

1 **Clinical Practice Guideline: Pediatric Intensive Feeding Programs**

2

3 **Date of Implementation: June 16, 2016**

4

5 **Product: Specialty**

6

7

Related Policies: CPG 155: Occupational Therapy Medical Policy/Guideline CPG 166 Speech-Language Pathology/Speech Therapy Guidelines
--

8

9

10

11

12 **GUIDELINES**

13 ASH considers treatment of feeding disorder in an outpatient pediatric intensive
14 multidisciplinary feeding program medically necessary when ALL of the following criteria
15 are met:

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

Note: Regular documentation supporting significant progress toward treatment is required to determine the medical necessity of continuation of a pediatric intensive multidisciplinary feeding program.

Not Medically Necessary

A pediatric intensive multidisciplinary feeding program is considered not medically necessary for any of the following:

- Maintenance or preventive treatment provided to prevent recurrence or to maintain the patient’s current status;
- Treatment intended is to improve or maintain general physical condition;
- When a home feeding program can be utilized to continue therapy;

- 1 • Therapy that duplicates services already being provided as part of an authorized
- 2 therapy program through another therapy discipline;
- 3 • Swallowing/feeding therapy for food aversions that are meeting normal growth and
- 4 developmental milestones.

5
6 ASH considers pediatric intensive feeding programs unproven for all other indications
7 (e.g., childhood obesity, Prader-Willi syndrome) because their effectiveness for indications
8 other than those listed above has not been established.

9
10 ASH considers electrical stimulation for the treatment of swallowing/feeding disorders
11 experimental and investigational because its effectiveness for these indications has not
12 been established.

13
14 Also, feeding disorders should not be confused with eating disorders, such as anorexia,
15 which are more common in adolescence and adulthood.

16
17 **ICD-10 Codes and Descriptions that Support Medical Necessity (may not be all**
18 **inclusive dependent upon coverage of developmental delay per benefit)**

ICD-10 Codes	ICD-10 Code Description
D51.0 - D53.9	Vitamin B12, folate, and other deficiency anemias
E41 E43	Nutritional marasmus and unspecified severe protein-calorie malnutrition
E44.0 - E46	Protein-calorie malnutrition
E56.0 - E63.9	Other nutritional deficiencies
E70.0 - E71.2 E72.00 - E72.51E72.59 - E72.9	Disorders of amino-acid transport and metabolism
E71.30, E75.21 - E75.22 E75.240 - E75.249 E75.3 E75.5 - E75.6 E77.0 - E78.70 E78.79 - E78.9 E88.1 - E88.2 E88.89	Disorders of lipid and glycoprotein metabolism and other specified metabolic disorders
E73.0 - E74.9	Disorders of carbohydrate transport and metabolism

E83.00 - E83.19 E83.30 - E83.9 E20.1	Disorders of mineral metabolism
E86.0 - E87.8	Disorders of fluid, electrolyte, and acid-base balance
K90.1 - K90.49 K90.89	Intestinal malabsorption
N18.1 - N18.9	Chronic kidney disease (CKD)
P74.0 - P74.49	Other transitory neonatal electrolyte and metabolic disturbances
P84	Other problems of newborn (acidosis)
P92.1 - P92.9	Feeding problems in newborn
Q35.1 - Q37.9	Cleft palate and cleft lip
R13.0 - R13.19	Aphagia and dysphagia
R62.51	Failure to thrive (child)
R63.30 – R63.39	Feeding difficulties
R63.4	Abnormal weight loss
R63.6	Underweight
R63.8	Other symptoms and signs concerning food and fluid intake

1
2

Related CPT Codes (not all inclusive)

CPT® Code	CPT® Code Description
92610	Evaluation of oral and pharyngeal swallowing function
92526	Treatment of swallowing dysfunction and/or oral function for feeding

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION

Good nutrition is essential for the growth and development of babies. Feeding progressions are based on specific reflexes and the development of the baby’s mouth. Initially they are able to suck and swallow and as their first year progresses; they are soon able to chew. The gastrointestinal or digestive tract matures from being only able to handle liquids such as breastmilk or formula, to being able to digest a variety of foods. During this time the baby moves from requiring help to feed to being able to feed themselves. As the infant matures into a child, their food and feeding patterns continue to change and this rate is dependent upon many things, including the baby’s own skills and attitudes. However, babies will do

1 best with feeding if they are supported in progressing at their own rate. Development of
2 specific reflexes is involved in feeding and eating. The different reflexes involved include:

- 3 • Rooting reflex—When a baby’s mouth, lips, cheek, or chin are touched by an
4 object, the head and mouth turn towards the object and the baby opens its mouth.
5 This reflex allows a baby to seek out and grasp a nipple.
- 6 • Suck/swallow reflex—When the baby’s lips and mouth area are touched in an open
7 mouth position, suckling or sucking movements begin. As liquid moves into the
8 mouth, the tongue moves it to the back of the mouth for swallowing.
- 9 • Tongue thrust reflex—When the lips are touched, the baby’s tongue moves out of
10 the mouth. This reflex allows for feeding from the breast or bottle but not from a
11 spoon or cup.
- 12 • Gag reflex—When an object, such as a spoon or solid food, is placed way back in
13 the mouth, the object is quickly moved back out of the mouth by the tongue. This
14 reflex is one reason for waiting until a baby is 4 to 6 months old to feed solid foods.
15

16 These reflexes may be stronger or weaker, or last longer than normal, in babies who are
17 delayed in their development.
18

19 Feeding is a critical self-help skill that develops during infancy and toddlerhood. Inability
20 to self-feed in toddlers or to be cooperative with caretaker feeding during infancy may
21 result in severe functional limitation, thus contributing to or establishing disability. Feeding
22 and swallowing is a complex process that involves the mouth, pharynx, larynx and
23 esophagus. In infants, the first phase also includes the sucking reflex. Oral skills such as
24 sucking or chewing solids are learned only at certain ages. Infants who do not learn these
25 skills at the specific times in their development may have difficulty mastering them at a
26 later point, leading to feeding problems. In infants and children, the feeding and
27 swallowing process includes the following phases: pre-oral or oral preparatory phase; oral
28 phase; pharyngeal phase; and esophageal phase (American Speech-Language-Hearing
29 Association [ASHA]).
30

31 Pediatric feeding disorders are a multifaceted set of feeding and swallowing problems that
32 include a wide range of problems that interfere with the attainment of age-appropriate
33 feeding habits and result in inadequate caloric or nutritional intake, thus compromising
34 normal growth and development rates. A feeding problem is defined as “The failure to
35 progress with feeding skills. Developmentally, a feeding problem exists when a child is
36 ‘stuck’ in their feeding pattern and cannot progress.” Feeding disorders may occur
37 frequently in early childhood. They are fairly common in infants and toddlers, with
38 approximately 25-35% of these children experiencing some difficulties (considered minor)
39 with feeding (Kodak, 2008). The incidence of severe feeding problems has been reported
40 to be as high as 40-70% among infants born prematurely or in children with chronic
41 medical conditions (Rogers, 2004).

