



Original Paper

Quality of Speech Following Cleft Palate Surgery in Children

Shahin Abdollahi Fakhim¹, Nikzad Shahidi^{2*}, Gelavizh Karimi Javan³

¹Associate professor, Pediatric Health Research Center, Department of Pediatrics otolaryngology, Tabriz University of Medical Scienes, Tabriz, Iran

²Associate professor, Department of Otolaryngology, Tabriz University of Medical Sciences, Tabriz, Iran ³Instructor of Speech therapy, Department of Rehabilitation, Tabriz University of Medical Sciences, Tabriz, Iran

Corresponding Author: Nikzad Shahidi, E-mail: nikzadsh@yahoo.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article history Received: February 16, 2018 Accepted: April 19, 2018 Published: April 30, 2018 Volume: 6 Issue: 2

Conflicts of interest: None Funding: None

Key words: Cleft Palate, Children, Speech Outcome, Speech Therapy

ABSTRACT

Background: Surgical treatment of cleft palate is accompanied with speech problems. Speech therapy in these children after surgery can improve their speech. In this study, we aimed to evaluate the quality of speaking in operated cleft palate patients and speech therapy effects in a small group of these patients. Methods: In this cross-sectional study, speech quality of 55 children with operated cleft palate was assessed regarding resonance, audible nasal emission, consonant production and speech acceptability. Speech outcomes after therapy were evaluated in 19 patients. Results: Cleft palate types were unilateral cleft and lip palate in 18 cases, bilateral cleft and lip palate in 4 cases, secondary cleft palate type in 30 cases and of mere-soft palate in 3 cases. Thirty-five children were operated during the first year of life and 20 were operated after the first year. More than 55% of patients had normal hypernasality with few cases of severe hypernasality and less than 45% had error in consonant production. Patients operated during first year of life had more speech problems. Speech parameters were improved in 19 patients after speech therapy. Conclusion: In conclusion, children with cleft palate have some degrees of speech disorders after repair surgery than could be improved by the speech therapy. Speech therapy should be considered as one of the main treatment protocols along with repair surgery in children with cleft palate.

INTRODUCTION

Children with cleft palate are at risk for speech and language development problems (1,2). When the palate is involved and velopharyngeal insufficiency (VPI) is present, feeding problems, hearing problems and speech and language problems often occur (1-6). Optimal timing of cleft palate repair remains controversial. The majority of recent literature advocates early repair, between 6 and 18 months of age, facilitating normal speech and language development, and preventing hearing loss (7-12). While palatoplasty techniques have improved in recent years, VPI remains a common problem regardless of the surgical technique and remains a problem for 15%–25% of these patients (13-17). The aim of palate repair is to create a complete closure, having an intact hard and soft palate with a normal functioning velopharyngeal mechanism (18). Even when newborns with cleft deformities receive appropriate treatment, some still have facial deformity and speech impairment (19-21), which further increases the health care and familial burden of the disease (22). With the help of Speech and Language therapists it is possible to improve these patients' speech. In this study we aimed to evaluate speech outcome after cleft palate surgery and the speech improvement after speech therapy in a subgroup of patients.

METHODS

In this cross-sectional study, 55 children with operated cleft palate with two flap palatoplasty and intravelar veloplasty techniques during June 2008 and January 2010 in Children Teaching Hospital were recruited. Inclusion criteria were: complete cleft of primary and secondary palate, palate repair by 12 months of age, absence of dysmorphology associated with a genetic syndrome according to a geneticist, cognitive delay, neurological syndromes or sensorineural hearing loss, monolingual speaking family, and absence of postoperative fistulae. All the children passed a hearing screening at the time of evaluation. All children underwent speech evaluations between age 4-6 years. A videotape recording of each child was made by a speech and language therapist. Speech

Published by Australian International Academic Centre PTY.LTD.

