

Therapeutic delivery from a solid formulation during breastfeeding: a feasibility study

Theresa Maier (BSc, MPhil, PhD)^{1,2}, Paula Peirce (IBCLC, RN, RM)³, Laura Baird (BSLT)³,

Sophie L. Whitehouse (BA, MA, PhD)⁴, Nigel K. H. Slater (FREng, FICHEM)¹, Kathryn

Beardsall (MD, FRCPCH)^{2,3*}

1 - Department of Chemical Engineering and Biotechnology, University of Cambridge, West Cambridge Site, Philippa Fawcett Drive, Cambridge CB3 0AS, UK

2 - Department of Paediatrics, University of Cambridge, Biomedical Campus, Cambridge CB2 0QQ, UK

3 - Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Biomedical Campus, Cambridge CB2 0QQ, UK

4 - College of Social Sciences, Arts and Humanities, University of Leicester, Leicester, LE2 1RQ, UK

***Corresponding author**

Name: Dr Kathryn Beardsall

Address: Department of Paediatrics, University of Cambridge
Cambridge Biomedical Campus, Cambridge CB2 0QQ, UK

Telephone number: +44 (0)7565964631

Fax number: +44 (0) 1223 336996

E-mail address: kb274@medschl.cam.ac.uk / kb274@ca.ac.uk

Word count: 2466 words (excluding title page, abstract, references, figures and tables)

Keywords: Breastfeeding, human milk, oral therapeutic delivery, medication systems,

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.
newborn infant, preterm infant, neonatal intensive care

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 **Background:** Enteral drug and nutrient delivery to breastfed infants depends on the use of oral
3 syringes and liquid formulations. This can pose both practical and emotional challenges to drug
4 delivery.

5 **Objectives:** The presented study aimed to explore the potential of using solid formulations for
6 therapeutic delivery during breastfeeding.

7 **Methods:** Single centre feasibility study within a tertiary level neonatal unit in the UK,
8 involving twenty-six breastfeeding mother-infant dyads. Vitamin B12 was delivered to infants
9 during breastfeeding from a solid formulation within a commercial silicon nipple shield.
10 Outcomes included the quantitative measurement of change in serum vitamin B12 and a mixed
11 methods assessment of maternal expectations and experiences.

12 **Results:** Participants described the surprising ease of ‘drug’ delivery, with no negative impact
13 on breastfeeding behaviour or sensation reported. Vitamin B12 levels rose on average from a
14 baseline of 533 pg/mL (236 - 925 pg/mL) to 1871 pg/mL (610 – 4981 pg/mL) at 6 - 8 hours
15 post-delivery. All mothers expressed their support for this approach, 85% a preference over the
16 use of oral syringes. Reasoning for support related to the reduced medicalisation of this
17 procedure compared to the use of oral syringes, and a desire for choices in relation to their
18 infants’ health.

19 **Conclusions:** This study demonstrated that therapeutic delivery from a solid formulation within
20 a nipple shield was feasible and acceptable to mothers and infants.

21 INTRODUCTION

22 Drug and nutrient delivery to breastfed infants can be challenging for parents, as many babies
23 demonstrate aversive behaviour towards drug delivery from oral syringes.[1] In low-resource
24 settings, additional challenges of liquid formulations arise due to the lack of refrigerated
25 storage.[2] To address this shortcoming, research at the University of Cambridge's Department
26 of Paediatrics and Department of Chemical Engineering and Biotechnology has been exploring
27 alternative approaches to therapeutic delivery in infancy. *In-vitro* studies have previously
28 demonstrated the potential of drug administration using a breastfeeding simulation apparatus.
29 [3,4] Qualitative studies within our Neonatal Unit also demonstrated parents' and nursing staff's
30 support for such an intervention, indicating that it could help foster mother-infant bonding and
31 encourage parental empowerment.[2]

32 The study aimed to evaluate the feasibility and acceptability of solid formulation delivery to
33 infants while breastfeeding. Following previous lab-based and qualitative research, it is the first
34 clinical feasibility study to ever be undertaken with mother-infant dyads.

