

Grade of Dysphonia: Correlation with Patient Self-Assessment Questionnaire and Acoustic measures

Thesis

Submitted for the partial fulfillment of the requirement
of Master Degree in Phoniatics

By

Fatma El-zhraa Mohamed El-Metwally

M.B., B.Ch.

Resident of Phoniatics, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University

Supervised by

Prof. Dr. Rasha Mohammed Shoeib

Professor of Phoniatics

Faculty of Medicine - Ain Shams University

Dr. Yomna Hassan Elfiky

Lecturer of Phoniatics

Faculty of Medicine - Ain Shams University

Faculty of Medicine

Ain Shams University

2018



First of all, thanks to **Allah** for helping and guiding me in accomplishing this work and for everything else I have.

Words are not sufficient to express my sincerest appreciation and my deepest gratitude to **Prof. Dr. Rasha Mohammed Shoeib**, Professor of Phoniatics, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, for her continuous encouragement, and her precious remarks which guided me to present this work in its proper way, it was indeed an honor to have been supervised by her.

I would like to thank **Dr. Yomna Hassan Elfiky**, Lecturer of Phoniatics, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, for her guidance and suggestions which were of great value to me.

An endless thanks for **my family** for their support without it, I would never completed this work.

Fatma El-zhraa Mohamed El-Metwally

Contents

	<i>Page No.</i>
• List of figures	I
• List of Tables	III
• Abbreviations	V
• Introduction	1
• Aim of the work	7
• Review of Literature:	
○ Chapter (1): Anatomy and Physiology	8
○ Chapter (2): Voice Disorders	14
○ Chapter (3): Quality of Life & Self- Assessment Questionnaire	37
• Subjects and Methods	71
• Results	81
• Discussion	100
• Summary	110
• Conclusion and Recommendations	113
• References	115
• Appendices	137
• Arabic summary	—

LIST OF FIGURES

<i>Fig. No.</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Page No.</i>
Figure (1):	Anatomical landmarks of the larynx	11
Figure (2):	Left vocal fold polyp	25
Figure (3a):	Vocal fold nodules during respiration	26
Figure (3b):	Vocal fold nodules during phonation	26
Figure (4):	Left vocal fold cyst	27
Figure (5):	Bilateral vocal folds Reink's edema	29
Figure (6):	Left vocal process granuloma	31
Figure (7):	Means of age in the case and control groups.	83
Figure (8):	Gender distribution in the case and control groups	83
Figure (9):	Distribution of diagnosis among the cases	85
Figure (10):	Distribution of grade of dysphonia among the cases	86
Figure (11):	Means of Average fundamental frequency in the case and control groups	88

Figure (12): Means of Jitter %, RAP %, Shimmer % and APQ % in the case and control groups	88
Figure (13): Means of Noise harmonic ratio in the case and control groups	89
Figure (14): Correlation between Grade of dysphonia and functional subscale of VHI	93
Figure (15): Correlation between Grade of dysphonia and APQ	95
Figure (16): Correlation between VHI total score and F0	97
Figure (17): Correlation between Functional subscale score and F0	98

LIST OF TABLES

<i>Table No.</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Page No.</i>
Table (1):	Major voice-disordered quality of life instruments	50
Table (2):	Comparison between cases and controls regarding personal data	82
Table (3):	Description of the diagnosis among the cases group	84
Table (4):	Description of grade of dysphonia among cases group	86
Table (5):	Comparison between cases and controls regarding acoustic parameters	87
Table (6):	Description of VHI total score and its three subscales among cases group	90
Table (7):	Comparison between males and females as regard VHI total score	91
Table (8):	Correlations between Grade of dysphonia and VHI total score and its three subscales among cases group	92
Table (9):	Correlations between Grade of dysphonia and acoustic parameters	94

Table (10): Correlations between VHI total score and acoustic parameters among cases group	96
Table (11): Correlations between Functional subscale score and acoustic parameters among cases group	97
Table (12): Correlations between physical subscale score and acoustic parameters among cases group	98
Table (13): Correlations between emotional subscale score and acoustic parameters among cases group	99

