

This item is the archived peer-reviewed author-version of:

International Pediatric Otolaryngology Group (IPOG) consensus on approach to aspiration

Reference:

Aldriweesh Bshair, Alkhateeb Ahmed, Boudewyns An, Chan Ching Yee, Chun Robert H., El-Hakim Hamdy G., Fayoux Pierre, Gerber Mark E., Kanotra Sohit, Kaspy Kimberley,- International Pediatric Otolaryngology Group (IPOG) consensus on approach to aspiration
International journal of pediatric otorhinolaryngology - ISSN 1872-8464 - 176(2024), 111810
Full text (Publisher's DOI): <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IJPORL.2023.111810>
To cite this reference: <https://hdl.handle.net/10067/2016230151162165141>

1 **International Pediatric Otolaryngology Group (IPOG) Consensus on Approach to**
2 **Aspiration**

3 **ABSTRACT**

4 **Objective:**

5 To provide recommendations for a comprehensive management approach for infants and
6 children presenting with symptoms or signs of aspiration.

7 **Methods:**

8 Three rounds of surveys were sent to authors from 23 institutions worldwide. The
9 threshold for the critical level of agreement among respondents was set at 80%. To
10 develop the definition of “intractable aspiration,” each author was first asked to
11 define the condition. Second, each author was asked to complete a 5-point Likert
12 scale to specify the level of agreement with the definition derived in the first step.

13 **Results:**

14 Recommendations by the authors regarding the clinical presentation, diagnostic
15 considerations, and medical and surgical management options for aspiration in children.

16 **Conclusion:**

17 Approach to pediatric aspiration is best achieved by implementing a multidisciplinary
18 approach with a comprehensive investigation strategy and different treatment options.

19
20 **Keywords:** Infant, Child, Delphi Method, Aspiration
21

1 **1. Consensus objectives**

2 To provide recommendations for a comprehensive management approach for infants
3 and children presenting with symptoms or signs of aspiration.

4 **2. Target population**

5 Pediatric patients with symptoms or signs of aspiration.

6 **3. Intended users**

7 These recommendations are intended to:

8 1. Provide initial guidance and diagnostic recommendations to physicians and health
9 care providers who evaluate young infants and children with possible aspiration.

10 2. Provide comprehensive care and management recommendations to
11 otolaryngologists who manage these patients.

12 **4. Methods**

13 The mission of the International Pediatric Otolaryngology Group (IPOG) is to
14 develop recommendations for the management of pediatric otolaryngological
15 disorders and improve patient care. Based on a thorough literature review, we
16 identified a pediatric otolaryngology-related topic with a knowledge gap, identified
17 the scope and population of interest, and recruited a panel. The authors were selected
18 based on their clinical expertise, publications, national/international presentations,
19 and/or leading programs.

20 Recommendations were obtained from physicians in 23 institutions worldwide
21 through three rounds of web-based surveys. The threshold for the critical level of
22 agreement among respondents was set at 80%. To develop the definition of
23 “intractable aspiration,” each author was asked to define it separately; then in the

1 second round, the authors were asked to specify their level of agreement on the
2 developed definition on a 5-point Likert scale. Consensus was defined as a mean
3 score of 3.89 (77.8%) or higher and one or fewer outliers [1]. Outliers were defined as
4 any deviation from the mean score of two or more Likert points [1]. The approach to
5 aspiration algorithm was developed by the first and senior authors based on the
6 results of the first 2 rounds. All authors provided a critical review of the algorithm.

7 **5. Recommendations and justification**

8 • **Section 1: Clinical presentation**

9 This section aimed to guide physicians in the detection of pediatric patients with possible
10 aspiration. Early detection and initiation of the investigation algorithm are valuable, along with
11 timely referral to a pediatric otolaryngologist within a multidisciplinary team.

12 Children with aspiration may present with choking, coughing, recurrent respiratory
13 infections, a wet voice, inefficient feeding, and/or poor weight gain [2,3] (Table 1). The
14 laryngeal cough reflex in term infants matures by 1-2 months of age, and its maturation may be
15 delayed up to 12 months [4]. Before the development of the cough reflex, infants protect their
16 airways from aspiration via the laryngeal adductor reflex [4]. Thus, infants with aspiration more
17 commonly present with stridor, apnea/desaturation, and/or bradycardia during feeding rather than
18 the classic cough [4].

