Pediatric gastroesophageal motility disorders

From diagnosis to management

van Lennep, M.

Publication date
2023

CHAPTER 2

Clinical experience with performing esophageal function testing in children

Marinde van Lennep* & Marin L. Leijdekkers*, Jac M. Oors, Marc A. Benninga, Michiel P. van Wijk, Maartje M.J. Singendonk

* *indicates shared first authorship*

J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr. 2021 Feb 1;72(2):226-231.

Abstract

Objectives: Pediatric high-resolution manometry (HRM) and 24-hour pH-impedance with/without ambulatory manometry (pH-MII+/-mano) tests are generally performed using adult-derived protocols. We aimed to assess the feasibility of these protocols in children, the occurrence of patient-related imperfections and their influence on test interpretability.

Methods: Esophageal function tests performed between 2015-2018 were retrospectively analyzed. All tests were subcategorized into uninterpretable or interpretable tests (regardless of occurrence of patient-related imperfections). For HRM, the following patient-related imperfections were scored: patient-related artefacts, multiple swallowing and/or inability to establish baseline characteristics. For pH-MII(+/-mano), incorrect symptom registration and/or premature catheter removal were scored. Results were compared between age-groups (0-3, 4-12 and >12 years).

Results: In total 106 HRM, 60 pH-MII and 23 pH-MII-mano could be fully analyzed.

Of these, 94.8% HRM, 91.9% pH-MII, and 95.7% pH-MII-mano were interpretable. Overall, HRM contained imperfections in 78.3% overall and in 8/8 (100%) in the youngest age-group, 36/42 (85.7%) in 4 to 12 years and in 37/56 (66.1%) in children above 12 years; $p = 0.011$. These imperfections led to uninterpretable results in 4 HRM (3.8%), of which 3 were in the youngest age group (3/8, 37.5%). Imperfections were found in 10% of pH-MII and 17.4% of pH-MII-mano. These led to uninterpretable results in 5.0% and 4.3% respectively. No age-effect was found.

Conclusion: Esophageal function tests in children are interpretable in more than 90% overall. In children under the age of 4 years, all patients had imperfect HRM and 3/8 tests were uninterpretable. HRM in older children and pH-MII+/-mano were interpretable in the vast majority.

What is known

- High-resolution manometry (HRM) and 24-hour pH impedance measurements (pH-MII) with and without ambulatory manometry in children are generally performed using adult(-derived) protocols as evidence-based pediatric protocols for the performance of these tests are lacking.

What is new

- Despite occurrence of patient-related imperfections, nearly all 24-hour pH impedance measurements with and without ambulatory manometry and high-resolution manometry performed in children aged 4 years and older lead to interpretable results. In infants and toddlers this decreases to approximately two-third of high-resolution manometry.
- Three-quarters of high-resolution manometry in children are imperfect because of occurrence of patient-related imperfections. All children <4 years and two-third of adolescents have imperfect measurements.

Introduction

Stationary high-resolution manometry (HRM) and intraluminal pH-impedance monitoring (pH-MII) with or without ambulatory manometry (pH-MII-mano) can evaluate esophageal function and monitor gastroesophageal reflux (1). These tests can be used to diagnose gastroesophageal reflux disease, achalasia, rumination syndrome, aerophagia and supragastric belching. As there are no well-established evidence-based pediatric protocols for these tests, they are generally performed according to adult protocols or adult-derived pediatric consensus-based protocols (2-4). This may, however, be complicated by several factors (5). First, discomfort and fear for the nasogastric catheters may lead to refusal or premature termination of the measurement. Second, younger children and infants may not be able to swallow on command as is required per HRM protocol. They may break up the bolus and perform multiple swallows with smaller volumes instead. This alters physiology, and may thus influence HRM-derived parameters and diagnosis (6). Third, objective symptom association during pH-MII may be difficult in infants and young children, where the accuracy of the symptom diary fully relies on proxy-report. Finally, analysis may be complicated by artefacts because of, for example, crying, gagging, coughing, and continuous movement (5).

