Phytosterolemia associated with parenteral nutrition administration in adult patients.

Josep M. Llop-Talaveron PharmD PhD[1,4], Elisabet Leiva-Badosa PharmD PhD[1,] Ana Novak PharmD[2], Raúl Rigo-Bonnin PhD[3,] Josep R. Tico-Grau PharmD PhD[2,] Josep M. Suñé-Negre PharmD PhD[2,] Ana Suárez-Lledó PharmD[1], Toni Lozano-Andreu PharmD[1], Maria B. Badía-Tahull PharmD PhD BCNSP,[1,4]

[1]Pharmacy Department, Hospital Universitari Bellvitge, L'Hospitalet de Llobregat, Barcelona Spain.

[2] Department of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Technology and Physical Chemistry, Faculty of Pharmacy and Food Sciences, University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain.

[3] Biochemistry Department, Hospital Universitari de Bellvitge, L'Hospitalet de Llobregat, Barcelona, Spain.

[4] Pharmacotherapy, Pharmacogenetics and Pharmaceutical Technology research group, Bellvitge Biomedical Research Institute (IDIBELL) , L'Hospitalet de Llobregat, Spain.

Corresponding autor:

Elisabet Leiva Badosa. Pharmacy Department Hospital Universitari Bellvitge C/Feix Llarga s/n 08917 L´Hospitalet de Llobregat Barcelona Spain

eleiva@bellvitgehospital.cat

Financial disclosure: none declared

Conflicts of interest: none declared

Abstract

Vegetable lipid emulsions (LE) contain non-declared phytosterols (PS). We aimed to determine PS content depending on the brand and LE batch; and in adult hospitalized patients treated with parenteral nutrition (PN), to establish the association between plasma and administered PS.

I. LE study: Totals and fractions of PS in 3-4 non-consecutive batches from 6 LE were analysed. II. Patient study: randomized, double-blind study of patients with at least 7 previous days of PN with 0.8 g/kg/day of an olive/soybean LE, were randomized (Day 0) 1:1 to olive/soybean (O/S) or 100% fish oil (FO) at a dose of 0.4 g/kg/day for 7 days (Day 7). Plasma PS, its fractions, total cholesterol on Days 0 and 7, their clearance, and their association with PS administered by LE were studied.

In part I. LE study: differences were found in the total PS, their fractions and cholesterol among different LE brands and batches. Exclusive soybean LE had the highest content of PS (422.36 ± 130.46 μg/mL). II. Patient study: 19 patients were included. In the O/S group, PS levels were maintained (1.11±6.98 μg/mL) from Day 0 to 7, while in the FO group, significant decreases were seen in total PS (-6.21±4.73 μg/mL) and their fractions, except for campesterol and stigmasterol. Plasma PS on Day 7 were significantly associated with PS administered (R^2=0.443).

PS content in different LE brands had great variability. PS administered during PN resulted in accumulation and could be prevented with the exclusive administration of FO LE.

Key words: parenteral nutrition, phytosterols, intravenous fat emulsions

Introduction

The use of lipid emulsions (LE) in parenteral nutrition (PN) is a widespread practice. Their energy efficiency is high, their administration safe and the new generations of LE bring functional advantages; only in very specific cases are LE not administered when PN is required. Parallel to the development of new formulations that improve LE stability has been the increasing accumulation of knowledge in all fields of its use.

First generation LE are 100% soybean oil and they have been used for decades. After that, next generation LE firstly included new formulations of 50% medium chain triglycerides (MCT) in combination with 50% long chain triglycerides (LCT) and a more efficient metabolic profile[1,2]; and secondly an 80:20 mix of olive oil and soybean oil with a high monosaturated fatty acid content, which is less prone to peroxidation than polyunsaturated fatty acids (PUFAs)[3]. Finally, the last development incorporated into the mix has been fish-oil (FO) based lipid emulsions (LE) used as a pharmaconutrient because of its anti-inflammatory activity[2,4,5] and marketed either alone or in combination with other generation LEs.

LE administration is not exempt from side effects, especially in certain clinical situations and in certain patient groups. Its use has been associated with hypertriglyceridemia, especially in septic patients, and pancreatitis and renal failure[6] in patients who are under metabolic stress and have systemic inflammatory response syndrome (SIRS), which needs a high energy PN contribution. It has also been associated with alterations of liver function parameters in patients on long-term PN and in preterm infants, leading to parenteral-nutrition-associated liver disease (PNALD) with cholestasis or steatosis.

Phytosterols (PS) have been noted as a factor associated with the alteration of liver function parameters and are therefore linked to PNALD[7–9]. PS are plant-derived sterols and undeclared components of vegetable origin in LE. Since all vegetable-origin LE contain PS and their content is not declared, the effect of their administration is unpredictable. PS content and their fractions in different LE have been analysed in a few studies[10]. Nevertheless the cumulative effect of PS and their plasma clearance are not clearly established, and neither is whether these are dose-dependent or vary according to the different fractions of PS present in each LE.

In this study, we present two complementary approaches aimed at determining the presence of PS and their fractions in commercial LE and in the plasma of patients treated with PN. This has been carried out in such a way that allows us later to study their association in the alteration of liver function parameters.

The first objective of the study was to determine if the presence of cholesterol and PS – total content and their fractions – varied depending on the brand and different batches of LE. The second objective was to study, in hospitalized adult patients treated with continuous total PN, the association of plasma PS values – total content and their fractions – with the type and dose of lipid administered, as well as the association with the amount of PS administered.

Methods

I. Study of lipid emulsions

A prospective observational study was conducted to determine the daily exposure to PS of patients treated with lipid PN, by quantification (μg/mL) of cholesterol, total PS and their fractions in commercialized intravenous LE available in the pharmaceutical market (**Table 1**). At least 3 batches, corresponding to non-consecutive manufacturing, of each one of the 5 commercial preparations of vegetable origin LE were studied. The PS fractions studied in the LE were β-sitosterol, campesterol, lanosterol, and stigmasterol. Cholesterol contained in egg lecithin added to LE as an emulsifier was also studied.

