

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم



-Call 4000





شبكة المعلومات الجامعية التوثيق الالكتروني والميكروفيلم





جامعة عين شمس

التوثيق الإلكتروني والميكروفيلم

قسم

نقسم بالله العظيم أن المادة التي تم توثيقها وتسجيلها علي هذه الأقراص المدمجة قد أعدت دون أية تغيرات



يجب أن

تحفظ هذه الأقراص المدمجة يعبدا عن الغبار





Nutritional Screening Assessment and Early Nutrition Intervention among Hospitalized Children

Thesis

 $Submitted \ for \ Partial \ Fulfillment \ of \ MD \ in \ Pediatrics$

By

Nada Tharwat Ezzat Deraz

MB BCh (2011), Master degree in Pediatrics (2016)

Under supervision of

Prof. Dr. Mohamed Ashraf Abdel Wahed

Professor of Pediatrics Faculty of Medicine – Ain Shams University

Prof. Dr. Ehab Khairy Emam

Professor of Pediatrics Faculty of Medicine – Ain Shams University

Prof. Dr. May Fouad Nassar

Professor of Pediatrics Faculty of Medicine – Ain Shams University

Ass. Prof. Dr. Nayera Samy Mostafa

Assistant Professor of Community Medicine Faculty of Medicine – Ain Shams University

Dr. Marian Girgis Rizk

Lecturer of Pediatrics Faculty of Medicine – Ain Shams University

> Faculty of Medicine Ain Shams University 2021



سورة البقرة الآية: ٣٢

Acknowledgment

First and foremost, I feel always indebted to **ALLAH**, the Most Kind and Most Merciful.

I'd like to express my respectful thanks and profound gratitude to **Prof. Dr. Mohamed Ashraf Abdel Wahed,** Professor of Pediatrics Faculty of Medicine – Ain Shams University for his keen guidance, kind supervision, valuable advice and continuous encouragement, which made possible the completion of this work.

I am also delighted to express my deepest gratitude and thanks to **Prof. Dr. Ehab Khairy Emam,** Professor of Pediatrics, Faculty of Medicine – Ain Shams University, for his kind care, continuous supervision, valuable instructions, constant help and great assistance throughout this work.

I am deeply thankful to **Prof. Dr. May Found Massar,** Professor of Pediatrics, Faculty of Medicine – Ain Shams University, for her great help, active participation and guidance.

I wish to introduce my deep respect and thanks to Ass. Prof. Dr. Mayera Samy Mostafa, Assistant Professor of Community Medicine, Faculty of Medicine – Ain Shams University, for her kindness, supervision and cooperation in this work.

I am deeply grateful for **Dr. Marian Girgis Rizk**, Lecturer of Pediatrics, Faculty of Medicine – Ain Shams University, for her valuable help and guidance.

I would like to express my hearty thanks to all my family especially my father and husband for their support till this work was completed.

Last but not least my sincere thanks and appreciation to all patients and their families who participated in this study.

Nada Charwat

List of Contents

| Title | Page No. |
|-----------------------|----------|
| List of Abbreviations | i |
| List of Tables | ii |
| List of Figures | X |
| Introduction | 15 |
| Aim of the Work | 17 |
| Review of Literature | |
| Malnutrition | 18 |
| Nutritional Screening | 29 |
| Patients and Methods | 41 |
| Results | 67 |
| Discussion | 151 |
| Summary | 164 |
| Conclusion | 166 |
| Recommendations | 168 |
| References | 169 |
| Arabic Summary | |