Patients with achalasia have an increased resistance to flow at the esophagogastric junction. This may make placement of the catheter more difficult and can cause bolus stasis in the distal esophagus with a subsequent increase in symptoms. It is known that adult achalasia patients have more often imperfect HRMs compared to patients without achalasia (7). We hypothesized that HRM performed in children also show more imperfections when performed in (suspect) achalasia cases compared with patients without achalasia. Additionally, we hypothesized that pH-MII-mano measurements would fail more often compared with pH-MII, because of fear and refusal of an additional manometry catheter.

To evaluate how well these tests can be performed in children and how often they lead to interpretable test results, we assessed the occurrence of patient-related imperfections in different pediatric age groups, and their influence on test interpretability by performing a retrospective review of esophageal function tests performed at our center.

Methods

Study Subjects

Data of patients (0-18 years) who had 1 or more esophageal function measurements (HRM, pH-MII and/or pH-MII-mano) scheduled at the pediatric motility unit of the Emma Children's Hospital / Amsterdam UMC, location AMC between January 1, 2015 and December 31, 2018 were considered for inclusion in this retrospective cohort study.

Patients and/or parents were sent an information brochure in which they were given the opportunity to object against the use of their data for this research project (opt-out procedure). Children were included and their measurements and medical charts were retrospectively reviewed when no objection was received within 6 weeks. Our study protocol was exempted from full ethical review by our local ethical review board because of its observational and retrospective nature (AMC Medical Ethical Review Committee, reference W19_337 # 19.397).

Study Design

HRM, pH-MII and pH-MII-mano performed between 2015 and 2018 were retrospectively re-analyzed. Retrospective review of data and re-analysis of measurements was performed between October 2018 and February 2019. Catheter specifications, study protocols and analysis software specifications are detailed in supplemental file 1, http://links.lww.com/MPG/C57 and Supplementary file 2, http://links.lww.com/MPG/C58.

Categorization of Tests

All tests that were scheduled during the study period were retrieved from a clinical database.

These tests were categorized as: first time diagnostic tests; additional diagnostic- or follow-up tests; repeated tests because of previously unperformed or uninterpretable tests.

If a child came in for the first time and multiple measurements were performed on the same day, all these were considered to be part of the first time (diagnostic) test.

Patient-related Imperfections

All performed measurements were re-analyzed for the occurrence of patient-related imperfections and for overall test interpretability. The different types of patient-related imperfections are defined below per test. All re-analyses were performed by the same investigator (M.L.). When interpretation was ambiguous, a second reviewer (M.vL.) was consulted. When no consensus was achieved, a third reviewer (J.O.) was consulted to adjudicate.

Subcategorization of Tests Based on Interpretability

A tests was called "*unperformed*" when it was never performed due to: 'refusal of catheter' or 'inability to position catheter through nasopharynx'. All performed tests were subcategorized into *uninterpretable or interpretable* tests (regardless of occurrence of patient-related imperfections).

Measurements were classified as *failed* if they were *unperformed* or if they became *uninterpretable* because of *patient-related imperfections*.

Stationary High-resolution Manometry

In our center, HRM's are performed according to the Chicago Classification (CC) v3.0 protocol, with a small adjustment for its use in children [supplemental file 1, http://links.lww.com/MPG/C57 (3)]. In cases where HRM was only performed to establish the LES position relative to the nares, the CC protocol was not carried out and the study was exempted from analysis of patient-related imperfections. If the upper esophageal sphincter (UES) was not visible during HRM because of the use of a relatively short catheter for the size of the patient involved, measurements were also excluded from analysis of patient-related imperfections.

Analysis of Stationary High-resolution Manometry

First, HRMs were re-analyzed for the occurrence of any of the following *patient-related imperfections*:

1.) inability to obtain baseline characteristics during a window of 10 seconds (see supplemental file 1, http://links.lww.com/MPG/C57) before or after the test swallows;
2.) double or multiple swallowing during a bolus swallow (ie, more than 1 swallow within 10 seconds of a bolus administration);
3.) premature termination of CC protocol (ie, less than 10 boluses administered)
4.) artefacts during bolus swallows, either caused by gagging, crying, coughing and/or belching.

All HRM studies were subsequently classified based on their overall interpretability:

Perfect measurement: 10 bolus swallows *without* any of abovementioned patient-related imperfections.