For the quantification of total PS and their fractions, an analytical method of high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) was developed. This method allowed us to separate PS from the matrix in a simple and efficient way, designed so that in a short time PS samples were obtained with a high percentage of extraction and good repeatability. Liquid chromatography was carried out in a Dionex Ultimate 3000 chromatograph, as published by our group[11]. PS analyses of the LE were carried out according to the "European Union Regulation (EEC) Number 2568/91" for liquid or gas chromatography. Each sample was analysed three times and the coefficient of

variation between the replicated analyses was determined. The sample preparation was adapted and modified (without derivation) using the methods previously described by Xu et al[12]. The tubes were purged with N_2 and subjected to saponification at 100ºC for 1 h. Our sample size was established from the results obtained by Xu et al[12] in their study on the amount of PS in different commercial preparations, in which the reproducibility among batches was greatly reduced for all fractions.

We estimated, according to the different standard deviations referenced, a sample size of 3 samples per batch for a power of 90% and an error of 5% and, given the characteristics, without estimated losses. To establish the differences between brands and batches of LE, the analysis of variance of one factor (ANOVA) was carried out using the post-hoc Scheffé test.

II. Study in patients

Plasma values of PS, their fractions, total cholesterol, their clearance and their association with those administered via LE were studied by means of a prospective, unicentric, randomized, double-blind study. The selected population corresponded to that included in a clinical trial designed to study the relationship between the type of LE used and the evolution of liver function *(EudraCT Number: 2014-003597-17 www.clinicaltrialsregister.eu).* We studied if, in patients with gamma glutamyltransferase (GGT) alteration associated with PN containing vegetable origin LE, the strategy of reducing the lipid dose by 50% by switching to an FO-based LE would reduce plasma levels of PS and GGT, and whether it is more effective and equally safe as a strategy of reducing the lipid by 50% while maintaining the same vegetal LE. The patients had received a minimum of 7 days of PN with a lipid intake of 0.8 g/Kg/day of a olive/soybean LE, until they were randomized to 2 LE groups (Day 0): olive/soybean vs 100% FO (omega-3 fatty acids, without PS) at a dose of 0.4 g/kg/day for a minimum of 7 days (Day 7).

To determine the plasma values of PS, blood samples were collected in 4 mL tubes of lithium heparin and kept cold at 2-8°C for up to one hour. They were centrifuged at 2000 g for 10 minutes at 4°C and aliquoted in 5 mL plastic tubes that were stored at -80°C until processing.

Measurements of different PS concentrations in the plasma were carried out using the UPLC-ACQUITY TQD measurement system, which uses liquid chromatography of high and rapid resolution (UPLC) coupled to tandem mass spectrometry as a measurement principle (MS/MS). We worked in the reverse phase modality using a C18 UPLC column that allowed a faster and higher resolution of the chromatographic peaks. The mobile phase was composed of two solutions of ammonium acetate and 0.1% (v/v) formic acid, one in acetonitrile and the other in methanol, using a gradient elution.

Plasma values of total PS, their fractions and cholesterol were measured on Days 0 and 7. The differences between olive/soybean and FO groups were calculated. Since the PS and cholesterol content of LE was known, total amount of PS, their fractions and cholesterol administered during the 7 days could be calculated. The PS plasma fractions studied were β-sitosterol, sitostanol, campesterol, lanosterol, and stigmasterol. In these plasma determinations one more fraction studied was sitostanol, since the developed plasma method was more precise than the one developed to study PS in LE. In addition, the plasma PS values and their fractions were adjusted for the amount of cholesterol, leading to the *phytosterol cholesterol ratio:* (phytosterol/cholesterol)*100. Analysis of plasma PS is included in Appendix I as a supplemental material

Statistical analysis

Continuous variables were expressed as mean and standard deviations and the categorical ones as percentages. To study the variation of plasma values between olive/soybean and FO groups, a student's t-test was applied. To establish the differences between the baseline values at Day 0 and Day 7 in each group, means were compared by a paired samples t-test. Simple linear regression tests were applied to study the association between plasma values and administered amounts. The data were processed with the IBM SPSS 22.0 statistical package, and the level of statistical significance was established at $p < 0.05$ with a two-tailed test.

RESULTS

I. Study of lipid emulsions

Contents of sterols in the studied LE are depicted in **Table 2**, as well as comparisons with the corresponding ANOVA.

Statistical differences were found in the content of total PS, their fractions and cholesterol content among the different LE. Intralipid, exclusive soybean oil derived LE, had the highest total PS content (422.36 ± 130.46 μg/mL).

Among PS fractions, β-sitosterol was found in greater amounts in all vegetable LE, although with variations between the different LE. Clinolenic (76.38%) and SMOFlipid (74.82%) had the highest percentage, followed by Lipofundin MCT/LCT (67.3%) and Lipoplus (67.4%); Intralipid had the lowest percentage (57.03%). Stigmasterol was found at its highest percentage in Intralipid (27.29%), followed by Lipofundin (21.81%) and Lipoplus (20.63%). Clinolenic (9.51%) and SMOFlipid (12.23%) had the lowest percentage.

There were also differences between different batches of each vegetable LE. Lipofundin was the LE with the least stigmasterol and campesterol inter-lot differences. Clinolenic and SMOF showed no significant differences for stigmasterol.

In Lipoplus, lanosterol was not detected in any of the batches analysed. In FO LE (Omegaven), as expected, no PS fractions were detected.

Cholesterol percentages were very different between LE and different batches of each LE. Omegaven, SMOFlipid and Intralipid had high cholesterol content, while Lipofundin and Clinolenic had the lowest content.