List of Abbreviations

AC	Arytenoid Cartilage.
APA	Auditory perceptual assessment.
APQ%	Amplitude perturbation quotient.
Arabic CSHI ...	Arabic Classical Singing Handicap index.
Arabic p-VHI ...	Arabic Pediatric Voice Handicap Index.
Arabic VHI ...	Arabic Voice Handicap Index.
Arabic VHI-10 ...	Arabic voice Handicap Index-10.
CAJ	Cricoarytenoid Joint.
CC	Cricoid Cartilage.
CSHI	Classical Singing Handicap Index.
CT	Cricothyroid muscle.
CTJ	Cricothyroid Joint.
dB	Decibel.
DLP	Deep layer of lamina propria.
E	Epithelium.
F0	Fundamental Frequency.
FVD	Functional voice disorder.
HRQOL	Health related quality of life.
IA	Interarytenoid Muscle.

ICF International Classification of Functioning.

ILP Intermediate layer of lamina propria.

Jitt% Jitter percent.

LCA..... Lateral Cricoarytenoid muscle.

LP Lamina propria.

MAPLs..... Minimal Associated Pathological Lesions.

MDVP Multi-Dimensional Voice Program.

MOS Medical outcomes study.

MTD..... Muscle tension disorder.

NHR Noise-to-harmonic ratio.

OVD Organic voice disorder.

p-VHI..... Pediatric Voice Handicap Index.

PVOS Pediatric Voice Outcomes Survey.

PV-RQOL.... Pediatric Voice-Related Quality of Life.

QOL Quality of life.

RAP% Relative average perturbation.

RFS Reflux Finding Score.

RSI Reflux Symptom Index.

SD Standard Deviation.

SF-36 Short form-36.

SF-36v2..... Short form-36 version 2.

Shim% Shimmer percent.

SLP..... Superficial layer of the lamina propria.

SVHI Singing Voice Handicap Index.

SVHI-10..... Singing Voice Handicap Index-10.

TA Thyroarytenoid muscle.

TC Thyroid Cartilage.

VAPP Voice Activity and Participation Profile.

VDQOL Voice disordered quality of life.

VHI Voice Handicap Index.

VHI-10 Voice Handicap Index-10.

VHI-P..... Voice Handicap Index-Partner.

VoiSS..... Voice Symptom Scale.

VOS..... Voice Outcomes Survey.

VPQ..... Vocal Performance Questionnaire.

V-RQOL Voice-Related Quality of Life Measure.

WHO..... World Health Organization.

INTRODUCTION

Health-related quality of life refers to patient-perceived impact of disease and treatment on physical, psychological, and social functions. One of the main domains in health-related quality of life is voice disordered quality of life (**Dehqan et al., 2017**).

As the primary means of communication, voice plays an important role in daily life. Voice also conveys personal information such as social status, personal traits, and the emotional state of the speaker (**Zhang, 2016**). It is an important tool and plays a significant role in today's society as well as in one's personal life. This is indicated by the fact that over 25 % of the working society depend on their voice during practicing their profession. Because of vocal abuse and vocal misuse, patients develop voice problems (**Stuut et al., 2014**).

Voice is the complex, dynamic product of vocal fold vibration that allows us to vocalize (i.e. make sound) and verbalize (i.e. produce language through speech) (**Justice, 2006**). In other words, voice is the acoustic outputs from the Larynx that are characterized by their dependence on Vocal fold vibratory inputs. The quality of the voice is wholly dependent upon the vibratory characteristics of the laryngeal structure (**Daniel and Stanley, 2016**).

Disruption of the voice function may occur as a result of fault in one or more of the following: the range of movement of the vocal folds, movement of the mucosa over the deeper structures, the coaptation of the vocal fold's edges, the timing between the closure of the vocal folds and the pulmonary exhalation, the motor force, the pulmonary breath control, and the tuning of the vocal fold musculature **(Kotby et al., 2016)**. There are other definitions of voice disorder including: "an abnormality of one or more of the three characteristics of voice: pitch, intensity, and quality", "any time the voice does not work, perform, or sound as it normally should, so that it interferes with communication". Among various definitions, those ones adequately suggest that a voice disorder occurs when there is some physical and perceptual difference in the voice of an individual **(Byrd et al., 2013)**.