Imperfect measurement(3)**:** <10 *perfect* bolus swallows.(3) We categorized imperfect measurements into 2 groups:

- <10, but ≥7 *perfect* swallows *without* any of abovementioned patient-related imperfections, which is considered acceptable to identify a CC diagnosis in adults (7).
- <7 *perfect* swallows.

Twenty-four Hour Studies (pH-impedance Monitoring and pH-impedance Monitoring With Ambulatory Manometry)

Measurements were classified as *imperfect* if they contained any of the following (4):

1.) incorrect use of event button;
2.) incomplete registration of symptoms, meals and/or body position (upright vs supine) in the diary;
3.) premature termination because of catheter removal by patient.

Statistical Analysis

Descriptive analysis was performed using SPSS (IBM Statistical Package for the Social Sciences [SPSS] for Windows, v 25.0 Armonk, NY: IBM Corp). Data are shown as median and range.

Results were subdivided between 3 age groups: pre-school children, school children and adolescents (0-3, 4-12 and 13-17 years). Subgroup analysis was performed in these 3 age groups and in patients with achalasia versus a group of age-matched patients without a diagnosis of achalasia. Additionally, differences between number of failed and imperfect pH-MII and pH-MII-mano were compared.

Chi-square and Fisher's exact test were used to compare age-groups in terms of: percentage of failed measurements; percentage of imperfect measurements containing < 10 but ≥ 7 perfect swallows; percentage of imperfect measurements containing <7 perfect swallows; percentage of overall adherence imperfections. A P <0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Spearman correlation coefficient was used to calculate the correlation between age and: percentage of failed HRM and pH-MII; percentage of imperfect HRM and pH-MII; and number of perfect swallows performed. The strength of a (positive or negative) significant (P <0.05) correlation was described using the following classification: 0.00 to 0.19 "very weak"; 0.20 to 0.39 "weak"; 0.40-.59 "moderate"; 0.60 to 0.79 "strong"; 0.80 to 1.0 "very strong" (8).

Results

Between January 2015 and December 2018, 123 children were referred to our motility center for esophageal motility testing. Parents of 1 patient objected against the use of its data.

A total of 122 children (52% boys, median age 12 [0 – 17] years) had 201 esophageal function tests scheduled: 116 HRM, 62 pH-MII, and 23 pH-MII-mano.

Categorization of Tests

One-hundred thirteen patients visited our motility center for a *first time diagnostic test* (102 HRM; 46 pH-MII and 19 pH-MII-mano, see table 1), 22 patients for *additional diagnostic- or follow-up tests* (13 HRM, 13 pH-MII, and 3 pH-MII-mano) and 5 patients had a *repeated test* after a previously failed test (1 water-perfused HRM, placed under anesthesia during esophagogastroduodenoscopy because of extreme fear; 3 pH-MII and 1 pH-MII-mano).

Of all patients visiting our center for the first time, 9/113 (8%) had one or more failed measurements (see Table 1 for details). All 22 patients who came for an additional diagnostic- or follow up test, had interpretable measurements.

One out of 5 children who had a repeated test because of a previously failed test, failed again (pH-MII failure due to premature catheter removal as a result of vomiting).

Table 1: reasons for failed measurements in children visiting the motility center for the first time

first measurements	0-3 yr	4-12 yr	13-18 yr	Total
all patients	n=16	n=45	n=52	n=113
one or more failed tests(%)	**3 (18.8)**	**3 (6.7)**	**3 (5.8)**	**9 (8.0)**
patient related(%)	3 (18.8)	2 (4.4)	2 (3.8)	7 (6.2)
inability to position catheter(%)	-	1 (2.2)	1(1.9)	2 (1.8)
HRM	*n = 7*	*n = 45*	*n = 50*	*n = 102*
failed(%)	**3 (42.8)**	**1 (2.2)**	**2 (4.0)**	**6 (5.9)**
refusal of catheter(%)	-	1 (2.2)	-	1 (1.0)
inability to position catheter (%)	-	-	1 (2.0)	1 (1.0)
patient-related artefact (%)	3 (42.8)[a]	-	-	3 (2.9)
premature termination (%)	-	-	1 (2.0)[b]	1 (1.0)
pH-MII (+/- mano)	*n = 15*	*n = 22*	*n = 28*	*n = 65*
failed(%)	**1 (6.7)**	**2 (9.1)**	**1 (3.6)**	**4 (6.2)**
refusal of catheter (%)	-	1 (4.5)[c]	-	1 (1.5)
inability to position catheter (%)	-	1 (4.5)	-	1 (1.5)
premature termination (%)	1 (6.7)[d]	-	1 (3.6)[e]	2 (3.1)