1 Feeding disorders include problems gathering food and getting ready to suck, chew, or
 2 swallow it. For example, a child who cannot completely close her lips to keep food from
 3 falling out of her mouth may have a feeding disorder. Other examples of feeding problems
 4 may include but are not limited to food refusal, disruptive meal-time behavior, rigid food
 5 preferences, suboptimal growth, and failure to master self-feeding skills commensurate
 6 with the child’s developmental abilities. Swallowing disorders, also called dysphagia, can
 7 occur at the (previously mentioned) different stages in the swallowing process:

- 8 • Oral prep phase – preparing food or liquid in the oral cavity to form a bolus which
 9 includes sucking, manipulating and chewing
- 10 • Oral phase – transit of food or liquid into the throat
- 11 • Pharyngeal phase – starting the swallow, squeezing food down the throat, and
 12 closing off the airway to prevent food or liquid from entering the airway (aspiration)
 13 or to prevent choking
- 14 • Esophageal phase – relaxing and tightening the cervical and thoracic levels of the
 15 esophagus transferring the food or liquid via esophageal peristalsis into the stomach
 16 (Logemann,1998)

17
 18 Dysphagia and feeding problems are classified according to which phase of swallowing is
 19 affected. Oral dysphagia in children is seen most commonly in those with
 20 neurodevelopmental disorders. These children will exhibit poor lingual and labial
 21 coordination. This will result in loss of food and a poor seal for sucking or removing food
 22 from a spoon. These children may also have difficulty with coordination of sucking,
 23 swallowing and breathing. Underlying medical conditions that may cause dysphagia may
 24 include, but are not limited to:

- 25 • Neurological disorders (e.g., cerebral palsy)
- 26 • Disorders affecting suck-swallow-breathing coordination (e.g., bronchopulmonary
 27 dysplasia)
- 28 • Structural lesions (e.g., neoplasm, cleft)
- 29 • Connective tissue disease (e.g., muscular dystrophy)
- 30 • Iatrogenic causes (e.g., surgical resection, medications)
- 31 • Anatomic or congenital abnormalities (e.g., cleft lip and/or palate)

32
 33 Signs and symptoms of a significant feeding disorder may include refusal to eat or drink;
 34 difficulty swallowing, inability to self-feed at an appropriate age, requiring an abnormally
 35 long time to eat, choking, gagging, or vomiting when eating, or other inappropriate
 36 mealtime behaviors. If such feeding problems occur for a prolonged period of time, they
 37 will have a significant effect upon the child's nutritional intake, affecting growth and
 38 development rates and may result in frequent illnesses, or death in severe cases. Such
 39 disorders may also be accompanied by behavioral problems such as hitting, biting, kicking,
 40 tantrums, crying, and vomiting at mealtime as an attention-getting strategy. The most
 41 common signs and symptoms of feeding disorders and dysphagia are coughing or choking

1 while eating, or the sensation of food sticking in the throat or chest. Signs and symptoms
2 of dysphagia may also include difficulty initiating swallowing, drooling, unexplained
3 weight loss, change in dietary habits, recurrent pneumonia, change in voice or speech, nasal
4 regurgitation, and dehydration. Infants may exhibit a feeding disorder with signs and
5 symptoms that include refusal to eat or drink, failure to gain weight, aversions to specific
6 food types or textures, recurrent pneumonias and chronic lung disease. Consequences of
7 dysphagia and feeding disorders may be severe and may include dehydration, malnutrition,
8 aspiration, choking, pneumonia, and death.

9
10 Feeding disorders may result from a wide range of causes, including medical conditions
11 (for example, food allergies, neurologic or neuromuscular disease, gastroesophageal
12 reflux, and others), structural or functional abnormalities (for example, defects of the
13 palate), or behavioral issues (for example, crying or tantrums that prevent successful
14 completion of mealtimes). In most cases, there is likely a complex interaction among
15 multiple causative factors. Additionally, often therapists are challenged by the fact that
16 children are unable to tell them what they are feeling or what is wrong. For example, a
17 significant number of children with feeding difficulty also have a history of gastrointestinal
18 problems such as gastroesophageal reflux, constipation, poor appetite, poor weight gain,
19 and sometimes food intolerance. Medical problems such as gastroesophageal reflux disease
20 (GERD) may cause eating to be painful. Early experiences with pain during eating can
21 cause the child to refuse, avoid, or stop eating and develop behavior problems that make it
22 difficult if not impossible for the parent to feed the child. Additionally, frequent avoidance
23 of eating may contribute to failure to develop appropriate oral sensorimotor skills required
24 for successful eating and swallowing due to decreased practice eating the needed amount
25 of food for normal growth and development and poor reception of age-appropriate foods.
26 Thus, improving stomach comfort is a key to successful treatment. For a child to be
27 diagnosed with feeding disorder of infancy or early childhood, the disorder must be severe
28 enough to affect growth for a significant period of time.

29
30 Infants and children who are tube fed for extended periods of time have an especially high
31 occurrence of feeding problems. For these patients, there appears to be a "critical period"
32 for developing proper oral feeding patterns and reflexes. This critical period has been
33 described as being between six and seven months of age, during which acquisition of oral
34 food consumption skill is most likely. Beyond this period oral feeding abilities may not be
35 established or may be established with great difficulty. These results were based on case
36 studies and overall program evaluation indicated that medically complicated, severe
37 feeding disorders can be treated successfully in a few months with a multidisciplinary
38 approach which incorporates behavioral procedures (Babbitt, 1994).

39
40 Premature infants and those that are of very low birth weight are at very high risk for
41 feeding disorders (Rommel et al., 2003; Schädler et al., 2007; Vohr et al., 2006). The
42 underdeveloped sphincter muscle between the stomach and esophagus can cause the infant

1 to spit up frequently during feedings. Because this is uncomfortable for the child, he or she
2 may not want to eat. Schädler et al. (2007) describes the successful use of behavioral
3 therapy for severe feeding disorders in 86 premature children. However, they indicate that
4 other conditions such as cerebral palsy, mental retardation and interaction problems, which
5 are frequent in this population, have a significant negative impact on therapy outcomes and
6 may require an even more intensive approach to address feeding disorders. Authors support
7 the addition of behavioral therapy in that they noted a therapeutic intervention based on
8 behavioral therapy achieved sustained success in almost two thirds of the children.

9
10 According to the recommendations of the Cole and Lanham and published in American
11 Family Physicians (2011), screening for nutrition risks and problems is an expected part of
12 routine preventive health services. Failure to thrive in childhood is a state of undernutrition
13 due to inadequate caloric intake, inadequate caloric absorption, or excessive caloric
14 expenditure. In the United States, it is seen in 5 to 10 percent of children in primary care
15 settings. Although failure to thrive is often defined as a weight for age that falls below the
16 5th percentile on multiple occasions or weight deceleration that crosses two major
17 percentile lines on a growth chart, use of any single indicator has a low positive predictive
18 value. There is no consensus on which specific anthropometric criteria should be used to
19 define FTT. Most cases of failure to thrive involve inadequate caloric intake caused by
20 behavioral or psychosocial issues. The most important part of the outpatient evaluation is
21 obtaining an accurate account of a child's eating habits and caloric intake (Cole and
22 Lanham, 2011). Failure to thrive (FTT) is a term used to describe inadequate growth or the
23 inability to maintain growth, usually in early childhood. It is a sign of undernutrition, and
24 because many biologic, psychosocial, and environmental processes can lead to
25 undernutrition, FTT should never be a diagnosis unto itself. A combination of
26 anthropometric criteria, rather than one criterion, should be used to more accurately
27 identify children at risk of FTT (Cole and Lanham, 2011). Weight for length is a better
28 indicator of acute undernutrition and is helpful in identifying children who need prompt
29 nutritional treatment. A weight that is less than 70 percent of the 50th percentile on the
30 weight-for-length curve is an indicator of severe malnutrition and may require inpatient
31 treatment (Cole and Lanham, 2011).

