The Impact of Nutritional Support and Biochemical Monitoring on Recovery in Patients with Gastrointestinal Diseases: A Radiological Perspective

Aminah K. Alanazi[1], Maryam H. Aldossari[2], Zahra A. Asiri[3], Ruba K. Alhammad[4], Bader H. Alanazi[5], Ali A. Almalki[6], Salem A. Alharbi[7], Maha S. Gassas[8], Rania A. Sharaf[9], Amer S. Alhumaidan[10]

Health Affairs at the Ministry of National Guard

Abstract

Background: Malnutrition is a common complication in patients with gastrointestinal (GI) diseases, contributing to increased morbidity and delayed recovery. This study aimed to evaluate the impact of nutritional support and biochemical monitoring on recovery outcomes, using radiological imaging to assess disease progression.

Methods: A prospective observational study was conducted over 12 months at a tertiary hospital, involving 150 patients with GI diseases. Nutritional support (enteral or parenteral nutrition), biochemical markers (albumin, prealbumin, CRP), and radiological imaging were used to monitor recovery. Data were collected at baseline, 6 months, and 12 months.

Results: Significant improvements in nutritional status were observed, with a mean BMI increase of 8.1% over 12 months. Radiological imaging showed reductions in bowel inflammation (56% to 23%) and complications like strictures and fistulas. Biochemical markers improved, with increases in serum albumin (3.0 to 3.8 g/dL, $p < 0.001$) and reductions in CRP (12.8 to 4.2 mg/L, $p < 0.001$).

Conclusion: Nutritional support combined with biochemical monitoring and radiological assessment significantly improves recovery in patients with GI diseases. A multidisciplinary approach is critical for optimizing outcomes.

Keywords: Gastrointestinal diseases, nutritional support, biochemical monitoring, radiological imaging, enteral nutrition, inflammatory bowel disease, malnutrition

Introduction

Gastrointestinal (GI) diseases, including conditions such as Crohn's disease, ulcerative colitis, celiac disease, and short bowel syndrome, are common disorders that can significantly impact nutritional status and overall health. These diseases often result in malabsorption, nutrient deficiencies, and weight loss, all of which contribute to poorer clinical outcomes and prolonged recovery times (Russell et al., 2022). Malnutrition in patients with GI diseases has been associated with increased morbidity, longer hospital

stays, and decreased quality of life (Lochs et al., 2006). Therefore, timely nutritional support is critical in the management of these patients.

Radiological imaging, including modalities such as computed tomography (CT), magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), and ultrasound, plays a crucial role in the diagnosis and monitoring of GI diseases (Deepak et al., 2019). These imaging techniques allow for the assessment of disease progression, detection of complications such as strictures or fistulas, and evaluation of treatment response. However, imaging alone is not sufficient to address the full complexity of managing GI diseases, particularly when nutritional status and metabolic balance are compromised.

Nutritional support, often through dietary modifications, enteral or parenteral nutrition, is essential for managing malnutrition in GI disease patients. These interventions can improve nutrient absorption, restore metabolic balance, and promote recovery (Farias et al., 2019). Additionally, biochemical monitoring of key markers such as albumin, prealbumin, electrolytes, and liver function tests provides important insights into the patient's nutritional status and helps guide treatment adjustments (Plauth et al., 2006).

The combination of radiological imaging, nutritional support, and biochemical monitoring offers a comprehensive approach to improving recovery in patients with gastrointestinal diseases. This study aims to assess the impact of nutritional interventions and biochemical monitoring on patient recovery, using radiological imaging to track disease progression and response to treatment.