Patients could undergo one or more measurements during first visit.
a: all due to continuous crying. b: due to fear; c: patient with autistic spectrum disorder; d: due to self-removal (same patient continuously cried during HRM); e: due to vomiting.

Stationary High-resolution Manometry

Of all 116 scheduled HRM, 110/116 (94.8%) were *interpretable*, regardless of patient-related imperfections. Two out of 116 (1.7%) scheduled measurements were *unperformed* (n=1 refusal of catheter; n=1 inability to position catheter). Out of 114 *performed* HRM, 8 (interpretable) measurements were exempted from analysis: 1 HRM was performed for determination of LES position only and no CC protocol was carried out. Seven measurements showed no UES visualization.

Of the remaining measurements, 83/106 (78.3%) contained *patient-related imperfections.* Seventy-six (71.7%) of these measurements became *imperfect* and 4/106 (3.8%) measurements were *uninterpretable* because of patient-related imperfections (see Table 2). There was no correlation between *failure* of HRM and age (r = -0.070; P =0.408).

Of 76 *imperfect tests,* 43 were imperfect as they contained <10 but ≥ 7 *perfect* swallows, whereas 33 contained <7 *perfect* swallows. Pre-school and school-children had significantly more *imperfect* HRM containing <7 *perfect* swallows compared to adolescents (100% *vs* 54.8% *vs* 9.1% respectively; P = <0.001). Number of perfect swallows performed had a strong correlation with age (r = 0.623). The number of *patient-related imperfections* had a very weak, negative correlation with age (r = -0.289; P = 0.011).

High-resolution Manometry in Patients With Achalasia

There were no differences in the number of *imperfect* or *failed* tests for achalasia versus nonachalasia age-matched controls (Table 3). Thirteen (46%) HRM measurements of patients with suspect achalasia versus 12 (43%) of control patients contained less than 7 perfect swallows.

Twenty-four Hour Studies (pH-impedance Monitoring and pH-impedance Monitoring With or Without Ambulatory Manometry)

A total of 62 pH-MII and 23 pH-were *interpretable*, regardless of patient-related imperfections. Two out of 62 (3.2%) scheduled pH-MII were *unperformed.* All scheduled pH-MII-mano were performed.

Patient-related imperfections occurred in 6/60 (10%) performed pH-MII versus 4/23 (17.4%) pH-MII-mano. These imperfections led to *imperfect tests* in 3/60 (5.0%) pH-MII versus 3/23 (13.0%) pH-MII-mano and to *uninterpretable tests in* 3/60 (5.0%) pH-MII and 1/23 (4.3%) pH-MII-mano, respectively. There was neither correlation between age and *uninterpretable measurements* nor with the occurrence of patient-related *imperfection*s (r = -0.70; p = 0.179 and r = 0.78; p = 0.406 respectively). There was no significant

difference between percentage of *uninterpretable* or *imperfect* pH-MII versus pH-MII-mano ($p = 0.668$ and $p = 0.617$ respectively).

Discussion

Our study shows that more than 90% of all esophageal motility tests performed (HRM, pH-MII and pH-MII-mano) in the pediatric age led to a meaningful test result. Age was a factor in how well HRM could be performed but this effect was not seen in 24 hour studies (pH-MII or pH-MII-mano). No difference was found between patients with (suspected) achalasia and age-matched controls in terms of patient-related imperfections or failed HRM.

In 95% of scheduled HRM tests, a meaningful result could be generated. A large proportion of these tests (78%) nevertheless contained patient-related imperfections. Age was clearly a factor influencing these numbers. In fact, all HRM performed in infants and toddlers showed patient-related imperfections to some extent and in this age group a meaningful result was generated in 63% only. Contrary to the youngest age group, tests of school children and adolescents were interpretable despite occurrence of patient-related imperfections in the majority of tests.