II. Study in patients: sterols plasma values

We studied 19 patients, 73.7% men, 66.74 ± 11.39 years and 74.92 ± 15.00 kg. The mean number of days of PN administration prior to inclusion in the study was 9.47 ± 4.01, and during this period the patients received an olive/soybean LE at 0.8 g/kg/day. All patients had a digestive pathology with 73.7% of them suffering from cancer, mostly rectal (n=5) and gastric

(n=4) cancer. The rest of patients suffered from one case of the following pathologies: adhesions, mesenteric ischemia, morbid obesity, occlusion and intestinal volvulus.

Table 3 shows the baseline values of the patients on Day 0, when no statistically significant differences were found between the group of patients, neither in sterol plasma values nor in demographic parameters.

Plasma PS levels on Days 0 and 7 had a normal distribution, according to the Kolgomorov-Smirnov test (p=0.200). **Table 4** shows sterol variations in the two study groups between Day 7 and Day 0. Intragroup variation (t-student) and intergroup variation (t-pairs) were analysed. In the olive/soybean LE, a lipid dose reduction, from 0.8 g/kg/day to 0.4 g/kg/day for one week, was not associated with a significant decrease in total plasma PS or any of its fractions; this was also true for cholesterol. However, the change from a dose of 0.8 g/kg/day of olive/soybean LE to 0.4g/kg/day of FO LE for one week was associated with a statistically significant decrease in total PS and their fractions, except for sitostanol, campesterol, and stigmasterol.

In the FO group, significant decreases in PS were seen while in the olive/soybean group PS levels were maintained. Additionally in the FO group, the most significant decreases during the 7 days of the study were total PS 31.49%, β-sitosterol 55.70% and lanosterol 72.11%, while smaller decreases were seen with stigmasterol and campesterol at 45.07% and 20.73%, respectively.

Table 5 shows the same temporal comparison as Table 4, adjusting total phytosterol values and their fractions for cholesterol by means of the *phytosterol/cholesterol ratio*. A decrease was seen compared with the values not adjusted for cholesterol. In the FO group, total PS adjusted for cholesterol decreased by 36.38%, while for those not adjusted the decrease was 31.49%.

III. Plasma sterols according to the sterol content of the lipid emulsions administered

Plasma PS on Day 7 were significantly associated with the amount of PS administered during the overall study period with a determination coefficient of R^2=0.443 (**Table 6**). When studying the PS fractions, both β-sitosterol and lanosterol were significantly associated with the respective fractions administered, with high determination coefficients (R^2) 0.657 and 0.557, respectively. Plasma levels of campesterol and stigmasterol showed no significant association with the amounts administered and showed a low coefficient of determination. Plasma cholesterol was also not associated with administered cholesterol and had low R^2 level.

DISCUSSION

I. Study of lipid emulsions

There are few publications[10,12–14] that study the content of PS in LE, despite the increasingly relevant evidence of the impact that PS have on hepatic damage. In this study, we show that the approach is not simple because of the significant differences in content between the different commercial brands of LE and, what is also relevant, between batches of the same commercial brand.

In our study, we found that the differences in the amount of total PS (depending on the brand) were within the range described in an update to the American Society of Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition (ASPEN) position paper in 2014, which collected data from several studies[12–14] (178.54±9.56 and 621.85±7.36 μg/mL). The values we have found are also in line with those reported by Ellegard[9] and Forchielle[15]. The highest concentrations were of β-sitosterol, while campesterol and lanosterol had the lowest concentration, even though there were large variations depending on the brand. It has been described previously that stigmasterol is a potent antagonist of some families of hepatic nuclear receptors that trigger biliary disorders, contrary to what happens with β-sitosterol and campesterol, which have hardly any inhibitory effects on liver cells[16]. On the other hand, it should also be considered that stigmasterol interrupts cholesterol homeostasis[15].

As far as we know, there are no studies analysing interbatch differences in the sterol content in LE of the same brand. The variability between batches may have its origin in the quality of the oil source, associated with the geographical source, climate, year of harvest and also the extraction and refining process used. Some authors have reported that levels can be further modified by product refinement, with a reduction of free sterols of up to 30% of their original quantity[17].

II. Study in patients: sterol plasma values

The values of plasma PS in our series of adult hospitalized patients after at least 7 days with PN were 21±6.44 μg/mL. These values are considerably different from the 55.4±6.2 μg/mL result

seen with 27 patients with home PN, and reported in our previous publication[18], this was very similar to that found by Ellegard et al[9] - 62.5±60.3 μg/mL - in 16 patients diagnosed with short bowel syndrome and treated with long-term PN.

In the previous clinical randomized trial with the same population and design, we found a positive association between plasma values of PS (and their fractions) and values of GGT and ALT, whereas these associations were not seen in AP[19]. Now our results show that there is an accumulation of PS because their elimination is slower than the usual administration rate. In the group of patients that changed from 0.8 g to 0.4 g of olive/soybean LE, no reduction in administered plasma sterols was observed. On the other hand, in patients treated with FO LE (without PS), after 7 days an average reduction of 31.5% to the plasma concentration of 13.51±5.16 μg/mL was observed, reaching values very close to those obtained in the healthy controls of our previous publication[18] (14.8±2.3 μg/mL). It has been reported that plasma PS concentrations tend to remain stable in healthy individuals consuming conventional western diets, ranging from 3 to 17 μg/ml[20], whereas in vegetarians and in patients with hypercholesterolemia treated with oral PS, higher values of up to 1.5 to 3 times those of western diets are expected[21].

In animal models, PS levels increase rapidly following PN initiation, not only in serum, but also in the liver[8,22–24]. In a recent and interesting study in children with intestinal failure, Hukkinen et al. [25], through their linear regression model, showed total serum PS to be a robust indicator of accumulated PS liver levels ($r=0.83$, $p<0.01$ for absolute concentrations and $r=0.98$, $p<0.01$ for ratios to cholesterol) and associated with portal inflammation, biochemical liver injury, liver fibrosis and liver damage. The authors correlated PS levels with increases of GGT according to other studies[8,18,26–31].

