



HAL
open science

Fiberoptic endoscopic validation of a clinical screening test of swallowing function in critically ill patients performed within 24 h after extubation

Adel Maamar, Valentine Parent, Emmanuelle Prudhomme, Emmanuel Guérot, Pauline Berneau, Aurélien Frérou, Yves Le Tulzo, Franck Jégoux, Arnaud Gacouin, Jean-Marc Tadie

► To cite this version:

Adel Maamar, Valentine Parent, Emmanuelle Prudhomme, Emmanuel Guérot, Pauline Berneau, et al.. Fiberoptic endoscopic validation of a clinical screening test of swallowing function in critically ill patients performed within 24 h after extubation. *Journal of Critical Care*, 2022, 72, pp.154119. 10.1016/j.jcrc.2022.154119 . hal-03776344

HAL Id: hal-03776344

<https://hal.science/hal-03776344>

Submitted on 20 Sep 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Highlights:

- Swallowing dysfunction after extubation is frequent after prolonged invasive ventilation
- Except for stroke patients, a bedside screening tool is still needed in the ICU setting
- We developed a new bedside accurate tool to detect swallowing dysfunction
- Our test could be a useful screening test in ICU to avoid unnecessary examination
- A negative test would allow to resume oral feeding earlier in critically ill survivors

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Fiberoptic endoscopic validation of a clinical screening test of swallowing function in critically ill patients performed within 24 hours after extubation.

Adel Maamar¹, Valentine Parent², Emmanuelle Prudhomme¹, Emmanuel Guérot³, Pauline Berneau¹, Aurélien Frérou¹, Yves Le Tulzo^{1,4}, Franck Jégoux², Arnaud Gacouin^{1,4}, Jean-Marc Tadié^{1,4}.

Correspondence to: Adel Maamar. Service de Maladies Infectieuses et Réanimation Médicale, Hôpital Pontchaillou, Université de Rennes 1, 2, rue Henri Le Guilloux, 35033 Rennes cedex 9, France. Electronic address: adel.maamar@chu-rennes.fr

Fax +33 2 99 28 41 16

Phone +33 2 99 28 43 21

¹Service de Maladies Infectieuses et Réanimation Médicale, Hôpital Pontchaillou, Université de Rennes 1, 2, rue Henri Le Guilloux, 35033 Rennes cedex 9, France.

² Service d'Oto-Rhino-Laryngologie, Hôpital Pontchaillou, Université de Rennes 1, 2, rue Henri Le Guilloux, 35033 Rennes cedex 9, France.

³ Service de Réanimation Médicale, Hôpital Européen Georges Pompidou, Assistance Publique des Hôpitaux de Paris, Paris, France.

⁴ Faculté de Médecine, Université de Rennes 1, Unité INSERM CIC 1414, IFR 140, Rennes, France.

1
2
3 **Declarations**

4 **Ethics approval**

5
6 This study was approved by the Rennes University hospital's ethical committee (no. 16.143)
7
8 and written informed consent was obtained from all subjects participating in the study.
9

10
11
12
13
14
15 **Conflicts of interest statement**

16
17
18 The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare that are relevant to the content of this
19
20
21 article.
22
23
24
25
26

27 **Data availability statement:**

28
29
30 The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author,
31
32
33 AM, upon reasonable request.
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 **Financial Disclosures:** The authors did not receive support from any organization for the
41
42 submitted work.
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **Authors' contributions**

50
51
52 AM conceptualized the study and participated in its design, data acquisition and analysis,
53
54 literature research, and manuscript drafting. VP participated in the literature research, data
55
56 acquisition and analysis, and the drafting of the manuscript. EP participated in data acquisition.
57
58
59 EG conceptualized the study, participated in data acquisition and analysis and manuscript
60
61

1 drafting. PB and AF participated in data acquisition, data analysis and manuscript drafting. YLT
2 participated in revising the article for important intellectual content and manuscript drafting. FJ
3
4 participated in the literature research. JMT and AG conceptualized the study and participated
5
6 in its design, data analysis, and manuscript drafting and revision for important intellectual
7
8 content. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Abstract

Background: A bedside screening tool of swallowing dysfunction (SD) (BSSD) after extubation would be useful to identify patients who are at risk of SD. We aimed to evaluate the accuracy of our BSSD in comparison with fiberoptic endoscopic evaluation of swallowing (FEES) in critically ill patients after extubation.

