Memorandum

#16-074

TO: WIC Regional Directors
WIC Local Agency Directors

FROM: Amanda Hovis, Director
Nutrition Education/Clinic Services Unit
Nutrition Services Section

DATE: August 8, 2016

SUBJECT: Texas WIC Risk Code and Health History/Participant Form Revisions

The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) has updated four risk codes, 211 – Elevated Blood Lead Levels, 332 –Short Inter-pregnancy Interval, 601 –Breastfeeding Mother of Infant at Nutritional Risk, and 602 –Breastfeeding Complications or Potential Complications. All Participant Forms and Health History Forms have been revised to reflect these changes. The implementation date for the revised forms and risk code assignments is **October 1, 2016.**

Revised materials include:

- Infant Participant Form (stock # WIC-36)
- Child Participant Form (stock # WIC-38)
- Pregnant Participant Form (stock # WIC-39)
- Breastfeeding Participant Form (stock # WIC-40)
- Postpartum Participant Form (stock # WIC-41)
- Diet/Health History for Infants (stock # WIC-42)
- Health History for Children (stock # WIC-44)
- Health History for Pregnant/Breastfeeding and Postpartum Women (stock # WIC-45)
- Clinic Assessment Manual (stock # 13-06-11842)

In preparation for implementing these revised materials, please begin to deplete your current inventory of materials. All revised materials will be distributed to each Local Agency by mid-September. Brief descriptions of the Risk Code revisions are outlined below and the four Risk Codes are attached to this memo.

- <u>211 Elevated Blood Lead Levels</u>
  The *Definition* is revised to reflect the current reference value of **greater than or equal to 5 mcg/deciliter** as published in guidance from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The *Justification, Implications for WIC Nutrition Services* and *Reference* sections have been expanded and updated.

- 332 Sort Interpregnancy Interval:
  Previously titled *Closely Spaced Pregnancies.* The *Definition* cut-off is revised to reflect a more recent review of data indicating increased risks for adverse perinatal and maternal outcomes with an interpregnancy interval of **less than 18 months** of a previous birth. In addition, the revised cut-off is consistent with the Healthy People 2020 goal of reducing the proportion of pregnancies conceived within 18months of a previous birth. The *Justification, Implications for WIC Nutrition Services* and *Reference* sections have been expanded and updated.

- 601 Breastfeeding Mother of Infant at Nutritional Risk:
  Pregnant women were added as an allowable category for assignment of this risk.

- 602 Breastfeeding Complications or Potential Complications:
  Pregnant women were added as an allowable category for assignment of this risk.

Brief descriptions of changes made to the Participant Forms include:

- Infant Participant Form (stock # WIC-36) and Child Participant Form (stock # WIC-38): 211 Blood Lead Levels to match new definition.
- Pregnant Participant Form (stock # WIC-39): 211 Blood Lead Levels to match new definition; 332 Short Interpregnancy Interval to match revised risk code; 601 Breastfeeding Mother of Infant at Nutritional Risk revised to add pregnant women as an allowable category; 602 Breastfeeding Complications or Potential Complications revised to add pregnant women as an allowable category.
- Breastfeeding Participant Form (stock # WIC-40) and Postpartum Participant Form (stock # WIC-41): 211 Blood Lead Levels to match new definition; 332 Short Interpregnancy Interval to match revised risk code.

Brief descriptions of changes made to Health History Forms include:

- Diet/Health History for Infants (stock # WIC-42): question added about Blood Lead Level testing. Some questions regarding breastfeeding and formula feeding have been revised.
- Health History for Children (stock # WIC-44): question added about Blood Lead Level testing.
- Health History for Pregnant/Breastfeeding and Postpartum Women (stock # WIC-45): question added about Blood Lead Level testing.

Brief description of changes made to the Clinic Assessment Manual (stock # 13-06-11842):

- New section titled *Guidelines for High Risk Referrals.*
- All instructions have been revised to reflect new questions regarding Blood Lead Level testing, breastfeeding and formula feeding.

