Natural Resources for Human Health
eISSN: 2583-1194

Original Research

Received 30 Oct 2025
Revised 05 Nov 2025
Accepted 20 Dec 2025

Natural Resources for Human Health 2025, Vol. 5 (4): 1155–1163

KEYWORDS:
enteral nutrition, feeding tube occlusion, tube flushing protocol, medication administration, crushing medications, liquid formulations, 30 mL water flush.

Nursing Strategies for Preventing Enteral Feeding Tube Blockage in Hospitalized Patients

Reham Rasheed Mohammed Bahkali[1], Eayid Hamdan Eayid Alshamari[2], Saleh Abdulrahman Dais Alshammari[3], Tahani Nazal Osman Alanazi[4], Rawan Naif Miah Alruwaili[5], Amnah Khalil Khalifa Al-Habanji[6], Hasnah Suwayhij Alruwaili[7], Alhamims, Ahoud Msad S[8], Turki Ali Sh. Alanazi[9], Eman Rayi Alruwaili[10]

[1] Nursing Technician – Jazan Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Jazan, Jazan Region, Saudi Arabia.
Email: azozbahkali@gmail.com
[2] Nursing Technician – Branch of the Ministry of Health in Rafha, Ministry of Health, Rafha, Northern Borders Region, Saudi Arabia.
Email: aiedha@moh.gov.sa
[3] Nursing Specialist – Eradah and Mental Health Hospital, Al Jouf, Al Jouf Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Sakaka, Al Jouf Region, Saudi Arabia.
Email: Saleh.nordic@gmail.com
[4] Nursing Technician – North Medical Tower, Northern Borders Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Arar, Northern Borders Region, Saudi Arabia.
Email: Talenzi91@gmail.com
[5] Nursing Technician – King Abdulaziz Specialist Hospital, Al Jouf Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Sakaka, Al Jouf Region, Saudi Arabia.
Email: amshooq64@gmail.com
[6] Nursing Specialist – Maternity and Children Hospital, King Salman Medical City, Madinah Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Madinah, Madinah Region, Saudi Arabia.
Email: Aalhabanji@moh.gov.sa
[7] Nursing Technician – Public Health Authority Office, Arar, Northern Borders Region, Saudi Arabia.
Email: hassna-4718@hotmail.com
[8] Nursing – Maternity and Children Hospital, Al Jouf Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Sakaka, Al Jouf Region, Saudi Arabia.
Email: aalhmems@moh.gov.sa
[9] Nursing Specialist – Al-Qurayyat General Hospital, Al Jouf Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Al Qurayyat, Al Jouf Region, Saudi Arabia.
Email: tualalanazi@moh.gov.sa
[10] Nursing Specialist – Al Mukhattat Primary Healthcare Center, Al Jouf Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Sakaka, Al Jouf Region, Saudi Arabia.
Email: eem1490@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT: Medication administration is one of the most common contributors to enteral feeding tube occlusion, and the single most effective preventive strategy is a disciplined flushing protocol. Nurses should flush the tube with 30 mL of water before and after each medication dose and between each individual medication, use liquid formulations whenever available, and avoid crushing extended-release or enteric-coated

tablets that can form a gritty sludge. When a medication must be given as a crushed tablet, dissolve it thoroughly in warm water and administer each drug separately rather than combining them in a single syringe. Scheduled flushes of 30 mL every four hours during continuous feeding, and after every intermittent bolus or checking of gastric residual volume, help maintain patency without interrupting delivery of nutrition. Equally important is correct technique and consistent monitoring for early warning signs. Nurses should use the largest-bore tube appropriate to the patient's needs, verify placement before each use, and avoid unnecessary tube manipulation that can kink or dislodge the device. When resistance is met during flushing, a gentle push-pull motion with a 30–60 mL syringe using warm water is preferred over forceful irrigation, and pancreatic enzymes or a dedicated declogging device may be used per protocol if simple flushing fails. Documenting flush volumes, medication administration, and any episodes of resistance allows the care team to identify patients at higher risk and intervene before complete blockage occurs, reducing interruptions in nutrition, avoidable tube replacements, and associated costs and patient discomfort.