Literature Review

Gastrointestinal Diseases and Their Nutritional Impact

Gastrointestinal (GI) diseases, such as Crohn's disease, ulcerative colitis, celiac disease, and short bowel syndrome, present significant challenges in patient management due to their effects on nutrient absorption and metabolism. These diseases are often associated with malnutrition, which can exacerbate symptoms and delay recovery. Inflammatory bowel diseases (IBDs), for instance, cause inflammation of the GI tract, leading to malabsorption of essential nutrients such as vitamins, minerals, and proteins (Russell et al., 2022). In patients with celiac disease, malabsorption stems from damage to the small intestine, which impairs the absorption of vital nutrients like iron and calcium, contributing to complications such as anemia and osteoporosis (Fasano &Catassi, 2012).

Malnutrition in GI disease patients is linked to higher morbidity and mortality rates, as well as prolonged hospital stays (Lochs et al., 2006). The condition can result in muscle wasting, reduced immune function, and impaired wound healing, making effective nutritional interventions critical in managing these patients. Studies have shown that addressing nutritional deficiencies through enteral or parenteral nutrition improves clinical outcomes, accelerates recovery, and enhances quality of life (Plauth et al., 2006).

Role of Radiological Imaging in Gastrointestinal Diseases

Radiological imaging plays a crucial role in diagnosing and managing GI diseases. Modalities such as computed tomography (CT), magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), and ultrasound are commonly used to assess disease activity, detect complications, and monitor treatment response (Deepak et al., 2019). CT scans are particularly useful for evaluating the extent of bowel inflammation, strictures, and fistulas in patients with Crohn's disease (Shaban et al., 2022). MRI, with its superior soft tissue contrast, is often preferred for detailed imaging of the bowel wall and surrounding structures, particularly in cases of complex fistulas or abscesses (Parente et al., 2004).

Ultrasound is also gaining popularity in the management of GI diseases due to its non-invasive nature and ability to assess bowel thickness, vascularity, and complications such as bowel obstruction (Horsthuis et al., 2009). Imaging findings are crucial in guiding therapeutic decisions, including surgical interventions, in patients with severe disease. However, radiological imaging alone is not enough to fully manage GI diseases, as it does not provide insights into the nutritional and metabolic status of the patient, highlighting the need for a multidisciplinary approach.

Nutritional Support in Managing GI Diseases

Nutritional support is a cornerstone of managing patients with GI diseases, particularly those who are at risk of malnutrition. Enteral nutrition (EN) is often the preferred method of nutritional intervention, as it preserves gut function and reduces the risk of infection compared to parenteral nutrition (PN) (Lochs et al., 2006). EN has been shown to induce remission in patients with Crohn's disease, especially in pediatric populations, by reducing inflammation and promoting gut healing (Narula et al., 2018).

In patients unable to tolerate EN due to severe disease or complications, PN is used to deliver essential nutrients directly into the bloodstream, bypassing the digestive system. Although effective, PN is associated with risks such as infection, liver dysfunction, and metabolic complications (Farias et al., 2019). Regardless of the method used, timely nutritional intervention is essential for maintaining energy balance, promoting recovery, and preventing complications associated with malnutrition in GI disease patients.

Biochemical Monitoring in Gastrointestinal Disease Management

Biochemical markers provide critical insights into the nutritional and metabolic status of patients with GI diseases. Key markers such as albumin, prealbumin, and C-reactive protein (CRP) are commonly used to assess inflammation and protein malnutrition (Plauth et al., 2006). Albumin and prealbumin are important indicators of protein reserves, with low levels often reflecting poor nutritional status or chronic inflammation. These markers help guide adjustments in nutritional support, ensuring that patients receive adequate protein and caloric intake (Farias et al., 2019).

Electrolytes and liver function tests (LFTs) are also important in monitoring patients with GI diseases, particularly those on PN. Electrolyte imbalances can arise due to malabsorption, diarrhea, or vomiting, and must be corrected to prevent further complications. Liver function tests, including bilirubin, alkaline phosphatase, and aminotransferases, help detect liver dysfunction, which can result from PN or advanced liver disease in patients with GI disorders (Plauth et al., 2006).

Regular monitoring of these biochemical markers, alongside clinical assessments and imaging, allows for a comprehensive approach to managing GI disease patients. It helps in adjusting nutritional strategies and detecting complications early, improving the overall quality of care.

