


# بِسْمِ اللّٰهِ الرَّحْمٰنِ الرَّحِیْمِ





# شبكة المعلومات الجامعية التوثيق الالكتروني والميكروفيلم



# جامعة عين شمس

التوثيق الإلكتروني والميكروفيلم


## قسم

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




## يجب أن

تحفظ هذه الأقراص المدمجة بعيدا عن الغبار






# بعض الوثائق الأصلية تالفة





# بالرسالة صفحات لم ترد بالأصل





# **Systematic Review of The Outcome of Different Modalities of Voice Rehabilitation Following Total Laryngectomy**

*Meta analysis / systemic review*

*Submitted for Partial Fulfillment of Master Degree  
in Otorhinolaryngology*

*By*

**Mohamed Samir Ahmed Kamal Mohamed Ghaly**

*M.B.B.Ch., Ain Shams University*

*Under Supervision*

**Prof. Dr. Ahmed Adly Mohamed**

*Professor of Otorhinolaryngology*

*Faculty of Medicine - Ain Shams University*

**Dr. Tarek Abdel Hamid Hamdy**

*Assistant Professor of Otorhinolaryngology*

*Faculty of Medicine - Ain Shams University*

**Dr. Anas Mohamed Askoura**

*Lecturer of Otorhinolaryngology*

*Faculty of Medicine - Ain Shams University*

*Faculty of Medicine*

*Ain Shams University*

*2020*

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

قَالَ

سَبِّحْكَ لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا مَا عَلَّمْتَنَا إِنَّكَ أَنْتَ  
الْعَلِيمُ الْعَظِيمُ

صدق الله العظيم

سورة البقرة الآية: ٣٢

# Acknowledgment

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

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

*I am also delighted to express my deepest gratitude and thanks to **Dr. Tarek Abdel Hamid Hamdy**, Assistant Professor of Otorhinolaryngology Faculty of Medicine - Ain Shams University, for his kind care, continuous supervision, valuable instructions, constant help and great assistance throughout this work.*

*I am deeply thankful to **Dr. Anas Mohamed Askoura**, Lecturer of Otorhinolaryngology Faculty of Medicine - Ain Shams University, for her great help, active participation and guidance.*

**Mohamed Samir**



# List of Contents

Title	Page No.
List of Tables .....	i
List of Figures .....	ii
List of Abbreviations.....	vi
Introduction .....	1
Aim of the Work.....	13
Review of Literature	
Anatomy & Physiology of the Larynx.....	15
Laryngectomy Rehabilitation .....	22
Patients and Methods.....	55
Results .....	71
Discussion .....	99
Summary .....	108
Conclusion & Recommendations.....	112
References .....	113
الملخص العربي.....	—

# List of Tables

Table No.	Title	Page No.
<b>Table (1):</b>	Summary of patients and study characteristics:	71
<b>Table (2):</b>	Comparison between the 2 groups of studies as regards age and sex using Kruskal-Wallis and Chi square tests. .....	72
<b>Table (3):</b>	Meta-analysis of (VHI) on group 1 vs 2 – Mean difference. ....	75
<b>Table (4):</b>	Meta-analysis of (QOL score) on group 1 vs 2 – Mean difference. ....	77
<b>Table (5):</b>	Meta-analysis of (speech intelligibility) on group 1 vs 2 – Mean difference. ....	79
<b>Table (6):</b>	Meta-analysis of (speech acceptability) on group 1 vs 2 – Mean difference. ....	81
<b>Table (7):</b>	Meta-analysis of (VHI) on group 1 vs 3 – Mean difference. ....	83
<b>Table (8):</b>	Meta-analysis of (QOL score) on group 1 vs 3 – Mean difference. ....	85
<b>Table (9):</b>	Meta-analysis of (speech acceptability) on group 1 vs 3 – Mean difference. ....	87
<b>Table (10):</b>	Meta-analysis of (speech intelligibility) on group 1 vs 3 – Mean difference. ....	89
<b>Table (11):</b>	Meta-analysis of (VHI) on group 2 vs 3 – Mean difference. ....	91
<b>Table (12):</b>	Meta-analysis of (QOL score) on group 2 vs 3 – Mean difference. ....	93
<b>Table (13):</b>	Meta-analysis of (speech intelligibility) on group 2 vs 3 – Mean difference. ....	95
<b>Table (14):</b>	Meta-analysis of (speech acceptability) on group 2 vs 3 – Mean difference. ....	97

# List of Figures

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
<b>Fig. (1):</b>	The muscles of the larynx .....	16
<b>Fig. (2):</b>	Complete glottal cycle .....	18
<b>Fig. (3):</b>	Esophageal speech. ....	25
<b>Fig. (4):</b>	Electrolarynx.....	29
<b>Fig. (5):</b>	A TEP allows a patient to channel air from the lungs through a puncture site in the back wall of the trachea, into the esophagus, and up through the pharynx mouth .....	35
<b>Fig. (6):</b>	Sizing device used to measure the depth of the tracheoesophageal wall and determine the appropriate prosthesis length .....	36
<b>Fig. (7):</b>	Tracheoesophageal voice restoration tracheoesophageal fistula with esophageal fistula indwelling voice prosthesis esophageal speech prosthesis provox voice prosthesis. ....	40
<b>Fig. (8):</b>	1-Blom-singer      Duckbill      voice      prostheses, 2-length measuring device. ....	45
<b>Fig. (9):</b>	Blom-Singer Low Pressure Non-indwelling prostheses. ....	46
<b>Fig. (10):</b>	Indwelling voice prostheses .....	47
<b>Fig. (11):</b>	Top photo shows leakage of ingested liquids around the device, which indicates an expanding tracheoesophageal tract possibly due to a prosthesis that is too long	48
<b>Fig. (12):</b>	Comparison photos of an aspirated indwelling-style prosthesis in right main bronchus on a chest x-ray film (A) versus a CT scan image (B) versus a bronchoscope (C). Only the outside ring of the esophageal flange is radiopaque .....	53