32
33 When the feeding problem is severe or complex, medical causes of FTT have been treated,
34 and initial treatment efforts by a single discipline (e.g., occupational therapist, speech
35 language pathologist) have failed, intensive treatment is considered. A referral is made to
36 an interdisciplinary team for assessment and intervention in order to evaluate and treat all
37 factors influencing growth. Services can include a comprehensive clinic evaluation,
38 videofluoroscopic swallow study, feeding therapy, and family and caregiver education. A
39 nutrition assessment completed by a registered dietitian obtains information needed to rule
40 out or confirm a nutrition related problem. Nutrition assessment consists of an in-depth and
41 detailed collection and evaluation of data in the following areas: anthropometrics,
42 clinical/medical history, diet, developmental feeding skills, behavior related to feeding, and

1 biochemical laboratory data. During the assessment, risk factors identified during nutrition
2 screening are further evaluated and a nutrition diagnosis is made. The assessment may also
3 reveal areas of concern such as oral-motor development or behavioral issues that require
4 referral for evaluation by the appropriate therapist or specialist. Other members of the
5 interdisciplinary team may include behaviorists, occupational therapist, physical therapist,
6 speech language pathologist/therapist, social worker, and home health care providers.

7
8 Disorders of the digestive system can also cause feeding problems. Examples of these types
9 of conditions include structural or functional abnormalities of the mouth, throat, or
10 esophagus that may result in inability to chew or swallow, or cause pain during swallowing,
11 or result in aspiration (inhaling food or fluid into the lungs). Celiac disease, necrotizing
12 enterocolitis, Hirschprung disease, short bowel syndrome, pyloric stenosis, and GERD may
13 also contribute to disordered feeding behaviors. A small controlled study by Mathisen et
14 al. (1999) concluded that the presence of GERD had a significant negative impact on the
15 energy intake of affected infants. Such infants demonstrated fewer adaptive skills and
16 readiness behaviors for solid foods, and significantly more food refusals and food loss at
17 meal times.

18
19 Neurologic and neuromuscular disorders, such as cerebral palsy, are associated with
20 significantly increased difficulty with feeding. Field (2003) reported on 349 participants
21 evaluated by an interdisciplinary feeding team that the frequencies of predisposing factors
22 varied by feeding problem. Differences were found in the prevalence of the five feeding
23 problems among children with three different developmental disabilities: autism, Down
24 syndrome and cerebral palsy. Gastroesophageal reflux was the most prevalent condition
25 found among all children in the sample and was the factor most often associated with food
26 refusal. Neurological conditions and anatomical anomalies were highly associated with
27 skill deficits, such as oral motor delays and dysphagia. In such children, spasticity or
28 weakness of the oral musculature results in difficulty with oral food preparation prior to
29 swallowing (for example, sipping, sucking, or chewing), but problems swallowing may
30 also be present. This may progress from simple frustration to more significant problems
31 such as aspiration and respiratory infections (Arvedson, 2008; Field, 2003; Gisel, 2008;
32 Rogers, 2004). Rogers (2004) concludes that oral feeding interventions for children with
33 cerebral palsy may be effective in promoting oral motor function but have not been shown
34 to be effective in promoting feeding efficiency or weight gain. Feeding gastrostomy tubes
35 are a reasonable alternative for children with severe feeding and swallowing problems who
36 have had poor weight gain. According to Arvedson (2008), in addition to the status of
37 feeding in the child, considerations include health status, broad environment, parent-child
38 interactions, and parental concerns. Interdisciplinary team approaches allow for
39 coordinated global assessment and management decisions. Underlying etiologies or
40 diagnoses must be delineated to every extent possible because treatment will vary
41 according to history and current status in light of all factors that are often interrelated in
42 complex ways.

1 Feeding problems are common even in normally developing infants and children.
2 However, they are more frequent and persistent in children with developmental disabilities
3 (Gisel, 2008). Developmental disorders, such as Down syndrome and autism spectrum
4 disorders, may also contribute to feeding problems (Manikam and Perman, 2000).
5 According to Manikam and Perman (2000), pediatric feeding disorders are common: 25%
6 of children are reported to present with some form of feeding disorder. However, this
7 number increases to 80% in developmentally delayed children. Consequences of feeding
8 disorders can be severe, including growth failure, susceptibility to chronic illness, and even
9 death. While such individuals frequently have co-existing physical disorders as described
10 above, they may also demonstrate unique behavioral issues that impair feeding (Kodak,
11 2008; Schreck et al., 2004). Schreck et al. (2004) reported results indicating children with
12 autism have significantly more feeding problems and eat a significantly narrower range of
13 foods than children without autism. According to Kodak (2008), children diagnosed with
14 autism or autism spectrum disorders (ASD) are more likely than other children to exhibit
15 behaviors characteristic of a feeding or sleeping disorder. Food aversion and food refusal
16 in these individuals are sometimes linked to difficulties with food texture and type which
17 significantly limit the accepted food options for these individuals. It is important to note
18 that feeding disorders may be comorbid with developmental disorders without being part
19 of the developmental disorder itself. There are no developmental disorders whose
20 diagnostic criteria include feeding disorders as defined above. The rationale for treatment
21 is that children whose feeding problems are treated with nasogastric, gastrostomy, or
22 jejunostomy tubes are more likely to need therapy to become oral feeders. Placement of a
23 feeding tube has been shown to actually cause or worsen feeding problems for many
24 children (Crosby and Duerksen, 2007). Crosby and Duerksen (2007) examined the long-
25 term complications related to tube malfunction and the effect these have on health care use.
26 Common tube-site complications included discharge from the tube site, red or tender
27 stoma, and granulation tissue. Mechanical problems related to tubes plugging, breaking,
28 and falling out were also common. Despite having a dedicated nurse and dietitian to follow
29 these patients, unscheduled health care contacts were frequent and averaged 5.4 contacts
30 over the mean follow-up time of 10.5 months. Authors concluded that in patients receiving
31 long-term home enteral nutrition, tube and tube-feeding complications are frequent and
32 result in significant health care use.

33
34 Pediatric feeding problems are typically treated in outpatient settings by individual
35 practitioners. Some hospitals have developed comprehensive outpatient clinics with
36 interdisciplinary care models called “pediatric intensive feeding programs” or “feeding
37 clinics” that are designed to evaluate, diagnose, and treat children with severe or complex
38 feeding and swallowing difficulties. Pediatric feeding disorder evaluation and, at times,
39 treatment are most likely best performed by a multi-or inter-disciplinary team in an
40 outpatient setting. These interdisciplinary clinics are intended to provide greater
41 environmental control, greater frequency of treatment, accelerated learning by increased
42 contact with caregivers, and frequent medical and nutrition monitoring to provide

1 clinicians with additional treatment options (e.g., appetite manipulation, swallow
2 induction). The interdisciplinary team of specialists work with the child and family to
3 address the multiple factors involved with eating. Members of this team may include, but
4 are not limited to, a pediatrician, family physician, gastroenterologist, dietitian,
5 occupational therapist, speech-language pathologist, pediatric behavioral and
6 developmental specialist, psychologist, and social worker. These professionals work
7 together to assess the individual and determine the possible underlying causes for the
8 disorder, followed by creating a treatment plan. Outpatient programs are typically provided
9 eight hours a day, five days per week, and involves feeding sessions of 3–5 meals a day.
10 Between feeding sessions, the patient may be involved in other therapies if needed,
11 playroom, naps or school activities. The day program typically lasts approximately 4–8
12 weeks.

