual RCTs were reviewed	Wang Y, Jiang ZM, Nolan MT, Jiang H, Han HR, Yu K, Li HL, Jie B, Liang XK. The impact of glutamine dipeptide-supplemented parenteral nutrition on outcomes of surgical patients: a meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials. JPEN J Parenter Enteral Nutr. 2010 Sep-Oct;34(5):521-9.
41	Elective surgical cancer pts	Lu CY, Shih YL, Sun LC, Chuang JF, Ma CJ, Chen FM, Wu DC, Hsieh JS, Wang JY. The inflammatory modulation effect of glutamine-enriched total parenteral nutrition in postoperative gastrointestinal cancer patients. Am Surg. 2011 Jan;77(1):59-64.
42	Not ICU patients, only 8- 14% patients ventilated	Hajdu N, Belagyi T, Issekutz A, Bartek P, Gartner B, Olah A. [Intravenous glutamine and early nasojejunal nutrition in severe acute pancreatitis - a prospective randomized clinical study]. Magyar sebeszet 2012;65(2):44-51.

43	Study Design, no results	Pérez-Bárcena J, Marsé P, Cervera M, Frontera G, Llompart-Pou JA, Raurich JM, García de Lorenzo A. [Efficacy of the dipeptide N(2)-L-Alanyl-L-glutamine in traumatic patients admitted to the ICU: a prospective, randomized, double-blind, multicentre study]. Nutr Hosp. 2012 Jan-Feb;27(1):116-22.
44	Meta-analysis, individual RCTs reviewed	Bollhalder L, Pfeil AM, Tomonaga Y, Schwenkglenks M. A systematic literature review and meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials of parenteral glutamine supplementation. Clin Nutr. 2013 Apr;32(2):213-23.
45	Not a RCT	Nägeli M, Fasshauer M, Sommerfeld J, Fendel A, Brandi G, Stover JF. Prolonged continuous intravenous infusion of the dipeptide L- alanine- L-glutamine significantly increases plasma glutamine and alanine without elevating brain glutamate in patients with severe traumatic brain injury. Crit Care. 2014 Jul 2;18(4):R139.
46	Systematic review	Wischmeyer PE, Dhaliwal R, McCall M, Ziegler TR, Heyland DK. Parenteral glutamine supplementation in critical illness: a systematic review. Crit Care. 2014 Apr 18;18(2):R76.
47	Post-hoc analysis	Heyland DK, Elke G, Cook D, Berger MM, Wischmeyer PE, Albert M, Muscedere J, Jones G, Day AG; Canadian Critical Care Trials Group. Glutamine and antioxidants in the critically ill patient: a post hoc analysis of a large-scale randomized trial. JPEN J Parenter Enteral Nutr. 2015 May;39(4):401-9. Epub 2014 May 5.
48	Not cared for in ICU	Liu X, Sun XF, Ge QX. The role of glutamine supplemented total parenteral nutrition (TPN) in severe acute pancreatitis. Eur Rev Med Pharmacol Sci. 2016 Oct;20(19):4176-4180.
49	Not critically ill	Yao D, Zheng L, Wang J, Guo M, Yin J, Li Y. Perioperative Alanyl-Glutamine-Supplemented Parenteral Nutrition in Chronic Radiation Enteritis Patients With Surgical Intestinal Obstruction: A Prospective, Randomized, Controlled Study. Nutr Clin Pract. 2016 Apr;31(2):250-6.
50	Not critically ill	Brinkmann SJ, Buijs N, Vermeulen MA, Oosterink E, Schierbeek H, Beishuizen A, de Vries JP, Wisselink W, van Leeuwen PA. Perioperative glutamine supplementation restores disturbed renal arginine synthesis after open aortic surgery: a randomized controlled clinical trial. Am J Physiol Renal Physiol. 2016 Sep 1;311(3):F567-75.