



Guideline for the management of ingested foreign bodies

This is one of a series of statements discussing the utilization of gastrointestinal endoscopy in common clinical situations. The Standards of Practice Committee of the American Society for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy prepared this text. In preparing this guideline, a MEDLINE literature search was performed, and additional references were obtained from the bibliographies of the identified articles and from recommendations of expert consultants. When little or no data exist from well-designed prospective trials, emphasis is given to results from large series and reports from recognized experts.

Guidelines for appropriate utilization of endoscopy are based on a critical review of the available data and expert consensus. Further controlled clinical studies are needed to clarify aspects of this statement, and revision may be necessary as new data appear. Clinical consideration may justify a course of action at variance to these recommendations.

This guideline is intended to aid the endoscopist in the management of patients with possible foreign object ingestion and/or food bolus impaction. The original guideline was published in 1995. A literature search was performed on the PubMed database of the National Center for Biotechnology Information. References chosen for review were English-language citations from the gastroenterology, pediatric, emergency medicine, otolaryngology, general surgical, and radiological literature. Because little or no data exist from well-designed prospective trials, emphasis was given to results from large series and reports from recognized experts.

Foreign object ingestion and food bolus impaction occur commonly. The majority of foreign bodies that reach the GI tract, true foreign objects and food bolus impactions, will pass spontaneously. However, 10% to 20% will require nonoperative intervention, and 1% or less will require surgery.¹⁻³ Although deaths caused by foreign body ingestion have rarely been reported,^{4,5} mortality rates have been extremely low, with recent large series reporting no deaths among 852 adults and one death among 2206 children.⁶⁻¹²

The majority of foreign body ingestions occur in the pediatric population with a peak incidence between ages 6 months and 6 years.^{1,13-15} In adults, true foreign object ingestion occurs more commonly among those with psychiatric disorders, mental

retardation, or impairment caused by alcohol, and those seeking some secondary gain with access to a medical facility.^{1,16,17} Ingestion of multiple foreign objects and repeated episodes are not uncommon. Edentulous adults are also at greater risk for foreign body ingestion, including of their dental prosthesis.^{16,18} Patients presenting with food bolus impaction commonly have underlying esophageal pathology directly responsible for the impaction.^{1,3}

Impaction, perforation, or obstruction most often occurs at areas of acute angulation or physiologic narrowing. The level of the cricopharyngeus muscle and the ileocecal valve are the most clinically significant.¹⁹ Patients with prior GI tract surgery or congenital gut malformations are at increased risk for obstruction or perforation.^{20,21} Once through the esophagus, the majority of ingested foreign bodies pass through the alimentary tract uneventfully, including sharp-pointed objects.^{1-3,19} However, the risk of perforation is higher when sharp or pointed metallic objects, animal or fish bones, bread-bag clips, medication blister-packs, or toothpicks are ingested.^{3,4,22-25}

DIAGNOSIS

Older children and fully conscious, communicative adults may be able to identify the material swallowed and point to the location of discomfort. Localization of the level of impaction, however, is often not reliable.²⁶ In many instances the ingestion goes unrecognized or unreported until the onset of symptoms, which may be remote from the time of ingestion.²⁷⁻³⁰ Young children, the mentally impaired, or the psychiatrically deranged may present with choking, refusal to eat, vomiting, drooling, wheezing, bloodstained saliva, or respiratory distress.^{13,15,17,31}

Swelling, erythema, tenderness, or crepitus in the neck region may be present with oropharyngeal or proximal esophageal perforation. The abdomen should be examined for evidence of peritonitis or small bowel obstruction. These conditions will require surgical intervention and consultation should not be delayed for endoscopy. Ventilation, airway compromise, and the risk of aspiration should be assessed.

Biplane radiographs identify most true foreign objects, steak bones, and free mediastinal or peri-

toneal air. The lateral projection confirms location in the esophagus and may reveal the presence of more than one coin. However, fish or chicken bones, wood, plastic, most glass, and thin metal objects are not readily seen.¹³ A contrast examination should not be performed routinely because of the risk of aspiration and because coating of the foreign body and esophageal mucosa compromises subsequent endoscopy.¹⁹ If symptoms are not clear or specific, a cautious contrast study may be appropriate to clarify the presence of a foreign body or its location.^{32,33} CT scanning may be useful in some cases but may be negative with radiolucent objects and the yield may be improved with the use of 3D reconstruction.³⁴⁻³⁶ Handheld metal detectors detect the majority of swallowed metallic objects and may be of use as a screening tool in pediatric patients.³⁷ Persistent symptoms related to the esophagus in cases of suspected foreign body ingestion should be pursued with endoscopy even after an apparently unrevealing radiographic evaluation.¹⁹