Integration of Radiology, Nutrition, and Biochemistry in Patient Recovery

The management of GI diseases requires a multidisciplinary approach, integrating radiological imaging, nutritional support, and biochemical monitoring. Imaging provides a detailed assessment of disease severity and response to treatment, while nutritional interventions address malnutrition and promote healing (Shaban et al., 2022). Biochemical markers offer real-time feedback on the patient's nutritional and metabolic status, guiding the adjustment of nutritional support and other therapies (Plauth et al., 2006).

Studies have demonstrated that patients with GI diseases who receive comprehensive care, including imaging, nutrition, and biochemical monitoring, experience better outcomes compared to those receiving standard care alone (Farias et al., 2019). For example, in patients with Crohn's disease, the combination of enteral nutrition, regular imaging to assess bowel inflammation, and biochemical monitoring of inflammatory markers like CRP has been shown to improve remission rates and reduce the need for surgery (Narula et al., 2018).

This integrated approach enhances the ability of healthcare teams to detect complications early, optimize treatment, and improve recovery outcomes. The use of radiological imaging alongside nutritional support and biochemical markers ensures a holistic view of the patient's condition, allowing for tailored interventions thataddressboth the underlyingdisease and the associated malnutrition.

Methodology

Study Design

This study utilized a prospective observational design conducted over a 12-month period at Tertiary care facility . The aim was to assess the impact of nutritional support and biochemical monitoring on the recovery of patients with gastrointestinal (GI) diseases, using radiological imaging to track disease progression and response to treatment. Ethical approval was obtained from the hospital's ethics committee.

Participants

The study included 150 adult patients diagnosed with GI diseases, including Crohn's disease, ulcerative colitis, celiac disease, and short bowel syndrome. Patients were recruited from the hospital's gastroenterology and nutrition departments. The inclusion criteria were:

- Adults aged 18 years or older.
- Diagnosed with a GI disease based on clinical, endoscopic, or radiological findings.
- Experiencing symptoms of malnutrition or requiring nutritional support (enteral or parenteral).

Patients with end-stage organ failure, uncontrolled malignancy, or those receiving other treatments that could confound the study outcomes (e.g., chemotherapy) were excluded.

Data Collection

1. Radiological Data

Radiological imaging, including CT and MRI, was used to evaluate disease progression, detect complications (e.g., strictures, fistulas, bowel obstructions), and assess the response to nutritional and medical interventions. Baseline imaging was conducted within one month of study enrollment, with follow-up imaging at 6 months and 12 months. Two radiologists independently reviewed the images to ensure accuracy in identifying changes in disease severity and recovery status.

2. Nutritional Data

Nutritional assessments were conducted by a clinical nutritionist at baseline and throughout the study. Data on dietary intake were collected using 24-hour dietary recalls and food frequency questionnaires. Patients requiring nutritional support received individualized plans, including enteral nutrition (EN) or parenteral nutrition (PN), tailored to their specific needs based on their disease and malnutrition severity. Adherence to nutritional support was monitored through regular follow-up visits and patient reports. Changes in weight, body mass index (BMI), and mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) were recorded at baseline, 6 months, and 12 months.

3. Biochemical Data

Biochemical monitoring was conducted at baseline, 6 months, and 12 months to assess the patients' nutritional and metabolic status. Blood samples were collected to measure the following markers:

- Albumin and prealbumin: Indicators of protein malnutrition.
- C-reactive protein (CRP): To evaluate inflammation levels.
- Electrolytes (sodium, potassium, chloride): To monitor for imbalances due to malabsorption or diarrhea.
- Liver function tests (bilirubin, alkaline phosphatase, ALT, AST): To detect liver dysfunction, especially in patients receiving PN.
- Vitamin and mineral levels (e.g., iron, calcium, vitamin D, folate): To assess deficiencies commonly associated with GI diseases.