13
14 The assessment process should evaluate a wide range of issues, including the structure and
15 function of the mouth, upper airway, gastrointestinal tract and duration of the feeding
16 problem; as well as behavioral aspects of feeding such as the parental-child interaction.
17 Programs vary across locations but generally focus on the feeding problems of infants and
18 children up to 16 years of age. The Kennedy Krieger Institute (Baltimore, MD) is an
19 example of a facility that offers services ranging from outpatient assessment, intensive day
20 treatment, and inpatient feeding programs that typically last about 8 weeks. Key aspects of
21 the program include direct observation behavior assessment, approaches for increasing and
22 decreasing feeding behavior, skill acquisition, transfer of treatment gains, and parent
23 training. Treatment for diagnosed pediatric feeding disorders may also require a
24 multidisciplinary team approach. This team includes the same types of professionals who
25 treat both the causative and underlying medical conditions, as well as provide the various
26 interventions deemed appropriate for the treatment of the individual.

27
28 In many intensive treatment programs, the intervention involves 3 phases: (1) the child is
29 fed directly by the therapist to establish a new set of feeding responses, (2) parents are
30 introduced into the feeding environment, and (3) parents feed their child with clinicians
31 coaching remotely.

32
33 The multidisciplinary feeding team may include, but is not limited to, the following
34 members:

35
36 **Pediatric psychologist:** Provides a behavioral viewpoint on feeding disorders, assesses for
37 associated behavioral or psychiatric conditions involved for the child or family structure,
38 and provides interventions or refers as appropriate. Behavioral treatment techniques
39 include application of meal-time structure and a feeding schedule, appetite and behavior
40 management, as well as parent training.

1 **Physician:** Monitors overall medical well-being of the child and provides oversight and
 2 support as needed while the child is in treatment, including medical studies to identify and
 3 treat various physiological causes, medication management, and coordination of the entire
 4 treatment team.

5
 6 **Dietitian/Nutritionist:** Provides targeted nutrition interventions to improve growth
 7 (weight at or above 90 % of ideal body weight for length), improve growth rate, nutrient
 8 intake, and nutrient balance. They will also guide families to avoid harmful
 9 foods/supplements.

10
 11 **Occupational therapist:** Focus on enhancing feeding performance by applying techniques
 12 to improve the mechanics of feeding or by suggesting strategies to their primary caregivers
 13 to promote feeding interaction and improve children's mealtime behaviors.

14
 15 **Speech and language pathologist:** Includes therapies to improve chewing and swallowing
 16 coordination, strengthen oral musculature, and improve oral tolerance to a broad range of
 17 flavors, textures, and temperatures of foods.

18
 19 Most nutrition and feeding problems of children can be improved or controlled but may
 20 not be totally resolved in complex cases. Some children may require ongoing and periodic
 21 nutrition assessment and intervention. Hospitalization may be neither helpful nor necessary
 22 unless the child is severely malnourished, seriously ill, or at risk of harm. Separation of the
 23 child from the family by hospitalization may result in more issues that may cause a delay
 24 in feeding and supporting the child within his or her normal environment (Kirkland and
 25 Motil, 2010).

26
 27 Indications for hospitalization include:

- 28 • Extremely problematic parent-child interaction
- 29 • Failure to respond to several months of out-patient management
- 30 • Precise documentation of energy intake
- 31 • Psychosocial circumstances that put the child at risk for harm
- 32 • Serious inter-current illness or significant medical problems
- 33 • Severe malnutrition (less than or equal to 75 % of ideal body weight)
- 34 • Significant dehydration

35
 36 Medical strategies that promote “gut” comfort and encourage appetite will help the child
 37 be receptive to eating and can improve response to feeding therapy. These strategies
 38 typically involve the following:

- 39 • Addressing weight gain and growth as the priority of a feeding program
- 40 • Treating constipation and establishing a routine of daily soft stooling
- 41 • Treating gastroesophageal reflux and hypersensitivity in the GI tract

- 1 • Using hydrolyzed formulas that are easier to digest and promote gastric emptying
2 and stooling
- 3 • Adjusting tube feeding rates and schedules to promote comfort
- 4 • Using appetite stimulants to boost hunger

5
6 Some children’s feeding skills improve dramatically with medical management alone.
7 Depending on the child, using medical management strategies can take multiple visits over
8 time with the physician. If the child’s symptoms persist despite using medicines for reflux
9 and constipation, a pediatrician may decide to refer the child to a gastroenterologist or
10 feeding team for specialized care. A child also may undergo further tests to rule out further
11 medical diagnoses that can negatively affect eating such as anemia, food allergy,
12 eosinophilic esophagitis, malrotation, and motility disorders. Other children will need
13 feeding therapy using techniques to improve acceptance of volume and variety of foods as
14 well as oral motor therapy to progress to age appropriate oral motor patterns. No matter
15 what type of feeding therapy approach used, the child will respond better if they feel better.
16 Many therapists have been taught to start with the mouth from a treatment perspective.
17 That means focusing on the oral motor hypersensitivity or oral motor delay first. It is
18 important to consider that despite the physician addressing the medical issues, such as
19 reflux, it is team effort because the physician may not see the child eat and also don’t see
20 the children as often as the therapist does. Therefore, it is important that therapists work
21 closely with the referring physicians to assist with proper diagnosis and treatment in order
22 to assure the best outcomes for patients. The most important reason to recognize and treat
23 the underlying medical issues of children with pediatric feeding problems is to help them
24 progress. It is important that GI issues are addressed prior to starting therapy so that pain
25 or discomfort is not reinforced for the child. Therapy goals for most patients involve weight
26 gain and growth, age appropriate oral motor patterns, and acceptance of a variety of foods
27 from all food groups for healthy eating. Using medical strategies to help the child feel better
28 will improve response to feeding therapy and eventually outcomes.

29
30 A pediatric intensive, multidisciplinary feeding program may be provided on an inpatient
31 basis or daily outpatient basis, which is also referred to as a day feeding program. The
32 inpatient programs are generally recommended for children with severe feeding difficulties
33 who may require around-the-clock medical supervision. The Kennedy Krieger Institute
34 website for their pediatric feeding disorders unit states that, “Inpatient services are
35 recommended for children with severe feeding difficulties (e.g., failure-to-thrive, vomiting,
36 G-tube dependence, total food refusal) so that close medical assessments, nutritional
37 monitoring, oral motor assessments and intense behavioral interventions can be
38 conducted.”

39
40 An outpatient program is typically provided eight hours a day, five days per week, and
41 involves feeding sessions of 3-5 meals a day. Between feeding sessions, the patient may

1 be involved in other therapies if needed, playroom, naps or school activities. The day
 2 program typically lasts approximately 4–8 weeks.

