

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم





شبكة المعلومات الجامعية التوثيق الالكتروني والميكروفيلم



جامعة عين شمس

التوثيق الإلكتروني والميكروفيلم

قسم

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



يجب أن

تحفظ هذه الأقراص المدمجة بعيدا عن الغبار





بالرسالة صفحات
لم ترد بالأصل





بعض الوثائق الأصلية تالفة



B11775

**MASTICATION AND SPEECH CONSIDERATIONS IN
PROSTHODONTIC REHABILITATION OF PARTIAL
GLOSSECTOMY PATIENTS.**

A Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for

Master Degree

In

Prosthodontics

By

Amal Abed El-Azeiz Salm

(BDS)

Prosthodontic Department

**FACULTY OF DENTISTRY
TANTA UNIVERSITY
2005**

SUPERVISORS

Prof. Dr. Samy A. EL-Badawy

*Prof. of Radiotherapy
National Cancer institute
Cairo University*

Dr. Attia A. A. El-Gendy

*Ass. prof. of Prosthodontic
Faculty of Dentistry
Tanta University*

Dr. Ibrahim R. EL-Torky

*Lecturer of Prosthodontic
Faculty of Dentistry
Tanta University*

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

"قَالُوا سُبْحَانَكَ لَا عِلْمَ لَنَا إِلَّا مَا عَلَّمْتَنَا إِنَّكَ أَنْتَ الْعَلِيمُ الْحَكِيمُ"

صدق الله العظيم

سورة البقرة (٣٢)

DEDICATED TO MY MOTHER

Acknowledgment

First of all I would like to thank "ALLAH" for his greatest mercy and virtues that enable me to finish this work.

I am deeply grateful to **Professor Dr. Samy Ahmed EL-Badawy** professor of Radiotherapy for his beneficial advice, and continuous help.

I can find no words to express my deep gratitude and my thanks to **Dr. Attia Ali El-Gendy** Assistant professor of *Prosthodontics* and the main supervisor of this study. I indebted to him for unfailing help in creation of this work and for the expertise, encouragement received from him.

My deepest appreciation and gratitude to **Dr. Ibrahim Ramadan El-Torky** lecturer of *Prosthodontics*. He always had time and patience for me. His decent guidance gave me a strong push and power to do this work.

I would like also to express my deep thanks to **Professor Dr. Abd-Elfatah Sadaka** professor of oral and maxillofacial surgery and Dean of Faculty of dentistry, Tanta University for his effort and efficient help.

I owe special thanks to **Dr Nervana Gamal El-deen** assistant professor of phonatics, ENT Department, Faculty of medicine, Ain-Shams University for her generous assistance and sincere help as regards the speech analysis.

I am also deeply grateful to **Dr. Mohamed Mamoon Elshaki** lecturer of *Prosthodontics*, Faculty of dentistry, Tanta University for sincere help as regards the computer image analysis work.

I pray that "ALLAH" will bless them all and reward them with good health.

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>FIGURE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Fig (1) Intra oral view showing patient with partial glossectomy.	75
Fig (2) Patient's tongue attempts to touch the palate.	75
Fig (3) Trial acrylic palatal plate.	76
Fig (4) Tissue conditioner impression material.	76
Fig (5) Functional impression of tongue-palatal contact during speech and swallowing.	77
Fig (6) Waxed-up palatal augmentation prosthesis.	77
Fig (7) The palatal augmentation prosthesis inserted in the oral cavity.	78
Fig (8) Mandibular partial denture metal framework.	78
Fig (9) Final silicon impression.	79
Fig (10) Finished mandibular partial denture.	79
Fig (11) Finished mandibular partial denture in the patient's mouth.	80
Fig (12) Cylinders of carrot and especial borer.	80
Fig (13) Chewed carrot dispersed on plastic sheet.	81
Fig (14) Computer screen showing UTHSCSA image tool.	81
Fig (15) Computerized Speech Lab (CSL).	82
Fig (16) CSL screen.	82

LIST OF TABLES

<u>TABLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Table (A) Shows TNM Classification.	20
Table (B) Shows AJCC cancer staging.	21
Table (1) Shows a comparison between the mean area of expectorated chewed food of glossectomy patients .	105
Table (2) Shows a comparison between the first formant frequency for normal speakers and glossectomy patients and among the glossectomy patients during pronunciation of \T\ sound .	106
Table (3) Shows a comparison between the second formant frequency for normal speakers and glossectomypatients and among the glossectomy patients during pronunciation of \T\ sound .	107
Table (4) Shows a comparison between the first formant frequency for normal speakers and glossectomy patients and among the glossectomy patients during pronunciation of \G\ sound .	108
Table (5) Shows a comparison between the second formant frequency for normal speakers and glossectomy patients and among the glossectomy patients during pronunciation of \G\ sound .	109
Table (6) Shows a comparison between the first formant frequency for normal speakers and glossectomy patients and among the glossectomy patients during pronunciation of \R\ sound .	110
Table (7) Shows a comparison between the second formant frequency for normal speakers and glossectomy patients and among the glossectomy patients during pronunciation of \R\ sound .	111

Table (8) Shows a comparison between the first formant frequency for normal speakers and glossectomy patients and among the glossectomy patients during pronunciation of \L\ sound . 112

Table (9) Shows a comparison between the second formant frequency for normal speakers and glossectomy patients and among the glossectomy patients during pronunciation of \L\ sound . 113

Table (10) Shows a comparison between the first formant frequency for normal speakers and glossectomy patients and among the glossectomy patients during pronunciation of \S\ sound . 114

Table (11) Shows a comparison between the second formant frequency for normal speakers and glossectomy patients and among the glossectomy patients during pronunciation of \S\ sound . 115

Table (12) Shows a comparison between the first formant frequency for normal speakers and glossectomy patients and among the glossectomy patients during pronunciation of \K\ sound . 116

Table (13) Shows a comparison between the second formant frequency for normal speakers and glossectomy patients and between glossectomy patients during pronunciation of \K\ sound . 120

Table (14) Shows a comparison between the percent of the normal formant shape for normal speakers and glossectomy patients and among the glossectomy patients during pronunciation of 6 words . 121

Table (15) Shows a comparison between the vowel duration for normal speakers and glossectomy patients and among the glossectomy patients during pronunciation of 6 words. 122

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

In the entire realm of human physiology, no muscular mechanism is more complicated or has more varied functions, unusual motility, and importance in social contact than the tongue.

Carcinoma of the tongue is approximately 19% of all oral cavity cancers in Gharbiah (Gharbiah Population-based Cancer Registry 2002).

Recent advances in cancer treatment and early tumor detection have greatly improved the survival rates of cancer patients for that the number of patients requiring prosthetic care after surgical treatment of the tongue carcinoma was increased.

After surgical treatment of cancer, patients with head and neck cancer often have more severe problems than other cancer patients because of serious functional difficulties such as speech impairment, chewing, and swallowing difficulties. The quality of life that arises from the rehabilitation has become the focus of attention in the past years, and maxillofacial prosthodontics is an important part of such rehabilitation.