Roman et al (7) argued that a minimum of 7 well performed swallows, instead of 10 swallows recommended by the CC protocol, seemed reasonable to clinically interpret a HRM. When applying these criteria to our cohort, the percentage of *imperfect* HRM remained 100% in the youngest age group, but dropped from 53.6% to 8.9% in adolescents, which is similar to the percentage of imperfect tests in adults (7).

Although patient-related imperfections do not necessarily hamper HRM analysis (7), they may influence accuracy of the diagnosis. For example, infants and young children are unable to refrain from swallowing after a bolus swallow, leading to multiple closely spaced swallows (6) It is known that this 'piecemeal deglutition' pattern alters pharyngeal high resolution impedance manometry (HRIM) parameters in infants and young children (up to 4 years old) (6).

Table 2: patient-related imperfections leading to imperfect- or failed measurements

High resolution manometry (HRM)	**0-3 yrs**	**4-12 yrs**	**13-17 yrs**	**Total**	**p-value**
Scheduled HRM (n)	**8**	**49**	**59**	**116**	
All scheduled HRM that led to a meaningful test result	**5 (62.5)**	**48 (97.6)**	**57 (96.6)**	**110 (94.8)**	<0.001
Unperformed tests (n (%))	**-**	**1 (2.0)**	**1 (1.7)**	**2 (1.7)**	n/a
refusal of catheter (n (%))	-	1 (2.0)	-	1 (0.9)	n/a
inability to position catheter (n (%))	-	-	1 (1.7)	1 (0.9)	n/a
Performed HRM (n)	**8**	**48**	**58**	**114**	
UES not visible due to catheter-related imperfection (n (%))	-	6 (12.5)	1 (1.7)	7 (6.1)	
Only LES determination, no CC protocol performed (n (%))	-	-	1 (1.7)	1 (0.9)	
Analyzed measurements (n)	**8**	**42**	**56**	**106**	
Measurements with any patient-related imperfection (n (%))	**8 (100.0)**	**38 (90.5)**	**37 (66.1)**	**83 (78.3)**	**0.011**
no baseline established (n (%))	1 (12.5)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.9)	n/a
double/multiple swallowing (n (%))	8 (100.0)	36 (85.7)	33 (58.9)	77 (72.6)	0.008
patient related artefacts (n (%))	5 (62.5)	9 (21.4)	6 (10.7)	20 (18.9)	ns
***Imperfect* measurements (n, %)**	**5 (62.5)**	**36 (85.7)**	**35 (62.5)**	**76 (71.7)**	**0.025**
≥ 7 but < 10 perfect swallows (n (%))	0 (0.0)	13 (30.9)	30 (53.6)	43 (40.6)	0.002
< 7 perfect swallows (n (%))	5 (62.5)	23 (54.8)	5 (8.9)	33 (31.1)	<0.001
***Uninterpretable* due to imperfections (n (%))**	**3 (37.5)**	**0 (0.0)**	**1 (1.8)**	**4 (3.8)**	n/a
artefacts (crying) throughout measurement (n (%))	3 (37.5)	-	-	3 (2.8)	n/a
no bolus swallows performed (n (%))	-	-	1 (1.8)	1 (0.9)	n/a
Number of bolus swallows performed per test					
median number bolus swallows per study [range]	8 [0-11]	10 [9-14]	10 [5-17]	10 [0-17]	<0.001
median number perfect bolus swallows [range]	0 [0-3]	6 [0-10]	9 [0-10]	9 [0-10]	<0.001
24 hour pH-impedance measurement	**0-3 yrs**	**4-12 yrs**	**13-17 yrs**	**Total**	**p-value**
Scheduled pH-MII	**17**	**21**	**24**	**62**	
All scheduled HRM that led to a meaningful test result	**16 (94.1)**	**17 (80.9)**	**24 (100)**	**57 (91.9)**	**ns**
Unperformed tests (n (%))	**-**	**2 (9.5)**	**-**	**2 (3.2)**	**n/a**
refusal of catheter (n (%))	-	1 (4.8)	-	1 (1.6)	n/a
inability to position catheter (n (%))	-	1 (4.8)	-	1 (1.6)	n/a
Performed pH-MII	**17**	**19**	**24**	**60**	
Measurements with any patient-related imperfection (n (%))	**2 (11.8)**	**2 (10.5)**	**2 (8.3)**	**6 (10.0)**	**ns**
Imperfect measurements (n (%))	**1 (5.8)**	**-**	**2 (8.3)**	**3 (5.0)**	**ns**
incorrect event button use (n (%))	1 (5.8)	-	-	1 (1.7)	n/a
incorrect diary registration (n (%))	1 (5.8)	-	2 (8.3)	3 (5.0)	n/a