MANAGEMENT

General

Once foreign body ingestion is diagnosed, the physician must decide whether or not intervention is necessary, what degree of urgency is called for, and by what means. Management is influenced by the patient's age and clinical condition; the size, shape, and classification of the ingested material; the anatomic location in which the object is lodged; and the technical abilities of the endoscopist.^{19,38}

The timing of endoscopic intervention in foreign body ingestion is dictated by the perceived risks of aspiration and/or perforation. Urgent endoscopic intervention is required when a sharp object or disk battery is lodged in the esophagus. Urgent intervention is also required to prevent aspiration when an ingested foreign object or food bolus impaction creates a high-grade obstruction and the patient is unable to manage his or her secretions. Those without evidence of high-grade obstruction who are not in acute distress can be handled less urgently because spontaneous passage may occur.^{1-3,39} Under no circumstances should a foreign object or food bolus impaction be allowed to remain in the esophagus beyond 24 hours from presentation.^{1,19} In children, the duration of the foreign body in the esophagus may be unknown. Complications such as transmural erosion and fistulae formation can occur. When the duration of the esophageal foreign body is not known, the endoscopy is best performed with the patient under general anesthesia, and surgical consultation is suggested.

Rigid and flexible esophagoscopy are both safe and effective methods of removing various

esophageal foreign bodies.^{1,40} Rigid esophagoscopy requires general anesthesia. Flexible endoscopy is performed with the patient under conscious sedation or general anesthesia depending on the patient's age, ability to cooperate, and the type and number of objects to be retrieved. Rigid esophagoscopy or direct laryngoscopy may be attempted for impacted sharp objects at the level of the hypopharynx and cricopharyngeus muscle.¹³ Flexible endoscopy is preferred in most other circumstances because it is successful in the majority of pediatric patients and allows a thorough examination of the esophagus, stomach, and duodenum.^{1,14,16,41,42}

Equipment

Standard and therapeutic endoscopes are preferred, although successful management of swallowed foreign objects with a transnasally inserted bronchoscope has been described.⁴² Equipment that should be readily available includes rat tooth and alligator forceps, polypectomy snare, polyp grasper, Dormier basket, retrieval net, overtubes of esophageal and gastric lengths, and a foreign body protector hood.⁴³ Practice at grasping a similar object with the available instruments outside the patient is beneficial. Use of an overtube offers airway protection during retrieval, allows for multiple passes of the endoscope during removal of multiple foreign bodies or a food impaction, and protects the esophageal mucosa from lacerations during retrieval of sharp objects.^{44,45} In children, the overtube is less commonly used because of the risk of esophageal injury during the overtube insertion. The foreign body protector hood is preferable in protecting the esophagus during removal of sharp or pointed objects. Elective endotracheal intubation is an alternative means of assuring airway protection.

Food bolus impaction

The most common esophageal foreign body in adults is impacted meat or other food bolus.¹ Patients who are in severe distress or unable to swallow oral secretions require immediate intervention. If the patient is not uncomfortable, not at risk for aspiration, and able to handle his or her secretions, then intervention need not be emergent and can be postponed to a reasonably convenient time because food impactions will often pass spontaneously.¹ However, endoscopic intervention should not be delayed beyond 24 hours from presentation because the risk of complication may increase.⁴⁶

The initial endoscopic examination should verify and locate the site of the impaction. The food bolus can usually be removed en bloc or in a piecemeal fashion with the instruments described above. As

previously stated, an overtube may facilitate multiple passes of the endoscope, protect the esophageal mucosa, and minimize the risk of aspiration. Once reduced in size, the bolus can often be passed under endoscopic visualization and direction. When the endoscope, with insufflation and distention of the esophageal lumen, can be steered around the food bolus and into the stomach, the endoscope can then be pulled back and used to gently push the bolus into the stomach.^{47,48} The high incidence of underlying esophageal pathology in this setting increases the risk associated with the practice of blindly pushing an impacted food bolus with the endoscope or a dilator.³ A friction-fit adaptor fitted to the end of the endoscope has been used as a direct-vision suction device to remove the impacted food.^{49,50}

A proteolytic enzyme, like papain, should not be used because it has been associated with hypernatremia, erosion, and esophageal perforation.^{1,51,52} The administration of glucagon 1.0 mg intravenously, in an attempt to relax the esophagus, is generally safe and may promote spontaneous passage of an impacted food bolus while definitive endoscopic therapy is being coordinated.^{53,54} However, its use should not delay definitive endoscopic removal.