Please use this memo for staff training purposes. Online risk code training will be available soon.

In order to implement the updated risk codes by October 1, 2016, the risk code table in Texas WIN must be downloaded to clinics on Thursday, September 29, 2016 with end-of-day processing. If the new risk code table has not been updated by Friday, September 30 morning, please have staff call the WIC Service Desk (Help Desk) at 1-800-650-1328.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact Tiffany Brown, WIC Certification Specialist Program Coordinator, at Tiffany.Brown@dshs.state.tx.us or (512) 341-4587.

Note: Risk Codes 211, 332, 601 and 602 (all revised 10/2016) are attached to this Memo.

211
Elevated Blood Lead Levels Within the Past 12 Months (P,B,N,I,C)

Definition/ Cut-Off Value

Blood lead level of *greater than or equal to* 5 mcg/deciliter within the past 12 months. (1)*

*The cut-off value is the current reference value published in guidance from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Participant Category and Priority Level

Category	**Priority**
Pregnant Women	I
Breastfeeding Women	I
Non-Breastfeeding Women	*III*
Infants	I
Children	III

Justification

Lead poisoning is a persistent, but entirely preventable, public health problem in the United States. Elevated blood lead levels (BLLs) – levels at or above the reference value identified by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) – are a potent, pervasive neurotoxicant associated with harmful effects on health, nutritional status, learning and behavior. The CDC recognizes that there is no safe blood lead level for a mother or fetus yet there are no published guidelines for these groups. Therefore, CDC recommends that the same guidelines identified for children be used for prenatal and breastfeeding women as well as infants until specific guidelines are available. (1, 2)

Blood lead levels have been declining the the U.S. population as a whole. It is most common in children, but can occur in other groups as well. Children remain at heightened risk because they absorb lead more readily than adults and their developing nervous system is particularly vulnerable to the effects of lead. Elevated blood lead levels in children have been associated with decreased IQ, academic failure, and behavioral problems. (1)

Avoidance of lead exposure remains the primary preventive strategy for reducing adverse health effects (1). As a result of the wide variability in lead exposure in different communities, CDC recommends that state and/or local communities implement lead screening requirements based on their local data. If a state or local plan does not exist, it is recommended that the universal BLL testing according to 1991 CDC guidance be followed. (1)

Testing

Venous blood samples are the preferred method of blood lead testing. Elevated BLLs obtained using capillary (finger stick) samples should be confirmed using a venous blood test. (1)

Lead in Pregnant Women

Lead poisoning in a pregnant woman results in lead crossing the placenta and can have a detrimental impact on a developing fetus. One cause of lead poisoning in pregnant women is from practicing pica. Pica is defined as the eating of one or more nonnutritive substances on a persistent basis for a period of at least one month. Items commonly ingested include soil, clay, ice, starch, baking powder, chalk and paint. Cases of lead poisoning have been found when lead containing items, such as lead-contaminated soil and pottery, have been ingested. Pica is commonly practiced in areas of Africa, Asia, and Central America. In the United States it occurs more frequently in the South and in immigrant populations where it is culturally acceptable. In areas of the U.S. where pica is viewed negatively, women may not admit to engaging in these practices thus, it places the pregnant woman and her fetus at risk. (2, 3)

Lead in Breastfeeding Women

Lead can be passed to the infant through breast milk. Some mothers exposed to lead may be encouraged to continue breastfeeding if their BLLs are within an acceptable range. The benefits of breastfeeding outweigh the potential health consequences the infant would otherwise endure.

Key Recommendations for Initiation of Breastfeeding (2):

- Mothers with BLLs <40 mcg/dL should breastfeed.
- Mothers with confirmed BLLs ≥40 mcg/dL should begin breastfeeding when their blood lead levels drop below 40 mcg/dL. Until then, they should pump and discard their breast milk.

Lead in Infants and Children

Similarly, children with pica may also have an elevated BLL. (For more information about pica please see the Lead in Pregnant Women, above and Risk *#470* Inappropriate Nutrition Practices for Children.)

