Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

ScienceDirect

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/mjafi

Case Report

Management of a case of velopharyngeal insufficiency with multidisciplinary approach

Maj Gen S.H. Gupta, vsm^a, Col M. Viswambaran^{b,*}, Maj R. Vijayakumar^c

^a Addl DGDS, O/o DGDS, IHQ of MoD (Army), 'L' Block, New Delhi 110001, India

^b Senior Specialist (Prosthodontics), Army Dental Centre (R&R), Delhi Cantt 110010, India

^c Graded Specialist (Prosthodontics), Command Military Dental Centre (Eastern Command), Kolkata, India

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 7 January 2015

Accepted 8 May 2015

Available online 20 July 2015

Keywords:

Speech prosthesis

Velopharyngeal insufficiency

Nasal resonance

and the management involves a multidisciplinary approach. The prosthodontic rehabilitation of velopharyngeal insufficiency involves obturation of the palatal defect with speech bulb prosthesis augmented with speech therapy.^{2,3}

Case report

A 20 year female patient reported with chief complaint of difficulty in normal speech with nasal sound in her voice. Medical and dental history revealed that she had undergone multiple surgical procedures for rehabilitation of her congenital cleft lip and palate. Extraoral examination revealed straight profile with well healed scar in the philtrum region due to surgical correction of cleft lip. Intraoral examination revealed missing 11, 12, 13, 14, 18, 22, 38 & 48 with transposition of 23 and 24. Soft palatal defect was present with missing uvula and a small incomplete cleft present in the palate [Fig. 1]. Defect was involving the premaxilla and a major portion of the soft palate. The patient was not able to speak normally and words were not recognizable. A multidisciplinary team approach was carried out with evaluation/suggestions from other specialists including otolaryngologist. Speech evaluation was performed by speech pathologists that assessed resonance, the occurrence of inappropriate nasal air emission, and articulation. Based on history, clinical findings & radiographic examination, diagnosis of velopharyngeal insufficiency was made. Prosthodontic rehabilitative treatment plan was formulated to give palatal speech bulb prosthesis for the patient with replacement of missing 11. There was no space available for the replacement of 12, 13, and 14 & 22. Treatment sequence involved making of diagnostic impressions for evaluation,

Introduction

Rehabilitation of a patient with resection of palate is a real prosthodontic challenge. Abnormalities of the soft palate may be due to congenital, acquired or developmental defects. Defects are classified based on the anatomy and physiology of the supporting structures.¹ Velopharyngeal (VP) dysfunction may occur either as insufficiency or incompetence. VP insufficiency means speech abnormalities related to a congenital or acquired anatomic defect of the soft palate whereas in VP incompetence, the palate is intact and speech aberration is related to some neuromuscular disorder.

VP insufficiency and VP incompetence usually affect the speech of the patients. The speech is characterized by nasal resonance, improper audible nasal air emission and a decrease in intra-oral air pressure during the production of oral speech sounds. The speech is only partially intelligible

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +91 (0) 9582803364 (mobile).

E-mail address: mviswambaran@rediffmail.com (M. Viswambaran).

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.mjafi.2015.05.002>

0377-1237/© 2015, Armed Forces Medical Services (AFMS). All rights reserved.

Fig. 1 – Pre-op intraoral view.

surveying and treatment planning. Mouth preparation was carried out involving oral prophylaxis, restorations of carious teeth and preparation of rest sets on 16 & 17 and 26 & 27. Impression of the maxillary arch was made using elastomeric impression material (3M, Germany) and master cast retrieved in die stone (Kalabhai, India) [Fig. 2]. Surveying and designing was carried out on the master cast for cast partial denture with replacement of missing 11 and metal loop extension extending towards the soft palatal defect region [Fig. 3]. The selected design was palatal plate major connector with embrasure clasps on 16, 17, 26 & 27 with additional rests on anterior 21 & 23. Subsequently the master cast was duplicated and cast partial denture framework fabricated in Co–Cr alloy (Wironit, Bego, Germany) following manufacturers recommendations. Impression of soft palate defect was made utilising cast metal framework. The patient was made to perform various functional movements involving bending of head in various guided positions and make functional movements like swallowing, sipping of water & speaking aloud. The patient was asked to move her head in a circular manner from side to side, to extend

her head as far forward and backward as possible and to say ‘ah’ and swallow. Initial molding was done with low fusing impression compound (DPI Pinnacle tracing sticks, DPI, India) and final correction with mouth temperature wax (corrective impression wax, MP Sai Enterprise, Mumbai, India). The impression was then sent to dental laboratory for fabrication of speech bulb prosthesis with replacement of missing 11. The processed prosthesis was then inserted in patient's mouth [Fig. 4]. The patient was evaluated by otolaryngologist for the correct extensions of the prosthesis and speech evaluation. Fiber optic nasopharyngoscopy was used to visualise the back of the nose for velopharyngeal function. This also involved looking at the back of throat while patient is speaking in order to see how the muscles of the throat work during speech. To prevent discomfort during the nasopharyngoscopic examination, anesthetic drops were placed in one side of the nose. A very small, flexible telescope is gently placed in the nose in order to see the back of the throat. Patient was also asked to say a few words of sentences with the telescope in place. Modifications were made in the extensions after nasopharyngoscopy evaluation [Fig. 5]. Over extensions were rectified as per the suggestions of otolaryngologist and again verified by nasopharyngoscopy till the desired extensions were achieved. Subsequently the patient was also evaluated by the speech therapist. The patient was counseled and trained over a period of time to how to use and speak with the prosthesis in mouth. Consolidated effort of the multidisciplinary team led to a marked improvement in the speech of the patient. The speech improvement was confirmed by a speech pathologist so that the patient's facial grimaces were disappeared and articulation of the explosive consonants such as “p”, “b”, “g”, “t”, and “d” was corrected. During two years of follow-up period, patient was satisfied with the use of the prosthesis and also expressed her social and psychological satisfaction.