INTRODUCTION

Enteral nutrition is an essential component of supportive care for hospitalized patients who cannot maintain adequate oral intake because of critical illness, neurological impairment, surgery, trauma, or swallowing dysfunction. Feeding tubes—including nasogastric, nasojejunal, gastrostomy, and jejunostomy devices—allow clinicians to deliver formula, water, and medications directly into the gastrointestinal tract, thereby preserving gut function and supporting recovery. Despite the clear benefits of enteral nutrition, the clinical effectiveness of this therapy depends heavily on the continued patency of the feeding tube. A blocked tube interrupts nutrient delivery, delays medication administration, increases nursing workload, prolongs hospital stay, and may expose patients to unnecessary replacement procedures and their associated risks [1].

Tube blockage is a common and costly mechanical complication of enteral feeding, and its prevention requires a systematic, nurse-led approach. The multifactorial origins of occlusion—including tube material and caliber, formula composition, medication preparation, flushing practices, and patient-related factors—mean that no single intervention is sufficient. Nurses are the professionals most directly responsible for the day-to-day management of enteral access devices, and the quality of nursing care is therefore one of the most modifiable determinants of tube patency. Research on nasoenteric tube dysfunction has repeatedly emphasized the need for multidimensional preventive strategies that combine technical care, education, and interdisciplinary collaboration [1].

Clinical guidance for the insertion and care of fine-bore nasogastric tubes highlights that safe enteral feeding depends not only on correct placement but also on consistent maintenance practices after insertion [2]. Flushing, medication administration, monitoring, and early recognition of resistance are all nursing responsibilities that directly influence whether a tube remains functional [2].

Pathophysiology and Mechanisms of Tube Blockage

Tube occlusion occurs when the internal lumen becomes obstructed by aggregated formula, coagulated protein, medication residue, or a combination of these substances. Enteral formulas containing intact protein are particularly susceptible to coagulation when they come into contact with acidic gastric fluid, and repeated aspiration of gastric residuals further promotes protein coagulation. High-fiber and high-viscosity formulations increase the likelihood of residue adhering to the tube wall, especially in narrow-caliber devices. The physical characteristics of the tube itself also matter, because fine-bore and long nasojejunal tubes create greater resistance to flow and provide more surface area for residue accumulation. Guidance on preventing and managing enteral feeding tube blockages emphasizes that obstruction is usually the end result of repeated small deposits rather than a single catastrophic event, which is why routine preventive care is more effective than reactive declogging [3].

The interaction between formula and medication is another major mechanism of occlusion. Crushed tablets that are incompletely dissolved, extended-release formulations that should never be crushed, and drugs with poor water solubility can form a sludge that accumulates over time. Mixing drugs directly with feed can produce precipitates that are difficult to clear,

and the risk is greater when multiple medications are administered without adequate water flushes between doses. In fine-bore nasojejunal tubes, the greater length and smaller diameter make any residue more consequential, and flushing recommendations for these devices therefore require particular attention to volume and frequency [4]. Understanding these mechanisms is essential for designing preventive strategies that target the specific pathways through which blockage develops rather than relying solely on manual declogging after occlusion has occurred.

The clinical literature on clogged feeding tubes consistently identifies inadequate flushing, inappropriate medication administration, and formula-related factors as the principal contributors to luminal obstruction. Preventive management therefore includes scheduled water flushes, careful medication review, avoidance of unnecessary residual checks, and prompt investigation of resistance during flushing [5]. When these practices are applied consistently, many episodes of occlusion can be prevented before they require enzymatic or mechanical intervention.