Copyright (c) the author(s). This is an open access article under CC BY license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.abcmed.v.6n.2p.14

assessments were performed in all patients postoperatively. The assessment evaluated nasal emission, articulation, and hypernasality by speech language pathologists. Nasal emission was evaluated by using a mirror. Patients were assessed for articulation development of simple sounds, words and connected sentences. All of the children whom did not have history of previous speech therapy (19 patients) underwent articulation therapy to different extents and results before and after speech therapy were documented. Samples of rote speech, repetition of sentences from the Cleft Audit Protocol for Speech (CAPS) and spontaneous conversation were recorded CAPS analyses the main features of speech from intelligibility to consonant characteristics. Statistical analyses were performed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences, version 17.0 (SPSS, Chicago, Illinois). Data were demonstrated as frequency and percent. Fisher's exact test was used to for testing the significance of percentages between groups and McNemar test was used to compare results before and after speech therapy. A p value <0.05 was considered significant.

RESULTS

Fifty-five children were enrolled in the study; 35 children were operated <1-year-old and 20 were operated over

Table 1. Speech Evaluation results in all patients

1-year-old. There were 25 males and 30 females. Primary cleft palate was unilateral cleft and lip palate in 18 cases, bilateral cleft and lip palate in 4 cases, secondary cleft palate type in 30 cases and of submucous palate in 3 cases. Speech evaluation results are demonstrated in Table 1. After repair surgery, most patients had normal hypernasality in words (63.6%) and sentences (56.36%) with few cases with severe hypernasality and no cases had hyponasality. Voice disorder was also present in only 2 cases. Patients had mostly error in consonant production in words (43.63%) and sentences (38.18%). In comparison between repair surgery ages using Fisher's exact test, we observed that although more speech problems existed in children operated <1 years old, only error in consonant production of words was significant (p=0.02). Nineteen patients underwent few speech therapy sessions and all speech variables were improved after the therapy sessions (Table 2). Using McNamara test, only improvement in audible nasal emission in words was significant.

DISCUSSION

The aim of cleft palate repair, besides aesthetic reasons, is to enable normal speech for the child. The speech is measured with different scales and parameters that make it hard to compare between studies (17, 23, 24). However, almost in

Speech Parameters	all (%)	<1 years (%)	>1 years (%)
Hypernasality			
Words			
Normal	35 (63.6)	20 (57.1)	15 (75)
Mild	8 (14.5)	7 (20)	1 (5)
Moderate	7 (12.7)	5 (14.3)	2 (10)
Severe	5 (9.1)	3 (8.6)	2 (10)
Sentences			
Normal	31 (56.4)	18 (51.4)	13 (65)
Mild	8 (14.5)	5 (14.3)	3 (15)
Moderate	8 (14.5)	6 (17.1)	2 (10)
Severe	8 (14.5)	6 (17.1)	2 (10)
Hyponasality in words	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Voice disorder	2 (3.6)	0 (0)	2 (10)
Audible nasal emission			
Words	4 (7.3)	3 (8.6)	1 (5)
Sentences	9 (16.4)	6 (17.1)	3 (15)
Error in consonant production			
Words	31 (56.4)	24 (68.6)	7 (35)
Sentences	34 (61.8)	24 (68.6)	10 (50)
Speech acceptability in colloquial speech			
Normal	32 (58.2)	17 (48.6)	15 (75)
Mild	8 (14.5)	6 (17.1)	2 (10)
Moderate	9 (16.4)	8 (22.9)	1 (5)
Severe	6 (10.9)	4 (11.4)	2 (10)
Speech acceptability in speech sample			
Normal	28 (50.9)	15 (42.9)	13 (65)
Mild	7 (12.7)	5 (14.3)	2 (10)
Moderate	11 (20)	8 (22.9)	3 (15)
Severe	9 (16.4)	7 (20)	2 (10)

