



Evan Greenwell, BA; Sabrina D'Souza, MS; Elizabeth Cash, PhD; Jeffrey Bumpous, MD; Suzanne N. King, PhD, CCC-SLP

Introduction

In the United States head and neck cancers (HNC) account for around 4% of all diagnosed cancers with an estimated 65,000 new cases developing this year^{7,8}. Dysphagia (swallowing dysfunction) is a significant toxicity following radiation based treatments. Changes in tongue base retraction and hyolaryngeal excursion are the most common physiologic changes reported. These declines in swallowing function are thought to be due to inflammation and/or fibrosis of the muscles integral for swallowing as a result of radiation injury^{1,6,7}. Dysphagia can lead to significant decreases in quality of life for patients and contribute to serious negative clinical outcomes such as aspiration related pneumonia or tube feeding placement to maintain nutrition. Of those who successfully complete treatment for laryngeal and/or oropharyngeal cancers, approximately 20-30% of these patients will develop a loco-regional recurrence². Re-irradiation is one approach for treatment of these recurrent patients who are not appropriate candidates for surgical resection. However, re-irradiation is challenging due to the risk of severe toxicities. The specific swallowing dysfunctions of patients with recurrent HNC before and after treatment is not clearly understood⁴. The goal of this study was to investigate the relationship between swallowing function and the roles treatment status, recurrence and various demographic characteristics may play in HNC patients. We hypothesized that patients with a recurrent HNC would have a greater number of swallowing deficits compared to their new HNC patient counterparts. Additionally, we hypothesized that HNC patients with lower socioeconomic-status markers would experience a greater number of swallowing deficits than their more affluent counterparts.

Methods

The information of newly diagnosed head and neck cancer patients was retrospectively gathered from electronic health records. The qualifications for inclusion included, a newly diagnosed squamous cell carcinoma head and neck cancer, treatment via radiation (with o without chemotherapy), and completion of a modified barium swallow study within two years of radiation treatment start date. Of our total HNC patient data base of ~300 patients, 41 of them had one or more modified barium swallow study report available for analysis.

Markers of swallowing function were collected from the MBSS reports for the purpose of analysis. Further information gathered included disease characteristics such as cancer staging, site and recurrence status as well as markers for anxiety/depressions (GAD-7 and PHQ-9 questionnaires).

In addition, various demographic characteristics were collected about each subject to characterize the population and explore the possible relationship between demographics and swallowing function. The 5-year average income of a patient's zip code was used to explore the relationship between socioeconomic status and swallowing outcomes⁵.

Preliminary Spearman correlations or Chi-square models determined by the nature of the data in each variable (e.g., if DV was continuous data, used Spearman; if DV was categorical, used Chi-square) were used to investigate the relationship between MBSS performance, disease characteristics and demographic information.

Factors Associated with Swallow Dysfunction Before and After Radiation-Based **Treatment for Head and Neck Cancer**

Department of Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery and Communicative Disorders, University of Louisville