Experimental studies[16,22] confirm that PS inhibit the farnesoid X receptor (FXR) by decreasing the transcription of target genes involved in the synthesis, uptake and excretion of bile acids, as well as in the excretion of sterol which is linked to cholestasis. Another complementary mechanism that would explain the role of PS in PNALD is the promotion of hepatic inflammation by the activation of hepatic macrophages acting as Toll-like receptor agonists,

which activate immune cell responses and promote cytokine production[22]. In a recent work, Guthrie et al[32] concluded that PS alone are not the cause of liver inflammation, but that this occurs in conjunction with sepsis. The study reports that PS have a synergistic inflammatory effect with the experimental administration of lipopolysaccharides in Kupffer cells.

A factor to take into account is the role of cholesterol, given that during PN administration the PS/cholesterol ratio is inverted with respect to the usual oral intake. PS in LE can displace cholesterol from cell membranes, which can decrease the elasticity of the tissue and contribute to the damage of hepatocytes[8,33]. As serum and liver sterol proportions are distorted during PN, with high PS and low cholesterol levels reflecting the lipid profile of PN solutions, the ratio of each PS fraction to cholesterol probably mirrors the metabolic effects of PS better than their absolute concentrations. In fact, in our series, when PS fractions were adjusted for cholesterol (**Table 5**), it was found that the clearance was greater in patients treated with FO. Besides, in the experimental study of Hukkinen et al[25], plasma phytosterols ratio to cholesterol had a better correlation with the amount of phytosterols in liver tissue than absolute concentrations of phytosterols.

β-sitosterol was the fraction with the highest concentration in LE administered to patients before starting the study, as well as in the olive/soybean LE group. It has been described that β-sitosterol is secreted into bile more effectively than other PS fractions[34], which possibly explains the greater β-sitosterol decrease compared with other fractions in the arm treated with FO. In their study Hukkinen et al[25] explained the decrease in both plasma and hepatic PS after PN interruption. As in our plasma concentrations, in Hukkinen et al[25] stigmasterol and campesterol in the liver did not differ when PN was suspended. In their study, serum and liver stigmasterol were not correlated, suggesting that these fractions are likely to be excreted at a slower rate. The same trend is seen in our series, where, after 7 days of PS administration (**Table 6**), the amount of stigmasterol administrated is not associated with its plasma values so pointing to a slower clearance.

The clinical relevance of LE brand change has been suggested to improve liver function associated with a lower content of plasma PS as well as changes in the profile of PS fractions. In fact, some studies conducted in adult patients show that the transition from PN with soybean oil to olive oil improves intestinal-failure associated liver disease[28,35], which can be partially explained by the different PS compositions of these LE, especially with stigmasterol which is reduced with the change of LE.

Despite the experimental studies of Carter[16] and El Kasmi[22] proving stigmasterol as a powerful in vitro antagonist of FXR, superior to β-sitosterol and campesterol, there is no clear clinical evidence that stigmasterol itself presents greater hepatotoxicity than other fractions, so it cannot be confirmed that high stigmasterol LE are critical for the development of PNALD. However, another alternative or complementary mechanism that could explain PNALD improvement

when changing brands from soybean exclusive LE to olive/soybean LE, is that a smaller stigmasterol content would lead to a greater (quicker) clearance of the total PS content.

Study limitations:

In the study of PS content of different LE brands, the accepted chromatographic method did not allow us to study small fractions of PS, thus prioritizing the implementation of a simple and accessible chromatographic method.

A relevant limitation is that the sample selected corresponds to a substudy of a study designed to evaluate the utilization of FO LE in the improvement of previously altered liver function parameters. The method for selection of patients did not allow us to establish the basal values of PS, their fractions and cholesterol, before the beginning of the PN, nor to integrate the number of days treatment with PN on the day of onset. The only criterion was that the patients had had at least 7 days of PN. Another limitation was the small number of patients included with nutritional support over 7 days, only 3 cases, which did not allow us to establish statistically significant differences to evaluate cases with more than 7 days of PN, due to lack of statistical power. In the study of plasma values, this is a first approximation that should be extended with subsequent studies.

CONCLUSION

This study reveals the great variability in the sterol content of LE. The PS content, their fractions and cholesterol vary depending not only on the commercial brand but also between batches of the same commercial brand. In addition, the percentage of different PS fractions varies substantially from one brand to another, and is especially relevant in the case of stigmasterol.

The amount of PS administered during PN exceeds the elimination, resulting in accumulation, and this varies depending on the fraction. The administration of FO LE exclusively (without PS) prevents accumulation. It is necessary to complement these data with clinical studies to evaluate the impact of PS levels and the possible therapeutic advantages of the administration of LE without PS.

The results obtained highlight the importance of including the total PS concentration in the technical sheet of each preparation released to the market with the aim of better and safer use in clinical practice.

Acknowledgments:

The authors thank Maren White for her correction and critical revision of the English manuscript.

Financial Support

This study has been funded by the Ministry of Economy, Industry and Competitiveness which is part of the State Research Agency, through the project AES-FIS PI14/00706 (15FIS026), and co-funded by the Spanish Society of Hospital Pharmacist through the project AISEFH PR030/14 (14PSJ009)

Authorship

The authors' contributions are as follows: J. LL-T. wrote the manuscript; J. LL-T., M. B-T. and E.L-B. prepared the manuscript; J. LL-T. conducted the statistical analyses; A.N., J. T-G. and J. S-N. conducted the LE determinations; R. R-B. conducted the blood analyses; all of the autors revised the manuscript critically for important intellectual content.