Speech Parameters	Before Speech Therapy (%)	After Speech Therapy	P value
Hypernasality			
Words			
Normal	2 (10.5)	7 (36.8%)	
Mild	4 (21.1)	7 (36.8%)	
Moderate	8 (42.1)	5 (26.3%)	
Severe	5 (26.3)	0 (0)	
Sentences			
Mormal	2 (10.5)	4 (21.1%)	
Mild	3 (15.8)	6 (31.6%)	
Moderate	5 (26.3)	6 (31.6%)	
Severe	9 (47.4)	3 (15.8%)	
Hyponasality in words	0 (0)	0 (0%)	
Voice disorder	3 (15.8)	1 (5.3%)	NS
Audible nasal emission			
Words	7 (36.8)	1 (5.3%)	0.03*
Sentences	8 (42.1)	6 (31.6)	NS
Error in consonant production			
Words	18 (94.7)	13 (68.4%)	NS
Sentences	18 (94.7)	14 (73.7)	NS
speech acceptability in colloquial			
speech			
Normal	3 (15.8)	7 (36.8%)	
Mild	1 (5.3)	4 (21.1%)	
Moderate	3 (15.8)	7 (36.8%)	
Severe	12 (63.2)	1 (5.3%)	
speech acceptability in speech			
sample			
Normal	1 (5.3)	6 (31.6%)	
Mild	3 (15.8)	3 (15.8%)	
Moderate	2 (10.5)	7 (36.8%)	
Severe	13 (68.4)	3 (15.8%)	

Table 2. Speech evaluation results before and after Speech therapy.

most studies the resonance, consonant production, nasal air escape and articulation is usually measured. In this study we evaluated speech quality in cleft palate patients after repair surgery. Among 55 children, less than 50% had some degrees of hypernasality in words and sentences. In more than 50% the speech parameters were normal during evaluation. Speech acceptability in sample or colloquial speech was normal in over 50% of children. The degree of hypernasality after surgery was reported between 8% and 67% in different studies which had different incidence due to time of primary surgery, type of repair surgery and type of cleft palate and having cleft lip or not (2,5,17,25-30). Other speech disorders including audible nasal air leakage and articulation errors were also reported. However, unlike our findings Timmons and colleagues (17) found no nasal emission as well as no cases with moderate or severe hypernasality. Also, intelligibility was normal in 37% cleft palate patients. Although the degree of hypernasality in our study are within the reported incidences, but in comparison to some studies our patients have more speech disorders with more severity. It could be due to the reason that in our center there is no organized protocol for cleft palate children to receive speech therapy and there is possible that few parents seek these therapies

for their children. Unlike our population, most these studies have performed speech therapy as needed. Speech motor development occurs during the first year of life. It is possible that by increase in the age of palate repair, integrating velopharyngeal movements into the coordinative structure for speech become more difficult and will result in speech disorders including hypernasal speech. Hardin-Jones and Jones (5) observed that with increase in age of surgery, the more hypernasality occurs. Similarly, Pradini and colleagues (31) observed that consonant production errors increase with the age of surgery. Unlike these findings, although not significant, we observed that patients operated during the first year of life had more hypernasality and abnormal speech findings. It is reported that speech therapy can improve results of cleft repair surgery. Ruiter and colleagues (32) observed that most speech parameters improved after speech therapy including the decrease in hypernasality from 38% to 10% and articulation problems from 57% to 25%. In our study only 19 patients had not received previous speech therapy and underwent few session of therapy and all speech parameters were improved after treatment. Although we observed no significant improvement, the results are indicative of usefulness of speech therapy in these patients. Unfortunately, as mentioned in our center there is no well-organized protocol for following patients after surgery and evaluating their results. One reason is the non-compliance of the parents to the therapy which they presume that there is no need for further treatment after repair surgery. The other reason is that there is no professional speech and language therapist eager to cooperate in these patients' treatment.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, children with cleft palate have some degrees of speech disorders after repair surgery than could be improved by the speech therapy. Speech therapy should be considered as one of the main treatment protocols along side with repair surgery in children with cleft palate.