Methods: We conducted a 1-year prospective monocentric study to evaluate the accuracy of our BSSD to diagnose SD following endotracheal intubation in comparison with FEES (gold standard). Patients intubated for longer than 48 hours were included. Both tests were assessed within 24 hours after extubation. Primary endpoint was the accuracy of the BSSD. Secondary endpoint was to assess risk factors of SD.

Results: Seventy-nine patients were included in the study. Thirty-three patients (42%) presented with a SD. The BSSD showed a sensitivity of 88% (95% CI 0.72-0.97) and a specificity of 91% (95% CI 0.79-0.98), a positive predictive value of 88% (95% CI 0.72-0.97) and a negative predictive value of 91% (95% CI 0.79-0.97). The AUC reached 0.83 (95% CI 0.74-0.92).

Conclusion: Our study describes an accurate clinical screening tool to detect SD after extubation in critically ill patients. Screening-positive cases should be confirmed by instrumental tests, ideally using FEES.

Keywords: Swallowing dysfunction, fiberoptic endoscopy, extubation, aspiration, pneumonia, endotracheal intubation.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Introduction

Swallowing dysfunction (SD) is a major issue in post-extubated patients as it can lead to aspiration, acute respiratory failure, health-care associated pneumonia, reintubation, and, consequently, prolonged intensive care unit (ICU) and hospital length of stay[1–3]. Moreover, delayed enteral feeding after extubation could expose these patients to underfeeding[4], or the use of nasogastric tube feeding to laryngeal injury[5].

Several risks factors for SD have been identified, such as preexisting dysphagia (cancer, surgery and irradiation of the neck), stroke[6] and neuromuscular diseases, or critical illness polyneuromyopathy[7]. Nevertheless, the association between SD and critical illness polyneuromyopathy must be handled with great caution, and as highlighted by Beduneau et al., the underlying mechanisms contributing to dysphagia in ICU patients remain incompletely understood. [6,7]. Patients known to have pre-existing swallowing dysfunction will be cautiously re-fed after extubation because they are at risk of aspiration[8,9]. Nonetheless, a large proportion of patients without any pre-existing swallowing dysfunction may be at risk for aspiration after extubation in the ICU. Along these lines, prolonged or multiple tracheal intubation are known risk factors for laryngeal injuries ~~and SD~~ which can be responsible for extubation failure[10]. Among these risk factors, the duration of mechanical ventilation has been associated with the occurrence of swallowing disorders. Endoscopic studies have found that swallowing dysfunction leading to aspiration in critically ill patients intubated for longer than 48 hours are frequent, up to 80%[11–16]. These studies also demonstrated that expected clinical signs of aspiration such as cough, wheeze, stridor, tachypnea, cyanosis with feeds, oxygen desaturations, and noisy or wet breathing were not present in extubated patients with SD. Therefore, these patients should be considered as silent aspirators[17].

1 As emphasized in recent reviews, a simple and reproducible bedside assessment of swallowing
2 function after extubation in the ICU setting is still lacking. Bedside swallowing assessments are
3
4 inaccurate in detecting aspiration when compared to flexible endoscopic evaluation of swallow
5
6 (FEES) or videofluoroscopic swallow study[18,19] which are the gold standard for the
7
8 diagnosis of SD. These procedures require manpower and equipment supply. Furthermore, a
9
10 recent study focused on acute respiratory failure survivors requiring mechanical ventilation and
11
12 intubation longer than 48 hours. ~~and They~~ successfully developed a decision-tree algorithm[20].
13
14
15
16 However, the authors concluded that their bedside swallowing evaluation demonstrated
17
18 variable accuracy to identify patients at high risk for aspiration and required further validation.
19
20 Therefore, the development of effective screening strategies using bedside and reproducible
21
22 assessments is crucial. Herein, we developed a new clinical bedside screening tool of
23
24 swallowing dysfunction (BSSD) after extubation of critically ill patients. We aimed to
25
26 prospectively assess the accuracy of our BSSD in comparison with FEES as a gold standard in
27
28 critically ill patients requiring mechanical ventilation for more than 48 hours. ~~at risk to develop~~
29
30 swallowing dysfunction following endotracheal intubation.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Methods