Analysis

				Analy					
	Laryngeal Elevation versus Recurrence			Recurent HNC		Clinical and Demographic Characteristics (n=41) Number of Participants Percentag			
			No	Yes	P-value		Clinical Characteristics		
Otorodo		Within Normal Limits		1.2	-2.3		Oral cavity	12	29
Standa	ardized Residual	Decreased		-1.4	2.7 <.001	Site Cotegory	Larynx	13	31
						Site Category	Tonsil Oropharynx	0	14 17
							Hypopharynx	3	
Tonai	ue Base Retraction Pre	versus Post Radiation	Rac	diation Status at MBS	55		T1, T1a	2	4
ronge			Pre	Post	P-value		T1b	1	
		Within Normal Limits		0.8	-1.1	T-Staging	T2	9	
Standa	ardized Residual	Decreased		-1.1	1.5 0.025		ТЗ	16	
				-1.1	1.0		T4	13	3
							Nx, NO	21	5
Dhay	ngeal Wall Residue Pre	a and Past Padiation	Rac	diation Status at MBS	S		N1	5	1:
гнау	riyeal wall itesiuue ric	σ and Γ ust Naulation	Pre	Post	P-value	N-Staging	N2, N2a N2b	4	
		No residue present		0.7	_1		N20 N2c	4	1:
Standa	ardized Residual				0.049		N3	2	4
		Residue Present		-0.9	1.3		No	32	
						Reccurent HNC	Yes	9	
V	Allesule Desidue Dre er	d Deat Dediction	Rac	diation Status at MBS	S	Radiation Status at MBSS	Prior to start	21	5
V	allecula Residue Pre ar	id Post Radiation	Pre	Post	P-value		After completion	20	48
		No regiduo present					erage PHQ-9 Score=6.10 (mild depression	· ·	
Standa	ardized Residual	No residue present		1.4	-1.9 0.003	A	verage GAD-7 Score= 6.51 (mild anxiety	/)	
		Residue Present		-1.1	1.5		Demographic Characteristics	24	0
						Race/Ethnicicty	Non-Hispanic White Black	34	8 1
. -			Rac	diation Status at MBS	S		Single/Divorced/Widowed	20	4
Pyri	form Sinus Residue Pre	and Post Radiation	Pre	Post	P-value	Relationship Status	Married/partnered	21	5
							>60K	13	3
Standa	ardized Residual	No residue present		0.9	-1.2 0.037	Income Range by Zip Code	e 60-80K	17	4
		Residue Present		-0.9	1.2		>80K	11	2
	T Stage of	nd Longrad Eld	wation (No	n Significant)		T Stage	9		
	r-Stage a	nd Laryngeal Ele			11, 11	a T1b T2	T3 T4 P-valu	Je	
	Standar	dized Residual	Withir	n Normal Limit	ts -0	.2 0.6 -	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	0	
	Stanuar	uizeu residuai	Decre	ased	0	.2 -0.7 1.	.1 -0.2 -0.7 0.43	9	
			Boolo	4004					
	N-Stage and	Laryngeal Eleva	tion (Non-S	Significant)		N Sta	ge		
	N-Stage and	Laryngeal Eleva	tion (Non-S	Significant)	Nx, NO	N Sta	ge	P-value	
			`	, v	Nx, NO	N Sta N1 N2, N2	Ige a N2b N2c N3 F 3 0 1 0 7 -1		
	N-Stage and Standardized	d Residual	Within No	rmal Limits	Nx, N0 0.4	N Sta N1 N2, N2 4 -0.8 0.4	Ige a N2b N2c N3 F 3 0.1 0.7 -1	P-value 0.214	
		d Residual	`	rmal Limits	Nx, NO	N Sta N1 N2, N2 4 -0.8 0.4	Ige a N2b N2c N3 F 3 0.1 0.7 -1		
	Standardized	d Residual	Within Nor Decreased	rmal Limits d	Nx, N0 0.4 -0.4	N Sta N1 N2, N2 4 -0.8 0.4 4 0.9 -0.4	Ige a N2b N2c N3 F 3 0.1 0.7 -1		
Site	Standardized	d Residual	Within Nor Decreased	rmal Limits d	Nx, N0 0.4 -0.4 te Category	N Sta N1 N2, N2 4 -0.8 0.4 4 0.9 -0.4	ge N2c N3 F 3 0.1 0.7 -1 3 -0.1 -0.8 1.5	0.214	
Site	Standardized	d Residual	Within Nor Decreased on (Non-Sigr	rmal Limits d nificant)	Nx, N0 0.4 -0.4 te Category al cavity La	N Sta N1 N2, N2 4 -0.8 0.4 4 0.9 -0.4	ge a N2b N2c N3 F 3 0.1 0.7 -1 3 -0.1 -0.8 1.5 Oropharynx Hypophary	0.214 ynx P-value	
	Standardized Category and L	d Residual	Within Nor Decreased	rmal Limits d nificant)	Nx, N0 0.4 -0.4 te Category al cavity La -0.2	N1 N2, N2 4 -0.8 0.4 4 0.9 -0.4 Arynx Tonsil (0.7 -1	Ige a N2b N2c N3 F 3 0.1 0.7 -1 3 -0.1 -0.8 1.5 Oropharynx Hypophary 0.5 -(0.214 ynx P-value 0.6 0.439	
	Standardized	d Residual	Within Nor Decreased n (Non-Sigr Normal Lin	rmal Limits d nificant)	Nx, N0 0.4 -0.4 te Category al cavity La	N Sta N1 N2, N2 4 -0.8 0.4 4 0.9 -0.4	Ige a N2b N2c N3 F 3 0.1 0.7 -1 3 -0.1 -0.8 1.5 Oropharynx Hypophary 0.5 -(0.214 ynx P-value	
	Standardized Category and L	A Residual	Within Nor Decreased n (Non-Sigr Normal Lin	rmal Limits d nificant)	Nx, N0 0.4 -0.4 te Category al cavity La -0.2	N1 N2, N2 4 -0.8 0.4 4 0.9 -0.4 Arynx Tonsil (0.7 -1	Ige a N2b N2c N3 F 3 0.1 0.7 -1 3 -0.1 -0.8 1.5 Oropharynx Hypophary 0.5 -(0.214 ynx P-value 0.6 0.439	
	Standardized Category and L	A Residual	Within Nor Decreased n (Non-Sigr Normal Lin	rmal Limits d nificant) nits	Nx, NO 0.4 -0.4 te Category al cavity La -0.2 0.2	N1 N2, N2 4 -0.8 0.4 4 0.9 -0.4 Arynx Tonsil (0.7 -1	Ige a N2b N2c N3 F 3 0.1 0.7 -1 3 -0.1 -0.8 1.5 Oropharynx Hypophary 0.5 -(0.214 ynx P-value 0.6 0.439	
	Standardized Category and L	A Residual	Within Nor Decreased n (Non-Sigr Normal Lin	rmal Limits d nificant) nits	Nx, NO 0.4 -0.4 te Category al cavity La -0.2 0.2	N1 N2, N2 4 -0.8 0.4 4 0.9 -0.4 Arynx Tonsil (0.7 -1	Ige a N2b N2c N3 F 3 0.1 0.7 -1 3 -0.1 -0.8 1.5 Oropharynx Hypophary 0.5 -(0.214 ynx P-value 0.6 0.439	
	Standardized Category and L	A Residual	Within Nor Decreased n (Non-Sigr Normal Lin	rmal Limits d nificant)	Nx, NO 0.4 -0.4 te Category al cavity La -0.2 0.2	N1 N2, N2 4 -0.8 0.4 4 0.9 -0.4 Arynx Tonsil (0.7 -1	Ige a N2b N2c N3 F 3 0.1 0.7 -1 3 -0.1 -0.8 1.5 Oropharynx Hypophary 0.5 -(0.214 ynx P-value 0.6 0.439	