Lead poisoning is most common in children, especially those living in low income, migrant, or new refugee households. CDC recommends blood lead screening for all children at high risk for elevated BLLs with follow-up screening within 12 months.

Nutrition and Lead Absorption

Adequate consumption of calcium, iron, selenium, and zinc along with vitamins C, D and E decreases the absorption of lead in adults and lowers the susceptibility to the toxic effects in children. (2) Nutritional status affects the absorption, deposition, and excretion of lead and thus may affect lead toxicity. Infants and children with a BLL $\geq$5 mcg/dL should be assessed for the adequacy of their diet with a focus on increasing iron, calcium, and vitamin C, as follows:

- Iron deficiency anemia (IDA) can be an indicator of lead poisoning as they often coexist. Iron status should be evaluated and nutritional supplementation may be recommended by the participant's health care provider to correct and prevent IDA. Testing for IDA should occur (4):
    - Once between ages 9-12 months,
    - Again 6 months later, and
    - Annually from ages 2 to 5 years.
- Inadequate dietary calcium intake generally affects lead absorption. Results from some studies indicate that dietary calcium (when consumed at Adequate intake levels) competitively inhibits lead absorption.
- The antioxidant, vitamin C, has been shown to have natural chelating properties, enhancing the urinary elimination of lead from the body. (2, 4)

Referrals

WIC agencies must assess the history of lead testing for every infant and child. The WIC staff should make a referral to a children's health care provider if the:

- Child has never received a lead test

- Child has an elevated BLL 12 months prior and has had no interim follow-up screening
- Child is suspected by a parent or a health care provider to be at risk for lead exposure
- Child has a sibling or frequent playmate with an elevated BLL
- Participant is a recent immigrant, refugee, or foreign adoptee
- Breastfeeding or lactating woman, parent, or child's principal caregiver works professionally or recreationally with lead
- Family has a household member who uses traditional, folk, or ethnic remedies; cosmetics; or who routinely eats unregulated/uninspected food imported from abroad
- Family has been identified at increased risk for lead exposure by the health department because the family has local risk factors for lead exposure

Implications for WIC Nutrition Services

WIC nutrition services may benefit participants with lead exposure or elevated BLL in the following ways by:

- Reinforcing primary prevention strategies to avoid lead exposure and reduce adverse health effects such as offering to explain risk factors and common sources of lead, and providing a referral to lead treatment programs in health departments. Other CDC prevention tips can be found at: http://www.cdc.gov/nceh/lead/tips.htm.
- Encouraging consumption of foods (with an emphasis on the foods in the WIC food package) with nutrients that help minimize absorption of ingested lead and assist in preventing adverse consequences.
    - Calcium: Low-fat dairy, bone-in-canned fish, and fortified fruit and vegetable juices http://ods.od.nih.gov/factsheets/Calcium-HealthProfessional/
    - Iron: Lentils and beans, fortified cereals, red meats, fish, and poultry
    - http://ods.od.nih.gov/factsheets/Iron-HealthProfessional/
    - Vitamin C: Citrus fruits, tomatoes, and other fruits and vegetables http://ods.od.nih.gov/factsheets/VitaminC-HealthProfessional/

- Helping to determine source(s) of lead exposure and counsel participants on avoiding further exposure, including identification and assessment of pica behavior. (For more information, see Risk *#480* Inappropriate Nutrition Practices for Women and Risk *#470* Inappropriate Nutrition Practices for Children.)
- Working with local lead treatment programs to determine source(s) of lead exposure and to support their recommendations for reducing further exposure.
- Providing breastfeeding support to mothers with elevated BLLs who need to temporarily pump and discard their breast milk.
- Working with healthcare providers to support breastfeeding according to the CDC guidelines if lead exposure occurs in a breastfeeding dyad.

Clarification/ *Guidelines*

*WIC staff shall refer infants and children to their health care provider for any applicable reason listed in the **Referrals** section of this risk code.*

References

1. Advisory Committee on Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention. Low level lead exposure harms children: a renewed call for primary prevention. Atlanta, GA: US Department of Health and Human Services, CDC, Advisory Committee on Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention; 2012.