The biochemical data provided insights into the patients ’nutritional status and helped guide adjustments in their nutritional support plans.

4. Clinical Data

Patient-reported outcomes, including symptom severity, quality of life, and functional status, were assessed using validated questionnaires such as the Inflammatory Bowel Disease Questionnaire (IBDQ) and the Short Form Health Survey (SF-36). Clinical data, including length of hospital stay, frequency of GI-related complications (e.g., flare-ups, infections), and the need for surgical interventions, were recorded.

Data Analysis

1. Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics were used to summarize patient demographics, baseline nutritional status (BMI, weight, MUAC), and biochemical markers. Continuous variables were expressed as means and standard deviations, while categorical variables were reported as frequencies and percentages.

2. Comparative Analysis

Paired t-tests were used to evaluate changes in nutritional status (e.g., BMI, weight), biochemical markers, and radiological findings over time (baseline, 6 months, 12 months). The impact of nutritional support (EN/PN) on radiological and clinical outcomes was assessed using analysis of variance (ANOVA) to compare groups based on the type of nutritional intervention.

3. Correlation Analysis

Pearson’s correlation coefficients were calculated to assess the relationship between biochemical markers (e.g., albumin, CRP) and recovery outcomes (e.g., changes in radiological findings, symptom improvement, weight gain). The correlation between adherence to nutritional interventions and improvements in clinical outcomes was also analyzed.

4. Multivariate Analysis

A multivariate regression model was used to determine the independent effect of nutritional support and biochemical markers on recovery outcomes, adjusting for potential confounders such as age, gender, disease severity, and baseline nutritional status.

Outcome Measures

The primary outcome measure was the improvement in radiological findings (e.g., reduction in inflammation, resolution of strictures) from baseline to 12 months. Secondary outcome measures included:

- Improvements in nutritional status (e.g., BMI, weight gain).
- Changes in biochemical markers (e.g., albumin, CRP).
- Clinical outcomes such as hospital length of stay, reduction in complications, and overall quality of life.

Ethical Considerations

Patient confidentiality was maintained throughout the study, with all data anonymized prior to analysis. Participants provided written informed consent, and the study was conducted in accordance with the ethical guidelines.

Findings

This section presents the results of the 12-month prospective study assessing the impact of nutritional support and biochemical monitoring on the recovery of patients with gastrointestinal (GI) diseases. The study included 150 patients, with data collected on radiological, nutritional, biochemical, and clinical outcomes.

Participant Demographics

The mean age of the study population was 46.2 ±12.5 years, with 54% of participants being male. The most common GI conditions in the cohort were Crohn's disease (40%), ulcerative colitis (35%), and celiac disease (15%).

Table 1: Participant Demographics and Baseline Characteristics

Characteristic	n (%)	Mean ±SD
Total participants	150	
Age (years)		46.2 ±12.5
Gender		
- Male	81 (54%)	
- Female	69 (46%)	
GI conditions		
- Crohn's disease	60 (40%)	
- Ulcerative colitis	52 (35%)	
- Celiac disease	22 (15%)	
- Other	16 (10%)	
Baseline BMI (kg/m²)		20.8 ±3.2
Patients receiving enteral nutrition	98 (65%)	
Patients receiving parenteral nutrition	52 (35%)	

Changes in Nutritional Status

Significant improvements in nutritional status were observed in patients receiving enteral or parenteral nutrition over the 12-month study period. The mean BMI increased by 8.1%, and weight gain was more pronounced in patients who adhered to their nutritional support plans.

Table 2: Changes in Nutritional Status from Baseline to 12 Months

Nutritional Parameter	Baseline (Mean ± SD)	12 Months (Mean ± SD)	% Change
Body Mass Index (BMI, kg/m²)	20.8 ±3.2	22.5 ±3.0	+8.1%
Weight (kg)	58.5 ±10.2	63.2 ±9.6	+8.0%
Mid-upper arm circumference (cm)	23.5 ±3.8	25.2 ±3.5	+7.2%

Radiological Findings

Radiological imaging showed significant improvements in disease severity, with reductions in bowel inflammation, strictures, and fistulas in patients with Crohn's disease and ulcerative colitis. These improvements were strongly correlated with nutritional support and biochemical marker changes.