Table continues on next page

Table 2: *(continued)*

High resolution manometry (HRM)	**0-3 yrs**	**4-12 yrs**	**13-17 yrs**	**Total**	**p-value**
Uninterpretable due to premature catheter removal (n (%))	**1 (5.8)**	**2 (10.5)**	**-**	**3 (5.0)**	**n/a**
24 hour pH-impedance-manometry	**0-3 yrs**	**4-12 yrs**	**13-17 yrs**	**Total**	**p-value**
Scheduled & performed pH-MII-mano	**1**	**8**	**14**	**23**	
All pH-MII-mano that led to a meaningful test result	**1 (100)**	**8 (100)**	**13 (92.9)**	**22 (95.7)**	**ns**
Measurements with any patient-related imperfection (n (%))	**-**	**1 (12.5)**	**3 (21.4)**	**4 (17.4)**	n/a
Imperfect measurements (n (%))	**-**	**1 (12.5)**	**2 (14.2)**	**3 (13.0)**	**n/a**
incorrect event button use (n (%))	-	1 (12.5)	1 (7.1)	2 (8.7)	n/a
incorrect diary registration (n (%))	-	-	1 (7.1)	1 (4.3)	n/a
Uninterpretable due to premature catheter removal (n (%))	**-**	**-**	**1 (7.1)**	**1 (4.3)**	**n/a**

HRM = high resolution manometry. One measurement can contain more than 1 adherence imperfection. P value (χ^2 or Fisher exact test in case of n <5) significance level <0.05; n/a = analysis not applicable <3 patients; ns = not significant

Table 3: age-matched comparison of HRM outcome of achalasia vs non-achalasia patients

	Achalasia n=28	**No achalasia n= 28**
Median age [range]	13 [8-17]	14 [6-17]
Uninterpretable measurements (%)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Imperfect measurements n (%)	19 (67.9)	18 (64.3)
Patient-related imperfections n (%)	18 (64.3)	16 (57.1)
Double/multiple swallowing n (%)	18/27 (66.7)*	16/27 (59.3)*
No baseline established n (%)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Premature stop of measurement n (%)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Patient-related artefacts n (%)	4/27 (14.8)*	4/27 (14.8)*
Imperfections leading to < 10 perfect swallows		
< 10 but ≥ 7 perfect swallows (%)	6 (21.4)	6 (21.4)
< 7 perfect swallows n (%)	13 (46.4)	12 (42.8)
Number of bolus swallows performed		
Median total no. of bolus swallows [range]	10 [10-12]	10 [1-14]
Median no. of *perfect* bolus swallows [range]	9 [3-10]	9 [0-10]

*Differences between achalasia and non-achalasia group calculated using Chi² or Fisher Exact test. p <0.05 significant. None of the imperfections led to a significant difference; *: n=1 not analyzable because UES was not visible.*

Similarly, esophageal motility may alter as well during piecemeal deglutition. When using the adult CC criteria in HRM's containing double/multiple swallows, healthy subjects may incorrectly be diagnosed with ineffective- or absent esophageal motility, while in fact their motility is normal (3). These double/multiple swallows may hypothetically also hamper HRIM analysis in achalasia suspects (6).

We hypothesized that achalasia patients would have more imperfect tests because of an increased resistance to flow at the EGJ (7); however, this was not seen in our cohort. Achalasia patients often deal with long-term symptoms, and may therefore, be more cooperative and motivated to undergo a HRM, even if the circumstances are more difficult (9).