Conflict of interest

M. B-T. and E.L-B. received payment for educational sessions from Baxter and Fresenius Kavi.

Bibliography

1. Calder PC. Lipids for intravenous nutrition in hospitalised adult patients: a multiple choice of options. *Proc Nutr Soc*. 2013;72(3):263-276. doi:10.1017/S0029665113001250
2. Hippalgaonkar K, Majumdar S, Kansara V. Injectable lipid emulsions-advancements, opportunities and challenges. *AAPS PharmSciTech*. 2010;11(4):1526-1540. doi:10.1208/s12249-010-9526-5
3. Manzanares W, Dhaliwal R, Jurewitsch B, Stapleton RD, Jeejeebhoy KN, Heyland DK. Alternative lipid emulsions in the critically ill: a systematic review of the evidence. *Intensive Care Med*. 2013;39(10):1683-1694. doi:10.1007/s00134-013-2999-4
4. Giraldo Villa A, Henao Roldan C, García Loboguerrero F, et al. [Use of fish oil lipid emulsions in hospitalized patients under 18 years old with abnormal results in liver tests associated with total parental nutrition]. *Nutr Hosp*. 2014;29(4):844-851. doi:10.3305/nh.2014.29.4.7209
5. Turner P. Providing optimal nutritional support on the intensive care unit: key challenges and practical solutions. *Proc Nutr Soc*. 2010;69(4):574-581. doi:10.1017/S002966511000385X
6. Llop J, Sabin P, Garau M, et al. The importance of clinical factors in parenteral nutrition-associated hypertriglyceridemia. *Clin Nutr*. 2003;22(6):577-583. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14613761. Accessed October 24, 2017.
7. Clayton PT, Bowron A, Mills KA, Massoud A, Casteels M, Milla PJ. Phytosterolemia in children with parenteral nutrition-associated cholestatic liver disease. *Gastroenterology*. 1993;105(6):1806-1813. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8253356. Accessed April 20, 2018.

8. Clayton PT, Whitfield P, Iyer K. The role of phytosterols in the pathogenesis of liver complications of pediatric parenteral nutrition. *Nutrition*. 1998;14(1):158-164. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9437703. Accessed March 20, 2018.

9. Ellegård L, Sunesson A, Bosaeus I. High serum phytosterol levels in short bowel patients on parenteral nutrition support. *Clin Nutr*. 2005;24(3):415-420. doi:10.1016/j.clnu.2005.01.001

10. Vanek VW, Seidner DL, Allen P, et al. Update to A.S.P.E.N. position paper: clinical role for alternative intravenous fat emulsions. *Nutr Clin Pract*. 2014;29(6):841. doi:10.1177/0884533614555235

11. Novak A, Gutiérrez-Zamora M, Domenech L, et al. Development and validation of a simple high-performance liquid chromatography analytical method for simultaneous determination of phytosterols, cholesterol and squalene in parenteral lipid emulsions. *Biomed Chromatogr*. 2018;32(2):e4084. doi:10.1002/bmc.4084

12. Xu Z, Harvey KA, Pavlina T, et al. Steroidal compounds in commercial parenteral lipid emulsions. *Nutrients*. 2012;4(8):904-921. doi:10.3390/nu4080904

13. Vanek VW, Seidner DL, Allen P, et al. A.S.P.E.N. Position Paper: Clinical Role for Alternative Intravenous Fat Emulsions. *Nutr Clin Pract*. 2012;27(2):150-192. doi:10.1177/0884533612439896

14. Harvey K, Xu Z, Walker C, et al. Parenteral Lipid Emulsions in Guinea Pigs Differentially Influence Plasma and Tissue Levels of Fatty Acids, Squalene, Cholesterol, and Phytosterols. *Lipids*. 2014;49(8):777-793. doi:10.1007/s11745-014-3927-2

15. Forchielli ML, Bersani G, Tala S, Grossi G, Puggioli C, Masi M. The spectrum of plant and animal sterols in different oil-derived intravenous emulsions. *Lipids*.

2010;45(1):63-71. doi:10.1007/s11745-009-3371-x

16. Carter B a., Taylor O a., Prendergast DR, et al. Stigmasterol, a soy lipid-derived phytosterol, is an antagonist of the bile acid nuclear receptor FXR. *Pediatr Res*. 2007;62(3):301-306. doi:10.1203/PDR.0b013e3181256492

17. Ferrari RA, Esteves W, Mukherjee KD, Schulte E. Alteration of Sterols and Steryl Esters in Vegetable Oils during Industrial Refining. *J Agric Food Chem*. 1997;45(12):4753-4757. doi:10.1021/jf970525j

18. Llop JM, Virgili N, Moreno-Villares JM, et al. Phytosterolemia in parenteral nutrition patients: Implications for liver disease development. *Nutrition*. 2008;24(11-12):1145-1152. doi:10.1016/j.nut.2008.06.017

19. Llop-Talaveron J, Badía-Tahull M, Lozano-Andreu T, et al. Phytosterolemia and γ-glutamyl transferase in adults with parenteral nutrition: Fish versus vegetal lipids: A randomized clinical trial. *Nutrition*. 2020;70. doi:10.1016/j.nut.2019.110587

20. Ling W., Jones PJ. Dietary phytosterols: A review of metabolism, benefits and side effects. *Life Sci*. 1995;57(3):195-206. doi:10.1016/0024-3205(95)00263-6

21. Ostlund RE. P HYTOSTEROLS IN H UMAN N UTRITION. *Annu Rev Nutr*. 2002;22(1):533-549. doi:10.1146/annurev.nutr.22.020702.075220

22. El Kasmi KC, Anderson AL, Devereaux MW, et al. Phytosterols promote liver injury and Kupffer cell activation in parenteral nutrition-associated liver disease. *Sci Transl Med*. 2013;5(206):206ra137. doi:10.1126/scitranslmed.3006898

23. Iyer KR, Spitz L, Clayton P. BAPS prize lecture: New insight into mechanisms of parenteral nutrition-associated cholestasis: role of plant sterols. British Association of Paediatric Surgeons. *J Pediatr Surg*. 1998;33(1):1-6. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9473088. Accessed March 20, 2018.