This study was approved by the Rennes University hospital's ethical committee (no. 16.143) and written informed consent was obtained from all subjects participating in the study.

Study design

We performed a prospective study over a 1-year period in our mixed 30-bed Intensive Care Unit at the Rennes University Hospital, a tertiary teaching hospital. This study complied with the STARD guidelines on reporting accuracy studies[21].

Patient eligibility

Criteria for inclusion were as follows: intubation for more than 48 h; extubation after a successful weaning trial of 1 h through a T-piece~~[10]~~; ability to maintain a sitting position and remain seated in an upright position for at least 5 minutes prior to the test; Glasgow coma scale after extubation of 15.

Exclusion criteria were a known laryngeal pathology, a preexisting swallowing dysfunction and an admission for stroke. We also excluded all patients for whom we were unable to perform the FEES within the first 24 hours following extubation because of the unavailability of the otorhinolaryngologists, and all patients who refused FEES.

All patients were orally intubated with soft, high-volume, low-pressure cuffed endotracheal tube (ETT) (Mallinckrodt Medical, Athlone, Ireland). All intubations were performed by experienced intensivists or emergency medicine physicians. During the ICU stay, cuff pressures were checked every 4 h to maintain a pressure < 25 cmH₂O.

Data collection

We prospectively collected the following parameters: age, sex, body mass index (BMI), severity of illness at admission according to the simplified acute physiological score[22] (SAPS II) and the sequential organ failure assessment score[23] (SOFA) at admission, main indication for intubation (neurologic failure, acute respiratory failure, hemodynamic failure and surgery), intubation characteristics (emergency or planned for surgery), use of sedation or myorelaxant drugs for intubation, the duration of intubation, ETT diameter (expressed in millimeters) and patient's height/ETT diameter ratio[10], history of self-extubation, and the number of intubations during ICU stay before inclusion. We also recorded if patients developed shock (defined as the need for dobutamine, epinephrine, or norepinephrine treatment during intubation period), if they received steroids prior to extubation (at least 50 mg equivalent of methylprednisolone per day during the period of intubation) and their SOFA score at the day of extubation[23].

After extubation, the patients were monitored for 28 days and the following parameters were recorded: extubation failure (defined as the need to reintubate the patient in the first week following extubation[24], regardless of cause), the development of pneumonia within 28 days after extubation[25], ICU length of stay, and vital status within 28 days after extubation.

Extubation procedure

Extubation was decided by the patient's attending physician after a successful 1h spontaneous breathing trial. A spontaneous breathing trial was considered as successful according to the following criteria: absence of development during the spontaneous breathing trial of any of the following events including respiratory rate > 35 breaths/min, increased accessory muscle activity, SpO₂ persistently below 90% despite increasing FiO₂, heart rate persistently above 140

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

beats/min, systolic blood pressure < 90 or > 180 mmHg, or appearance of cyanosis or mottling, depressed mental status or agitation. Planned extubations were performed by a nurse and a respiratory therapist under the control of a physician, as previously reported[10]. The decision to resume oral feeding following extubation was left at the discretion of the attending physician, with the knowledge of the FEES result. Consequently, none of the patients with abnormal FEES was refed.