# List of Figures Cont...

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
<b>Fig. (13):</b>	Parts and Use of an Artificial Larynx .....	54
<b>Fig. (14):</b>	PRISMA flow chart for study selection.....	62
<b>Fig. (15):</b>	Forest plot of (VHI) on group 1 vs 2 - Mean difference. .....	76
<b>Fig. (16):</b>	Funnel plot of (VHI) on group 1 vs 2 - Mean difference (publication bias was non-significant).....	76
<b>Fig. (17):</b>	Forest plot of (QOL score) on group 1 vs 2 - Mean difference.....	78
<b>Fig. (18):</b>	Funnel plot of (QOL score) on group 1 vs 2 - Mean difference (publication bias was non-significant). 78	78
<b>Fig. (19):</b>	Forest plot of (speech intelligibility) on group 1 vs 2 - Mean difference.....	80
<b>Fig. (20):</b>	Funnel plot of (speech intelligibility) on group 1 vs 2 - Mean difference (publication bias was non-significant). .....	80
<b>Fig. (21):</b>	Forest plot of (speech acceptability) on group 1 vs 2 - Mean difference.....	82
<b>Fig. (22):</b>	Funnel plot of (speech acceptability) on group 1 vs 2 - Mean difference (publication bias was non-significant). .....	82
<b>Fig. (23):</b>	Forest plot of (VHI) on group 1 vs 3 - Mean difference. .....	84
<b>Fig. (24):</b>	Funnel plot of (VHI) on group 1 vs 3 - Mean difference (publication bias was non-significant).....	84
<b>Fig. (25):</b>	Forest plot of (QOL score) on group 1 vs 3 - Mean difference.....	86

# List of Figures Cont...

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
<b>Fig. (26):</b>	Funnel plot of (QOL score) on group 1 vs 3 - Mean difference (publication bias was non-significant).	86
<b>Fig. (27):</b>	Forest plot of (speech acceptability) on group 1 vs 3 - Mean difference.....	88
<b>Fig. (28):</b>	Funnel plot of (speech acceptability) on group 1 vs 3 - Mean difference (publication bias was non-significant). .....	88
<b>Fig. (29):</b>	Forest plot of (speech intelligibility) on group 1 vs 3 - Mean difference.....	90
<b>Fig. (30):</b>	Funnel plot of (speech intelligibility) on group 1 vs 3 - Mean difference (publication bias was non-significant). .....	90
<b>Fig. (31):</b>	Forest plot of (VHI) on group 2 vs 3 - Mean difference. .....	92
<b>Fig. (32):</b>	Funnel plot of (VHI) on group 2 vs 3 - Mean difference (publication bias was non-significant).....	92
<b>Fig. (33):</b>	Forest plot of (QOL score) on group 2 vs 3 - Mean difference.....	94
<b>Fig. (34):</b>	Funnel plot of (QOL score) on group 2 vs 3 - Mean difference (publication bias was non-significant).	94
<b>Fig. (35):</b>	Forest plot of (speech intelligibility) on group 2 vs 3 - Mean difference.....	96
<b>Fig. (36):</b>	Funnel plot of (speech intelligibility) on group 2 vs 3 - Mean difference (publication bias was non-significant). .....	96

# List of Figures Cont...

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
<b>Fig. (37):</b>	Forest plot of (speech acceptability) on group 2 vs 3 - Mean difference.....	98
<b>Fig. (38):</b>	Funnel plot of (speech acceptability) on group 2 vs 3 - Mean difference (publication bias was non-significant). .....	98

# List of Abbreviations

---

Abb.	Full term
CT.....	Computed tomography
EL.....	Electrolarynx
ELS.....	Electrolarynx Speech
EMG .....	Electromyography
EORTC QLQ.....	European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer Quality Of Life Questionnaires
ES .....	Esophageal speech
Fr.....	French
HADS .....	Hospital Anxiety Depression Scale
IQR.....	Inter-quartile range
PCF .....	Pharyngocutaneous fistula
PE.....	Pharyngoesophageal
PRISMA .....	Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses
QOL.....	Quality of life
RCT .....	Randomized controlled trial
SD.....	Standard deviation
SECEL .....	Self-evaluation of Communication Experiences after Laryngectomy
SIT.....	Sentence Intelligibility Test
TEP .....	Tracheoesophageal prothesis
TEP .....	Transesophageal puncture
TES.....	Tracheoesophageal Speech
TL.....	Total laryngectomy
TL.....	Total Laryngectomy
UWQOL .....	University of Washington Quality Of Life