4 **EVIDENCE REVIEW**

5 **Treatment of Pediatric Feeding Disorders**

6 Byars et al. (2003) conducted a prospective clinical trial for the purpose of describing
 7 outcomes in nine children with Nissen fundoplication and feeding gastrostomy (G-tube)
 8 treated in a multicomponent intensive feeding program. Nine children with a history of
 9 behavioral feeding resistance and G-tube dependence were admitted for intensive treatment
 10 to an inpatient feeding program. The treatment included short-term behavioral treatment
 11 with a family-focused approach. A team of behavioral therapists managed all aspects of
 12 behavioral treatment. A gastroenterologist and registered dietician monitored and managed
 13 the medical and nutritional status. At discharge, it was reported that 44% of the sample had
 14 been successfully weaned from gastrostomy feedings. At follow-up, six of the nine patients
 15 (67%) were weaned from G-tube feeding and taking 100% of their nutritional needs by
 16 mouth. It was noted that range of inpatient treatment was 5–16 days. Follow-up assessment
 17 was obtained in a clinic visit scheduled 2–4 months after the child’s discharge from the
 18 program. Three families did not return for the follow-up visit due to distance from the
 19 facility. Weight gains were noted to be small. Limitations of the study included no control
 20 group, the small group size and the length of follow-up time after the study. Sharp et al.
 21 (2010) conducted a systematic review of the literature regarding treatment of pediatric
 22 feeding disorders. The review included 48 single-case research studies that reported
 23 outcomes for 96 participants. Most children in the studies had complex medical and
 24 developmental concerns and received treatment at multidisciplinary feeding disorders
 25 programs. All of the studies involved behavioral interventions—no well-controlled studies
 26 that evaluated feeding interventions by other theoretical perspectives or clinical disciplines
 27 met inclusion criteria. Treatment settings included hospital inpatient units (43.8% of the
 28 studies) followed by home/school setting (29.2%), day treatment programs (16.7%),
 29 outpatient clinics (10.4%) and residential facilities (6.3%). The results of the review
 30 indicated that behavioral intervention was associated with significant improvements in
 31 feeding behavior. This review evaluated behavioral interventions used in feeding disorder
 32 programs; however, the settings for the treatment was not compared or evaluated.
 33 Silverman et al. (2013) reported on a retrospective study of a cohort of 77 children
 34 diagnosed as having a feeding disorder, gastrostomy tube (GT) feeding dependence (>1
 35 year), and an inability to maintain acceptable growth via oral feeding that completed a tube
 36 weaning protocol in an inpatient behavioral feeding program. In the inpatient program,
 37 children received treatment from a pediatric psychologist at each meal three times per day,
 38 seven days per week, until discharged with at least one parent was required to be present
 39 at all mealtimes. Measures for analysis included About Your Child’s Eating, the Mealtime
 40 Behavior Questionnaire, and the Parenting Stress Index Short Form. The mean duration of
 41 hospitalization was 10.9 days. At discharge, 51% of patients needed no GT feeding, and
 42 after one year after discharge an additional 12% needed no GT feeding. Limitations of the

1 study include the retrospective data collection and incomplete ascertainment of follow-up
2 data resulting in a decreasing sample size through 12 months of follow-up, heterogeneity
3 of the patient populations and the psychological measures were dependent upon parent
4 report.

5 6 **Multidisciplinary Approach**

7 Many studies have demonstrated the benefits of such a multidisciplinary approach.
8 Manikam and Perman (2000) support that assessment and treatment are best conducted by
9 an interdisciplinary team of professionals. They believe that, at a minimum, the team
10 should include a gastroenterologist, dietitian, behavioral psychologist, and occupational
11 and/or speech therapist. Intervention should be comprehensive and include treatment of the
12 medical condition, behavioral modification to alter the child's inappropriate learned
13 feeding patterns, and parent education and training in appropriate parenting and feeding
14 skills. A majority of feeding problems can be resolved or greatly improved through
15 medical, oral motor, and behavioral therapy. Behavioral feeding strategies have been
16 applied successfully even in organically mediated feeding disorders. To avoid iatrogenic
17 feeding problems, initial attempts to achieve nutritional goals in malnourished children
18 should be via the oral route. The need for exclusive tube feedings should be minimized.
19 (Manikam and Perman, 2000).

20
21 Rommel et al. (2003) described the multidisciplinary treatment of 700 infants and young
22 children with feeding disorders, reporting that almost 50% of the study subjects presented
23 with a combination of medical (for example, GERD, neurologic or other problem) and oral
24 (for example, oral motor issues, sensory problems, etc.) pathology underlying their
25 disorder. They found a significant relationship was found between the type of feeding
26 problem and age. Infants born preterm and/or with a birthweight below the tenth percentile
27 for gestational age are at greater risk for developing feeding disorders. There were also
28 a substantial number of individuals presenting with combined oral-behavioral (for example,
29 food avoidance, tantrums, etc.), and medical-behavioral conditions as well. These
30 individuals were treated by a team approach, with 73.1 % of the individuals experiencing
31 significant benefits beyond 2 months to 5 years. Authors conclude that a multidisciplinary
32 team approach is essential for assessment and management because combined medical and
33 oral problems are the most frequent cause of pediatric feeding problems. In a review of the
34 literature on feeding problems of infants and toddlers, Bernard-Bonnin (2006) note that
35 there is often overlap between classifications of feeding problems, which includes
36 structural abnormalities, neurodevelopmental disabilities, and behavioral disorders. A
37 medical approach also needs an evaluation of diet and an assessment of the interaction
38 between parent and child. Treating medical or surgical conditions, increasing caloric
39 intake, and counseling about general nutrition can alleviate mild to moderate problems.
40 Thus, feeding problems in early childhood often have multi-factorial causes with a
41 behavioral component. The author states that more complicated cases should be referred to
42 multidisciplinary teams, including behavioral therapy to foster appropriate behavior and

1 discourage maladaptive behavior. Greer et al. (2008) investigated the impact of an
2 intensive interdisciplinary feeding program on caregiver stress and child outcomes of
3 children with feeding disorders across 3 categories: (1) tube dependent, (2) liquid
4 dependent, or (3) food selective. Outcomes for caregiver stress levels, child meal-time
5 behaviors, weight, and calories were examined at admission and discharge for 121 children.
6 Analysis examined differences pre- and post-treatment and across feeding categories.
7 Caregiver stress, child meal-time behaviors, weight, and caloric intake improved
8 significantly following treatment in the intensive feeding program, regardless of category
9 placement. The authors concluded that regardless of a child's medical and feeding history,
10 an intensive interdisciplinary approach significantly improved caregiver stress and child
11 outcomes. This study provides support that regardless of a child's medical and feeding
12 history, an intensive interdisciplinary approach significantly improves caregiver stress and
13 child outcomes. Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center's best evidence statement
14 (BEST) on "Behavioral and oral motor interventions for feeding problems in children"
15 (2013) recommended that an intensive feeding program model that combines oral motor
16 and behavioral interventions may be used with children with severe feeding problems to
17 increase intake.

18
19 Williams et al. (2017) conducted a retrospective cohort controlled study design to compare
20 outcomes of outpatient multidisciplinary intensive feeding therapy (IFT) program (n=23)
21 who completed the 5-week IFT program to traditional therapy (TT) (n=22) of single-
22 discipline, once weekly feeding therapy to reduce enteral tube nutrition (ETN) dependence
23 in medically complex young children. The children in the IFT cohort experienced a median
24 reduction in ETN dependence of 49% (34.5-58.5%) compared with a median reduction of
25 0% (0-25%) for TT ($p>0.0001$) by the conclusion of the 5-week program. Sharp et al.
26 (2017) reported on a systematic review and meta-analysis of program outcomes for
27 children receiving intensive, multidisciplinary intervention for pediatric feeding disorders.
28 The review included 11 studies involving 593 patients with nine retrospective articles and
29 two studies with randomized controlled trials. All samples involved children with complex
30 medical and/or developmental histories who displayed persistent feeding concerns
31 requiring formula supplementation. Behavioral intervention and tube weaning represented
32 the most common treatment approaches. The core disciplines included in the care included
33 psychology, nutrition, medicine, speech-language pathology and occupational therapy. The
34 overall effect size for percentage of patients successfully weaned from tube feeding was
35 71% (95% CI 54%-83%). Treatment gains continued following discharge, with 80% of
36 patients (95% CI 66%-89%) weaned from tube feeding at last follow-up. Treatment also
37 was associated with increased oral intake, improved mealtime behaviors, and reduced
38 parenting stress. The authors concluded that results indicate intensive, multidisciplinary
39 treatment holds benefits for children with severe feeding difficulties.