Bedside screening test of swallowing dysfunction (BSSD)

A bedside evaluation was conducted according to a standardized protocol within 24 h after extubation by two physiotherapists and, importantly, before the FEES procedure. The BSSD comprised a clinical evaluation of eight items as shown in Table 1[25]. SD was suspected if the patients did not check all the criteria summarized in the Table 1. Post-extubation stridor was defined as an audible inspiratory wheeze after extubation[26]; clear voice was defined as the absence of signs of wet-sounding voice and the absence of whispers; mobility of the tongue was defined as the ability to stick out the tongue and move it; voluntary coughing was defined as the ability to cough when asked for; the ability to maintain head lifted was defined as the ability to lift the head against gravity in a horizontal position for a few seconds; the oral praxis skills were defined as the ability to voluntarily move the facial muscles (ie. close the lips, puff out the cheeks, smile); salivary stasis was defined as the inability to keep the mouth clean and/or the absence of saliva control (ie. anterior leaking)- The potential items were identified based on data acquired during a study evaluating post-intubation laryngeal injuries[10]. Then, a descendant stepwise logistic regression analysis was performed to assess the independent variables with p=0.20 for enter. Then, the final variables were chosen for their ability to explore the first phases of normal swallowing[27]. Thus, the oral praxis skills, salivary stasis and

1 mobility of the tongue explore the oral phase; tone of the flexor muscles of the neck and ability
2 to maintain head lifted explore the pharyngeal phase; voluntary coughing and clear voice
3
4 explore the signs of aspiration; and the post-extubation stridor explore the presence of laryngeal
5 injuries. A pass/fail response was assigned to each item so that failure on any item constitutes
6
7 a positive screen result and therefore an increased risk for swallowing dysfunction. Importantly,
8
9 BSSD was performed by two trained physiotherapists and inter reliability was assessed. To
10
11 ensure blindness between the physiotherapists, the two BSSDs were made separately within the
12
13 hour. Neither the attending physician nor the physiotherapists were aware of the results.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 **Endoscopic evaluation and definition of swallowing dysfunction**

24
25
26 A laryngeal nasofibroscope was performed within 24 h after extubation by two experienced
27
28 otolaryngologists. The FEES procedure was performed in the ICU in accordance with
29
30 previously published studies[17]. We carried out the examination in a bed or on a chair for all
31
32 patients with the back elevated to at least 75°. A fiberoptic laryngoscope (Karl Storz
33
34 Endoskope™ 11101SP, Tuttlingen, Germany, 30 cm long and of 3.5 mm diameter was used
35
36 with a Karl Storz™ 11301 DF cold light supply for illumination) was passed transnasally to the
37
38 nasopharynx, oropharynx, and supraglottic area to allow adequate visualization of the structures
39
40 involved in swallowing. No topical anesthetic or other preparation was used before placing the
41
42 scope in the nose. Gastric tube, if it was present, was not removed during the procedure. Ten
43
44 milliliter of stained liquid (International Dysphagia Diet Standardization Initiative consistency
45
46 (IDDSI) of 0) and semi-liquid boluses (IDDSI = 4) were then given. Otolaryngologists assessed
47
48 the ability to protect the airway and to uphold airway protection, the capability to clear the bolus
49
50 during deglutition, the presence of pooling and residual material in the hypopharynx.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62

1
2 To diagnose swallowing dysfunction, the Penetration Aspiration Scale (PAS) was used[28]
3 (**Supplementary Table 1**). The PAS allows describing all penetration and aspiration events in
4 the same scale and in an ordinal way. A score of 1 is considered as normal. We defined
5 swallowing dysfunction as a Penetration Aspiration Scale (PAS) > 1. Penetration is scored
6 either 2 or 3 if residue remains above the vocal folds and 4 or 5 if material crosses to the level
7 of the vocal folds. Finally, aspiration is scored 6, 7 or 8. Two boluses were used to explore
8 swallowing function and the highest PAS score was taken into account.
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18 The FEES was performed after BSSD, without knowledge of the BSSD result.
19
20
21
22
23

24 **Endpoints**

25
26
27 The primary endpoint was the accuracy of the BSSD compared to the FEES procedure.
28
29 Secondary endpoints were: to identify risk factors for SD, to evaluate the incidence of SD,
30 pneumonia and death occurrence within the 28 first days following extubation.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 **Statistical analysis**