19 Recurrent pneumonia was defined as two or more episodes in a year or more than three episodes
20 in a lifetime [3]. Recurrent aspiration leads to progressive respiratory morbidity (lower
21 respiratory tract infections, bronchiectasis, and respiratory failure/supplemental oxygen
22 requirement), recurrent hospitalization, and possibly mortality [5]. There was unanimous support
23 for pneumonia as a red flag for aspiration, followed by choking and wet voice/gurgling. Other

1 symptoms or signs mentioned by the group but not listed in the table included low baseline
2 saturation without other known lung diseases, bronchiectasis, or sialorrhea. Sialorrhea can be
3 defined as either anterior or posterior drooling; we discuss posterior drooling in this manuscript
4 as anterior drooling was covered by a previous IPOG consensus [6].

1 Table 1. Red flags identified by the authors as concerns for possible aspiration

SYMPTOMS AND SIGNS OF CONCERN FOR ASPIRATION	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS IN AGREEMENT
Pneumonia	100%*
Choking	96.3%*
Wet voice/gurgling	96.3%*
Coughing	92.6%*
Apnea/desaturation or bradycardia with feeding	88.9%*
Noisy breathing while feeding	85.2%*
Deteriorating pulmonary status	81.5%*
Abnormal pulmonary auscultation	55.6%
Inefficient feeding	55.6%
Noisy breathing	44.4%
Poor weight gain	44.4%

2 *Reached agreement between authors.

3

1 **Section 2: Workup for aspiration**

2 The authors identified important investigative considerations. The variation in practice among
3 current group members remains, and this section aimed to provide a list of reasonable options
4 based on the authors' opinions.

5 Investigations that reached 80% agreement by the authors regarding their helpfulness in
6 the workup of aspiration included fiberoptic endoscopic evaluation of swallowing (FEES),
7 videofluoroscopic swallowing study (VFSS), clinical bedside feeding evaluation, and direct
8 laryngoscopy and bronchoscopy (Figure 1). The other investigations did not reach a consensus
9 but remained reasonable options available for use (Table 2). Most investigations help to confirm
10 the diagnosis of aspiration, and some also identify the underlying cause.

11 FEES confirms the diagnosis of aspiration and provides information on both the
12 anatomical and physiological components of swallowing as well as the sensory function and
13 protective mechanism [7]. Awake flexible laryngoscopy allows the identification of anatomical
14 abnormalities in the nasopharynx, oropharynx, and hypopharynx, all of which can contribute to
15 swallowing dysfunction in the pediatric population [7]. In particular, the laryngeal anatomy and
16 normal vocal fold mobility are assessed, allowing for the diagnosis of laryngomalacia and/or
17 vocal fold immobility, both of which can contribute to aspiration [8,9]. The addition of colorants
18 during FEES helps to identify pooling within the piriform sinus, laryngeal penetration, or
19 aspiration. FEES is valid and safe for both infants and children, even those who are primarily
20 breastfed [10]. It is best performed in a multidisciplinary collaboration with a speech-language
21 pathologist or an occupational therapist. It has an additional advantage in that it is readily
22 accessible and can be performed in an outpatient clinic or at the bedside [7,10]. FEES can be
23 used as an adjunct to VFSS or as an alternative to short-interval repeated VFSS to limit radiation

1 exposure [7,11]. However, it is important to emphasize that this exam can be affected by a lack
2 of cooperation from the infant/child, the degree of crying, and movement. In addition, the glottic
3 view is occasionally difficult to obtain, and FEES does not provide an adequate assessment of
4 the oral phase or, to some extent, the pharyngeal phase of swallowing.

5 VFSS involves an integrated dynamic evaluation of the oral, pharyngeal, and esophageal
6 phases of swallowing and is the most reliable method for detecting silent aspiration [2,11,12].
7 During VFSS, the safe liquid and solid consistencies are established for each patient to reduce
8 the likelihood of aspiration [13]. There is controversy in the literature in regards to the impact of
9 the presence of a nasogastric tube on the VFSS results [13,14].