2. National Center for Environmental Health. Guidelines for the identification and management of lead exposure in pregnant and lactating women. Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Environmental Health, U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services, 2010.

3. Cleveland LM, Minter ML, Cobb KA, Scott AA, German VF. Lead Hazards for Pregnant Women and Children: Part 1. American Journal of Nursing. 2008; 108(10):40-49.

4. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Managing Elevated Blood Lead Levels Among Young Children: Recommendations from the Advisory Committee on Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention. Atlanta, GA: US Department of Health and Human Services, CDC, Advisory Committee on Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention; 2002. P. 59-76.

332
Short Interpregnancy Interval (P, B, N)

Definition/ Cut-Off Value

Short Interpregnancy Interval (IPI), formerly known as Closely Spaced Pregnancies, is defined as an interpregnancy interval of less than 18 months from the date of a live birth to the conception of the subsequent pregnancy for the following:

Pregnant Women: current pregnancy

Breastfeeding/Non-Breastfeeding: most recent pregnancy

Note: The evidence-based information supporting this criterion is specific to live births and did not include women who had miscarriages or stillbirths. Thus, the definition for this criterion is specific only to women who experienced live births. Women whose pregnancies did not result in a live birth may be assigned, as appropriate, Risk #321 History of Spontaneous Abortions, Fetal or Neonatal Loss.

Participant Category and Priority Level

Category	Priority
Pregnant Women	I
Breastfeeding Women	I
Non-Breastfeeding Women	*III*

Justification

Adverse maternal and infant health outcomes have been associated with short Interpregnancy Intervals (IPIs). While there is no standard definition for short IPI, an IPI less than 18 months has been associated with increased risk for adverse outcomes (1, 2). An interval of 18 to 24 months has been associated with the lowest relative risk (2). Evidence associated with the lowest relative risk for an IPI following a miscarriage or abortion is still unclear (see Clarification Section for more information) therefore only health effects associated with a short IPI following a live birth were reviewed for this criterion.

Historically, the World Health Organization (WHO) and other international authorities had recommended at least 2-3 years between pregnancies and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) had suggested an interval of 3-5 years. Given the inconsistency, various countries and regional programs requested the WHO to further review the research and provide recommendations. As a result, the report from the 2005 WHO Technical Consultation and Scientific Review of Birth Spacing recommended an inter of at least 24 months after a live birth to reduce the risk of adverse maternal, perinatal, and infant outcomes (3). A more recent review of data suggests that there are increased risks for adverse perinatal and maternal outcomes with an IPI less than 18 months (1, 2, 4) and increased risks for perinatal (1, 4) and

maternal (4, 5, 6) outcomes longer than 59 months while 18 to 24 months was associated with the lowest relative risk (2). Parallel to recent findings, Healthy People 2020 has proposed a 10% improvement in reducing the proportion of pregnancies conceived within 18 months of a previous birth (7).

Outcomes associated with short IPI have included maternal complications such as uterine rupture in women attempting a vaginal birth after a previous cesarean delivery (also referred to as VBAC) (8, 9); and perinatal and neonatal complications such as preterm birth (1, 2, 10), low birth weight (1, 2), small for gestational age (1, 2), birth defects (11), and autism (12, 13).

Short interpregnancy interval has been identified as a risk for increasing uterine rupture in women attempting a VBAC delivery (8, 9, 14). Yet when comparing short interpregnancy interval to labor type – induced labor and spontaneous, there was a decrease rate in VBAC success in women who were induced, and no difference with spontaneous labor (15). Given the lack of a specific IPI recommendation for women with a previous cesarean delivery and the inconsistencies in study designs there appears to be no specific guidelines for interval length after a cesarean delivery (16). The short interpregnancy interval definition cut-off of 18 months, however, appears to be inclusive of women who delivered by cesarean with their previous pregnancy.