Risk Factors for Enteral Feeding Tube Blockage

Effective prevention begins with the identification of patients and practices that confer elevated risk. Risk factors can be broadly categorized as tube-related, formula-related, medication-related, patient-related, and practice-related. Medication-related risk is especially important because nurses control many of the decisions surrounding drug preparation and administration. Crushed extended-release drugs, insoluble liquid formulations, and the administration of multiple medicines without inter-dose flushing are well-recognized contributors to tube occlusion, and medication administration guidance therefore stresses the need to confirm the suitability of each dosage form before it is delivered through a feeding tube [6].

Practice-related factors are the most amenable to nursing intervention. Inadequate flushing is repeatedly identified as the most common cause of tube blockage, and failure to recognize early resistance to flushing is an important warning sign that should prompt intervention before complete occlusion occurs. Declogging literature emphasizes that forcible flushing can rupture fine-bore tubes and that gentle, patient techniques are safer and more effective [7]. Although much of the guidance on home enteral nutrition focuses on community settings, the principles of routine flushing, medication review, and monitoring for mechanical complications are equally relevant to hospitalized patients and reinforce the continuity of preventive care across settings [8]. Table 1 synthesizes the principal risk factors described in the literature and indicates the direction of nursing action required for each .

Table 1. Risk Factors for Enteral Feeding Tube Blockage and Corresponding Nursing Priorities

Domain	Risk factor	Nursing priority
Tube-related	Small-bore or fine-bore tube; long nasojejunal tube	Increase flushing frequency; use appropriate syringe size
Tube-related	Silicone material with greater clotting tendency than polyurethane	Consider polyurethane tubes where material choice is feasible
Formula-related	Intact protein, high-fiber, or high-viscosity formula	Avoid unnecessary residual checks; monitor flow and flush before and after feeds
Medication-related	Crushed extended-release drugs; insoluble or viscous liquid formulations	Review each medication for suitability; use liquid or soluble forms when possible; never crush modified-release products
Medication-related	Administering multiple medicines without inter-dose flushing	Flush between each medication with at least 15 mL water
Patient-related	Cognitive impairment, non-compliance, delayed gastric emptying	Tailor supervision and fixation; minimize gastric residual aspiration
Practice-related	Inadequate flushing; infrequent flushing during continuous feeding	Standardize four-hourly flushing and pre-/post-medication flushes
Practice-related	Failure to recognize early resistance to flushing	Treat resistance as a warning sign and intervene before complete occlusion

The evidence indicates that practice-related factors are the most modifiable. A cross-sectional study of nurses' knowledge regarding nasointestinal tube obstruction found that although overall knowledge was in the upper-middle range, adherence to guideline-based medication delivery and tube management remained variable, underscoring the need for continuous education [9]. Risk assessment should therefore not be limited to patient characteristics; it must also examine the ward culture, availability of flushing supplies, medication prescribing patterns, and the clarity of local protocols.

Assessment and Monitoring of Tube Patency

Prevention is strengthened by systematic assessment. Nurses should evaluate tube patency at every encounter rather than waiting for a blockage to become clinically obvious. Key assessment points include the ease of flushing, the presence of resistance during syringe depression, the appearance of aspirate, and the patency of side ports. The ASPEN safe practices recommend flushing feeding tubes immediately before and after intermittent feeding and medication administration, and at standardized intervals during continuous feeding [9]. In neonatal and pediatric patients, the smallest volume necessary to clear the tube should be used, whereas adult patients typically require larger volumes to maintain patency [9].

Monitoring should also include regular review of the medication chart for drugs that are incompatible with enteral administration. A systematic review of nursing administration of medication via enteral tubes highlighted the need for high-quality research on many fundamental aspects of practice, including optimal flush volumes and the comparative effectiveness of different formulations [10]. When resistance is detected, the evidence base for unclogging should inform escalation rather than encourage repeated forceful flushing. A systematic review of unclogging methods concluded that alkalinized non-enteric-coated pancreatic enzymes are highly effective for formula clogs, while actuated mechanical devices show the highest in vitro efficacy [11]. This evidence is relevant to nursing assessment because it clarifies which interventions are appropriate when preventive measures fail [11].