Our results implicate that a pediatric tailored protocol for performing HRM in young children is needed to improve feasibility and clinical utility. For example, piecemeal deglutition should be taken into account in such a protocol (6). Additionally, in patients with achalasia, pattern recognition is often sufficient to establish a diagnosis. This is also reflected in our cohort, almost half of achalasia suspects had < 7 *perfect* swallows on HRM and still a diagnosis of achalasia could be made. Although strict criteria are not always met, a shorter pediatric protocol may be sufficient to establish a clinical diagnosis in some cases (11). Similarly, in esophageal atresia patients who all exhibit disordered motility, it may clinically be more relevant to describe the distinct patterns of the residual proportion of peristalsis (eg, absent-, distal or a pressurization contraction pattern) as recently proposed, rather than to derive all HRM metrics and apply the CC algorithm (10). On the other hand, prolonged protocols for the use of HRIM might be of added value in specific cases (11, 12). By administering additional liquid, semi-solid and solid boluses of various volumes, the so called 'pressure flow analysis' can enhance understanding of the underlying motility problem and symptom etiology.

We hypothesized that pH-MII-mano measurements would fail more often compared with pH-MII, because of fear and refusal of an additional manometry catheter. In our study, however, none of the patients who had a pH-MII-mano scheduled refused the test and only 1 catheter was removed prematurely. This might partly be explained because our pH-MII-mano cohort was older than the pH-MII only cohort. On the other hand, placement of an additional catheter only takes a few extra seconds. Once these catheters are placed and secured patients may, contrary to our hypothesis, not experience any additional burden compared with pH-MII measurements.

Our study has several strengths. We managed to build a large cohort by including 122 patients over 4 years and our experienced pediatric motility team performed

all measurements according to the current (adult or adult-derived) protocols, which enabled comparison between the tests. Limitations include the retrospective design of the study. Additionally, low incidence rates of rare diseases such achalasia and small patient groups, such as pre-school children led to small samples in subgroups. In a small minority of HRMs performed, the UES was not visible as a result of catheter-related (technical) imperfections. This made analysis of patient-related imperfections impossible in these children.

Conclusions

In summary, esophageal function tests in children were interpretable in more than 90%. Patient-related imperfections occurred often in HRM and were more common in infants and young children. HRMs performed in (suspect) achalasia cases did not differ from those performed in controls without achalasia. In contrast to HRM, patient-related imperfections occurred in only a minority of 24 hour studies (pH-MII and PH-MII-mano). Therefore, we conclude that pH-MII and pH-MII-mano are well tolerated and can be performed in all age groups according to the currently used protocol. HRM is well tolerated in older children and adolescents but we believe that specific pediatric protocols could improve feasibility and test interpretability especially in infants and (young) children. Future studies assessing the effect of interventions by psychological or pedagogical staff, such as medical hypnotherapy or mental support before and during the measurement may further improve the performance of esophageal function tests in children.

Supplemental file 1: specifications of high resolution manometry catheters, measurement protocol and analysis software

The solid-state high resolution manometry (HRM) and high resolution impedance manometry (HRIM) catheter were respectively 4.0 diameter with 36 equally spaced pressure sensors at 1cm intervals (Manoscan, Given Imaging Mansfield, USA) and 3.2 mm diameter with 25 pressure sensors at 1 cm intervals and 12 impedance segments at 2 cm intervals (Unisensor USA Inc, Portsmouth, NH, USA).

A pediatric HRIM catheter was used in children with an estimated length from nares to lower esophageal sphincter of <40cm, whereas adult HRM catheters were used in children with an estimated length from nares to lower esophageal sphincter of >40cm.

Patients fasted 3 hours prior to the measurement and in case of (suspicion of) achalasia, this interval was extended up to 8 hours. Lidocaine gel was administered in case patients / parents preferred topical intranasal anesthesia. Catheters were positioned to measure the region from the hypopharynx to the stomach. HRM and HRIM studies were performed according to the Chicago Classification (CC) V3.0 protocol.(1) In our center, baseline characteristics in children are obtained within a 10 seconds timeframe (instead of 30s according to the CC protocol) in which patients are asked to refrain from swallowing. We believe that this timeframe is more feasible in children and in our experience baseline characteristics can be analyzed within this timeframe.