Factors contributing to adverse outcomes and short IPI remain controversial. It was thought that socioeconomic factors contributed to adverse outcomes. However, when controlled for possible cofounders, short IPI remained an independent risk factor (1, 2). Nutrition-related hypothetical causal mechanisms have been proposed to explain the effects short IPIs have on health, yet research remains inconclusive (4). The Maternal Depletion Syndrome hypothesized that mothers who have a short IPI often do not have adequate time to replenish macro- and micro-nutrients which may lead to the mother and fetus competing for nutrients (17). However, a recent systematic review of the literature found no evidence to support this hypothesis (4). Studies to support the folate depletion theory have had differing results (11, 180). When folate intake in inadequate, concentrations begin to decrease in the fifth month of pregnancy and for several weeks after birth (19). Women who did not take folic acid supplementation during pregnancy, compared to women who did, were at greater risk of fetal growth restriction with a short (less than six months) IPI and, this risk was found to decrease as IPI increased (18). Of interest, a retrospective Canadian study of 46,243 women found an association between IPI (less than six months) and folate-

independent anomalies, however not for folate-dependent anomalies such as neural tube defects, cleft lip and palate, and cardiovascular defects (11). In addition, the association between short IPI and anemia was found inconclusive (2).

Implications for WIC Nutrition Services

Findings from a small pilot study found coordination of primary health care and social support services reduced adverse pregnancy outcomes and the average number of pregnancies conceived within 18 months among low-income African-Americans who previously delivered a very low birth weight baby (20). Results from a 2007 U.S. survey found that among women of childbearing age, those aged 18-24 years were the least aware of the need for folic acid prior to pregnancy and least likely to report daily use of supplements containing folic acid. Of equal concern, only 17% of women aged 18-24 years were likely to hear about folic acid from their healthcare provider (21).

Initiations of healthcare referrals for family planning, early prenatal care, and folic acid supplementation have the potential to improve health outcomes for women, infants, and children. Given that half of all pregnancies nationwide are unintended (22), WIC can help to reduce the risk of adverse pregnancy outcomes by:

- Encouraging postpartum women and their partner to meet with their healthcare provider to discuss developing a reproductive plan and birth spacing, as appropriate. http://www.cdc.gov/preconception/
- Encouraging folic acid supplementation. http://www.cdc.gov/features/folicacidbenefits/
- Encouraging healthful eating patterns consistent with the Dietary Guidelines for Americans. http://www.cnpp.usda.gov/DietaryGuidelines

Clarification/ *Guidelines*

Study results for an optimal Interpregnancy Interval (IPI) following a termination or miscarriage have been inconsistent (3, 10, 23, 24). The WHO Technical Consultation on Birth Spacing Report recommended a minimum interval of at least 6 months between a miscarriage or induced abortion and the next pregnancy. This recommendation was based on a large retrospective cross-sectional study, a review of 258,108 hospital records from several Latin American countries between 1985-2002, that found women whose previous pregnancy resulted in a spontaneous or induced abortion and had an IPI shorter than 6 months had an increased risk for adverse maternal and perinatal outcomes (21). Given several limitations in

the study the WHO cautioned against generalizing the results to other regions or even within the Latin American region since service operations and conditions may differ from the study sample (3). However, more recently a review of approximately a million California births found a decreased risk for preterm birth for women with an IPI of less than six months after a terminated pregnancy (10). An overview of the research found that there may be little benefit from delaying pregnancy after an uncomplicated miscarriage, and to that end pregnancy spacing recommendations following a miscarriage should be individually tailored to the person (25).

Before assigning this risk code, make sure pregnancy and pregnancy outcome history is documented on the WIC-45, WIC-40, or WIC-41, whichever is appropriate.

*This risk code does not apply to miscarriages or stillbirths. Please refer to the **Note** listed in the **Definition** of this risk code.*

References

1. Conde-Agudeloa A, Rosas-Bermúdez A, Kafury-Goeta AC. Birth spacing and risk of adverse perinatal outcomes: a meta-analysis. JAMA. 2006;295(15):1809-1823.