10 Clinical feeding evaluation is a non-invasive complementary assessment that provides
11 important clinical information [4]. It involves general and neurodevelopmental examinations and
12 the assessment of oral motor control, sucking reflex, and voice quality after feeding. It can also
13 detect signs of coughing, gagging, stridor, increased work of breathing, desaturation, and nasal
14 regurgitation after feeding [2,4]. Although valuable, bedside swallowing assessments may be
15 falsely negative for aspiration because 80% of pediatric aspirations are silent without overt
16 clinical signs [2,15]. This should be performed when the child is in optimal condition, as the
17 level of alertness, fatigue, agitation, and clinical stability may influence the results. This is of
18 particular concern because undetected chronic aspiration can lead to pulmonary sequelae.

19 In patients with aspiration, microlaryngoscopy and bronchoscopy (MLB) provide a
20 higher diagnostic yield for aspiration-related airway lesions than flexible laryngoscopy [9]. A
21 history of recurrent pneumonia is an important predictor of identifying airway lesions on MLB
22 related to aspiration [9]. The MLB aids in identifying anatomical contributions to aspiration,

1 such as the presence of a deep interarytenoid groove, laryngeal cleft, or tracheoesophageal
2 fistula, which can be surgically repaired [8,9].

3 Flexible bronchoscopy allows visualization of the airway until the segmental and
4 subsegmental bronchi and is useful for diagnostic and therapeutic bronchoalveolar lavage (BAL)
5 [16]. Diagnostic BAL provides information on the degree of airway inflammation and
6 underlying microbiological pathogens in the aspirated fluid [17]. However, BAL cultures have
7 low sensitivity for detecting pathogens, which can be enhanced by implementing a multiplex
8 polymerase chain reaction detection method [18]. Measurement of lipid-laden macrophages and
9 pepsin detection from BAL fluid are utilized in the diagnosis of aspiration of gastroesophageal
10 reflux (indirect aspiration) [19,20]. However, there is no significant correlation between pepsin
11 positivity in BAL and pH impedance parameters or upper gastrointestinal (GI) pathology [20].

12 For the indirect aspiration workup, pH-study, impedance manometry, and upper GI
13 endoscopy may provide additional information. The Modified Evans Blue Dye test is a
14 diagnostic option for children with tracheostomy tubes. Despite being supported by only 59.3%
15 of the authors, it remains a valuable screening tool for aspiration [21].

16

1 Table 2: Investigations helpful in a child suspected of aspiration

INVESTIGATIVE OPTION	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS IN AGREEMENT
Functional endoscopic evaluation of swallow	96.3%*
Videofluoroscopy	88.9%*
Clinical bedside feeding evaluation	88.9%*
Direct laryngoscopy and bronchoscopy	85.2%*
Awake fiberoptic laryngoscopy	74.1%
Flexible bronchoscopy & bronchoalveolar lavage	70.4%
Dye study in the presence of tracheostomy	59.3%
Chest Computed Tomography scan	51.9%
Chest X-ray	40.7%
pH-study & impedance manometry	18.5%

2 *Reached agreement between authors.

3

1 • **Section 3: Management of pediatric aspiration**

2 The management of pediatric aspiration is best accomplished with the involvement of a
3 multidisciplinary team. Multidisciplinary teams exist in many forms ranging from
4 comprehensive programs to ad hoc groups of specialists. Ideally, teams include or have access to
5 pediatric otolaryngologists, speech and language pathologists, occupational therapists,
6 pulmonologists, gastroenterologists, pediatric surgeons, nutritionists, radiologists, and general
7 pediatricians. Collective perspectives of expertise in different specialties can improve diagnostic
8 processes and guide management decisions. Management of pediatric aspiration includes diet
9 modification and medical and/or surgical interventions (Figure 1).

10 **3.1. Conservative/medical interventions:**

11 The role of conservative management is highlighted as silent aspiration in children can
12 spontaneously resolve over time [22]. In pediatric patients with normal upper airway anatomy,
13 feeding and swallowing therapy may result in resolution of aspiration [9]. Additionally, targeted
14 feeding therapy can provide a foundation to maximize success of procedures.