- and laryngeal elevation. This suggests that those presenting with a recurrent head and neck cancer may be at greater risk of dysphagia regardless of site and tumour size compared to a patient presenting with a first time cancer.
- Modified barium swallow studies which were performed following the completion of radiation were more likely to have incomplete/impaired tongue base retraction (p=.025) and pharyngeal wall residue than MBSS performed pre radiation. This suggests that deficits are occurring in the pharyngeal phase of swallowing following treatment. In contrast post radiation MBSS were significantly less likely to have vallecular residue (p=.003) and pyriform sinus residue (p=.037). This distinction stands out as it may suggest swallowing deficits are happening in separate stages of swallowing.
- function.

In contrast to our initial hypothesis we saw no clear significant relationship between socioeconomic status and swallowing



Discussion

 Recurrent HNC was associated with an increase in swallowing function deficits. As dysphagia both contributes to negative clinical outcomes and a decrease in quality of life for patients, this study lends credence to the argument that all recurrent HNC patients should receive prophylactic swallowing evaluations at the time of recurrent diagnosis.

 Changes in swallowing function following radiotherapy were observed. Deficits occurred during the pharyngeal phase of swallowing. These findings expand upon the well documented negative effects that radiotherapy can have upon swallowing ability.

 Our study did not observe any relationship between demographic characteristics/socio-economic status and swallowing function. However, we believe comparing standardized scales such as the functional oral intake scale to these factors is worth exploring in future studies as socio-economic status has repeatedly shown to be correlated with physical health⁹.

Reference

et al. (2000). Swallowing Function in Patients With Head and Neck Cancer Prior to Treatment. Archives of Otolaryngology–Head & Neck Surgery, 126(3), 371. doi: Wall LR, Ward EC, Cartmill B, Hill AJ. Physiological changes to the swallowing mechanism following (chemo)radiotherapy for head and neck cancer: a systematic review. Dysphagia. 2013;28(4):481-

2. Curtis, K. K. et al. (2016). Outcomes of patients with loco-regionally recurrent or new primary squamous cell carcinomas of the head and neck treated with curative intent reirradiation at Mayo ClinicDOLLARS. Explore Census Data. https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?q=median+income&tid=ACSST5Y2017.S1902&hidePreview=true. . Radiation Oncology, 11(1)

3. Wang, J., & Geng, L. (2019). Effects of Socioeconomic Status on Physical and Psychological Health: Lifestyle as a Mediator. International journal of environmental research and public health, 16(2), 281. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16020281Pauloski B. R. (2008). Rehabilitation of dysphagia following head and neck cancer. *Physical medicine and rehabilitation clinics of North* America, 19(4), 889-x. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmr.2008.05.01

4. United States Census Bureau. MEAN INCOME IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS (IN 2017 INFLATION-ADJUSTED DOLLARS). https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?q=median%20income&tid=ACSST5Y2017.S1902. Accessed July 23, 2021 5. Jensen, K., Lambertsen, K., & Grau, C. (2007). Late swallowing dysfunction and dysphagia after radiotherapy for pharynx cancer frequency, intensity and correlation with dose and volume parameters. Radiotherapy and oncology : journal of the European Society for Therapeutic Radiology and Oncology, 85(1), 74-82. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.radonc.2007.06.004

6. Marur, S., & Forastiere, A. A. (2008). Head and neck cancer: changing epidemiology, diagnosis, and treatment. Mayo Clinic proceedings, 83(4), 489-501. https://doi.org/10.4065/83.4.489Head and Neck Cancer - Statistics. Cancer.Net https://www.cancer.net/cancer-types/head-and-neck-cancer/statistics. Published March 23, 2021. Accessed July 22, 2021 7. Wang, J., & Geng, L. (2019). Effects of Socioeconomic Status on Physical and Psychological Health: Lifestyle as a Mediator. International journal of environmental research and public health, 16(2), 281. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16020281

Acknowledgments

This research was partial supported by USPHS grant R25-CA134283 from the National Cancer Institute.