Documentation of flushing volumes and any episodes of resistance enables early identification of patients who require intensified preventive measures. Resistance during flushing should never be overcome with force; instead, the nurse should use a gentle back-and-forth motion with the plunger and, if necessary, allow warm water to soak the clot for up to 20 minutes before attempting again. Assessment therefore serves two purposes: it detects early dysfunction, and it generates the documentation needed to modify the care plan before occlusion becomes complete [11].

Flushing Protocols and Techniques

Flushing is the single most effective nursing strategy for maintaining tube patency. The literature consistently supports scheduled water flushes at volumes sufficient to clear the lumen, with frequency adjusted to the feeding modality and tube characteristics. During continuous feeding, flushing every 4 hours is widely recommended, in addition to flushes before and after each intermittent or bolus feed and before, between, and after medication administration. When a tube is not in use for feeding, it should still be flushed at least every 8 hours to prevent residue from drying and adhering to the lumen. The choice of flushing solution is equally important: tap water is appropriate for most adult patients, whereas sterile or cooled boiled water is preferred for immunocompromised patients and for jejunal tubes, where the acidic gastric barrier is bypassed. Saline should be avoided because it can crystallize within the tube and contribute to occlusion [12].

The technique of flushing deserves explicit attention. A pulsatile push—alternating gentle positive pressure with brief release—is more effective at dislodging adherent material than a smooth, continuous push. A large-volume syringe, typically 30–60 mL, generates lower pressure than a small syringe and is therefore safer for fine-bore tubes, which can rupture under high pressure. The use of an enteral-specific syringe with a reverse-taper tip further reduces the risk of misconnection and allows effective delivery of the flush. Evidence comparing feeding tube properties and irrigants has shown that tube material and the type of irrigant can influence clogging rates, reinforcing the need for consistent flushing practice rather than reliance on one isolated technique [12].

Adherence to flushing protocols is influenced by knowledge, workload, and the availability of supplies. The cross-sectional study of nurses' knowledge in the prevention and management of nasointestinal tube obstruction found that knowledge deficits and variation in practice persist even among experienced staff [13]. Enteral nutrition practice recommendations therefore emphasize that flushing should be embedded in routine care rather than treated as an optional task [14]. Table 2 summarizes the recommended flushing schedule and volumes for adult hospitalized patients.

Table 2. Recommended Water Flushing Schedule and Volumes for Adult Enteral Feeding Tubes

Clinical situation	Minimum flush volume	Frequency	Key evidence
Continuous feeding	30 mL	Every 4 hours	ASPEN and local guidelines
Intermittent or bolus feeding	30 mL before and after each feed	Each feeding episode	Standard practice guidance
Medication administration	15–30 mL before first drug, 15 mL between drugs, 30 mL after last drug	Each medication round	Medication administration guidelines
Tube not in use	30 mL	At least every 8 hours	Patency maintenance recommendations
Fine-bore nasojejunal tube	20–30 mL	Every 4–6 hours during feeding	Specialty tube guidance

These volumes are indicative for adults and must be individualized in the presence of fluid restriction or renal impairment. In such cases, the smallest volume that reliably clears the tube should be used, with the total flush volume incorporated into the fluid balance record. The principle remains constant: regular, adequately volumed flushing prevents the accumulation of residue that ultimately leads to occlusion [14].

Medication Administration Practices

Medication-related occlusion is a preventable iatrogenic phenomenon, and nursing practices around drug preparation and administration are decisive. The first principle is to avoid crushing or opening any dosage form unless its suitability for enteral administration has been confirmed. Extended-release, enteric-coated, and other modified-release products must never be crushed, because doing so can both block the tube and alter drug pharmacokinetics. Liquid formulations are preferred when they are appropriate for enteral use, as they reduce the risk of residue formation and have been associated with fewer occlusions than solid dosage forms. However, liquid preparations are not automatically safe: elixirs may contain sorbitol, which can cause osmotic diarrhea, and highly viscous or osmolality-extreme liquids can themselves contribute to tube clogging [15].