15 The respondents were asked to list all the conservative/medical treatment options that
16 their team offer for aspiration. All authors supported the use of diet modification and positioning
17 during feeding in pediatric patients with aspiration as a first-line intervention. Other
18 conservative/medical treatment options that were agreed upon included temporary gavage
19 feeding and, in patients with drooling, salivary gland botulinum toxin injections (Table 3).
20 Neuromuscular electrical stimulation can be helpful in children with aspiration who also have
21 oropharyngeal dysphagia, as it improves swallowing function throughout repeated sessions
22 lasting 1-6 months [23].

1 The medical management of posterior drooling includes anticholinergic medications that
2 reduce salivary volume. Glycopyrrolate is effective in reducing drooling in children; however,
3 35%–83% of children may develop adverse effects requiring its discontinuation [24]. The side
4 effects of anticholinergic medications include behavioral changes, excessive oral dryness,
5 urinary retention, changes in bowel habits, thickened secretions, and blurry vision [24].
6

1 Table 3: Conservative/medical treatment options for aspiration listed by authors

CONSERVATIVE/MEDICAL INTERVENTION	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS IN AGREEMENT
Diet modification	100%*
Positioning during feeding	100%*
NGT/GT feeding	96.2%*
Salivary glands botulinum toxin injection	92.3%*
Anticholinergic drugs for sialorrhea	19.2%
Reflux treatment	11.5%

2 *Reached agreement between authors.

3 Abbreviations: Nasogastric tube (NGT); gastrostomy tube (GT)

4

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

3.2 Surgical Management:

Various surgical options are available and tailored to the underlying cause: whether aspiration is secondary to a known anatomical airway anomaly (Table 4) or to other etiologies that are often neurological or physiological (Table 5).

3.2.1 Surgical management of aspiration secondary to a known anatomic airway anomaly:

Airway anomalies that may contribute to aspiration and can be addressed surgically include laryngeal cleft, laryngomalacia, vocal cords paresis/paralysis, tracheoesophageal fistula (TEF), oropharyngeal or lingual tonsil obstruction, cricopharyngeal dysfunction, or esophageal stricture.

The respondents were asked to list all surgical treatment options that their team offer for aspiration secondary to anatomic airway anomaly (Table 4).

- 1 Table 4: Surgical treatment options identified by the authors as being performed at their
 2 institutions to address aspiration secondary to anatomic airway anomaly

DIAGNOSIS	SURGICAL PROCEDURES	PERCENTAGE
Laryngeal cleft	Laryngeal cleft injection	69.2%
	Laryngeal cleft suture repair	96.2%
Laryngomalacia	Supraglottoplasty	92.3%
Vocal fold paralysis	Vocal fold injection augmentation	84.6%
	RLN reinnervation procedure	53.8%
Tracheoesophageal fistula	Endoscopic TEF repair	65.4%
	Open TEF repair	76.9%
Oropharyngeal or lingual tonsils obstruction	Palatine or lingual tonsillectomy	90.9%
Cricopharyngeal dysfunction	Cricopharyngeal myotomy	81.8%
Esophageal stricture	Esophageal dilation	100%

3 Abbreviations: Recurrent laryngeal nerve (RLN); tracheoesophageal fistula (TEF)

4

1 **3.2.2 Surgical management of salivary aspiration:**

2 The authors were asked to list all surgical treatment options that their team offer for
3 salivary aspiration (Table 5). Excision of the bilateral submandibular glands with ligation of the
4 parotid ducts was agreed upon by the authors as the surgical intervention of choice for saliva
5 aspiration. Direct resection or ligation of the submandibular glands reduces the incidence of
6 nonviral respiratory infections, respiratory-related emergency visits, and hospitalizations [25].

7

1

Table 5: Surgical treatment options for salivary aspiration

SURGICAL INTERVENTION		PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS IN AGREEMENT
Salivary gland surgery	Excision of the submandibular glands with ligation of the parotid ducts	81.5%*
	Excision of the submandibular glands only	55.6%
	4-Duct ligation	37.0%
	Excision of the submandibular and sublingual glands, and ligation of the parotid ducts	33.3%
	Excision of the submandibular and sublingual glands	29.6%
	3-Duct ligation (2 submandibular ducts and 1 parotid duct)	18.5%
	Other surgeries	
Tracheostomy	70.4%	
Laryngotracheal separation	40.7%	

2

*Reached agreement between authors.