2. Shachar BZ and Deirdre JL. Interpregnancy Interval and Obstetrical Complications. Obstet Gynecol Surv. 2012;67(9):584-596.

3. World Health Organization. Report of a WHO technical consultation on birth spacing. Geneva, Switzerland, 13–15 June 2005. 2006;1-44.

4. Conde-Agudelo A, Rosas-Bermudez A, Castaño F, Norton MH. Effects of birth spacing on maternal, perinatal, infant, and child health: a systematic review of causal mechanisms. Stud Fam Plann. 2012;43(2):93-114.

5. Conde-Agudelo A, Belizán JM. Maternal morbidity and mortality associated with interpregnancy interval: cross sectional study. BMJ. 2000;321(7271):1255-9.

6. Conde-Agudelo A, Rosas-Bermúdez A, Kafury-Goeta AC. Effects of birth spacing on maternal health: a systematic review. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2007;196(4):297-308.

7. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion. Healthy People 2020. [cited 2015 Feb 1]. Available from:

http://www.healthypeople.gov/2020/topicsobjectives2020/objectivelist.aspx?topicId=13.

8. Shipp TD, Zelop CM, Repke JT, Cohen A, Lieberman E. Interdelivery Interval and Risk of Symptomatic Uterine Rupture. Obstet Gynecol. 2001;97:175–7.

9. Stamilio DM, DeFranco E, Pare´ E, Odibo AO, Peipert JF, Allsworth JE, et al. Short Interpregnancy Interval: Risk of Uterine Rupture and Complications of Vaginal Birth After Cesarean Delivery. Obstet Gynecol. 2007;110:1075–82.

10. Shachar BZ, Mayo J, Lyell D, Stevenson D, Shaw G. Interpregnancy interval length and risk of preterm birth, a large US study. American Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology. 2014;210(1)Suppl:S373. Abstract. Poster Session V, Number 760.

11. Chen I, Jhangri GS, Chandra S. Relationship between interpregnancy interval and congenital anomalies. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2014;210(6):564.e1–564.e8.

12. Cheslack-Postava K, Liu K, Bearman PS. Closely Spaced Pregnancies Are Associated With Increased Odds of Autism in California Sibling Births. Pediatrics. 2011;127(2):246-53.

13. Gunnes N, Surén P, Bresnahan M, Hornig M, Lie KK, Lipkin WI, et al. Interpregnancy Interval and Risk of Autistic Disorder. Epidemiology. 2013;24:906–912.

14. Bujold E, and Gauthier R J. Risk of Uterine Rupture Associated With an Interdelivery Interval Between 18 and 24 Months. Obstet Gynecol. 2010;115(5):1003–6.

15. Huang WH, Nakashima DK, Rumney PJ, Keegan KA Jr, Chan K. Interdelivery interval and the success of vaginal birth after cesarean delivery. Obstet Gynecol. 2002;99(1):41-4.

16. The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, Women's Health Care Physicians. ACOG Practice bulletin no. 115: Vaginal birth after previous cesarean delivery. Obstet Gynecol. 2010;116(NO.2 Pt 1):450-63.

17. King JC. The Risk of Maternal Nutritional Depletion and Poor Outcomes Increases in Early or Closely Spaced Pregnancies. J. Nutr. 2003;133:1732S–1736S.

18. van Eijsden M, Smits LJ, van der Wal MF, Bonsel GJ. Association between short interpregnancy intervals and term birth weight: the role of folate depletion. Am. J. Clin. Nutr. 2008;88(1):147-53.

19. Smits LJ, Essed GG. Short interpregnancy intervals and unfavorable pregnancy outcome: role of folate depletion. Lancet. 2001;358:2074-7.

20. Dunlop AL, Dubin C, Raynor BD, Bugg GW Jr, Schmotzer B, Brann AW Jr. Interpregnancy primary care and social support for African-American women at risk for recurrent very-low-birthweight delivery: a pilot evaluation. Matern Child Health J. 2008;12(4):461-8.

21. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Use of Supplements Containing Folic Acid Among Women of Childbearing Age --- United States, 2007. MMWR. 2008;57(01);5-8.

22. Finer LB, Zolna MR. Shifts in intended and unintended pregnancies in the United States, 2001-2008. Am J Public Health. 2014;104: S43–S48.

23. Conde-Agudeloa A, Belizána JM, Bremanb R, Brockmanb SC, Rosas-Bermudez A. Effect of the interpregnancy interval after an abortion on maternal and perinatal health in Latin America. Int J Gynaecol Obstet. 2005;89(1):S34–S40.

24. Love ER, Bhattacharya, Siladitya; Smith NC, Bhattacharya Sohinee. Effect of interpregnancy interval on outcomes of pregnancy after miscarriage: retrospective analysis of hospital episode statistics in Scotland. BMJ. 2010;341:c3967.

25. Bhattacharya, Sohinee; Smith N. Pregnancy following miscarriage: what is the optimum interpregnancy interval? Women's Health. 2011;7(2):139-141.

601
Breastfeeding Mother of Infant at Nutritional Risk (P,B)

Definition/ Cut-Off Value	A breastfeeding woman whose breastfed infant has been determined to be at nutritional risk.
Participant Category and Priority Level	**Category** — **Priority** Pregnant Women — I, II, or IV* Breastfeeding Women — I, II, or IV* * Must be same priority as at-risk infant
Justification	A breastfed infant is dependent on the mother's milk as the primary source of nutrition. Special attention should therefore be given to the health and nutritional status of the mother (5). Lactation requires approximately 500 additional Kcal per day as well as increased protein, calcium, and other vitamins and minerals (3, 1). Inadequate maternal nutrition may result in decreased nutrient content of the milk (1).
Clarification/ *Guidelines*	*You must identify what priority the infant is given in order to assign the same priority for the breastfeeding mother. Risk codes 601 and 702 are the only risk conditions in which the infant's and mother's priorities must match. This risk condition may be assigned with other risk criteria.*
References	1. Institute of Medicine. Nutrition During Lactation. National Academy Press, Washington, D.C.; 1991. 2. Lawrence RA. Breastfeeding a guide for the medical profession. St. Louis: Mosby, 1994. 3. National Research Council (U.S.), Subcommittee on the Tenth Edition of the RDAs, National Institutes of Health, Committee on Dietary Allowances. Recommended dietary allowances. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 1989. 4. WIC Program Regulations, Sect. 246.7(e)(1)(iii). 5. Worthington-Roberts BS, Williams SR. Nutrition in Pregnancy and Lactation. St. Louis: Mosby, 1993.

602
Breastfeeding Complications or Potential Complications – Women (P,B)

Definition/ Cut-Off Value

A breastfeeding woman with any of the following complications or potential complications for breastfeeding:

1. Severe breast engorgement
2. Recurrent plugged ducts
3. Mastitis (fever or flu-like symptoms with localized breast tenderness)
4. Flat or inverted nipples
5. *Cracked, bleeding or severely sore nipples*
6. *Age greater than or equal to 40 years*
7. *Failure of milk to come in by 4 days postpartum*
8. *Tandem nursing (breastfeeding two siblings who are not twins)*

Participant Category and Priority Level

Category	Priority
Pregnant Women	I
Breastfeeding Women	I

Justification

1. **Severe breast engorgement.** Severe engorgement is often caused by infrequent nursing and/or ineffective removal of milk. This severe breast congestion causes the nipple-areola area to become flattened and tense, making it difficult for the baby to latch-on correctly. The result can be sore, damaged nipples and poor milk transfer during feeding attempts. This ultimately results in diminished milk supply. When the infant is unable to latch-on or nurse effectively, alternative methods of milk expression are necessary, such as using an electric breast pump.

2. **Recurrent plugged ducts.** A clogged duct is a temporary back-up of milk that occurs when one more of the lobes of the breast do not drain well. This usually results from incomplete emptying of milk. Counseling on feeding frequency or method or advising against wearing an overly tight bra or clothing can assist.