35

36 METHODS

37 Study design

38 This was a single centre feasibility study, conducted from July to November 2018 at the
39 University of Cambridge Addenbrooke's Hospital Trust. The intervention involved the delivery
40 of vitamin B12 to breastfed infants via a nipple shield during a single breastfeed. Assessments
41 included quantitative measurements of serum vitamin B12 levels at baseline and 6 - 8 hours
42 after the intervention, as well as a mixed methods assessment of maternal expectations,
43 experience, and acceptability. The latter was conducted by the first author, a single female
44 researcher with clinical research training. A qualified nurse or lactation consultant known to the
45 mother provided breastfeeding support and advised on the appropriate application of the nipple
46 shield to the breast.

47 **Study population and participant recruitment**

48 Breastfeeding mother-infant dyads were recruited through convenience sampling from the
49 neonatal unit and postnatal transitional care wards.

50 The study's intention and practice was to recruit infants on the postnatal wards below one moth
51 of corrected age, while the upper limit for inclusion included corrected age <12 months. Infants
52 had to be clinically stable and competent at breastfeeding, as confirmed by the lactation team.
53 Exclusion criteria were hypersensitivity to the vitamin B12 tablet's ingredients, short bowel
54 syndrome, and malabsorption. No restrictions related to prior B12 supplementation were
55 applied, or potential interactions with human milk considered, as the study was solely designed
56 as a proof-of-principle for nutrient / therapeutic delivery during breastfeeding, not to determine
57 B12 absorption kinetics. Potentially eligible mother-infant dyads were identified by the clinical
58 team, following which mothers were approached by the research team. The total number of
59 participants was determined based on guidelines for feasibility studies and qualitative research,
60 and in alignment with the objective of reaching information saturation.[5,6]

61

62 **Nipple shield and vitamin formulation**

63 Commercial ultrathin contact nipple shields (Medela, UK) of 16 mm, 20 mm, or 24 mm size,
64 as recommended by the lactation support team, were selected and worn by mothers during the
65 study feed. Immediately prior to the breastfeed, a sublingual vitamin B12 tablet (1000 µg
66 Methylcobalamin, JustVitamins Ltd, UK), suitable for vegans and without known allergenic
67 components, was placed into the shield's teat, following which the mother breastfed as usual.
68 A baseline blood sample was taken prior to and a peak level at 6 - 8 hours after the study feed.
69 The timing for collection was based on the pharmacokinetic profile and anticipated peak B12
70 levels.[7] Samples were immediately centrifuged and separated, with serum stored at -20°C for
71 later batch analysis. Serum vitamin B12 levels were analysed using a LOCI vitamin B12 assay
72 (Siemens Healthcare) at the Core Biochemical Assay Laboratory (CBAL), Cambridge

73 University Hospitals. Vitamin B12 was chosen as a therapeutic, due to its physiological
74 importance for infant development, and its known safety profile over a wide dosage range.[8]
75 Within this study, it served as a model compound for other therapeutic formulations.

76

77 **Mixed methods approach**

78 A combination of tablet-based Likert-scale questionnaires and recorded semi-structured
79 interviews, developed based on established guidelines,[9] were undertaken before and after the
80 study feed. Interviews were performed in a quiet area at the infants' cot side to avoid separation
81 of mother and infant. Discussions focused on the evaluation of maternal expectation,
82 experience, and acceptability of the intervention. Interviews were voice-recorded, but to support
83 honest critical reporting, mothers also provided scored answers on a tablet. Data on those scores
84 was quantitatively evaluated, while semi-structured interviews were transcribed verbatim, and
85 potentially identifiable data anonymized. Analysis was facilitated by ATLAS.ti (Scientific
86 Software Development GmbH) using an inductive approach of thematic content
87 analysis.[10,11] Hereby, an initial coding framework emerged following pre-reading, a line-by-
88 line open-coding step, and regrouping. A final coding framework was developed through
89 iterative revisions within the research team. Supporting quotes are used in the following tables
90 and the main body of text to illustrate key findings, content in square brackets has been edited
91 to improve clarity and brevity. The abbreviation "NS" and "no NS" refer to the current nipple
92 shield use of the participating mother-infant pair, "Mx" to a mother's participant code. Further
93 quotes are included in the article's supplementary data.