1 **Section 4: Postoperative assessment**

2 The authors were asked to list all potential post-operative investigation(s) they might
3 perform to determine the success of a surgical intervention for pediatric aspiration. VFSS was
4 the most valued by the authors (21 responses, 77.8%). Of these 21 respondents, some reported
5 that they used VFSS *and/or* FEES (nine responses, 32.14%). Four authors (14.28 %) reported
6 using FEES alone. The decision to perform a postoperative swallowing study was guided by the
7 preoperative findings. Patients with silent aspiration would benefit the most from postoperative
8 VFSS or FEES, whereas clinical evaluation might be sufficient for patients with clinically overt
9 aspiration.

10 There is variability in the available hospital resources, access to speech/language
11 pathologists/occupational therapists, and increased awareness of the risks of radiation exposure
12 in the pediatric population, which can affect diagnostic strategies. Other follow-up modalities
13 suggested by the authors included the thickener-weaning protocol, MLB, a salivagram for saliva
14 aspiration, and dye testing in the presence of a tracheostomy.

15 **Section 5: Intractable aspiration**

16 The group was asked to define “intractable aspiration” as there is no clear definition in
17 the literature. Many respondents deemed this to be controversial. The most comprehensive
18 definition obtained by the authors was persistent aspiration despite
19 maximal rehabilitative, medical, and surgical interventions (excluding laryngotracheal separation
20 and diversion procedures). Intractable aspiration can lead to clinically important sequelae such as
21 progressive pulmonary deterioration.

1 The authors scored the definitions on a 5-point Likert scale (mean = 4.85, SD = 0.36).
2 Although no consensus was reached as there were four outliers (deviation from the mean score
3 by two or more Likert points), 23 (85.2%) respondents strongly agreed with the definition.

4 Aspiration is considered persistent after at least 3-months of an intensive feeding therapy
5 trial. Patients with an underlying neurological deficit, chronic inability to handle secretions, or
6 abnormal cough reflex are at an increased risk of intractable aspiration. Intractable aspiration can
7 be addressed by (percentage of respondents in agreement): laryngotracheal separation (96.3%),
8 tracheostomy (70.4%), diversion procedure (55.6%), or narrow field laryngectomy (40.7%).

9 **6. Conclusion**

10 The management of pediatric aspiration is best achieved through a multidisciplinary
11 approach with a comprehensive investigation strategy and different treatment options.

12 **7. Disclaimer**

13 The mission of the IPOG is to develop recommendations for the management of pediatric
14 otolaryngologic disorders to improve patient care. Recommendations are based on the collective
15 opinions of the authors for each specific topic/publication. Any person seeking to apply or
16 consult a report is expected to use an independent medical judgment in the context of individual
17 patients and institutional circumstances.

18 **8. Authors contributions**

19 Dr. Bshair Aldriweesh is the first author and Dr. Sam J Daniel is the senior author. The
20 remaining authors are listed in alphabetical order. All authors contributed to the drafting and
21 critical revision of the recommendations. All authors approved the final version of this
22 manuscript and agreed to be accountable for all aspects of this work.