3. **Mastitis.** Mastitis is a breast infection that causes a flu-like illness accompanied by an inflamed, painful area of the breast - putting both the health of the mother and successful breastfeeding at risk. The woman should be referred to her health care provider for antibiotic therapy.

4. **Flat or inverted nipples.** Infants may have difficulty latching-on correctly to nurse when nipples are flat or inverted. Appropriate interventions can improve nipple protractility and skilled help guiding a baby in proper breastfeeding technique can facilitate proper attachment.

5. **Cracked, bleeding or severely sore nipples.** Severe nipple pain, discomfort lasting throughout feedings, or pain persisting beyond one week postpartum is atypical and suggests the baby is not positioned correctly at the breast. Improper infant latch-on not only causes sore nipples, but impairs milk flow and leads to diminished milk supply and inadequate infant intake. There are several other causes of severe or persistent nipple pain, including Candida or staph infection. Referrals for lactation counseling and/or examination by the woman's health care provider are indicated.

6. **Age ≥ 40 years.** Older women (over 40) are more likely to experience fertility problems and perinatal risk factors that could impact the initiation of breastfeeding. Because involutional breast changes can begin in the late 30's, older mothers may have fewer functioning milk glands resulting in greater difficulty producing an abundant milk supply.

7. **Failure of milk to come in by 4 days postpartum.** Failure of milk to come in by 4 days postpartum may be a result of maternal illness or perinatal complications. This may place the infant at nutritional and/or medical risk, making temporary supplementation necessary until a normal breast milk supply is established.

8. **Tandem nursing (breastfeeding two siblings who are not twins).** With tandem nursing, the older baby may compete for nursing privileges, and care must be taken to assure that the younger baby has first access to the milk supply. The mother who chooses to tandem nurse will have increased nutritional requirements to ensure adequate milk production.

Clarification/ *Guidelines*

Breastfeeding complications are identified through the diet history and client interview. If the mother is currently experiencing a complication or has experienced any of the mentioned complications, which are interfering with or challenging the breastfeeding relationship, use this risk code.

References

1. Alexander JM, Grant AM, Campbell MJ. Randomised controlled trial of breast shells and Hoffman's exercises for inverted and non-protractile nipples. BMJ 1992; 304:1030-2.

2. Akre J. Infant Feeding. The physiological basis. Bull.World Health Organ 1989; 67 Suppl:1-108.

3. Amier, L, Garland, SM, Dennerstein, L, et al.: Candida albicans: Is it associated with nipple pain in lactating women? Gynecol Obstetr Invest; 1996; 41:30-34.

4. De Coopman J. Breastfeeding after pituitary resection: support for a theory of autocrine control of milk supply? J. Hum. Lact. 1993; 9:35-40.

5. Lawrence RA. Breastfeeding a guide for the medical profession. St. Louis: Mosby, 1994.

6. Livingstone VH, Willis CE, Berkowitz J. Staphylococcus aureus and sore nipples. Can. Fam. Physician 1996; 42:654-9.

7. Mohrbacher N, Stock J, La LL, I. The breastfeeding answer book. Schaumburg, Ill: La Leche League International, 1997.

8. Neifert M. Early assessment of the breastfeeding infant. Contemporary Pediatr. 1996 Oct; 13:142.

9. Neifert MR. The optimization of breast-feeding in the perinatal period. Clin. Perinatol. 1998; 25:303-26.

10. Neifert MR, Seacat JM, Jobe WE. Lactation failure due to insufficient glandular development of the breast. Pediatrics 1985; 76:823-8.

11. Riodan J, Auerbach KG. Breastfeeding and human lactation. Boston: Jones and Bartlett Publishers, 1993.

12. The Main Trial Collaborative Group: Preparing for breastfeeding: treatment of inverted and non-protractile nipples in pregnancy; Midwifery; 1994; 10:200.

13. Woolridge MW. Aetiology of sore nipples. Midwifery 1986; 2:172-6.