94

95 **RESULTS**

96 A total of 60 infants were screened, including 4 twin pairs, of which 43 were eligible for
97 participation. Reasons for ineligibility included: health problems or feeding difficulties (9),
98 change to bottle feeding (4), discharge (4). Twenty-six mother-infant dyads provided their

99 consent, of which twenty dyads completed the full study protocol (Table 1). Reasons for
100 declining participation included: mother felt overwhelmed with the establishment of
101 breastfeeding (3), mother did not wish to have further infant blood samples taken (3), mother
102 declined vitamin administration (1), mother had stopped using a nipple shield (2), no reason
103 provided (8). Reasons for non-completion/exclusion from analysis in the six cases were: change
104 to bottle feeding (1), discharge before study feed (2), blood sampling time not kept (2), and
105 parent-led withdrawal (1).

106

107 **Table 1:** Participant characteristics (mother-infant pairs, n = 20).

Characteristics	Mean (range) or N (%)
Mothers' characteristics	
Mother's age, mean (range) [years]	32.4 (Range 23 – 39)
Total number of children, N (%)	
1	9 (45)
2-3	10 (50)
>3	1 (5)
Infants' characteristics	
Gestational age at birth, n (%)	
Preterm <32 weeks	3 (15)
Preterm 32 to <37 weeks	4 (20)
Term > 37 (37 to <41 weeks)	13 (65)
Birth weight, mean (range) [gram]	2769 (890 - 4145)
Age at time of study, mean (range) [days]	16.2 (2 - 70)
Corrected gestational age at time of study, mean (range) [days]	-3.7 (-30-15)
Stay of infant on Neonatal Intensive Care, N (%)	
Yes, up to 1 week	5 (25)
Yes, 1 week or longer	7 (35)
No	8 (40)
Exclusive breastfeeding at time of study, N (%)	
Yes	7 (35)
No, also NG	9 (45)
No, also bottle	4 (20)
Use of nipple shield, N (%)	
For current infant	9 (45)
Only for a previous infant	1 (5)
Never	10 (50)

108

109 **Vitamin B12 delivery**

110 Observations by the lactation and research team did not report any apparent impact of the
111 tablet's presence in the nipple shield on the process of feeding. Complete tablet disintegrating
112 and delivery of the full vitamin B12 dose was achieved in all study feeds, with no residue visible
113 to the naked eye. Changes in serum B12 levels are provided in Table 2.

114

115 **Table 2: Changes in serum vitamin B12 levels from baseline to 6-8 hours after the study**
116 **feed.** Data provided are gestational age at birth, and age at time of study. Vitamin B12 levels
117 of four infants were excluded as samples clearly showed haemolysis, affecting the assay's
118 accuracy.

Infant ID	Gestational age at birth [weeks+days]	Age at time of study [days from birth]	Baseline serum vitamin B12 level (pre study feed) [pg/mL]	Peak serum vitamin B12 level (6-8 hours post study feed) [pg/mL]	Percentage change
1	31+5	55	575	3484	506
2	26+5	70	681	2577	278
3	37+0	6	449	1743	288
4	37+2	6	858	1285	50
5	41+1	4	303	1045	245
6	31+3	30	236	4981	2011
7	38+4	21	593	1928	225
8	34+6	19	596	4104	589
9	41+1	6	430	1006	134
10	40+6	6	925	1121	21
11	37+6	4	565	1321	134
12	41+2	6	325	610	88
13	40+2	4	660	1259	91
14	40+2	6	582	1104	90
15	41+0	8	397	866	118
16	32+1	29	352	1506	328

119

120

121 **Mixed methods assessment**

122 The average duration of semi-structured interviews to assess maternal expectations and
123 experiences was 7.7 min (range 4.4 – 16.6 min) and 7.0 min (range 3.5 - 12.2 min), respectively.