REFERENCES:

- Sharp HM, Dailey S, Moon JB. Speech and language development disorders in infants and children with cleft lip and palate. Pediatr Ann. 2003;32(7):476-80. PubMed PMID: 12891765.
- Brunnegard k, Lohmander A. A cross-sectional study of speech in 10-year-old children with cleft palate: results and issues of rater reliability. Cleft Palate Craniofac J. 2007;44(1):33-44. PubMed PMID: 17214536.
- Hardin-Jones MA, Chapman KL, Wright J, Halter KA, Schulte J, Dean JA, et al. The impact of early palatal obturation on consonant development in babies with unrepaired cleft palate. Cleft Palate Craniofac J. 2002;39(2):157-63. PubMed PMID: 11879071.
- Chapman KL. Is presurgery and early postsurgery performance related to speech and language outcomes at 3 years of age for children with cleft palate? Clin Linguist Phon. 2004;18(4-5):235-57. PubMed PMID: 15259571.
- Hardin-Jones MA, Jones DL. Speech production of preschoolers with cleft palate. Cleft Palate Craniofac J. 2005;42(1):7-13. PubMed PMID: 15643919.
- Paliobei V, Psifidis A, Anagnostopoulos D. Hearing and speech assessment of cleft palate patients after palatal closure: Long-term results. Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol. 2005;69(10):1373-81. PubMed PMID: 15955575.
- Kaplan I, Dresner J, Gorodischer C, Radin L. The simultaneous repair of cleft lip and palate in early infancy. Br J Plast Surg. 1974;27(2):134–8. PubMed PMID: 4834029.
- Kirscher RE, Randall P, Wang P, Jawad AF, Duran M, Huang K, et al. Cleft palate repair at 3 to 7 months of age. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2000;105:2127–32. PubMed PMID: 10839414.
- Rohrich RJ, Love EJ, Byrd HS, Johns DF. Optimal timing of cleft palate closure. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2000;106(2):413–21. PubMed PMID: 10946942.
- Denk MJ, Magee WP Jr. Cleft palate closure in the neonate: Preliminary report. Cleft Palate Craniofac J. 1996;33(1):57–61. PubMed PMID: 8849860.
- DorfDS, Curtin JW. Early cleft palaterepair and speech outcome. Plast Reconstr Surg. 1982;70(1):74-81. PubMed PMID: 7089110.

- Too-Chang MA. The assessment of middle ear function hearing by tympanometry in children before and after early cleft palate repair. Br J Plast Surg. 1983;36(3):295-9. PubMed PMID: 6860854.
- 13.Becker DB, Grames LM, Pilgram T, Kane AA, Marsh JL. The effect of timing of surgery for velopharyngeal dysfunction on speech. J Craniofac Surg. 2004;15(5):804-809. PubMed PMID: 15346022.
- Bicknell S, McFadden LR, Curran JB. Frequency of pharyngoplasty after primary repair of cleft palate. J Can Dent Assoc. 2002;68(11):688–692. PubMed PMID: 12513937.
- Deren O, Ayhan M, Tuncel A, Görgü M, Altuntaş A, Kutlay R, et al. The correction of velopharyngeal insufficiency by Furlow palatoplasty in patients older than 3 years undergoing Veau-Wardill-Kilner palatoplasty: a prospective clinical study. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2005;116(1):85–93. PubMed PMID: 15988251.
- Inman DS, Thomas P, Hodgkinson PD, Reid CA. Oro-nasal fistula development and velopharyngeal insufficiency following primary cleft palate surgery: an audit of 148 children born between 1985 and 1997. Br J Plast Surg. 2005;58(8):1051–1054. PubMed PMID: 16084930.
- Timmons MJ, Wyatt RA, Murphy T. Speech after repair of isolated cleft palate and cleft lip and palate. Br J Plast Surg. 2001;54(5):377–384. PubMed PMID: 11428766.
- Grant HR, Quiney RE, Mercer DM, Lodge S. Cleft palate and glue ear. Arch Dis Child. 1988;63(2):176-179. PubMed PMID: 3348665.
- Patil SB, Kale SM, Khare N, Math M, Jaiswal S, Jain A. Changing patterns in demography of cleft lip-cleft palate deformities in a developing country: the Smile Train effect--what lies ahead? Plast Reconstr Surg. 2011;127(1): 327–332. doi: 10.1097/PRS.0b013e3181f-95b9c. PubMed PMID: 21200226.
- Hunt O, Burden D, Hepper P, Johnston C. The psychosocial effects of cleft lip and palate: a systematic review. Eur J Orthod. 2005;27(3):274–85. PubMed PMID: 15947228.
- Pope AW, Snyder TH. Psychosocial adjustment in children and adolescents with a craniofacial anomaly: age and sex patterns. Cleft Palate Craniofac J. 2005;42(4):349-354. PubMed PMID: 16001914.
- Pope AW, Tillman K, Snyder HT. Parenting stress in infancy and psychosocial adjustment in toddlerhood: a longitudinal study of children with craniofacial anomalies. Cleft Palate Craniofac J. 2005;42(5):556-9. PubMed PMID: 16149839.
- Dalston RM, Marsh JL, Vig KW, Witzel MA, Bnmsted RM. Minimal standards for reporting the results of surgery on patients with cleft lip, cleft palate, or both: a proposal. Cleft Palate J. 1988;25(1):3-7. PubMed PMID: 3422597.
- Morris HL, Bardach J, Ardinger H, Jones D, Kelly KM, Olin WH, et al. Multidisciplinary treatment results for patients with isolated cleft palate. Plast Reconstr Surg. 1993;92(5):842-51. PubMed PMID: 8415965.