Table 3: Radiological Outcomes at 12 Months

Radiological Outcome	Baseline (n, %)	12 Months (n, %)	p-value
Bowel inflammation	84 (56%)	34 (23%)	<0.001
Strictures	38 (25%)	16 (11%)	| 0.002
Fistulas	20 (13%)	8 (5%)	0.01
Bowel obstruction	16 (11%)	6 (4%)	0.03

Biochemical Marker Changes

Biochemical monitoring revealed significant improvements in key nutritional and inflammatory markers. Serum albumin and prealbumin levels, which reflect protein nutrition, showed marked increases, while C-reactive protein (CRP) levels decreased, indicating reduced inflammation.

Table 4: Changes in Biochemical Markers from Baseline to 12 Months

Biochemical Marker	Baseline (Mean ± SD)	12 Months (Mean ± SD)	p-value
Serum albumin (g/dL)	3.0 ±0.6	3.8 ±0.5	<0.001
Prealbumin (mg/dL)	14.5 ±5.3	20.2 ±4.7	<0.001
C-reactive protein (CRP, mg/L)	12.8 ±7.6	4.2 ±3.4	<0.001
Sodium (mmol/L)	138.2 ±3.4	139.1 ±2.7	0.08
Potassium (mmol/L)	4.0 ±0.5	4.1 ±0.4	0.12

Clinical Outcomes

In addition to improvements in nutritional status and biochemical markers, significant clinical improvements were observed. Patients who adhered to their nutritional interventions experienced fewer hospitalizations, shorter lengths of hospital stays, and reported improved quality of life.

Table 5: Clinical Outcomes at 12 Months

Outcome	Baseline (Mean ± SD)	12 Months (Mean ± SD)	p-value
Number of hospitalizations	2.1 ±0.9	0.8 ±0.4	<0.001
Length of hospital stay (days)	14.5 ±5.6	8.3 ±3.4	<0.001
Quality of life score (IBDQ)	105.6 ±20.4	145.3 ±22.7	<0.001

Correlation Analysis

Strong correlations were found between improvements in nutritional status, biochemical markers, and radiological outcomes. Patients with higher serum albumin and prealbumin levels showed greater reductions in bowel inflammation and better overall recovery.

Table 6: Correlation Between Biochemical Markers and Radiological Outcomes

Biochemical Marker	Bowel Inflammation (r)	p-value
Serum albumin	-0.68	<0.001
Prealbumin	-0.65	<0.001
C-reactive protein (CRP)	+0.71	<0.001

Summary of Findings

- Significant improvements in nutritional status were observed in patients receiving enteral and parenteral nutrition, with marked increases in BMI and weight.
- Radiological outcomes demonstrated reduced disease severity, with significant decreases in bowel inflammation, strictures, and fistulas.
- Biochemical markers such as serum albumin and prealbumin improved, while inflammation, as indicated by CRP, decreased significantly.
- Patients experienced fewer hospitalizations and reported improved quality of life after 12 months of nutritional support and biochemical monitoring.
- Strong correlations were found between improved biochemical markers and better radiological and clinical outcomes.

Discussion

This study assessed the impact of nutritional support and biochemical monitoring on the recovery of patients with gastrointestinal (GI) diseases, using radiological imaging to evaluate disease progression and response to treatment. The findings demonstrate that a multidisciplinary approach combining nutritional interventions, biochemical monitoring, and radiological assessment significantly improves both clinical and biochemical outcomes in patients with GI diseases.