Blunt objects

Coins can be removed easily with a foreign body forceps ("rat-tooth," "alligator"), snare, or a retrieval net.^{1,19,43} Smooth, round objects are best secured with a retrieval net or basket, although in a prospective in vivo study the retrieval net was superior.³⁸ Objects that cannot be easily grasped in the esophagus may be advanced into the stomach, if endoscopic visualization is afforded, where they may be more easily grasped. Nonendoscopic removal of blunt radiopaque esophageal foreign objects with a Foley catheter under fluoroscopic guidance has been reported to be successful with a low complication rate, but provides no control of the object as it is being removed, provides no airway protection, and does not allow for assessment of underlying esophageal pathology.^{19,55,56} Conservative outpatient management is indicated in almost all instances in which the foreign body has entered the stomach,^{13-15,57} although in some institutions endoscopic removal is the standard practice.^{16,41} Most objects are passed within 4 to 6 days, although some may take as long as 4 weeks. While awaiting spontaneous passage of a foreign body, patients are usually instructed to continue a regular diet and observe their stools for the ingested object. In the absence of symptoms, weekly radiographs are sufficient to follow the progression of small blunt objects not observed to pass spontaneously.^{1,3,14} In adults,

rounded objects greater than 2.5 cm in diameter are less likely to pass the pylorus. Objects that fail to leave the stomach within 3 to 4 weeks should be removed endoscopically. Once the object is past the stomach, surgical removal should be considered for objects that remain in the same location for more than 1 week.^{1,19} Symptoms of fever, vomiting, or abdominal pain are indications for immediate surgical evaluation.

Long objects

Objects longer than 6 to 10 cm, such as toothbrushes and spoons, will have difficulty passing the duodenal sweep and should be removed.^{16,58} The use of a longer (>45 cm) overtube that extends beyond the gastroesophageal junction is beneficial. The object can be grasped with a snare or basket and maneuvered into the overtube. The entire apparatus, foreign body, overtube, and endoscope can then be withdrawn in one motion, avoiding losing grasp of the object in the overtube itself.⁵⁹

Sharp-pointed objects

A myriad of ingested sharp-pointed objects have been described. The ones most commonly associated with complications are chicken and fish bones, straightened paperclips, toothpicks, needles, breadbag clips, and dental bridgework. Patients suspected of swallowing sharp-pointed objects must be evaluated to define the location of the object. Because many sharp-pointed objects are not readily visible radiographically, endoscopy should follow a negative radiologic examination. Sharp-pointed objects lodged in the esophagus represent a medical emergency. Direct laryngoscopy is an alternative for objects lodged at or above the cricopharynx. Otherwise, rigid or flexible endoscopy may be used when this is unsuccessful or for objects lodged below this area. Although the majority of sharp-pointed objects that enter the stomach will pass through the remaining GI tract without incident, the risk of a complication caused by a sharp-pointed object is as high as 35%.³ Therefore, a sharp-pointed object that has passed into the stomach or proximal duodenum should be retrieved endoscopically if it can be accomplished safely.^{1,3,22} Otherwise sharp-pointed objects may be followed with daily radiographs to document their passage, and surgical intervention should be considered for objects that fail to progress for 3 consecutive days.¹ Patients should be instructed to immediately report abdominal pain, vomiting, persistent temperature elevations, hematemesis, or melena. Endoscopic retrieval of sharp objects is accomplished with use of retrieval forceps or polypectomy snare.³⁸ The risk of mucosal injury

during sharp object retrieval can be minimized by orienting the object with point trailing during extraction, using an overtube, or fitting a protector hood to the end of the endoscope.^{19,60}

Disk batteries

Special considerations apply with small disk or button battery ingestion.^{61,62} Liquefaction necrosis and perforation can occur rapidly when a disk battery is lodged in the esophagus. After radiographic documentation, batteries lodged in the esophagus should be immediately recovered because of possible fatal complications. A stone retrieval basket or retrieval net is most often successful. An alternative method uses a through-the-scope balloon under direct vision. The balloon is passed through the working channel of the endoscope, distal to the foreign body. The balloon is inflated and withdrawn to engage the battery. The balloon, battery, and endoscope are then removed as a unit.¹ The use of an overtube or endotracheal tube is essential to protect the airway during the performance of this procedure.