124 Maternal expectations of the study feed

125 Identified themes related to the uncertainty of risks but also curiosity for the intervention, as
126 well as strong expectations of perceived emotional and practical benefits. Areas of concerns
127 included the use of a nipple shield itself, and the therapeutic it contains. In particular, for
128 mothers who have not previously used nipple shields, unknowns about the infant's reaction and
129 behaviour during the study feed were the predominant source of worry, including the infant's
130 ability to latch and the alteration of normal breastfeeding behaviour.

131 "It might take some [time] getting used to. I don't know how she is going to do with a nipple
132 shield. And I don't know whether it is going to affect her, I mean the way that she latches."

133 (M12, no NS)

134 In contrast, mother with previous experience using nipple shields, reflected exclusively on the
135 tablet's disintegration properties, its potential impact on the milk's taste and implication on
136 breastfeeding practice.

137 "[...] will it dissolve, and will she... be able to taste it?" (M2 , NS)

138 "I don't have any particular worries. Ok, I suppose if I was going to have a worry it would
139 be that it would give them a negative experience of breastfeeding and then would put them
140 of breastfeeding." (M6, NS)

141 Despite associated worries, mothers described their positivity and curiosity in attempting
142 vitamin delivery during breastfeeding.

143 "I think it's worth looking into. It is something I have never thought about. I think it is a
144 good idea." (M12, no NS)

145 "It is just quite exciting to see how it works." (M2, NS)

146 All participants expected an emotional improvement and increased convenience of infant
147 therapeutic delivery whilst feeding (Table 3). Advantages on an emotional level included the
148 reduction of stress for both mother and infant, as well as a perceived enhancement in physical
149 intimacy for some mothers (Table 3). Perceived practical benefits were related to time saving,

150 and fewer dosing errors using solid dosage forms and being “less messy” (M2, NS). Mothers
151 associated these benefits with breastfeeding as a more ‘natural’ method of delivery compared
152 to oral syringes.

153 “It seems a more natural way of administering medication. Because he would have to nurse
154 in this manner. So this shouldn’t be too different from that natural process.” (M5, no NS)

155

156 Maternal experiences of the study feed

157 The majority of mothers expressed a positive experience and a feeling of surprise in the nipple
158 shield’s ease of use for therapeutic delivery, and the lack of impact on the infant’s breastfeeding
159 behaviour. This consolidated previous positive thoughts around the use of nipple shields for
160 therapeutic delivery (Table 4). Mothers attributed their surprise about their infants’ contentment
161 to the lack of experience and emotional factors relating to preconceptions about nipple shields.

162 “I think those worries were probably fear of the unknown. Not ever using a nipple shield
163 before. Sort of remembering how they were three years ago, when I saw them in the
164 shops, and they were a little bit alien-looking... I suppose not having that practice or
165 that experience made me think ‘Oh, what is this going to feel like? And is it going to be
166 a barrier to feeding? And is he going to latch properly.’ But actually, all of that was
167 fine.” (M4, no NS)

168 Practical concerns remained regarding the potential of incomplete therapeutic delivery.

169 “What would you do - if it was an actual drug – and [you had] given only part of a dose?
170 (M2, NS)

171

172 Overarching themes: perceived advantages and acceptability

173 Mothers emphasised the potential of this therapeutic delivery method to de-medicalize infant
174 treatment by combining it with the natural process of breastfeeding. It was described by mothers
175 as “less invasive” (M7, no NS), and “not an aggressive method of delivery” (M16, no NS), “you

176 are not forcing them” (M20, no NS). This was seen as a way to ease the emotional burden for
177 mothers of infants with prior neonatal intensive care experience.

178 “[...] what’s really nice, especially for [my daughter] - because she started off her life
179 being poked and prodded, and having things stuck in her - that this is such a lovely...
180 like for babies who’ve had to undergo all that, to have something so natural, is lovely.”
181 (*moved to tears*) (M12, no NS)

182 “[...] for my daughter, because she has been in a hospital for three weeks, I would like
183 something more natural for her from now on. She had - she has - a tube in her nose, and
184 I hope that in the future, we don’t have anything clinical, you know, to deal with. [...]
185 the thought [of it] brings us back here. And not that it has been a horrible experience [on
186 the NICU], but it has been very scary. [...] at the moment, for us everything that has to
187 do with syringes and medication makes me think of NICU and, you know, this very
188 scary part of her life.” (M19, NS)

189 All mothers advocated for the availability of oral infant therapeutic administration during
190 breastfeeding, with the majority preferring this method of infant therapeutic delivery (see
191 Table 4), emphasizing that it would provide “choices to make things simpler” (M8, no NS).