Key Findings

Nutritional Support and Improved Outcomes

The study found significant improvements in the nutritional status of patients who received tailored enteral or parenteral nutrition support over 12 months. Body mass index (BMI), weight, and mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) showed notable increases, with an 8.1% improvement in BMI. These findings highlight the critical role of nutrition in managing malnutrition in GI disease patients, as malnutrition is a common and serious complication of conditions such as Crohn's disease, ulcerative colitis, and celiac disease (Russell et al., 2022). Nutritional support, particularly enteral nutrition, has been shown to reduce inflammation and promote mucosal healing, which contributes to better clinical outcomes (Narula et al., 2018).

The high adherence to nutritional interventions (65% for enteral nutrition and 35% for parenteral nutrition) also underscores the importance of personalized care plans. Patients who adhered to their nutritional regimens experienced better recovery, reduced hospitalizations, and improved quality of life. These results align with previous research indicating that early and consistent nutritional intervention is essential for improving clinical outcomes in malnourished GI patients (Lochs et al., 2006).

Radiological Improvements and Disease Management

Radiological imaging provided valuable insights into the disease progression and the effectiveness of nutritional support. Significant reductions in bowel inflammation, strictures, and fistulas were observed at the 12-month follow-up. The decrease in bowel inflammation from 56% at baseline to 23% after 12 months of intervention suggests that combining nutritional support with medical treatment can reduce the need for more invasive procedures such as surgery. These findings are consistent with previous studies that emphasize the importance of imaging in monitoring disease progression in GI disorders (Parente et al., 2004).

The reduction in complications such as strictures and fistulas in patients with Crohn's disease further highlights the role of imaging in detecting early improvements that may not be immediately evident through clinical symptoms alone. The correlation between radiological findings and nutritional status, particularly the improvements in serum albumin and prealbumin levels, indicates that nutritional interventions play a critical role in reducing GI inflammation and promoting healing.

Biochemical Markers as Predictors of Recovery

Biochemical markers, particularly serum albumin, prealbumin, and C-reactive protein (CRP), were effective in monitoring the nutritional and inflammatory status of patients. Significant increases in albumin and prealbumin levels, alongside a marked reduction in CRP, suggest that nutritional support not only improved the patients' nutritional status but also reduced systemic inflammation. These results align with the literature, which identifies albumin and prealbumin as key indicators of protein malnutrition, while CRP reflects inflammatory activity (Plauth et al., 2006).

The strong correlations between serum albumin levels and reductions in bowel inflammation ($r = -0.68$, $p < 0.001$) suggest that albumin may be a reliable marker for assessing the effectiveness of nutritional interventions in reducing GI inflammation. Similarly, the reduction in CRP levels, which reflect a decrease in systemic inflammation, further supports the role of nutritional support in promoting recovery and reducing disease severity.

Clinical Implications

The findings of this study have several important clinical implications. First, they underscore the need for a multidisciplinary approach in managing patients with GI diseases, integrating nutritional support, biochemical monitoring, and radiological imaging. The significant improvements in nutritional status, radiological findings, and biochemical markers highlight the benefits of personalized nutritional interventions in reducing complications and promoting recovery.

Second, the study emphasizes the importance of adherence to nutritional support plans. Patients who consistently adhered to their prescribed nutritional regimens experienced fewer hospitalizations, shorter lengths of hospital stay, and improved quality of life. These results suggest that healthcare providers should focus on improving patient education and support to enhance adherence, particularly for those requiring long-term nutritional support.

Third, the use of biochemical markers such as albumin, prealbumin, and CRP provides a valuable tool for monitoring patient progress and guiding treatment adjustments. Regular monitoring of these markers allows clinicians to assess the effectiveness of nutritional interventions and make timely adjustments to optimize patient care. The combination of radiological and biochemical assessments provides a comprehensive approach to managing GI diseases, allowing for more informed and personalized treatment plans.

Limitations

There are several limitations to this study that should be acknowledged. First, the study was conducted at a single tertiary hospital, which may limit the generalizability of the findings to other healthcare settings. A multicenter study would provide more diverse patient populations and increase the applicability of the results.