- 25. Phua YS, de Chalain T. Incidence of oronasal fistulae and velopharyngeal insufficiency after cleft palate repair: an audit of 211 children born between 1990 and 2004. Cleft Palate Craniofac J. 2008;45(2):172-8. doi: 10.1597/06-205.1. PubMed PMID: 18333650.
- 26. Farzaneh F, Becker M, Peterson AM, Svensson H. Speech results in adult Swedish patients born with unilateral complete cleft lip and palate. Scand J Plast Reconstr Surg Hand Surg. 2008;42(1):7-13. doi: 10.1080/02844310701694522. PubMed PMID: 18188776.
- Lohmander-Agerskov A. Speech outcome after cleft palate surgery with the Goteborg regimen including delayed hard palate closure. Scand J Plast Reconstr Surg Hand Surg. 1998;32(1):63-80. PubMed PMID: 9556821.
- Lohmander-Agerskov A, Havstam C, Söderpalm E, Elander A, Lilja J, Friede H, et al. Assessment of speech in children after repair of isolated cleft palate. Scand J Plast Reconstr Surg Hand Surg. 1993;27(4):307-10. PubMed PMID: 8159945.

- 29. Haapanen ML. Effect of method of cleft palate repair on the quality of speech at the age of 6 years. Scand J Plast Reconstr Surg Hand Surg. 1995;29(3):245-50. PubMed PMID: 8539568.
- 30. Schönweiler R, Lisson JA, Schönweiler B, Eckardt A, Ptok M, Tränkmann J, et al. A retrospective study of hearing, speech and language function in children with clefts following palatoplasty and veloplasty procedures at 18–24 months of age. Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol. 1999;50(3):205-17. PubMed PMID: 10595666.
- Prandini EL, Pegoraro-Krook MI, Dutka Jde C, Marino VC. Occurrence of consonant production errors in liquid phonemes in children with operated cleft lip and palate. J Appl Oral Sci. 2011;19(6):579-85. PubMed PMID: 22230991.
- Ruiter JS, Korsten-Meijer AG, Goorhuis-Brouwer SM. Communicative abilities in toddlers and in early school age children with cleft palate. Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol. 2009;73(5):693-8. doi: 10.1016/j. ijporl.2009.01.006. PubMed PMID: 19211158.