40
41 Sharp et al. (2020) assessed characteristics and outcomes of young children receiving
42 intensive multidisciplinary intervention for chronic food refusal and feeding tube

1 dependence. Of 229 patients admitted during the 5-year period, 83 met the entry criteria;
2 81 completed intervention (98%) and provided outcome data (46 males, 35 females; age
3 range, 10-230 months). All patients had complex medical, behavioral, and/or
4 developmental histories with longstanding feeding problems (median duration, 33
5 months). At discharge, oral intake improved by 70.5%, and 27 patients (33%) completely
6 weaned from tube feeding. Weight gain (mean, 0.39 ± 1 kg) was observed. Treatment gains
7 continued following discharge, with 58 patients (72%) weaned from tube feeding at follow-
8 up. Authors concluded that findings support the effectiveness of their intensive
9 multidisciplinary intervention model in promoting oral intake and reducing dependence on
10 tube feeding in young children with chronic food refusal. Further research on the
11 generalizability of this intensive multidisciplinary intervention approach to other
12 specialized treatment settings and/or feeding/eating disorder subtypes is warranted.

13
14 Lagatta et al. (2021) compares healthcare use and parent health-related quality of life
15 (HRQL) in 3 groups of infants whose neonatal intensive care unit (NICU) discharge was
16 delayed by oral feedings. This was a prospective, single-center cohort of infants in the
17 NICU from September 2018 to March 2020. After enrollment, weekly chart review
18 determined eligibility for home nasogastric (NG) feeds based on predetermined criteria.
19 Actual discharge feeding decisions were at clinical discretion. At 3 months' post discharge,
20 authors compared acute healthcare use and parental HRQL, measured by the PedsQL
21 Family Impact Module, among infants who were NG eligible but discharged with all oral
22 feeds, discharged with NG feeds, and discharged with gastrostomy (G) tubes. NICU days
23 saved by home NG discharges were calculated. Among 180 infants, 80 were orally fed, 35
24 used NG, and 65 used G tubes. Compared with infants who had NG-tube feedings, infants
25 who had G-tube feedings had more gastrointestinal or tube-related readmissions and
26 emergency encounters, and orally-fed infants showed no difference in use. Multivariable
27 adjustment did not change these comparisons. Parent HRQL at 3 months did not differ
28 between groups. Infants discharged home with NG tubes saved 1574 NICU days. Authors
29 concluded that NICU discharge with NG feeds is associated with reduced NICU stay
30 without increased post discharge healthcare use or decreased parent HRQL, whereas G-
31 tube feeding was associated with increased post discharge healthcare use.

32
33 Ostadi et al. (2022) sought to examine if a combined program of NNS and SE compared
34 with a program that only involves NNS would be more effective on oral feeding readiness
35 of premature infants. This randomized controlled trial was conducted in a neonatal
36 intensive care unit (NICU). 45 preterm infants were recruited in three groups. In the group
37 I, infants were provided with NNS twice a day. The group II received a program that
38 involved 15 min of NNS and 15 min of SE, daily. Both interventions were provided 10
39 days during two consecutive weeks. The group III, control group, just received the routine
40 NICU care. All infants were assessed by functional oral feeding outcome measures
41 including postmenstrual age (PMA) at the start of oral feeding, PMA at full oral feeding,
42 transition time (days from start to full oral feeding), PMA at discharge time and also the

1 infant's dependency on tube-feeding at discharge time after interventions. Also, all infants
2 were assessed via Preterm Oral Feeding Readiness Scale (POFRAS) before and after
3 intervention. No significant differences were observed in the PMA mean at start of oral-
4 feeding, full oral-feeding, discharge time and the mean of transition time. Compared to the
5 control group, more infants in the group II were discharged without tube-feeding. The mean
6 of POFRAS was significantly higher in both groups I and II compared to the group III.
7 This score was, however, not statistically different between the groups I and II. Authors
8 concluded that both studied interventions were superior to routine NICU care in enhancing
9 the oral feeding readiness of preterm infants based on the POFRAS score. The studied
10 combined program of NNS and SE, and not NNS program, could significantly increase the
11 number of discharged infants without tube-feeding compared to control group.

12
13 Patel et al. (2022) evaluated the effectiveness of an interdisciplinary home-based feeding
14 program, which is a unique service delivery model. Data were provided on oral intake, tube
15 feeding elimination, and weight for patients who were dependent on tube feedings (n = 78).
16 Weight data were collected for patients who showed failure to thrive (n = 49). Number of
17 foods consumed and percentage of solids were collected for patients who were liquid-
18 dependent (n = 23), and number of foods consumed were collected for patients who were
19 food-selective (n = 61). For patients dependent on tube feedings, 81% achieved tube
20 feeding elimination. Tube elimination was achieved after 8 months of treatment on
21 average. All failure-to-thrive patients showed weight gain from baseline to discharge. For
22 liquid-dependent patients, there was an increase in foods consumed from 2 foods at
23 admission to 32 foods at discharge. For food selective patients, there was an increase from
24 4 foods at admission to 35 foods at discharge. For all dependent variables, results showed
25 statistical significance and a large-sized effect. Authors concluded that these data show that
26 an intensive interdisciplinary home-based program can be successful in treating complex
27 feeding problems in children.

28 29 **Neuromuscular Re-education/Electrical Stimulation and Swallowing**

30 Electrical stimulation for the treatment of swallowing impairments is among the most
31 studied swallowing interventions in the published literature, yet many unanswered
32 questions about its effectiveness remain. In a meta-analysis, Carnaby-Mann et al. (2007)
33 evaluated the effect of neuromuscular electrical stimulation (NMES) on swallowing
34 rehabilitation. A significant summary effect size was noted for use of NMES for
35 swallowing; however, heterogeneity of studies was significant and problematic to confirm
36 results. The authors concluded that this preliminary meta-analysis revealed a small but
37 significant summary effect size for NMES for swallowing. However, because of the small
38 number of studies and low methodological grading for these studies, caution should be
39 taken in interpreting this finding. They stated that these results support the need for more
40 rigorous research in this area. Clark et al. (2009) reviewed the literature examining the
41 effects of NMES on swallowing and neural activation. Out of 899 citations initially
42 identified for the broad review of OMEs, 14 articles relating to NMES qualified for

1 inclusion. Most of the studies (10/14) were considered exploratory research, and many had
2 significant methodological limitations. The authors concluded that this systematic review
3 revealed that surface NMES to the neck has been most extensively studied with promising
4 findings, yet high-quality controlled trials are needed to provide evidence of efficacy. The
5 authors stated that additional research is needed to document the effects of such protocols
6 on swallowing performance. Christiaanse et al. (2011) compared changes in swallowing
7 function in pediatric patients with dysphagia who received NMES to a control group who
8 received usual oral motor training and dietary manipulations without NMES. Children
9 were classified into 2 groups based on the etiology of their dysphagia (primary versus
10 acquired). The authors concluded that NMES treatment of anterior neck muscles in a
11 heterogeneous group of pediatric patients with dysphagia did not improve the swallow
12 function more than that seen in patients who did not receive NMES treatment. However,
13 there may be subgroups of children that will improve with NMES treatment.