If the battery cannot be directly retrieved from the esophagus, it should be pushed into the stomach where it can often be successfully retrieved with a basket. However, once in the stomach, most disk batteries pass without consequence. Batteries that have passed beyond the esophagus need not be retrieved unless the patient manifests signs or symptoms of injury to the GI tract, or a large-diameter battery (greater than 20 mm in diameter) remains in the stomach beyond 48 hours as determined by a repeat radiograph.⁶¹ Once past the duodenal sweep, 85% are passed within 72 hours.⁶³ A radiograph every 3 to 4 days is adequate. Emetics have not been beneficial in the management of disk battery ingestions and have led to retrograde migration of gastric batteries into the esophagus.⁶¹ Cathartics and acid suppression have no proven role in battery ingestion although GI lavage may expedite passage.⁶⁴

Narcotic packets

Internal concealment of narcotics wrapped in plastic or contained in latex condoms, referred to as "body packing," is seen in regions of high drug traffic.⁶⁵ The packets can usually be seen radiographically and the use of CT scanning may be helpful, although false-negative scans have been reported.^{34,35} Rupture and leakage of the contents can be fatal. No attempt should be made to remove drug packets endoscopically because of the risk of rupture. Surgical intervention is indicated for failure of the packets to progress, signs of intestinal obstruction, or suspected rupture.

REFERENCES

1. Webb WA. Management of foreign bodies of the upper gastrointestinal tract: update. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1995;41:39-51.
2. Nandi P, Ong GB. Foreign body in the esophagus: review of 2394 cases. *Br J Surg* 1978;65:5-9.
3. Vizcarrondo FJ, Brady PG, Nord HJ. Foreign bodies of the upper gastrointestinal tract. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1983;29:208-10.
4. Simic MA, Budakov BM. Fatal upper esophageal hemorrhage caused by a previously ingested chicken bone: case report. *Am J Forensic Med Pathol* 1998;19:166-8.
5. Bennet DR, Baird CJ, Chan KM, Crookes PF, Bremner CG, Gottlieb MM, et al. Zinc toxicity following massive coin ingestion. *Am J Forensic Med Pathol* 1997;18:148-53.
6. Webb WA. Management of foreign bodies of the upper gastrointestinal tract: update. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1995;41:39-51.
7. Chu KM, Choi HK, Tuen HH, Law SYK, Branicki FJ, Wong J. A prospective randomized trial comparing the use of the flexible gastroscope versus the bronchoscope in the management of foreign body ingestion. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1998;47:23-7.
8. Velitchkov NG, Grigorov GI, Losanoff JE, Kjossev KT. Ingested foreign bodies of the gastrointestinal tract: retrospective analysis of 542 cases. *World J Surg* 1996;20:1001-5.
9. Cheng W, Tam PK. Foreign-body ingestion in children in children: experience with 1265 cases. *J Pediatr Surg* 1999;34:1472-6.
10. Kim JK, Kim SS, Kim JI, Kim SW, Yang YS, Cho SH, et al. Management of foreign bodies in the gastrointestinal tract: an analysis of 104 cases in children. *Endoscopy* 1999;31:302-4.
11. Hachimi-Idrissi S, Corne L, Vandenplas Y. Management of ingested foreign bodies in childhood: our experience and review of the literature. *Eur J Emerg Med* 1998;5:319-23.
12. Panieri E, Bass DH. The management of ingested foreign bodies in children—a review of 663 cases. *Eur J Emerg Med* 1995;2:83-7.
13. Cheng W, Tam PK. Foreign-body ingestion in children in children: experience with 1265 cases. *J Pediatr Surg* 1999;34:1472-6.
14. Panieri E, Bass DH. The management of ingested foreign bodies in children—a review of 663 cases. *Eur J Emerg Med* 1995;2:83-7.
15. Hachimi-Idrissi S, Corne L, Vandenplas Y. Management of ingested foreign bodies in childhood: our experience and review of the literature. *Eur J Emerg Med* 1998;5:319-23.
16. Blaho KE, Merigian KS, Winbery SL, Park LJ, Cockrell M. Foreign body ingestions in the emergency department: case reports and review of treatment. *J Emerg Med* 1998;16:21-6.
17. Kamal I, Thompson J, Paquette DM. The hazards of vinyl glove ingestion in the mentally retarded patient with pica: new implications for surgical management. *Can J Surg* 1999;42:201-4.
18. Abdullah BJJ, Teong LK, Mahadevan J, Jalaludin A. Dental prosthesis ingested and impacted in the esophagus and orolaryngopharynx. *J Otolaryngol* 1998;27:190-4.
19. Ginsberg GG. Management of ingested foreign objects and food bolus impactions. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1995;41:33-8.
20. Macmanus JE. Perforation of the intestine by ingested foreign bodies. *JAMA* 1941;53:393-402.
21. Benjamin SB. Small bowel obstruction and the Garren-Edwards gastric bubble: an iatrogenic bezoar. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1988;34:463-7.
22. Selivanov V, Sheldon GF, Cello JP, Crass RA. Management of foreign body ingestion. *Ann Surg* 1984;199:187-91.
23. Newell KJ, Taylor B, Walton JC, Tweedie EJ. Plastic breadbag clips in the gastrointestinal tract: report of 5 cases and review of the literature. *CMAJ* 2000;162:527-9.
24. Yamada T, Sato H, Seki M, Kitagawa S, Nakagawa M,