24. Vlaardingerbroek H, Ng K, Stoll B, et al. New generation lipid emulsions prevent PNALD in chronic parenterally fed preterm pigs. *J Lipid Res*. 2014;55(3):466-477. doi:10.1194/jlr.M044545

25. Hukkinen M, Mutanen A, Nissinen M, Merras-Salmio L, Gylling H, Pakarinen MP. Parenteral Plant Sterols Accumulate in the Liver Reflecting Their Increased Serum Levels and Portal Inflammation in Children With Intestinal Failure. *JPEN J Parenter Enteral Nutr*. 2017;41(6):1014-1022. doi:10.1177/0148607116637855

26. Kurvinen A, Nissinen MJ, Gylling H, et al. Effects of long-term parenteral nutrition on serum lipids, plant sterols, cholesterol metabolism, and liver histology in pediatric intestinal failure. *J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr*. 2011;53(4):1. doi:10.1097/MPG.0b013e3182212130

27. Zaloga GP. Phytosterols, Lipid Administration, and Liver Disease During Parenteral Nutrition. *J Parenter Enter Nutr*. 2015;39(1 Suppl):39S-60S. doi:10.1177/0148607115595978

28. Hallikainen M, Huikko L, Kontra K, et al. Effect of Parenteral Serum Plant Sterols on Liver Enzymes and Cholesterol Metabolism in a Patient With Short Bowel Syndrome. *Nutr Clin Pract*. 2008;23(4):429-435. doi:10.1177/0884533608321138

29. Kurvinen A, Nissinen MJ, Andersson S, et al. Parenteral Plant Sterols and Intestinal Failure–associated Liver Disease in Neonates. *J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr*. 2012;54(6):803-811. doi:10.1097/MPG.0b013e3182474118

30. Mutanen A, Nissinen MJ, Lohi J, Heikkilä P, Gylling H, Pakarinen MP. Serum plant sterols, cholestanol, and cholesterol precursors associate with histological liver injury in pediatric onset intestinal failure. *Am J Clin Nutr*. 2014;100(4):1085-1094. doi:10.3945/ajcn.114.088781

31. Savini S, D'Ascenzo R, Biagetti C, et al. The effect of 5 intravenous lipid emulsions on plasma phytosterols in preterm infants receiving parenteral nutrition: a randomized clinical trial. *Am J Clin Nutr*. 2013;98(2):312-318. doi:10.3945/ajcn.112.056556

32. Guthrie G, Tackett B, Stoll B, Martin C, Olutoye O, Burrin DG. Phytosterols Synergize With Endotoxin to Augment Inflammation in Kupffer Cells but Alone Have Limited Direct Effect on Hepatocytes. *JPEN J Parenter Enteral Nutr*. August 2017:148607117722752. doi:10.1177/0148607117722752

33. Pianese P, Salvia G, Campanozzi A, et al. Sterol profiling in red blood cell membranes and plasma of newborns receiving total parenteral nutrition. *J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr*. 2008;47(5):645-651. doi:10.1097/MPG.0b013e318170956a

34. Sudhop T, Sahin Y, Lindenthal B, et al. Comparison of the hepatic clearances of campesterol, sitosterol, and cholesterol in healthy subjects suggests that efflux transporters controlling intestinal sterol absorption also regulate biliary secretion. *Gut*. 2002;51(6):860-863. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12427790. Accessed March 21, 2018.

35. Reimund J-M, Arondel Y, Joly F, Messing B, Duclos B, Baumann R. Potential usefulness of olive oil-based lipid emulsions in selected situations of home parenteral nutrition-associated liver disease. *Clin Nutr*. 2004;23(6):1418-1425. doi:10.1016/j.clnu.2004.08.011

Table 1. Intravenous lipid emulsion composition as declared by the producer

Brand (Pharmaceutical laboratory)	**Composition**
Clinoleic (Baxter)	80% olive oil and 20% soybean oil
Intralipid (Fresenius Kabi)	100% soybean oil
Intralipid LCT/MCT (Braun)	50% soybean oil and 50% MCT
Lipoplus (Braun)	50% MCT, 40% soybean oil and 10% fish oil
Omegaven (Fresenius Kabi)	100% fish oil
SMOFlipid (Fresenius Kabi)	30% soybean oil, 30% MCT, 20% olive oil and 15% fish oil

LCT: Long-chain triglycerides; MCT: Medium-chain triglycerides

Table 2. Total phytosterol content, fractions and cholesterol in different brand and batches