192 “[...] as parents we have to make sure to give our children medications when they need
193 them, and in the most calm, you know, not upsetting way possible for them. So, having
194 the choice, since every child is different...there isn’t just one way to make it easier, I
195 think. So having more ways means that there will be more children having the best way.”
196 (M19, NS)

197 **Table 3:** Comparison of maternal expectations before and experiences reported after the study
 198 feed. The Likert scale was used (10 = highly agree, 0 = highly disagree). Further quotes can be
 199 found in Table A.1 (supplementary data).

	Likert scale before study feed	Likert scale after study feed	Change [%]
The nipple shield with a vitamin tablet...			
...will be / was easier than using an oral syringe.	7.0 ± 1.6	8.3 ± 1.8	+19
...will make / made me less worried.	7.2 ± 2.0	8.6 ± 1.5	+19
...will make / made my baby feel less upset/ distressed.	7.7 ± 1.5	8.6 ± 1.4	+12
...will help / helped me to feel closer to my baby.	7.7 ± 1.6	8.4 ± 1.7	+9

200

201 **Table 4:** Summary of reported maternal experience and acceptability of the study feed. Further
 202 quotes can be found in Table A.2 and in Table A.3 (supplementary data).

	Agreement [%]
Experience	
The nipple shield with a vitamin tablet...	
...was a positive experience	95
...was easy to use.	95
...was comfortable to wear.	95
My baby....	
...latched as usual.	95
...breastfed as usual.	90
Acceptability	
I prefer to give medicines / nutrients using a nipple shield over using an oral syringe.	85
I think the nipple shield could be an acceptable method for <u>nutrient</u> delivery.	100

I think the nipple shield could be an acceptable method for <u>medicine</u> delivery.	95
I would like that medicine / nutrient delivery during breastfeeding becomes possible for parents in the future	100

203

204

205 **DISCUSSION**

206 This is the first ever proof-of-concept study to demonstrate clinical feasibility and acceptability
207 of therapeutic delivery from a solid formulation during breastfeeding. The study demonstrated
208 that a solid formulation, placed within an ultrathin contact nipple shield, was easily dispersed
209 in human milk and that complete delivery of the tablet's 'dose' was achieved. All infants
210 showed a clear and significant rise in B12 serum levels after their study feed.

211

212 The percentage change following B12 delivery varied between infants, and seemed to be neither
213 related to the infants' gestational age nor to their B12 baseline levels, but may be related to
214 maturational age. Further analyses were beyond the scope of this study, and would require a
215 larger sample size. Future studies on specific formulations would need to assess any inter-
216 individual differences and clinical implications for dosing. The vitamin tablet and nipple shield
217 did not interfere with either infant latch, or maternal breastfeeding experience.

218

219 **Maternal perspectives**

220 Although oral syringes are routinely used for the delivery of liquid formulations, maternal
221 responses indicated their association with a predominantly negative, 'medical' sensation. While
222 it might be assumed that mothers with previous experience of neonatal intensive care would
223 regard oral syringes as a rather non-invasive intervention, our study showed that nonetheless
224 these mothers perceived the use of oral syringes as stressful.