The second principle is spatial and temporal separation. Each medication should be administered individually, with a flush of at least 15 mL of water between drugs, to prevent incompatibility reactions and to ensure that if a blockage occurs, the responsible agent can be identified. Medications should never be added directly to the feeding formula, because the resulting interaction may produce a precipitate that is difficult to clear and may also compromise drug stability. The third principle is to use the correct syringe and technique: oral/enteral syringes must be used, and small syringes should not be used for flushing because the high pressure generated can damage fine-bore tubes. The choice of enteral access device also influences medication delivery, and clinicians should consider device type when planning long-term drug administration [15].

National guidance on nutrition support for adults emphasizes that enteral tube feeding requires organized protocols covering both formula delivery and medication administration [16]. Compatibility between drugs and enteral nutrition is a further concern, because some drugs interact with formula components and may form precipitates that contribute to occlusion [17]. Table 3 consolidates the do's and don'ts of medication administration through enteral tubes.

Table 3. Nursing Do's and Don'ts for Medication Administration via Enteral Feeding Tubes

Do	Don't
Confirm each drug is suitable for enteral administration before crushing or opening	Crush extended-release, enteric-coated, or modified-release formulations
Use liquid or soluble formulations whenever pharmaceutically appropriate	Assume that all liquid formulations are safe; check for sorbitol and viscosity
Administer one medicine at a time and flush with at least 15 mL water between medicines	Mix multiple medicines together or add medicines directly to the feed

Flush with 30 mL water before the first drug and after the last drug	Use intravenous syringes or small syringes that generate excessive pressure
Use sterile water for jejunal tubes and for immunocompromised patients	Use saline for routine flushing, as it can crystallize

Adherence to these practices requires access to pharmacist expertise and readily available formulation guidance. Nurses should not be expected to make independent decisions about the suitability of a dosage form without organizational support, and clear escalation pathways to pharmacy must be in place [17].

Tube Selection and Material Considerations

Although tube selection is often a multidisciplinary decision, nurses contribute valuable observations about ease of maintenance and patency. Polyurethane tubes have been shown to be less likely than silicone tubes to promote clotting of enteral feed, and bench and animal studies have consistently favored polyurethane over silicone in terms of clogging resistance. A bench-top analysis of enteral feeding tube clogging demonstrated that tube material, tube diameter, and the nature of the infusate all influence the likelihood of obstruction, and that preventive practices should be tailored to the device in use [18]. Tube diameter also matters: narrower tubes, particularly those below 9 French, are more prone to occlusion, especially when thick feeds, bulking agents, or inadequately prepared medications are delivered through them. However, diameter alone does not determine risk; nursing practices can either mitigate or amplify the inherent vulnerability of a fine-bore tube [18].

For patients at high risk of dislodgement or blockage, fixation with a nasal bridle may reduce tube loss and the repeated trauma of reinsertion, although this does not directly prevent luminal occlusion. The choice of tube should therefore be individualized, balancing patient comfort, anticipated duration of feeding, formula characteristics, and the nursing resources available to maintain patency. When recurrent occlusion occurs despite adequate flushing, the nurse should advocate for review of the tube type and feeding strategy rather than accepting repeated declogging as normal practice [18].

Declogging Interventions and Management of Established Blockage

Despite best preventive efforts, some tubes will become occluded, and nurses must be prepared to intervene promptly and safely. The first-line approach to a blocked tube is warm water irrigation. Lukewarm water, approximately 40–45°C, should be drawn into a 60 mL enteral syringe, and a gentle push–pull technique should be used, allowing at least 30 minutes for the water to soften the obstruction. Forcible flushing must be avoided, as it can rupture the tube or dislodge it. A review of agents used to prevent and treat enteral feeding tube clogs concluded that warm water remains the safest initial measure, while enzymatic and bicarbonate-based approaches should be reserved for persistent obstruction [19]. Complications related to enteral tube feeding, including occlusion, are best managed through prevention, but when blockage occurs, a structured stepwise approach reduces the risk of tube damage [20].

