



City Research Online

City, University of London Institutional Repository

Citation: Harding, C. & Crossley, S-L. (2021). Comment on 'Direct swallowing training and oral sensorimotor stimulation in preterm infants: a randomised controlled trial' by Heo et al. Archives of Disease in Childhood. Fetal and Neonatal Edition, 107(2), 228. doi: 10.1136/archdischild-2021-323171

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version.

Permanent repository link: <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/27240/>

Link to published version: <https://doi.org/10.1136/archdischild-2021-323171>

Copyright: City Research Online aims to make research outputs of City, University of London available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to.

Reuse: Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

City Research Online:

<http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/>

publications@city.ac.uk

Title - Re: A Comment re: Heo, J. S., Kim, E. K., Kim, S. Y., Song, I. G., Yoon, Y. M., Cho, H., ... & Kim, H. S. (2021). Direct swallowing training and oral sensorimotor stimulation in preterm infants: a randomised controlled trial. *Archives of Disease in Childhood-Fetal and Neonatal Edition*.

Professor Celia Harding, FRCSLT

Division of Language and Communication Science,
City, University of London,
Northampton Square,
London,
EC1V 0HB
UK

Ringgold ID 4895

C.Harding@city.ac.uk

+44 (0)20 7040 8946

Ms Siew-Lian Crossley

Speech – Language Pathologist, Professional Lead
Monash Children’s Hospital,
246, Clayton Road, Clayton,
Melbourne, VIC 3168
Australia

Siew-Lian.Crossley@monashhealth.org

+61 – 38572 3000

Ringgold ID 2541

Sir,

We were interested to read Heo et als’ well designed study where infants were allocated randomly to control, swallowing therapy (ST) or sensorimotor oral stimulation + swallow therapy (SOMST) groups. Whilst outcomes are impressive in reducing neonatal stay, we do have some concerns. It was interesting to note that the ST group did not progress as well as the SOMST group.

This is surprising given that in Lau & Smith's (1) study infants receiving ST progressed to independent oral feeding aged 36.6 ± 0.5 PMA in comparison with infants in Heo's SOMST group who were independent oral feeders at 37.0 ± 0.5 . Incidentally, Lau & Smith (1) initiated their intervention when infants were 34 weeks PMA, in contrast with Heo et al (2021) who began their programme earlier, at 32 weeks PMA. As swallowing develops competence before sucking, it would be anticipated that those infants who have swallow stimulation at an earlier age might benefit more. Due to the different developmental onset of function between swallowing and sucking, perhaps "swallow therapy" should be a pre-oral preparatory feeding form of intervention, administered alongside developing infant behavioural responses and early communication signs before implementing oral feeding trials (2). Although a Developmental Care (DC) nurse is mentioned and DC is discussed as highly valuable at the end of the paper, the actual environmental context the study has been undertaken in is not clear. Occupational Therapists, not parents carried out the programme. Although allied health roles vary, it is of great concern that a speech and language pathologist was not available to consider any pharyngeal problems, and no parents were involved developing both confidence and competence when learning to care for their infant. Ten infants across all three groups did not complete the programme due to respiratory problems, and given the stringent exclusion criteria already in place, this should alert neonatal professionals to the fact that even though a preterm infant may be "straight forward" medically, progression with oral feeding may not be predictable.

Preterm infants are at high risk of developing persistent feeding problems, leading to long term eating and drinking difficulties. In addition, determining when infants are ready to start oral feeding trials can be a complex process involving many factors including physiological maturity, oral readiness signs, etc. Coregulation between the infant and feeder during early feeds may require careful assessment and can have an impact on progress (3). Parents need to be considered and included, and predictably find the neonatal environment difficult and challenging (4). In our view, approaches such as non-nutritive sucking, for example, often only superficially address an infant's early feeding needs. There is still much we need to do to improve the range of interventions to support preterm infant feeding, but they must be framed within a DC and parent context.

Future research that investigates implementing oral feeding for preterm infants needs to replicate clearly the supportive neonatal environment, and we look forward to these emerging studies.

References

- 1Lau C, Smith EO. Interventions to improve the oral feeding performance of preterm infants. *Acta Paediatr.* 2012 Jul;101(7):e269-74.
- 2Harding C, Cockerill H, Cane C, et al. Using non-nutritive sucking to support feeding development for premature infants: A commentary on approaches and current practice. *J.Pediatr.Rehabil.Med.* 2018 Jan 1;11(3):147-52.
- 3Patel N, Ballantyne A, Bowker G, et al. Family integrated care: changing the culture in the neonatal unit. *ADC.* 2018 May 1;103(5):415-9.
- 4Thoyre SM, Brown RL. Factors contributing to preterm infant engagement during bottle-feeding. *Nurs.Res.* 2004 Sep;53(5):304.

Author contribution

Professor Celia Harding and Siew – Lian Crossley SLP contributed equally to the letter.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank their respective institutions, City, University of London and Monash Children's Hospital.

Competing interests

None declared.

Patient consent for publication

None required.