Fat emulsion	**ID**	**Batch**	**Total phytosterols (µg/mL)** mean±SD	**Betasistosterol (µg/mL)** **mean±SD**	**Campesterol (µg/mL)** mean±SD	**Lanosterol (µg/mL)** mean±SD	**Stigmasterol (µg/mL)** mean±SD	**Cholesterol (µg/mL)** mean±SD
Clinoleic 20%	1 (n=3)	14H29N30	231.87±15.66[3]	172.66±10.32[3]	18.14±1.77[2,3]	13.98±2.01[2]	27.07±3.15	51.04±4.12[2]
	2 (n=6)	15F15N31	227.17±21.04[3]	171.57±6.27[3]	9.52±2.13[3]	23.32±5.22[1,3]	22.75±12.61	67.16±2.73[1,3]
	3 (n=3)	16F22N30	148.99±3.99[1,2]	122.16±2.11[1,2]	7.47±0.67[1]	12.49±0.64[2]	6.89±0.76	45.84±1.08[2]
	Total (n=12)		208.80±39.52[II,V,VI]	159.49±23.35 [II,IV,V,VI]	11.16±4.60 [II]	18.28±6.42 [II,III,IV,V,VI]	19.87±11.79 [II]	57.80±10.29 [II,V,VI]
*p value intrabatch			p<0.001	p<0.001	p<0.001	p=0.006	p=0.059	p<0.001
Intralipid	1 (n=3)	10HB3671	451.34±23.24[2,3]	276.54±2.21[3]	32.66±3.89[2]	13.21±0.58[3]	128.92±17.77[3]	360.92±7.09[3]
	2 (n=3)	10IK7012	554.10±36.49[1,3]	283.03±17.12[3]	99.97±6.61[1,3]	13.09±0.91[3]	158.00±12.38[3]	368.68±23.50[3]
	3 (n=3)	10KC3584	261.64±12.85[1,2]	163.10±9.13[1,2]	32.89±0.90[2]	6.84±0.37[1,2]	58.81±2.52[1,2]	212.20±10.88[1,2]
	Total (n=9)		422.36±130.46[I,III,IV,V,VI]	240.89±59.22[I,III,IV,V,VI]	55.17±33.82[I,III,IV,V,VI]	11.05±3.21 [I,III,IV,V,VI]	115.25±45.48[I,III,IV,V,VI]	313.94 ± 77.55[I,III,IV,V]
*p value intrabatch			p<0.001	p<0.001	p<0.001	p<0.001	p<0.001	p<0.001
Lipofundin MCT/LCT	1 (n=3)	143638082	178.84±3.71[3]	119.70±2.37[3]	17.67±0.68	2.50±0.53[3]	38.95±1.16	63.59±2.41[2,3]
	2 (n=3)	144718082	189.75±9.37	125.63±4.53[3]	19.88±1.73	1.82±0.02	42.42±3.73	82.88± 4.41[1]
	3 (n=3)	154818081	195.36±3.97[1]	134.22±2.04[1,2]	18.03±0.84	1.46±0.05[1]	41.66±1.32	76.19±0.18[1]
	Total (n=9)		187.99 ± 9.07[II,VI]	126.52±6.90 [II,VI]	18.53±1.45 [II]	1.93±0.53 [I,II]	41.01±2.59 [III,VI]	74.22±8.85[II,V,VI]

*p value intrabatch			p=0.045	p=0.004	p=0.123	p=0.016	p=0.250	p=0.001
Lipoplus	1 (n=3)	144538082	145.88±6.06[2,3]	102.10±4.95[3]	17.29±0.59[2,3]	0.00	26.47±0.79[2]	182.48±8.91[3]
	2 (n=3)	153938083	160.53±1.50[1,3]	107.88±1.19[3]	19.48±0.41[1,3]	0.00	33.16±0.49[1,3]	176.22 ±4.17[3]
	3 (n=3)	160128082	113.78±1.61[1,2]	73.25±0.39[1,2]	13.47±0.52[1,2]	0.00	27.06±0.88[2]	112.73±0.40[1,2]
	Total (n=9)		140.06 ± 20.96 [II,VI]	94.41±16.27 [I,II,VI]	16.74±2.67 [II]	0.00[I,II,V]	28.90±3.27 [II,VI]	157.15±11.26 [II,V,VI]
*p value intrabatch			p<0.001	p<0.001	p<0.001	--	p<0.001	p<0.001
SMOFlipid	1 (n=3)	16IF1650	137.64±2.95[3,4]	99.99±1.36[3,4]	13.38±1.26[3,4]	7.41±0.56[2,3,4]	16.86±1.38	420.95±4.67[2,3,4]
	2 (n=3)	16HI2073	138.94±7.57[3,4]	99.58±1.18[3,4]	12.63±2.37[3,4]	10.27±1.56[1,3,4]	16.46±3.07	399.49±2.68[1,3,4]
	3 (n=3)	16IG1719	121.12±9.29[1,2,4]	93.53±1.65[1,2,4]	7.21±1.68[1,2]	2.78±0.51[1,2]	15.78±6.08	578.92±6.15[1,2,4]
	4 (n=3)	16KG5043	102.35±3.23[1,2,3]	74.50±2.06[1,2,3]	7.62±0.35[1,2]	4.79±1.37[1,2]	15.45±2.24	300.75± 13.41[1,2,3]
	Total (n=12)		124.23±15.28 [II,VI]	92.96±9.88 [I,II,VI]	9.61±3.21[II]	5.60±0.80 [I,II,IV,VI]	16.06 ± 3.9[II,III,IV]	455.80±112.39 [I,II,III,IV]
*p value intrabatch			p<0.001	p<0.001	p<0.001	p<0.001	p=0.976	p<0.001
Omegaven	1 (n=3)	16H60131	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	400.39±1.79[2,4]
	2 (n=3)	16IG1719	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	507.35± 4.42[1,3,4]
	3 (n=3)	16IE1319	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	408.67±8.90[2,4]
	4 (n=3)	16KF4268	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	348.23±3.42[1,2,3]
	Total (n=12)		0.00[I,II,III,IV,V]	0.00 [I,II,III,IV,V]	0.00 [I,II,III,IV,V]	0.00 [I,II,III,IV,V]	0.00 [I,II,III,IV,V]	416.16±60.25 [I,III,IV]
*p value intrabatch			--	--	--	--	--	p<0.001
**p value intrabrands			p<0.001	p<0.001	p<0.001	p<0.001	p<0.001	p<0.001

* One factor ANOVA of one factor between batches of every fat emulsion, Snedeckor F and signification (p).

** One factor ANOVA of one factor between fat emulsions, Snedeckor F and signification (p).

Arabic numbers in superindex are the result of the posthoc Scheffé analysis between batches identified as 1, 2, 3 and 4 with $p<0.05$ for each fat emulsion $p<0.05$.