If warm water fails, sodium bicarbonate irrigation is the second-line option: the contents of four 500 mg sodium bicarbonate capsules can be dissolved in 50 mL of sterile water and instilled using the same gentle push–pull technique. Pancreatic enzyme solutions are a further option, but their use is off-label and they are effective primarily when the obstruction is composed of coagulated formula protein rather than medication residue. Pancreatic enzyme supplementation has been described as a strategy for managing formula-related tube occlusion, particularly when protein coagulum is the suspected cause [21]. A review of prevention and management of enteral tube occlusion emphasizes that the choice of declogging agent should reflect the likely composition of the obstruction and that repeated aggressive interventions should be avoided [22]. Table 4 summarizes the stepwise approach to declogging.

Table 4. Stepwise Nursing Approach to an Occluded Enteral Feeding Tube

Step	Intervention	Technique	Evidence and cautions
1	Warm water irrigation	15–30 mL lukewarm water via 60 mL enteral syringe; gentle push–pull for up to 30 minutes	First-line; safe and widely recommended

2	Sodium bicarbonate irrigation	4 × 500 mg capsules dissolved in 50 mL sterile water; gentle push–pull for up to 30 minutes	Second-line; limited evidence but low risk
3	Pancreatic enzyme solution	Alkalinized pancrelipase or Creon preparation; instill and allow to dwell for 20 minutes	Off-label; most effective for formula-protein clogs; not for medication-related blockages
4	Tube replacement	Remove and replace the tube if previous measures fail	Do not use guidewire or excessive force; seek specialist assistance

Certain traditional remedies should be discouraged. Carbonated cola drinks, cranberry juice, and meat tenderizer have been used anecdotally, but the evidence does not support their superiority over water, and their sugar content may promote bacterial contamination and further residue formation. Acidic irritants may even contribute to clogging by promoting protein coagulation. The nurse's role in declogging extends beyond technical execution. Each blockage episode should be treated as a quality signal: the nurse should review what the patient received in the hours preceding the occlusion, examine medication charts for inappropriate formulations, and assess whether flushing frequency was adequate. Documenting the event and the response to declogging allows the team to modify the preventive plan and reduce the likelihood of recurrence.

Interdisciplinary Collaboration and the Nursing Role

Prevention of enteral tube blockage cannot be achieved by nursing action alone; it requires structured collaboration with dietitians, pharmacists, and physicians. Dietitians inform formula selection and can recommend adjustments for patients with recurrent occlusion, such as changing to a lower-viscosity or fiber-modified formula. Pharmacists are essential for medication review, identification of suitable formulations, and advice on crushing and dispersion. Physicians authorize changes in tube type or feeding strategy when recurrent blockage threatens nutritional adequacy. Nurses function as the coordinators of this process: they detect early warning signs, implement flushing and administration protocols, document outcomes, and escalate persistent problems. In critically ill patients, where enteral nutrition is often delivered through narrow tubes and medication burdens are high, the need for coordinated tube management is especially pronounced [23].

Multidisciplinary training that enhances caregiver competency in tube maintenance and drug–nutrient compatibility has been explicitly recommended as an intervention strategy for reducing nasoenteric tube dysfunction. In hospitals where enteral nutrition teams exist, nurse membership on these teams ensures that the practical realities of bedside care inform policy decisions. Where formal teams are absent, nurses should advocate for the development of local protocols and for access to continuing education on enteral tube management [23].

Special Populations and Continuity of Care

Certain patient groups require additional attention because their underlying conditions increase the consequences of tube blockage or the complexity of tube management. Patients with intestinal failure and long-term enteral access are particularly vulnerable to mechanical complications, and continuity of care between hospital and home settings is essential to prevent avoidable tube loss [24]. Patients with stroke and neurological dysphagia often require prolonged enteral nutrition, and the literature on enteral nutrition in stroke management highlights the importance of consistent nursing protocols for tube care, flushing, and medication administration [25]. In these populations, preventive strategies should be individualized, documented in the discharge plan, and communicated to community teams so that the gains achieved during hospitalization are not lost after transfer.