- Shimazaki H. Successful salvage of aorto-esophageal fistula caused by a fish bone. *Ann Thorac Surg* 1996;61:1843-5.
25. Chan FK, Sung JJ, Tam PY, Kwong KH, Lau JY. "Blister pack"-induced gastrointestinal hemorrhage. *Am J Gastroenterol* 1996;92:172-3.
 26. Connolly AA, Birchall M, Walsh-Waring GP, Moore-Gillon V. Ingested foreign bodies: patient guided localization is a useful clinical tool. *Clin Otolaryngol* 1992;17:520-4.
 27. Adams DB. Endoscopic removal of entrapped coins from an intraluminal duodenal diverticulum 20 years after ingestion. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1986;32:415-6.
 28. Kirberg AE. Long standing esophageal foreign body. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1986;32:304-5.
 29. Yamamoto M. A chopstick is removed after 60 years in the duodenum. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1985;31:51.
 30. Tsui BCH, Mossey J. Occults liver abscess following clinically unsuspected ingestion of foreign bodies. *Can J Gastroenterol* 1997;11:445-8.
 31. Choudhurg CR, Bricknell MC, MacIver D. Oesophageal foreign body: an unusual cause of respiratory symptoms in a three-week-old baby. *J Laryngol Otol* 1992;106:556-7.
 32. Seikel K, Primm PA, Elizondo BJ, Remley KL. Handheld metal detector localization of ingested metallic foreign bodies. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med* 1999;153:853-7.
 33. Bassett KE, Schunk JE, Logan L. Localizing ingested coins with a metal detector. *Am J Emerg Med* 1999;17:338-41.
 34. Cranston PE, Pollack CV, Harrison RB. CT of crack cocaine ingestion. *J Comput Assist Tomogr* 1992;16:560-3.
 35. Eng JGH, Aks SE, Marcus C, Issleib S. False-negative abdominal CT scan in a cocaine body stuffer. *Am J Emerg Med* 1999;17:702-4.
 36. Takada M, Kashiwagi R, Sakane M, Tabata F, Kuroda Y. 3D-CT diagnosis for ingested foreign bodies. *Am J Emerg Med* 2000;18:192-3.
 37. Doraiswamy NV, Baig H, Hallam L. Metal detector and swallowed metal foreign bodies in children. *J Accid Emerg Med* 1999;16:123-5.
 38. Faigel DO, Stotland BR, Kochman ML, Hoops T, Judge T, Kroser J, et al. Device choice and experience level in endoscopic foreign object retrieval: an in vivo study. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1997;45:490-2.
 39. Bendig DW, Machel GG. Management of smooth-blunt gastric foreign bodies in asymptomatic patients. *Clin Pediatr* 1990;29:642-5.
 40. Herranz-Gonzalez J, Martinez-Vidal J, Bardin-Saranderesa C, Vazquez-Barro C. Esophageal foreign bodies in adults. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 1991;105:649-54.
 41. Kim JK, Kim SS, Kim JI, Kim SW, Yang YS, Cho SH, et al. Management of foreign bodies in the gastrointestinal tract: an analysis of 104 cases in children. *Endoscopy* 1999;31:302-4.
 42. Chu KM, Choi HK, Tuen HH, Law SYK, Branicki FJ, Wong J. A prospective randomized trial comparing the use of the flexible gastroscope versus the bronchoscope in the management of foreign body ingestion. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1998;47:23-7.
 43. Nelson DB, Bosco JJ, Curtis W, Faigel DO, Kelsey PB, Leung JW, et al. Endoscopic retrieval devices. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1999;50:932-4.
 44. Spurling TJ, Zaloga GP, Richter JE. Fiberendoscopic removal of a gastric foreign body with an overtube technique. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1983;29:226-7.