225 Despite some pre-conceptions about the use of nipple shields, none of the mothers reported any
226 difficulties with either their use or inclusion of the tablet within the shield. This positive
227 evaluation by mothers on the use of nipple shields contrasts with literature-reported discomfort,
228 inconvenience, and the fear of nipple confusion,[12] but complements positive observations of
229 their benefits in establishing and maintaining breastfeeding with appropriate support.[13,14]
230 Anticipated anxiety related to incomplete delivery, e.g. in case taste could have impacted the
231 infant's desire to suckle, were not apparent during the study. This aligns with previous literature
232 on the infant's acquaintance with a variety of tastes and that milk may have taste masking
233 properties.[15–18]
234 In this setting of a neonatal (intensive) care unit, there was a strong desire to move to a less
235 medicalised approach and gain more ownership in care. This is in keeping with the literature,
236 which suggests mothers welcome an opportunity to build confidence in their own ability to take
237 responsibility for their infant's care,[19–22] and is an important part of mother-infant-
238 bonding.[23]

239

240 **Limitations**

241 This is a single centre study with a limited sample size, intentionally chosen to enable proof-of-
242 concept assessment while reducing unnecessary infant exposure. Studies have not previously
243 investigated single-dose B12 supplementation, and only limited data on pharmacokinetics of
244 B12 in the newborn are available for comparison. Since only mothers willing to use a nipple
245 shield provided their consent, the sample might be biased towards a more favourable evaluation.
246 However, approximately half the participants had not used a nipple shield previously, and only
247 5% of mothers declined participation due to concerns about its use. Additional studies will be
248 needed to explore different formulations and different age groups.

249 **CONCLUSIONS**

250 This is the first study to demonstrate the clinical feasibility and acceptability of therapeutic
251 delivery from a solid formulation during breastfeeding. All mothers expressed their support for
252 this approach, with 85% expressing a preference over the use of oral syringes. Further research
253 is warranted to investigate the potential range of therapeutic indications.

254 **DECLARATIONS**

255 **Acknowledgements**

256 The authors like to thank the participants for providing their time to the study. For their support
257 in facilitating the investigation, thanks is given to the nursing and medical teams on both the
258 Neonatal Intensive Care Unit and the Transitional Care Unit at the University of Cambridge
259 Addenbrooke's Hospital Trust. We would like to thank the Core Biochemical Assay Laboratory
260 (CBAL), Cambridge University Hospitals, for their support in blood sample analysis, and the
261 National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Cambridge Biomedical Research Centre.

262

263 **Ethics approval**

264 The study was approved by the London, Brighton & Sussex Research Ethics Committee
265 (18/LO/0551). All participants provided their written informed consent to take part and to be
266 quoted anonymously in this publication.

267

268 **Competing interests**

269 None declared.

270

271 **Funding**

272 The research was supported by a University of Cambridge WD Armstrong PhD studentship,
273 the University of Cambridge Kurt Hahn Trust, and the German Academic Scholarship
274 Foundation.

275

276 **Contributors**

277 TM, PP, KB designed the feasibility study and recruitment material. TM led participant
278 recruitment, supported by PP, LB, and KB. TM conducted the interviews and study feeds,
279 supported by PP and LB for several study feeds. TM and KB performed data analysis. SLW

280 provided advice with regard to the study's mixed methods approach. TM and KB wrote the
281 manuscript, which was revised by PP, LB, SLW, and NKHS. All authors provided approval for
282 publication of the final manuscript.

283 **References**

- 284 1 Helms RA, Quan DJ. *Textbook of therapeutics: drug and disease management*. 2nd ed.
285 Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins 2006.
- 286 2 Maier T, Bonner O, Peirce P, *et al*. Drug and nutrient administration on the NICU - is
287 delivery during breastfeeding an alternative to oral syringes? *J Neonatal Nursing, Press*
288 Published Online First: 2019. doi:10.1016/j.jnn.2019.09.009
- 289 3 Maier T, Scheuerle RL, Markl D, *et al*. Zinc delivery from non-woven fibres within a
290 therapeutic nipple shield. *Int J Pharm* 2018;**537**:290–9.
291 doi:10.1016/j.ijpharm.2017.12.042
- 292 4 Maier T, Kerbs A, Fruk L, *et al*. Iron delivery from liquid-core hydrogels within a
293 therapeutic nipple shield. *Eur J Pharm Sci* 2019;**131**:119–26.
294 doi:10.1016/j.ejps.2019.01.032
- 295 5 Dworkin SL. Sample size policy for qualitative studies using in-depth interviews. *Arch*
296 *Sex Behav* 2012;**41**:1319–20. doi:10.1007/s10508-012-0016-6
- 297 6 Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research
298 (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *Int J Qual Heal Care*
299 2007;**19**:349–57. doi:10.1093/intqhc/mzm042
- 300 7 Carkeet C, Dueker SR, Lango J, *et al*. Human vitamin B12 absorption measurement by
301 accelerator mass spectrometry using specifically labeled ¹⁴C-cobalamin. *Proc Natl*
302 *Acad Sci* 2006;**103**:5694–9. doi:10.1073/pnas.0601251103
- 303 8 Allen LH. Vitamin B12. *Adv Nutr* 2012;**3**:54–5. doi:10.3945/an.111.001370
- 304 9 Patton MQ. *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks: :
305 SAGE Publications 2002.