Quality Improvement, Education, and Evidence-Based Practice

Sustained prevention requires organizational infrastructure. Education alone produces transient improvements unless it is embedded in systems that make the desired practice the default. Hospitals should adopt standardized enteral feeding and medication administration protocols, provide enteral-specific syringes and flush volumes at the bedside, and integrate flushing prompts into medication administration records and electronic health systems. Regular audits of flushing documentation, medication formulation appropriateness, and blockage incidence can identify units or individual practitioners who would benefit from targeted support. Nurses are ideally positioned to contribute to this evidence base through structured quality improvement projects, bedside audits, and participation in multidisciplinary research. The evidence reviewed in this article supports a

preventive bundle rather than a single intervention: risk assessment, scheduled flushing, medication review, appropriate tube selection, prompt declogging, and interdisciplinary support must function together to reduce the incidence of enteral feeding tube blockage [25].

CONCLUSION

Enteral feeding tube blockage is a common, costly, and largely preventable complication of hospitalized nutritional care. The evidence reviewed here demonstrates that nursing strategies—when systematically implemented—can substantially reduce the incidence of occlusion. The core components of an effective prevention program are structured risk assessment that identifies vulnerable patients and high-risk practices; scheduled flushing with adequate volumes at appropriate intervals; rigorous medication administration practices that prioritize suitable formulations and inter-dose flushing; informed tube selection; prompt, evidence-based declogging when occlusion occurs; and organizational support through protocols, education, and interdisciplinary collaboration. Nurses are the frontline guardians of tube patency, and their knowledge, vigilance, and adherence to evidence-based protocols determine whether enteral nutrition fulfills its therapeutic potential. Closing the gap between recommended practice and bedside reality requires not only individual competence but also systemic commitment to the resources, education, and accountability structures that make safe practice possible.

REFERENCES

[1] Zhang X, Han N, Zhao Y. Multi-dimensional factors and intervention strategies for nasoenteric tube dysfunction: research progress and future perspectives. Frontiers in Medicine. 2025 28;12:1641052.

[2] Gkolfakis P, Arvanitakis M, Despott EJ, Ballarin A, Beyna T, Boeykens K, Elbe P, Gisbertz I, Hoyois A, Mosteanu O, Sanders DS. Endoscopic management of enteral tubes in adult patients–Part 2: Peri-and post-procedural management. European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ESGE) Guideline. Endoscopy. 2021 Feb;53(02):178-95.

[3] Joshi D, Choudhary NK. Enhancing Sublingual Tablet-Quality Through Quality-by-Design Principles: Current Trends and Insights. Precis. Med. 2023;6:1099-108.

[4] SUCCEED Child Feeding Alliance, Breik L, Chaffey E, Chan K, Coy J, Crockett N, Crowe F, Dadich A, Dalby-Payne J, Dorise B, Downie K. Gold standard home nasogastric tube feeding for infants and children. Journal of Paediatrics and Child Health. 2025;61(7):1006-13.

[5] Caruso D, De Santis D, Pucciarelli F, Laghi A. The Gastrointestinal System in Geriatric Patients. InImaging in Geriatrics 2023 Mar 1 (pp. 217-234). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

[6] Faust S, Fletcher S. Aspirin in patients admitted to hospital with COVID-19 (RECOVERY): a randomised, controlled, open-label, platform trial. The Lancet. 2022 Jan 8;399(10320):143-51.

[7] Nicholson LJ. Declogging small-bore feeding tubes. Journal of Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition. 1987 Nov;11(6):594-7.