Manoview (Given Imaging, Mansfield, USA) was used for the analysis of HRM studies. MMS (MMS Quickview software, Solar GI acquisition system, Enschede, The Netherlands) was used for analysis of HRIM studies.

Supplemental file 2: specifications of 24h pH-impedance and ambulatory manometry catheters, measurement protocol and analysis software

All tests were performed using a 2.1 mm diameter Isphet pH sensor and 6 impedance segments (Unisensor USA Inc, Portsmouth, NH, USA), 2.1 mm diameter Antimony pH sensor with 6 impedance segments (Laborie, Mississauga, Canada) or 2.1mm diameter Antimony pH with 8 impedance segments (Laborie, Mississauga, Canada).

Patients fasted 3 hours prior to the measurement. Lidocaine gel was administered in case patients / parents preferred topical intranasal anesthesia.

The catheters were passed trans-nasally into the esophagus to reach from the upper esophageal sphincter to 5cm above the lower esophageal sphincter.

A Unisensor (Unisensor Attikon, Switzerland) catheter with a diameter of 2,1mm and 3 pressure sensors spaced 5 cm apart was used for ambulatory manometry.

MMS Quickview software, Solar GI acquisition system, Enschede, The Netherlands was used for reviewing the 24h pH-MII with or without ambulatory manometry.

References

1 Kahrilas PJ, Sifrim D High-resolution manometry and impedance-pH/manometry: valuable tools in clinical and investigational esophagology. Gastroenterology 2008;135(3):756-69.

2 Rosen R, Garza JM, Tipnis N, et al. An ANMS-NASPGHAN consensus document on esophageal and antroduodenal manometry in children. Neurogastroenterology and motility : the official journal of the European Gastrointestinal Motility Society 2018;30(3):10.1111/nmo.13239.

3 Kahrilas PJ, Bredenoord AJ, Fox M, et al. The Chicago Classification of esophageal motility disorders, v3.0. Neurogastroenterology and motility : the official journal of the European Gastrointestinal Motility Society 2015;27(2):160-74.

4 Wenzl TG, Benninga MA, Loots CM, et al. Indications, Methodology, and Interpretation of Combined Esophageal Impedance-pH Monitoring in Children: ESPGHAN EURO-PIG Standard Protocol. Journal of Pediatric Gastroenterology and Nutrition 2012;55(2):230-34.

5 Chumpitazi B, Nurko S Pediatric gastrointestinal motility disorders: challenges and a clinical update. Gastroenterology & hepatology 2008;4(2):140-48.

6 Ferris L, King S, McCall L, et al. Piecemeal Deglutition and the Implications for Pressure Impedance Dysphagia Assessment in Pediatrics. Journal of Pediatric Gastroenterology and Nutrition 2018;67(6):713-19.

7 Roman S, Kahrilas PJ, Boris L, et al. High-Resolution Manometry Studies Are Frequently Imperfect but Usually Still Interpretable. Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology 2011;9(12):1050-55.

8 Evans JD Straightforward Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. Pacific Grove, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing 1996.

9 Smits M, van Lennep M, Vrijlandt R, et al. Pediatric Achalasia in the Netherlands: Incidence, Clinical Course, and Quality of Life. J Pediatr 2016;169(110-5 e3.

10 Lemoine C, Aspirot A, Le Henaff G, et al. Characterization of Esophageal Motility Following Esophageal Atresia Repair Using High-Resolution Esophageal Manometry. Journal of Pediatric Gastroenterology and Nutrition 2013;56(6):609-14.

11 Rommel N, Rayyan M, Scheerens C, et al. The Potential Benefits of Applying Recent Advances in Esophageal Motility Testing in Patients with Esophageal Atresia. Front Pediatr 2017;5(137.

12 Singendonk MMJ, Omari TI, Rommel N, et al. Novel Pressure-Impedance Parameters for Evaluating Esophageal Function in Pediatric Achalasia. J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr 2018;66(1):37-42.