- 306 10 Richards L. *Handling qualitative data: a practical guide*. 3rd ed. London: : SAGE
307 Publications 2014.
- 308 11 Vaismoradi M, Turunen H. Content analysis and thematic analysis: Implications for
309 conducting a qualitative descriptive study. *Nurs Heal Sci* 2013;**15**:398–405.
310 doi:10.1111/nhs.12048
- 311 12 Chow S, Chow R, Popovic M, *et al*. The Use of Nipple Shields: A Review. *Front*
312 *Public Heal* 2015;**3**:8. doi:10.3389/fpubh.2015.00236
- 313 13 Chertok IRA, Schneider J, Blackburn S. A pilot study of maternal and term infant
314 outcomes associated with ultrathin nipple shield use. *J Obstet Gynecol Neonatal Nurs*
315 2006;**35**:265–72. doi:10.1111/j.1552-6909.2006.00028.x
- 316 14 Meier PP, Brown LP, Hurst NM, *et al*. Nipple shields for preterm infants: effect on
317 milk transfer and duration of breastfeeding. *J Hum Lact* 2000;**16**:106–14.
318 doi:10.1177/089033440001600205
- 319 15 Lopez FL, Ernest TB. Formulation approaches to pediatric oral drug delivery: benefits
320 and limitations of current platforms. *Expert Opin Drug Deliv* 2015;**12**:1727–40.
321 doi:10.1517/17425247.2015.1060218
- 322 16 Cosmi VD, Scaglioni S, Agostoni C. Early taste experiences and later food choices.
323 *Nutrients* 2017;**9**:107. doi:10.3390/nu9020107
- 324 17 Bravi F, Wiens F, Decarli A, *et al*. Impact of maternal nutrition on breast-milk
325 composition: a systematic review. *Am J* 2016;**104**:646–62.
326 doi:10.3945/ajcn.115.120881
- 327 18 Bennett SM, Zhou L, Hayes JE. Using milk fat to reduce the irritation and bitter taste
328 of ibuprofen. *Chemosens Percept* 2012;**5**:231–6. doi:10.1007/s12078-012-9128-6

- 329 19 Arockiasamy V, Holsti L, Albersheim S. Fathers' experiences in the neonatal intensive
330 care unit: a search for control. *Pediatrics* 2008;**121**:e215-22. doi:10.1542/peds.2007-
331 1005
- 332 20 Cescutti-Butler L, Galvin K. Parents' perceptions of staff competency in a neonatal
333 intensive care unit. *J Clin Nurs* 2003;**12**:752-61. doi:10.1046/j.1365-
334 2702.2003.00783.x
- 335 21 Lewandowski LA, Tesler MD. *Family-centered care: Putting it into action: the*
336 *SPN/ANA guide to family-centered care*. 1st ed. Washington: : American Nurses
337 Association 2003. doi:10.1039/c2cs35265f
- 338 22 Jiang S, Warre R, Qiu X, *et al*. Parents as practitioners in preterm care. *Early Hum Dev*
339 2014;**90**:781-5. doi:10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2014.08.019
- 340 23 Kennell J, McGrath S. Starting the process of mother-infant bonding. *Acta Paediatr*
341 2007;**94**:775-7. doi:10.1111/j.1651-2227.2005.tb01982.x
- 342