Roman numbers in superindex are the result of the posthoc Scheffé analysis between LE identified as I Clinoleic; II Intralipid; III Lipofundin MCT/LCT; IV, Lipoplus; V SMOFlipid, and VI, Omegaven with $p<0.05$.

Table 3. Demographics and baseline (Day 0) values of patients

Parameter	**Olive/soy n=10**	**Fish oil n=9**	**P***
Men, n (%)	9 (90%)	5 (56%)	0.089
Age (years), mean ±SD	65.7±13.58	67.88±8.29	0.681
Weight (Kg), mean ±SD	80.54±8.92	68.68±18.26	0.085
Cholesterol (**µg/mL**), mean ±SD	1022.96±261.26	954.76±389.83	0.657
Total Phytosterol (**µg/mL**), mean ±SD	22.19±6.40	19.72±6.61	0.420

Day 0 means that the patients had received a minimum of 7 days of PN with a lipid intake of 0.8 g/Kg/day of an olive/soybean lipid emulsion.

Table 4. Variation of sterols between Day 0 and Day 7

Sterols variation	Patients with vegetable fat emulsion (n=10)		Patients with fish oil (n=9)		p*
	Initial values Final values mean (±SD)	Variations (differences) mean (±SD)	Initial values Final values mean (±SD)	Variations (differences) mean (±SD)	
Phytosterols (µg/mL)	22.190±6.40 23.300±6.91	1.11±6.98	19.72±6.61 13.51±5.16	-6.21±4.73	**0.016**
p**		0.621		**0.004**	
B-Sitoesterol (µg/mL)	13.12±4.11 13.79±4.67	0.67±5.08	11.50±2.97 5.39±2.05	-6.11±2.20	**0.002**
p**		0.685		**0.000**	
Sitostanol (µg/mL)	0.36±0.15 0.33±0.12	-0.03±0.16	0.25±0.18 0.14±0.11	-0.11±0.10	0.223
p**		0.560		**0.013**	
Campesterol (µg/mL)	2.24±0.69 2.25±0.68	0.01±0.53	1.93±0.95 1.53±0.68	-0.40±0.73	0.171
p**		0.940		0.136	
Lanosterol (µg/mL)	1.19±0.68 1.05±0.41	-0.14±0.66	1.04±0.50 0.30±0.19	-0.74±0.46	**0.035**
p**		0.536		**0.015**	
Stigmasterol (µg/mL)	0.67±0.34 0.68±0.44	0.01±0.44	0.69±0.53 0.39±0.28	-0.30±0.48	0.160
p**		0.933		0.101	
Cholesterol (µg/mL)	1022.96±261.27 1145.70±212.80	122.74±234.78	954.76±389.83 996.24±355.21	41.49±253.91	0.478
P**		0.133		0.637	

**Significance between groups (p) for the variable differences (t-student)*

***Significance intra groups (p) for initial and final variables (t-pairs)*

Day 0 means that the patients had received a minimum of 7 days of PN with a lipid intake of 0.8 g/Kg/day of an olive/soybean lipid emulsion.

Day 7 means that the patients had received 7 days of PN with a lipid intake of 0.4 g/kg/day of an olive/soybean LE or a fish oil lipid emulsion.

Table 5. Variation of plasma values of phytosterols and fractions adjusted by cholesterol between Day 0 and 7 days post-randomization

Ratio sterols variation and fractions	Patients with vegetable fat emulsion (10)		Patients with fish oil (9)		P*
	Initial values Final values mean (±SD)	Variations (differences) mean (±SD)	Initial values Final values mean (±SD)	Variations (differences) mean (±SD)	
R_Phytosterols (µg/mL)	2.28±0.78 2.02±0.50	-0.25±0.64	2.16±0.48 1.37±0.34	-0.79±0.47	0.057
p**		0.243		**0.001**	
R_β-sitoesterol (µg/mL)	1.35±0.51 1.21±0.34	-0.14±0.47	1.30±0.35 0.56±0.17	-0.74±0.35	**0.006**
p**		0.367		**0.000**	
R_Sitostanol (µg/mL)	0.04±0.02 0.03±0.01	-0.01±0.01	0.03±0.02 0.01±0.01	-0.01±0.01	0.606
p**		0.119		**0.019**	
R_Campesterol (µg/mL)	0.23±0.08 0.20±0.06	-0.03±0.41	0.20±0.05 0.15±0.04	-0.05±0.05	0.227
p**		0.067		**0.012**	
R_Lanosterol (µg/mL)	0.12±0.08 0.09±0.03	-0.03±0.07	0.12±0.07 0.03±0.02	-0.09±0.06	0.061
p**		0.188		**0.003**	
R_Stigmasterol (µg/mL)	0.07±0.04 0.06±0.03	-0.01±0.04	0.07±0.06 0.04±0.03	-0.03±0.06	0.301
p**		0.537		0.133	

**Significance between groups (p) for the variable differences (t-student)*

***Significance intra groups (p) for initial and final variables (t-pairs)*

R_ means the coefficient that results from dividing each phytosterol value by the value of cholesterol expressed as a percentage.

Table 6. Simple lineal regressions between plasma phytosterols on Day 7 (y) and phytosterols administered (x) (n=19)

Sterols	**R^2**	**b_1**	**CI (95%)**	**p**
Phytosterol	0.443	0.007	0.003 – 0.011	**0.002**
B- sitoesterol	0.657	0.009	0.006 – 0.012	**0.000**
Campesterol	0.093	0.003	-0.002 – 0.008	0.205
Lanosterol	0.557	0.006	0.004 – 0.009	**0.000**
Stigmasterol	0.066	0.001	-0.001 – 0.004	0.287
Cholesterol	0.066	0.094	-0.331 – 1.051	0.287

$y=b_0 \pm b_1 x_{1;}$ y: plasma phytosterols on day 7; x: phytosterols administered

R^2= determination coefficient