14
15 Epperson et al. (2019) reviewed neuromuscular development, summarized the current body
16 of evidence describing the use of neuromuscular electrical stimulation (NMES) therapy in
17 infants, and identified possible contraindications for the use of NMES in the neonate and
18 young infant. After a review of the literature describing neuromuscular development, we
19 created a timeline of the developmental processes. Key milestones were determined, and a
20 literature search was conducted to identify potential effects of electrical stimulation on this
21 process. Current evidence supporting the use of NMES in the pediatric population is
22 limited and of poor quality. Contraindications of the use of NMES in the neonate and young
23 infant were identified, including (a) inhibited expression of the neural cell adhesion
24 molecule that is vital for neuromuscular development, (b) alteration of muscle fiber type
25 metabolic profile away from intended muscle fiber type morphology, and (c) interruption
26 of postsynaptic acetylcholine receptor synthesis during neuromuscular junction
27 development. Authors concluded that the use of NMES for the treatment of dysphagia in
28 the neonate and young infant may influence early neuromuscular development in a manner
29 that is not currently well understood. Future research is needed to further understand the
30 effects of NMES on the developing neuromuscular system.

31
32 Propp et al. (2022) aimed to determine the effectiveness of neuromuscular electrical
33 stimulation (NMES) for treatment of oropharyngeal dysphagia in children. Studies of
34 children (≤ 18 years) diagnosed with oropharyngeal dysphagia using NMES in the
35 throat/neck region were included. A meta-analysis was not conducted due to clinical
36 heterogeneity in studies. Ten studies were included (5 RCTs, 4 case series, 1 cohort study;
37 including 393 children, mean or median age below 7 years, including children with
38 neurologic impairments). In all studies, swallowing function improved after NMES
39 treatment. Eight of 10 studies reported on the child's feeding ability, and, with one
40 exception, there was improvement in feeding ability. Few studies reported on health status
41 ($N=2$), impact on caregiver ($N=1$), adverse events and harms ($N=2$), and child's quality of
42 life ($N=1$). In most studies, outcome follow-up was less than 6 months. The studies

1 demonstrated moderate to high risk of bias. Authors concluded that NMES treatment may
 2 be beneficial in improving swallowing function for children with dysphagia, however,
 3 given the quality of the studies, inadequate outcome reporting, and short follow-up
 4 duration, uncertainty remains. Well-designed RCTs are needed to establish its
 5 effectiveness before its adoption in clinical practice.

6
 7 Currently, there is insufficient evidence to support the use of electrical stimulation in the
 8 treatment of feeding/swallowing disorders. Well-designed studies are needed to determine
 9 the effectiveness of electrical stimulation for these disorders.

10 **PRACTITIONER SCOPE AND TRAINING**

11 Practitioners should practice only in the areas in which they are competent based on their
 12 education, training and experience. Levels of education, experience, and proficiency may
 13 vary among individual practitioners. It is ethically and legally incumbent on a practitioner
 14 to determine where they have the knowledge and skills necessary to perform such services
 15 and whether the services are within their scope of practice.

16
 17
 18 It is best practice for the practitioner to appropriately render services to a member only if
 19 they are trained, equally skilled, and adequately competent to deliver a service compared
 20 to others trained to perform the same procedure. If the service would be most competently
 21 delivered by another health care practitioner who has more skill and training, it would be
 22 best practice to refer the member to the more expert practitioner.

23
 24 Best practice can be defined as a clinical, scientific, or professional technique, method, or
 25 process that is typically evidence-based and consensus driven and is recognized by a
 26 majority of professionals in a particular field as more effective at delivering a particular
 27 outcome than any other practice (Joint Commission International Accreditation Standards
 28 for Hospitals, 2020).

29
 30 Depending on the practitioner’s scope of practice, training, and experience, a member’s
 31 condition and/or symptoms during examination or the course of treatment may indicate the
 32 need for referral to another practitioner or even emergency care. In such cases it is prudent
 33 for the practitioner to refer the member for appropriate co-management (e.g., to their
 34 primary care physician) or if immediate emergency care is warranted, to contact 911 as
 35 appropriate. See the *Managing Medical Emergencies (CPG 159 – S)* clinical practice
 36 guideline for information.

37 **References**

38 American Medical Association. (current year). Current Procedural Terminology (CPT)
 39 Current year (rev. ed.). Chicago: AMA.
 40

- 1 American Medical Association. (current year). ICD-10-CM. American Medical
2 Association.
- 3
- 4 Arvedson JC. Assessment of pediatric dysphagia and feeding disorders: clinical and
5 instrumental approaches. *Dev Disabil Res Rev.* 2008;14(2):118-127.
6 doi:10.1002/ddrr.17
- 7
- 8 Babbitt RL, Hoch TA, Coe DA, et al. Behavioral assessment and treatment of pediatric
9 feeding disorders. *J Dev Behav Pediatr.* 1994;15(4):278-291
- 10
- 11 Bernard-Bonnin AC. Feeding problems of infants and toddlers. *Can Fam Physician.*
12 2006;52(10):1247-1251
- 13
- 14 Byars KC, Burklow KA, Ferguson K, O'Flaherty T, Santoro K, Kaul A. A multicomponent
15 behavioral program for oral aversion in children dependent on gastrostomy feedings. *J*
16 *Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr.* 2003;37(4):473-480. doi:10.1097/00005176-200310000-
17 00014
- 18
- 19 Carnaby-Mann GD, Crary MA. Examining the evidence on neuromuscular electrical
20 stimulation for swallowing: a meta-analysis. *Arch Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.*
21 2007;133(6):564-571. doi:10.1001/archotol.133.6.564
- 22
- 23 Christiaanse ME, Mabe B, Russell G, Simeone TL, Fortunato J, Rubin B. Neuromuscular
24 electrical stimulation is no more effective than usual care for the treatment of primary
25 dysphagia in children. *Pediatr Pulmonol.* 2011;46(6):559-565. doi:10.1002/ppul.21400
- 26
- 27 Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center. Best evidence statement (BEST).
28 Behavioral and oral motor interventions for feeding problems in children. Cincinnati,
29 OH: Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center; July 15, 2013
- 30
- 31 Clark H, Lazarus C, Arvedson J, Schooling T, Frymark T. Evidence-based systematic
32 review: effects of neuromuscular electrical stimulation on swallowing and neural
33 activation. *Am J Speech Lang Pathol.* 2009;18(4):361-375. doi:10.1044/1058-
34 0360(2009/08-0088)
- 35
- 36 Cole SZ, Lanham JS. Failure to thrive: an update. *Am Fam Physician.* 2011;83(7):829-834
- 37
- 38 Crosby J, Duerksen DR. A prospective study of tube- and feeding-related complications in
39 patients receiving long-term home enteral nutrition. *JPEN J Parenter Enteral Nutr.*
40 2007;31(4):274-277. doi:10.1177/0148607107031004274