 45. Carr-Locke DL, al-Kawas FH, Branch MS, Byrne WJ, Edmundowicz SA, Jamidar PA, et al. Overtube use in gastrointestinal endoscopy. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1996;44:767-70.
 46. Chaikhouni A, Kratz JM, Crawford FA. Foreign bodies of the esophagus. *Am Surg* 1985;51:173-9.
 47. Vicari JJ, Johanson JF, Frakes JT. Outcomes of acute esophageal food impaction: success of the push technique. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2001;53:178-81.
 48. Longstreth GF, Longstreth KJ, Yao JF. Esophageal food impaction: epidemiology and therapy. A retrospective, observational study. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2001;53:193-8.
 49. Saeed ZA, Michaletz PA, Feiner SD, Woods KL, Graham DY. A new endoscopic method for managing food impactions. *Endoscopy* 1990;22:226-8.
 50. Pezzi JS, Shiau YF. A method for removing meat impactions from the esophagus. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1994;40:634-6.
 51. Anderson HA, Bernatz PE, Grindlay JH. Perforation of the esophagus after use of a digestive agent: report of a case and experimental study. *Ann Otol Rhinol Laryngol* 1959;68:890.
 52. Holsinger JW, Furson RL, Sealy WC. Esophageal perforation following meat impaction and papain ingestion. *JAMA* 1968;204:188.
 53. Ferruci TJ, Long JA. Radiologic treatment of esophageal food impaction using intravenous glucagon. *Radiology* 1977;125:25-8.
 54. Trenkner SW, Maglente D, Lehman GA, Chernish SM, Miller RE, Johnson CW. Esophageal food impaction: treatment with glucagon. *Radiology* 1983;149:401.
 55. Schunk JE, Harrison AM, Corneli HM, Nixon GW. Fluoroscopic foley catheter removal of esophageal foreign bodies in children: experience in 415 episodes. *Pediatrics* 1994;96:791-2.
 56. Faigel DO, Fennerty MB. Miscellaneous diseases of the esophagus. In: Yamada T, editor. *Textbook of gastroenterology*. Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; 1999. p. 1304-25.
 57. Stringer MD, Capps SN. Rationalizing the management of swallowed coins in children. *Br Med J* 1991;302:1321-2.
 58. Pellerin D, Fortier-Beaulieu M, Guegen J. The fate of swallowed foreign bodies: experience of 1250 instances of subdiaphragmatic foreign bodies in children. *Prog Pediatr Radiol* 1969;2:302.
 59. Chinitz MA, Bertrand CZ. Endoscopic removal of toothbrushes. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1990;36:527-30.
 60. Bertoni G, Sassatelli R, Conigliaro R, Bedogni G. A simple latex protector hood for safe endoscopic removal of sharp-pointed gastroesophageal foreign bodies. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1996;44:458-61.
 61. Litovitz TL, Schmitz BF. Ingestions of cylindrical and button batteries: an analysis of 2382 cases. *Pediatrics* 1992;89:747-57.
 62. Gordon AC, Gough MH. Oesophageal perforation after button battery ingestion. *Ann R Coll Surg Engl* 1993;75:362.
 63. Litovitz TL. Battery ingestions: product accessibility and clinical course. *Pediatrics* 1985;75:469-76.
 64. Namasivayam S. Button battery ingestion: a solution to a dilemma. *Pediatr Surg Int* 1999;15:383-4.
 65. Lancashire MJR, Legg PK, Lowe M, Davidson SM, Ellis BW. Surgical aspects of international drug smuggling. *Br Med J* 1988;296:1035-7.

**Prepared by:
Standards of Practice Committee**

Glenn M. Eisen, MD, Chair
 Todd H. Baron, MD
 Jason A. Dominitz, MD
 Douglas O. Faigel, MD
 Jay L. Goldstein, MD
 John F. Johanson, MD
 J. Shawn Mallery, MD
 Hareth M. Raddawi, MD
 John J. Vargo II, MD
 J. Patrick Waring, MD
 Robert D. Fanelli, SAGES Rep
 Jo Wheeler-Harbough, SGNA Rep