23

1 **References**

- 2 [1] R.M. Rosenfeld, L.C. Nnacheta, M.D. Corrigan, Clinical Consensus Statement Development
3 Manual, *Otolaryngol.–Head Neck Surg. Off. J. Am. Acad. Otolaryngol.–Head Neck Surg.* 153
4 (2015) S1–S14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0194599815601394>.
- 5 [2] M. Saad, O. Afsah, H. Baz, M.E. El-regal, T. Abou-Elsaad, Clinical and videofluoroscopic
6 evaluation of feeding and swallowing in infants with oropharyngeal dysphagia, *Int. J.*
7 *Pediatr. Otorhinolaryngol.* 150 (2021) 110900.
8 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2021.110900>.
- 9 [3] E.H. Wick, K. Johnson, K. Demarre, A. Faherty, S. Parikh, D.L. Horn, Reliability and Construct
10 Validity of the Penetration-Aspiration Scale for Quantifying Pediatric Outcomes after
11 Interarytenoid Augmentation, *Otolaryngol. Neck Surg.* 161 (2019) 862–869.
12 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0194599819856299>.
- 13 [4] A.L. Balest, A.S. Mahoney, A.D. Shaffer, K.E. White, R. Theiss, J. Dohar, Infant aspiration and
14 associated signs on clinical feeding evaluation, *Int. J. Pediatr. Otorhinolaryngol.* 149 (2021)
15 110856. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2021.110856>.
- 16 [5] C.P. Delsing, S. Bekkers, C.E. Erasmus, K. van Hulst, F.J. van den Hoogen, Posterior drooling
17 in children with cerebral palsy and other neurodevelopmental disorders, *Dev. Med. Child*
18 *Neurol.* 63 (2021) 1093–1098. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dmcn.14888>.
- 19 [6] S.J. Daniel, P. Fayoux, N. Bateman, A. Boudewyns, M. Brigger, C.Y. Chan, K. Chan, A. Cheng,
20 S. Conley, H. Kubba, E.M. Lambert, H. Muntz, R. Nuss, J. Russell, M. Rutter, Y. Schwarz, J.
21 Spratley, R. Thevasagayam, D. Thompson, T. Valika, M. Wyatt, Comprehensive
22 management of anterior drooling: An International Pediatric Otolaryngology Group (IPOG)
23 consensus statement, *Int. J. Pediatr. Otorhinolaryngol.* (2023) 111500.
24 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2023.111500>.
- 25 [7] Miller Ck, Willging Jp, Fiberoptic Endoscopic Evaluation of Swallowing in Infants and
26 Children: Protocol, Safety, and Clinical Efficacy: 25 Years of Experience, *Ann. Otol. Rhinol.*
27 *Laryngol.* 129 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003489419893720>.
- 28 [8] C. Wentland, C. Hersh, S. Sally, M.S. Fracchia, S. Hardy, B. Liu, J.A. Garcia, C.J. Hartnick,
29 Modified Best-Practice Algorithm to Reduce the Number of Postoperative
30 Videofluoroscopic Swallow Studies in Patients With Type 1 Laryngeal Cleft Repair, *JAMA*
31 *Otolaryngol. Neck Surg.* 142 (2016) 851–856. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaoto.2016.1252>.
- 32 [9] E. Adil, O. Gergin, K. Kawai, R. Rahbar, K. Watters, Usefulness of Upper Airway Endoscopy in
33 the Evaluation of Pediatric Pulmonary Aspiration, *JAMA Otolaryngol. Neck Surg.* 142
34 (2016) 339–343. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaoto.2015.3923>.
- 35 [10] J.W. Schroeder, Fiberoptic Endoscopic Evaluation of Swallowing in the Breastfeeding
36 Infant, *The Laryngoscope.* (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1002/lary.30565>.
- 37 [11] A.P. da Silva, J.F.L. Neto, P.P. Santoro, Comparison between videofluoroscopy and
38 endoscopic evaluation of swallowing for the diagnosis of dysphagia in children,
39 *Otolaryngol. Neck Surg.* 143 (2010) 204–209.
40 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.otohns.2010.03.027>.
- 41 [12] A.L. Irace, N.D. Dombrowski, K. Kawai, K. Watters, S. Choi, J. Perez, P. Dodrill, K.
42 Hernandez, K. Davidson, R. Rahbar, Evaluation of Aspiration in Infants With