- 1 Epperson HE, Sandage MJ. Neuromuscular Development in Neonates and Postnatal
 2 Infants: Implications for Neuromuscular Electrical Stimulation Therapy for Dysphagia.
 3 J Speech Lang Hear Res. 2019;62(8):2575-2583. doi:10.1044/2019_JSLHR-S-18-
 4 0502
- 5
- 6 Feeding and Swallowing Disorders (Dysphagia) in Children. Retrieved on July 1, 2023
 7 from [http://www.asha.org/public/speech/swallowing/feeding-and-swallowing-](http://www.asha.org/public/speech/swallowing/feeding-and-swallowing-disorders-in-children/)
 8 [disorders-in-children/](http://www.asha.org/public/speech/swallowing/feeding-and-swallowing-disorders-in-children/)
- 9
- 10 Feeding Infants in the Child and Adult Care Food Program. Retrieved on July 3, 2023 from
 11 <https://www.fns.usda.gov/tn/feeding-infants-child-and-adult-care-food-program>
- 12
- 13 Field D, Garland M, Williams K. Correlates of specific childhood feeding problems. J
 14 Paediatr Child Health. 2003;39(4):299-304. doi:10.1046/j.1440-1754.2003.00151.x
- 15
- 16 Gisel E. Interventions and outcomes for children with dysphagia. Dev Disabil Res Rev.
 17 2008;14(2):165-173. doi:10.1002/ddrr.21
- 18
- 19 Greer AJ, Gulotta CS, Masler EA, Laud RB. Caregiver stress and outcomes of children
 20 with pediatric feeding disorders treated in an intensive interdisciplinary program. J
 21 Pediatr Psychol. 2008;33(6):612-620. doi:10.1093/jpepsy/jsm116
- 22
- 23 Kennedy Krieger Institute. Retrieved July 15, 2022 from <https://www.kennedykrieger.org/>
- 24
- 25 Kodak T, Piazza CC. Assessment and behavioral treatment of feeding and sleeping
 26 disorders in children with autism spectrum disorders. Child Adolesc Psychiatr Clin N
 27 Am. 2008;17(4):887-xi. doi:10.1016/j.chc.2008.06.005
- 28
- 29 Lagatta JM, Uhing M, Acharya K, et al. Actual and Potential Impact of a Home Nasogastric
 30 Tube Feeding Program for Infants Whose Neonatal Intensive Care Unit Discharge Is
 31 Affected by Delayed Oral Feedings. J Pediatr. 2021;234:38-45.e2.
 32 doi:10.1016/j.jpeds.2021.03.046
- 33
- 34 Lawlor CM, Choi S. Diagnosis and Management of Pediatric Dysphagia: A Review.
 35 JAMA Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg. 2020;146(2):183-191.
 36 doi:10.1001/jamaoto.2019.3622
- 37
- 38 Manikam R, Perman JA. Pediatric feeding disorders. J Clin Gastroenterol. 2000;30(1):34-
 39 46. doi:10.1097/00004836-200001000-00007

- 1 Mathisen B, Worrall L, Masel J, Wall C, Shepherd RW. Feeding problems in infants with
 2 gastro-oesophageal reflux disease: a controlled study. *J Paediatr Child Health*.
 3 1999;35(2):163-169. doi:10.1046/j.1440-1754.1999.t01-1-00334.x
 4
- 5 Nutrition Screening for Infants and Young Children with Special Health Care Needs:
 6 Spokane County, Washington. 2008. Retrieved on July 3, 2023 from
 7 [http://www.doh.wa.gov/portals/1/documents/pubs/970-](http://www.doh.wa.gov/portals/1/documents/pubs/970-116_nutritioncreeningforinfantsandyoungshcn.pdf)
 8 116_nutritioncreeningforinfantsandyoungshcn.pdf
 9
- 10 Ostadi M, Jokar F, Armanian AM, Namnabati M, Kazemi Y, Poorjavad M. The effects of
 11 swallowing exercise and non-nutritive sucking exercise on oral feeding readiness in
 12 preterm infants: A randomized controlled trial. *Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol*.
 13 2021;142:110602. doi:10.1016/j.ijporl.2020.110602
 14
- 15 Patel MR, Patel VY, Andersen AS, Miles A. Evaluating Outcome Measure Data for an
 16 Intensive Interdisciplinary Home-Based Pediatric Feeding Disorders Program.
 17 *Nutrients*. 2022;14(21):4602. Published 2022 Nov 1. doi:10.3390/nu14214602
 18
- 19 Propp R, Gill PJ, Marcus S, et al. Neuromuscular electrical stimulation for children with
 20 dysphagia: a systematic review. *BMJ Open*. 2022;12(3):e055124. Published 2022 Mar
 21 25. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2021-055124
 22
- 23 Rogers B. Feeding method and health outcomes of children with cerebral palsy. *J Pediatr*.
 24 2004;145(2 Suppl):S28-S32. doi:10.1016/j.jpeds.2004.05.019
 25
- 26 Rommel N, De Meyer AM, Feenstra L, Veereman-Wauters G. The complexity of feeding
 27 problems in 700 infants and young children presenting to a tertiary care institution. *J*
 28 *Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr*. 2003;37(1):75-84. doi:10.1097/00005176-200307000-
 29 00014
 30
- 31 Schädler G, Süß-Burghart H, Toschke AM, von Voss H, von Kries R. Feeding disorders
 32 in ex-prematures: causes--response to therapy--long term outcome. *Eur J Pediatr*.
 33 2007;166(8):803-808. doi:10.1007/s00431-006-0322-x
 34
- 35 Schreck KA, Williams K, Smith AF. A comparison of eating behaviors between children
 36 with and without autism. *J Autism Dev Disord*. 2004;34(4):433-438.
 37 doi:10.1023/b:jadd.0000037419.78531.86
 38
- 39 Sharp WG, Jaquess DL, Morton JF, Herzinger CV. Pediatric feeding disorders: a
 40 quantitative synthesis of treatment outcomes. *Clin Child Fam Psychol Rev*.
 41 2010;13(4):348-365. doi:10.1007/s10567-010-0079-7

- 1 Sharp WG, Volkert VM, Scahill L, McCracken CE, McElhanon B. A Systematic Review
2 and Meta-Analysis of Intensive Multidisciplinary Intervention for Pediatric Feeding
3 Disorders: How Standard Is the Standard of Care?. *J Pediatr.* 2017;181:116-124.e4.
4 doi:10.1016/j.jpeds.2016.10.002
5
- 6 Sharp WG, Volkert VM, Stubbs KH, et al. Intensive Multidisciplinary Intervention for
7 Young Children with Feeding Tube Dependence and Chronic Food Refusal: An
8 Electronic Health Record Review. *J Pediatr.* 2020;223:73-80.e2.
9 doi:10.1016/j.jpeds.2020.04.034
10
- 11 Sharp WG, Silverman A, Arvedson JC, Bandstra NF, Clawson E, Berry RC, McElhanon
12 BO, Kozlowski AM, Katz M, Volkert VM, Goday PS, Lukens CT. Toward Better
13 Understanding of Pediatric Feeding Disorder: A Proposed Framework for Patient
14 Characterization. *J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr.* 2022 Sep 1;75(3):351-355. doi:
15 10.1097/MPG.0000000000003519. Epub 2022 Jun 10. PMID: 35687655; PMCID:
16 PMC9365260.
17
- 18 Silverman AH. Interdisciplinary care for feeding problems in children. *Nutr Clin Pract.*
19 2010;25(2):160-165. doi:10.1177/0884533610361609
20
- 21 Vohr BR, Wright LL, Dusick AM, et al. Neurodevelopmental and functional outcomes of
22 extremely low birth weight infants in the National Institute of Child Health and Human
23 Development Neonatal Research Network, 1993-1994. *Pediatrics.* 2000;105(6):1216-
24 1226. doi:10.1542/peds.105.6.1216
25
- 26 Williams C, VanDahm K, Stevens LM, et al. Improved Outcomes with an Outpatient
27 Multidisciplinary Intensive Feeding Therapy Program Compared with Weekly Feeding
28 Therapy to Reduce Enteral Tube Feeding Dependence in Medically Complex Young
29 Children. *Curr Gastroenterol Rep.* 2017;19(7):33. doi:10.1007/s11894-017-0569-6