Voice disorders can be classified into **(Kotby et al., 2016)**:

- Organic voice disorders where there are detectable morphological changes in the vocal apparatus.
- Non-organic voice disorders where no visible structural or neurological pathology exists to explain the voice disturbance (the larynx is organically free).
- Minimal Associated Pathological Lesions (MAPLs) which is non-neoplastic, non-inflammatory, traumatic

lesion of the vocal fold. This group occupies a position somewhere between the organic benign, and non-organic groups as they are usually associated with and might have been predisposed by long standing non-organic vocal dysfunction.

- Accompaniments of neuro-psychiatric ailments as an element of dysarthrophonia or personality and mood changes.

There are different symptoms of voice disorders ranging from *Dysphonia* "change of voice", *Aphonia* "loss of voice", *Dysodia* "change of singing voice", and *Phonasthenia* "voice fatigue". Phonasthenia gives rise to symptoms like; throat dryness, throat soreness, frequent clearance of the throat, tightness in the neck over the larynx and difficulty in swallowing sticky throat (**Kotby et al., 2016**).

As the individual's expressions in all social realms manifested through the voice; hence the impact of voice disorders will be major on the patient. It is estimated that 50–60 % of patients with voice disorders experience social, psychological and physical problems due to their voice problem. The impact varies per patient and depends on several factors such as personal and professional demands and the ability to cope with the problem and adjust to the problem (**Stuut et al., 2014**). Therefore, voice problems have

negative impact on patient's quality of life. The definition of quality of life is broad and subjective, comprehending aspects related to the population's health, culture, and socioeconomic conditions (**World Health Organization, 1997**).

There are many protocols and measures to assess the severity of voice disorders however, measuring the severity of voice disorders is difficult as methods have ranged from subjective measures including perceptual judgements to objective measures of voice characteristics (e.g. acoustic analysis and aerodynamic measurements) (**Roy et al., 2013**).

The vocal assessment process should consider the multidimensionality involved in the demonstration of a voice disorder. The assessment should include a perceptual assessment of vocal quality, visual examination of the larynx, aerodynamic measures, acoustic analysis, and vocal self-assessment procedures. Each of these items has a specific relevance and provides particular information on voice disorder, whether in view of the clinician or the patient. Clinical decisions for treatment to be offered should use the integrated interpretation of these data, enabling the characterization of vocal behavior, identification of the possible etiology and triggering and maintaining factors, and description of the vocal adjustments used and the association

between the vocal aspects and the impact caused on patient's communication (**Lopes et al., 2016**).

Auditory perceptual assessments are often the golden standard to assess voice disorders in clinical decisions and are the standard where the objective measurements are being compared to (**De Bodt et al., 2015**). However, auditory perceptual assessment classifies severity of vocal disorders but does not address the impact of the vocal disorder has on quality of life. The impact that the disorder has on quality of life may go beyond the level of perceived voice change. In practical terms, two subjects with similar dysphonia may experience different impacts on their quality of life, depending on their vocal needs. So, self-perception of vocal changes, as in any other specific health issue, is a factor that is difficult to measure and highly relevant to the voice therapy intervention process (**Spina et al., 2009**).

Therefore, various quality of life questionnaires have been developed for populations with voice disorders such as the **Voice Symptom Scale (VoiSS)** (**Deary et al., 2003**), the **Voice Related Quality of Life Measure (V-RQOL)** (**Hogikyan and Sethuraman, 1999**), the **Vocal Performance Questionnaire (VPQ)** (**Carding et al., 1999**), and the **Voice Handicap Index (VHI)** (**Jacobson et al., 1997**). Although all of these questionnaires were valuable but VHI was more accepted and has been used widely in