List of Abbreviations

| Abb. | Full term |
|------------|---|
| ASPEN | American Society of Parenteral and Enteral |
| | Nutrition |
| BMI | Body Mass Index |
| BNF | British National Formulary |
| CDC | Center of disease control |
| CIAF | Composite Index of Anthropometric failure |
| ESPEN | European Society of Parenteral and Enteral |
| | Nutrition |
| ESPGHN | European Society for Pediatric |
| | Gastroenterology, Hepatology, and Nutrition |
| GPD | Gross Domestic Product |
| HAZ | Height Z score |
| HC | head circumference |
| MUAC | Mid-Upper Arm Circumference |
| NCHS | National Center for Health Statistics |
| NRT | Nutrition Rescue Team |
| OF | Over failure |
| OFC | Occipito-frontal circumference |
| ON | Only normal |
| | Pediatric digital scaled malnutrition risk |
| | screening tool |
| PNRS | Pediatric nutritional score |
| PNST | Pediatric nutrition screening tool |
| PYMS | Pediatric Yorkhill malnutrition score |
| SD-scores | Standard Deviation scores |
| SGA | Subjective global assessment |
| STAMP | Screening tool for the assessment of |
| | malnutrition in pediatrics |
| STRONGkids | Screening Tool for Risk on Nutritional Status |
| | and Growth |
| UF | Under failure |
| WAZ | Weight Z score |
| | World Health Organization |
| | Weight/height Z score |

List of Tables

| Table No. | Title | Page No. |
|--------------------|---|-----------|
| Table (1): | Disease group considered high STRONG _{kids} method. | |
| Table (2): | WHO classification of growth para | meters 48 |
| Table (3): | STRONG _{kids} score | 59 |
| Table (4): | The seven groups of CIAF acco | _ |
| Table (5): | The malnutrition indices: | 61 |
| Table (6): | The new CIAF model as proposed and Bose in 2018 including nine gr | • |
| Table (7): | Classification of the study according to gender | _ |
| Table (8): | Distribution of the study sample a to age groups | _ |
| Table (9): | Distribution of the study sample a to their nutritional status | |
| Table (10): | Distribution of the study sample a to order of birth | |
| Table (11): | Distribution of the study sample a to social class | _ |
| Table (12): | Distribution of the study sample a to their affiliation to specialized cli | • |
| Table (13): | Distribution of the study sample a to presence of organomegaly | _ |
| Table (14): | STRONG _{kids} score results during sof the initial sample | screening |
| Table (15): | Distribution of the study sample a to presence of chronic illness | _ |

| Table No. | Title | Page No. |
|--------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| Table (16): | Distribution of the study sample to presence of signs of nedeficiency | utritional |
| Table (17): | The initial anthropometric meas of the study sample | |
| Table (18): | The anthropometric measurement study sample after one month assessment, after removing child normal anthropometry | of NRT lren with |
| Table (19): | The anthropometric measurement study sample after six months assessment, after excluding child normal anthropometry | of NRT lren with |
| Table (20): | Prevalence of different CIAF grouinitial screening | |
| Table (21): | Comparison between the anthropometric measurements as intervention group and those a month of NRT intervention | mong the after one |
| Table (22): | Comparison between anthromeasurements among the integroup after one and six months | ervention |
| Table (23): | Comparison between anthropometric measurements are intervention group and those months of NRT intervention | initial mong the after six |
| Table (24): | Distribution of moderate and underweight at initial screening | |

| Table No. | Title | Page No. |
|--------------------|---|---------------------|
| Table (25): | Distribution of moderate and underweight after 1 month of interby NRT | rvention |
| Table (26): | Distribution of moderate and underweight after 6 mont intervention by NRT | ths of |
| Table (27): | Comparison between underweight between the initial anthrop measurements and those after on months of NRT intervention | oometric e and 6 |
| Table (28): | Distribution of moderate and stunting at initial screening | |
| Table (29): | Distribution of moderate and stunting after one month o intervention | f NRT |
| Table (30): | Distribution of moderate and stunting after 6 months of intervention | f NRT |
| Table (31): | Comparison between stunting sevinitial screening and after one months of NRT intervention | and 6 |
| Table (32): | Distribution of moderate and wasting at initial screening | |
| Table (33): | Distribution of moderate and wasting after one month o intervention | severe f NRT |
| Table (34): | Distribution of moderate and wasting at 6 months of NRT interven | severe |