- 1 Laryngomalacia and Recurrent Respiratory and Feeding Difficulties, *JAMA Otolaryngol.*
2 *Neck Surg.* 145 (2019) 146–151. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaoto.2018.3642>.
- 3 [13] M. Alnassar, K. Oudjhane, J. Davila, Nasogastric tubes and videofluoroscopic swallowing
4 studies in children, *Pediatr. Radiol.* 41 (2011) 317–321. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00247-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00247-010-1834-0)
5 010-1834-0.
- 6 [14] S.T. Edwards, L. Ernst, A.K. Sherman, A.M. Davis, Increased episodes of aspiration on
7 videofluoroscopic swallow study in children with nasogastric tube placement, *PloS One.* 15
8 (2020) e0227777. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0227777>.
- 9 [15] H. Jaffal, A. Isaac, W. Johannsen, S. Campbell, H.G. El-Hakim, The prevalence of swallowing
10 dysfunction in children with laryngomalacia: a systematic review, *Int. J. Pediatr.*
11 *Otorhinolaryngol.* 139 (2020) 110464. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2020.110464>.
- 12 [16] C. Rosas-Salazar, S.A. Walczak, D.G. Winger, G. Kurland, J.E. Spahr, Comparison of Two
13 Aspiration Techniques of Bronchoalveolar Lavage in Children, *Pediatr. Pulmonol.* 49 (2014)
14 978–984. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ppul.22916>.
- 15 [17] D. Schramm, N. Freitag, T. Nicolai, A. Wiemers, B. Hinrichs, P. Amrhein, D. DiDio, C. Eich, B.
16 Landsleitner, E. Eber, J. Hammer, on behalf of the S.I.G. on P.B. of the S. for P.P. (GPP) and
17 invited S. involved in pediatric airway Endoscopy, *Pediatric Airway Endoscopy:*
18 *Recommendations of the Society for Pediatric Pneumology, Respiration.* 100 (2021) 1128–
19 1145. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000517125>.
- 20 [18] E. Tschiedel, A. Goralski, J. Steinmann, P.-M. Rath, M. Olivier, U. Mellies, T. Kottmann, F.
21 Stehling, Multiplex PCR of bronchoalveolar lavage fluid in children enhances the rate of
22 pathogen detection, *BMC Pulm. Med.* 19 (2019) 132. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s12890-019-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12890-019-0894-7)
23 0894-7.
- 24 [19] E.A. Kelly, D.E. Parakininkas, S.L. Werlin, J.F. Southern, N. Johnston, J.E. Kerschner,
25 Prevalence of Pediatric Aspiration-Associated Extraesophageal Reflux Disease, *JAMA*
26 *Otolaryngol. Neck Surg.* 139 (2013) 996–1001.
27 <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaoto.2013.4448>.
- 28 [20] C.N. Martin, Z. Barnawi, E. Chorvinsky, D. Pillai, M. Gatti, M.E. Collins, G.M. Krakovsky,
29 N.M. Bauman, S. Sehgal, D.K. Pillai, Positive bronchoalveolar lavage pepsin assay
30 associated with viral and fungal respiratory infections in children with chronic cough,
31 *Pediatr. Pulmonol.* 56 (2021) 2686–2694. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ppul.25450>.
- 32 [21] M. Streppel, L.L. Veder, B. Pullens, K.F.M. Joosten, Swallowing problems in children with a
33 tracheostomy tube, *Int. J. Pediatr. Otorhinolaryngol.* 124 (2019) 30–33.
34 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2019.05.003>.
- 35 [22] E.O. Shay, J.B. Meleca, S. Anne, B. Hopkins, Natural history of silent aspiration on modified
36 barium swallow studies in the pediatric population, *Int. J. Pediatr. Otorhinolaryngol.* 125
37 (2019) 116–121. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2019.06.035>.
- 38 [23] R. Propp, P.J. Gill, S. Marcus, L. Ren, E. Cohen, J. Friedman, S. Mahant, Neuromuscular
39 electrical stimulation for children with dysphagia: a systematic review, *BMJ Open.* 12
40 (2022) e055124. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2021-055124>.
- 41 [24] P. You, J. Strychowsky, K. Gandhi, B.A. Chen, Anticholinergic treatment for sialorrhea in
42 children: A systematic review, *Paediatr. Child Health.* 27 (2022) 82–87.
43 <https://doi.org/10.1093/pch/pxab051>.

1 [25] D.W. Chen, K.R. Billings, J.B. Ida, J. Lavin, S. Ghadersohi, T. Valika, Salivary gland surgery
2 and nonviral respiratory-related hospitalizations in children with neurodevelopmental
3 impairment, *Int. J. Pediatr. Otorhinolaryngol.* 163 (2022) 111362.
4 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2022.111362>.
5

1 **Figure legends**

2 Figure 1. Approach to aspiration algorithm

3