Second, the reliance on self-reported adherence to nutritional interventions may introduce bias, as patients may overestimate their adherence. Future studies could use more objective measures of adherence, such as direct observation or electronic monitoring, to improve the accuracy of the data.

Finally, while the study demonstrated significant improvements in radiological and biochemical outcomes, the long-term effects of nutritional interventions on clinical outcomes, such as mortality and the need for surgical interventions, were not assessed. Future research should include longer follow-up periods to evaluate the sustainability of the observed improvements and their impact on long-term disease management.

Future Research

Future studies should focus on the long-term impact of nutritional support and biochemical monitoring on clinical outcomes, including mortality rates and the need for surgical interventions in GI disease patients. Additionally, research exploring strategies to improve patient adherence to nutritional interventions, such as the use of technology and telemedicine, could further enhance the effectiveness of personalized care plans. Expanding the study to include a larger, more diverse population across multiple healthcare centers would also provide a broader understanding of how nutritional support and biochemical monitoring can be optimized for different patient demographics.

Conclusion

This study demonstrates that integrating nutritional support and biochemical monitoring with radiological imaging significantly improves recovery outcomes in patients with GI diseases. The findings emphasize the importance of a multidisciplinary approach in managing these patients, with tailored nutritional interventions playing a critical role in reducing disease severity, improving nutritional status, and promoting overall recovery. Radiological imaging and biochemical markers provide valuable tools for monitoring patient progress, allowing for more personalized and effective treatment plans. With continued research and refinement of these approaches, healthcare providers can further optimize the management of GI diseases, improving both short-term and long-term patient outcomes.

References:

1. Deepak, P., Axelrad, J. E., &Ananthakrishnan, A. N. (2019). The role of the radiologist in determining disease severity in inflammatory bowel diseases. *Gastrointestinal Endoscopy Clinics*, *29*(3), 447-470.
2. Farias, U., Augusto, P., & Nancy, V. (2019). Nutritional support for inflammatory bowel disease. *ArchivosLatinoamericanos De Nutricion*, *69*(2), 288-293.
3. Horsthuis, K., Bipat, S., Stokkers, P. C., & Stoker, J. (2009). Magnetic resonance imaging for evaluation of disease activity in Crohn's disease: a systematic review. *European radiology*, *19*, 1450-1460.
4. Lochs, H., Dejong, C., Hammarqvist, F., Hébuterne, X., Leon-Sanz, M., Schütz, T., ... &Thul, P. (2006). ESPEN guidelines on enteral nutrition: gastroenterology. *Clinical nutrition*, *25*(2), 260-274.
5. Narula, N., Dhillon, A., Zhang, D., Sherlock, M. E., Tondeur, M., &Zachos, M. (2018). Enteral nutritional therapy for induction of remission in Crohn's disease. *Cochrane database of systematic reviews*, (4).
6. Parente, F., Greco, S., Molteni, M., Anderloni, A., Maconi, G., &Porro, G. B. (2004). Modern imaging of Crohn's disease using bowel ultrasound. *Inflammatory Bowel Diseases*, *10*(4), 452-461.
7. Plauth, M., Cabre, E., Riggio, O., Assis-Camilo, M., Pirlich, M., Kondrup, J., ... & Nolte, W. (2006). ESPEN guidelines on enteral nutrition: liver disease. *Clinical nutrition*, *25*(2), 285-294.
8. Russell, L. A., Balart, M. T., Serrano, P., Armstrong, D., & Pinto-Sanchez, M. I. (2022). The complexities of approaching nutrition in inflammatory bowel disease: current recommendations and future directions. *Nutrition reviews*, *80*(2), 215-229.
9. Shaban, N., Hoad, C. L., Naim, I., Alshammari, M., Radford, S. J., Clarke, C., ... & Moran, G. (2022). Imaging in inflammatory bowel disease: Current and future perspectives. *Frontline Gastroenterology*, *13*(e1), e28-e34.