| Table No. | Title | Page No. |
|--------------------|---|----------|
| Table (35): | Comparison between wasting sevinitial screening and after one months of NRT intervention | and 6 |
| Table (36): | Difference between initial la parameters and those after one months of intervention | and 6 |
| Table (37): | Classification of the under-nutrition according to gender | |
| Table (38): | Age group distribution of the nutrition group | |
| Table (39): | Order of birth distribution of the nutrition group | |
| Table (40): | Social class distribution of the nutrition group | |
| Table (41): | Distribution of the under-nutrition according to follow up in specialized | |
| Table (42): | Distribution of the under-nutrition according to presence of organomes | ~ - |
| Table (43): | Distribution of the under-nutrition according to presence of chronic illu | · - |
| Table (44): | Distribution of the under-nutrition according to presence of sinutritional deficiency | gns of |
| Table (45): | STRONG _{kids} score results in nutrition sample | |
| Table (46): | Initial anthropometric measurement the under-nutrition group | nents of |
| Table (47): | The anthropometric measurement under-nutrition group (134 paties month after NRT intervention | nts) one |

| Table No. | Title | Page No. |
|--------------------|--|------------------------------|
| Table (48): | Comparison between anthropometric measurements an under-nutrition group and those a month of NRT intervention | after one |
| Table (49): | The anthropometric measurem under-nutrition group 6 months at intervention | fter NRT |
| Table (50): | Comparison between the anthromeasurements of the undergroup (134 patients) taken after of months of NRT intervention | nutrition ne and 6 |
| Table (51): | Comparison between the anthropometric measurements under-nutrition group (134 patie those taken after 6 months intervention | of the nts) and of NRT |
| Table (52): | Distribution of moderate and underweight at initial screening on nutrition group | of under- |
| Table (53): | Distribution of moderate and underweight in the under-nutritic after one month of NRT intervention | on group |
| Table (54): | Distribution of moderate and underweight in the under-nutritic after 6 months of NRT intervention | on group |
| Table (55): | Comparison between underweight in initial screening, and after or months of NRT intervention in th nutrition group. | ne and 6 e under- |

| Table No. | Title | Page No. |
|--------------------|--|-------------------|
| Table (56): | Distribution of moderate and stunting at initial screening of the nutrition group | e under- |
| Table (57): | Distribution of moderate and stunting after 1 month of intervention in the under-nutrition | NRT |
| Table (58): | Distribution of moderate and stunting after 6 months of interver NRT in the under-nutrition group. | ntion by |
| Table (59): | Comparison between stunting sevinitial screening, and after one months of NRT intervention in the nutrition group. | and 6 e under- |
| Table (60): | Distribution of moderate and wasting at initial screening of nutrition group | under |
| Table (61): | Distribution of moderate and wasting after one month of intervention of the under-nutrition | f NRT |
| Table (62): | Distribution of moderate and wasting after 6 months of intervention | f NRT |
| Table (63): | Comparison between wasting sevinitial screening, and after one months of NRT intervention in the nutrition group. | and 6 e under- |
| Table (64): | Comparison between CIAF categinitial screening, and after one months of NRT intervention in the nutrition group. | and 6 e under- |

| Table No. | Title | Page No. |
|--------------------|--|----------------------|
| Table (65): | Classification of the overweigh | |
| Table (66): | Age group distribution of the ov | - |
| Table (67): | Order of birth distribution overweight group | |
| Table (68): | Social class distribution of the ov | - |
| Table (69): | Distribution of the overweight according to whether they followspecialized clinics | w up in |
| Table (70): | Distribution of the study sample a to presence of organomegaly | • |
| Table (71): | Distribution of the overweigh according to presence of chronic ill | |
| Table (72): | STRONG _{kids} score results in ov | • |
| Table (73): | Initial anthropometric measurer the overweight group | |
| Table (74): | The anthropometric measuremen overweight group one month af intervention | ter NRT |
| Table (75): | Comparison between anthromeasurements among the overgroup initially and one month at | erweight fter NRT |
| | intervention | 146 |