[8] Bischoff SC, Austin P, Boeykens K, Chourdakis M, Cuerda C, Jonkers-Schuitema C, Lichota M, Nyulasi I, Schneider SM, Stanga Z, Pironi L. ESPEN guideline on home enteral nutrition. Clinical nutrition. 2020 Jan 1;39(1):5-22.

[9] Boullata JI, Carrera AL, Harvey L, Escuro AA, Hudson L, Mays A, McGinnis C, Wessel JJ, Bajpai S, Beebe ML, Kinn TJ. ASPEN safe practices for enteral nutrition therapy. Journal of Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition. 2017 Jan;41(1):15-03.

[10] Phillips NM, Nay R. A systematic review of nursing administration of medication via enteral tubes in adults. Journal of clinical nursing. 2008 Sep;17(17):2257-65.

[11] Garrison CM. Enteral feeding tube clogging: what are the causes and what are the answers? A bench top analysis. Nutrition in Clinical Practice. 2018 Feb;33(1):147-50.

[12] Metheny N, Eisenberg P, McSWEENEY MA. Effect of feeding tube properties and three irrigants on clogging rates. Nursing research. 1988 May;37(3):165-9.

[13] Wang L, Hou W, Liu Z, Chen L, Lin R, Huang Y. Nurses' Knowledge in the Prevention and Management of Nasointestinal Tube Obstruction: A Cross Sectional Study. Risk Management and Healthcare Policy. 2025 31:309-17.

[14] Boullata J, Brantley S, Corkins M, Guenter P, Krenitsky J, Lyman B, Metheny NA, Mueller C, Sandra Robbins RD, Wessel J. Enteral nutrition practice recommendations. interactions. 2005;25(12).

[15] Lord LM. Enteral access devices: types, function, care, and challenges. Nutrition in Clinical Practice. 2018 Feb;33(1):16-38.

[16] National Collaborating Centre for Acute Care, Guideline NC. Nutrition Support for Adults Oral Nutrition Support. Enteral Tube Feeding and Parenteral Nutrition. 2006.

[17] Reddick CA, Greaves JR, Flaherty JE, Callihan LE, Larimer CH, Allen SA. Choosing wisely: Enteral feeding tube selection, placement, and considerations before and beyond the procedure room. Nutrition in Clinical Practice. 2023 Apr;38(2):216-39.

[18] Garrison CM. Enteral feeding tube clogging: what are the causes and what are the answers? A bench top analysis. Nutrition in Clinical Practice. 2018 Feb;33(1):147-50.

[19] Dandeles LM, Lodolce AE. Efficacy of agents to prevent and treat enteral feeding tube clogs. Annals of Pharmacotherapy. 2011 May;45(5):676-80.

[20] Ballesteros-Pomar MD, Alfaro-Martínez JJ, Guardia-Baena JM, Fernández MR, Vega-Piñero B, Fullana AA, Marín MG, Román DD, Portilla AJ, Ochoa JD, Viña MV. Clinical experience with enteral tube nutrition and Nutrison® range of enteral tubes in patients with specific enteral feeding requirements in Spain: The NUTRECONSONDA study. Clinical Nutrition Open Science. 2025 1;60:200-17.

[21] Ferrie S, Graham C, Hoyle M. Pancreatic enzyme supplementation for patients receiving enteral feeds. Nutrition in clinical practice. 2011 Jun;26(3):349-51.

[22] Mikhail M, Scoleri Y, Dahan M, Ng ER. –Routine Preterm Care. RESIDENT'S.

[23] Hao M, Tan X, Liu K, Xin N. Nanoencapsulation of nutraceuticals: Enhancing stability and bioavailability in functional foods. Frontiers in Nutrition. 2025;12:1746176.

[24] Brewczyński A, Jabłońska B, Mrowiec S, Składowski K, Rutkowski T. Nutritional support in head and neck radiotherapy patients considering HPV status. Nutrients. 2020 Dec 27;13(1):57.

[25] Güngör L. Nutritional approach and treatment in patients with stroke, an expert opinion for Turkey. Turkish Journal of Neurology. 2018 Oct 1.