Discussion

Palatopharyngeal dysfunction generally takes place when palatopharyngeal port is not able to carry out its own closing action due to a lack of tissue (palatopharyngeal insufficiency) or lack of proper movement (palatopharyngeal incompetence) as associated with neuromuscular disorders. To assess the

Fig. 2 – Final impression and master cast.

Fig. 3 – Palatal plate framework design.

Fig. 4 – Intra-oral view of Speech bulb prosthesis.

palatopharyngeal port and speech intelligibility, we need to understand the normal palatopharyngeal physiology. During the rest position, the soft palate hangs from the posterior border of the hard palate, leaving an opening from the back of the oral cavity. During function, especially while speaking,

swallowing, sucking, whistling and breathing through the oral cavity, complete closure of palatopharyngeal port is mandatory.^{4,5} Incomplete closure leads to defective speech.

Diagnosis of such patients are based on intraoral examination and speech evaluation.⁶ Clinical assessment by dental

Fig. 5 – Nasopharyngoscopic examination.

surgeon can only identify problems related to structural anatomy but not those related to the palatopharyngeal function for speech. The palatopharyngeal port needs to be evaluated by otolaryngologist and speech by speech therapist. Speech assessment includes oronasal resonance, inappropriateness of nasal air flow during consonant production, speech articulation and overall speech intelligibility. Video fluoroscopy is very effective method for evaluation of palatopharyngeal function in functional movements. Clinical evaluation combined with nasopharyngoscopic examination helps in proper designing of the prosthesis.^{7,8} The contributions made by the otolaryngologist for overall success of this particular case is significant. Clinical evaluation combined with nasopharyngoscopic examination ensured three dimensional obturation of palato-pharyngeal port. During the clinical procedures, the impression was examined for contact with the pharynx bilaterally and posteriorly. In this report, patients were allowed to drink water to test the complete closure of the anatomical defect of soft and hard palate. The water should not reflux into the nasal cavity when the patient is in upright position.

Prosthetic rehabilitation is considered once all the surgical options are ruled out.^{9,10} But there are certain situations where the prosthesis should be the first treatment option. These include 1) extensive cleft of hard palate with neuromuscular deficit of the soft palate and pharynx and 2) when surgery is not feasible due to medical reasons.

Management of velopharyngeal insufficiency in patients with cleft palate is always a multidisciplinary approach. The patient usually presents with problems like nasal regurgitations, speech aberrations and dental anomalies. The specialties involved include the pediatrician, otolaryngologist, plastic surgeons, speech therapist, psychologist, prosthodontists and orthodontists.^{11,12} The palatal speech bulb prosthesis may be the best option in several situations such as this case report, where surgery is not feasible. This may be due to systemic, anatomical, functional, or social disturbances, or even when the subject is not willing to undergo surgery. With the limitations of surgery, ease of construction and patient

compliance, the treatment with palatal speech bulb prosthesis has become part of the current philosophy for the rehabilitation of velopharyngeal insufficiency.

REFERENCES

1. Abadi BJ, Johnson JD. The prosthodontic management of cleft palate patients. *J Prosthet Dent.* 1982 Sept;48:297–302.
2. Dalston RM. Prosthodontic management of the cleft-palate patient: a speech pathologist's view. *J Prosthet Dent.* 1977;37:190–195.
3. Shetty NB, Shetty S, E N, D'Souza R, Shetty O. Management of velopharyngeal defects: a review. *J Clin Diagn Res.* 2014 Mar;8:283–287.
4. Mazaheri EH. Prosthodontic aspects of palatal elevation and palatopharyngeal stimulation. *J Prosthet Dent.* 1976;35:319–326.
5. Karnell MP, Rosenstein H, Fine L. Nasal videoendoscopy in prosthetic management of palatopharyngeal dysfunction. *J Prosthet Dent.* 1987;58:479–484.
6. Rich BM, Farber K, Shprintzen RJ. Nasopharyngoscopy in the treatment of palatopharyngeal insufficiency. *Int J Prosthodont.* 1988;1:248–251.
7. Walter JD. The design of prostheses used in treatment of velopharyngeal insufficiency. *Br Dent J.* 1981;151:338–342.
8. Schaaf NG, Casey DM. Transfer of the pharyngeal portion of the speech aid prosthesis. *J Prosthet Dent.* 1981;46:78–87.
9. Wolfaardt JF, Wilson FB, Rochet A, McPhee L. An appliance based approach to the management of palatopharyngeal incompetency: a clinical pilot project. *J Prosthet Dent.* 1993 Feb;69:186–195.
10. Yoshida H, Michi K, Yamashita Y, Ohno K. A comparison of surgical and prosthetic treatment for speech disorders attributable to surgically acquired soft palate defects. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg.* 1993 Apr;51:361–365.
11. Rieger J, Bohle Iii G, Huryn J, Tang JL, Harris J, Seikaly H. Surgical reconstruction versus prosthetic obturation of extensive soft palate defects: a comparison of speech outcomes. *Int J Prosthodont.* 2009 Nov-Dec;22:566–572.
12. Psillakis JJ, Toothaker S. A simple, expeditious method for placement of thermoplastic impression material for speech aid prostheses. *J Prosthet Dent.* 1999;81:247–248.