40
41
42 Based on the literature and a first unpublished cohort, we hypothesized a prevalence of SD of
43 0.30 and an expected sensitivity of our BSSD of 0.80 with a minimal lower confidence interval
44 of 0.6; these estimates allowed us to calculate a sample size of 76 patients[29].
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 Normally distributed continuous variables are presented as the means (standard deviations),
52 whereas non-normally distributed data are presented as medians (Interquartile ranges).
53
54 Categorical variables are presented as numbers (percentages). For between groups comparison,
55
56
57
58 Mann-Whitney test for continuous variables and a χ^2 test or Fisher's exact test when more
59
60
61
62

1 appropriate for categorical variables were used. The two groups (normal swallowing vs.
2 swallowing dysfunction) were compared using the Mann-Whitney test for continuous variables
3 and a χ^2 or Fisher's exact test when more appropriate for categorical variables. A descendant
4 stepwise logistic regression analysis was performed to assess the independent factors of
5 swallowing dysfunction with $p=0.20$ for enter. Among related factors (SAPS II at admission
6 and SOFA at intubation) only the most clinically relevant (SAPS II for severity) were included
7 in the multivariable analysis model to minimize the effect of collinearity. Thus, the variables
8 entered into the multivariable analysis were SAPS II at admission, hemodynamic failure,
9 intubation characteristics (emergency or planned for surgery), duration of intubation and main
10 indication for intubation.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 We identified potential items for our BSSD based on data acquired during a study evaluating
26 post-intubation laryngeal injuries[10] and their impact on extubation. Then, a descendant
27 stepwise logistic regression analysis was performed to assess the independent variables with
28 $p=0.20$ for enter. Because we aimed to develop a screening test, we wanted to focus on the
29 sensitivity and negative predictive values. We then assigned one point for each identified
30 variable. The novel BSSD (Table 1) was then assessed on these preliminary data, the results are
31 reported in the supplementary appendix 1.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 The FEES results were considered as the gold standard[20]. We calculated the accuracy,
44 sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), and negative predictive value (NPV) of
45 the BSSD from 2 x 2 table. Ninety-five percent confidence intervals (95% CI) were calculated
46 as exact binomial confidence intervals. The accuracy of the BSSD was assessed by the mean of
47 receiver operating characteristics (ROC) curves and the area under curve (AUC). The threshold
48 value of the BSSD was then determined from analysis of the ROC curves as the value that led
49 to the best compromise between sensitivity and specificity. The reproducibility of the BSSD
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62

1 between the 2 physiotherapists was analyzed using the weighted Cohen's Kappa measure of
2 interrater reliability.
3

4
5 Statistical analyses were performed using R 4.0.2 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing,
6 Vienna, Austria), and p values of less than 0.05 were considered significant.
7
8
9

Results

During the one-year study period, a total of 1026 patients were admitted to the ICU. Among them, 554 were intubated, and 307 were intubated longer than 48 h. Ninety-five patients did not meet the inclusion criteria for the following reasons: 55 patients died before their extubation, 12 had a Glasgow coma scale < 15 and 28 were not able to maintain a sitting position. 79 patients were included. Of note, althoughIn total, 212 patients were eligible for inclusion, and 133 were excluded for the following reasons: 37 (17%) patients were reintubated before both evaluations, 2 died before both evaluations, and 8 were transferred to a different hospital before extubation. Importantly, unavailability of a FEES operator affected 74 (55.6%) patients. Finally, 12 patients refused FEES examination before or at the beginning of the procedure. Thus, 79 patients were included. Flow-chart is represented in the **Figure 1**. The time interval between extubation and BSSD was 3.3 ± 2.1 h (mean \pm SD) and 6.8 ± 5.7 h between BSSD and FEES. There was no clinical intervention between the two tests. Of note, no FEES complications were observed.

Thirty-three patients were diagnosed as having SD according to the FEES. Their baseline characteristics are shown in **Table 2**. Of note, the SD frequency of FEES confirmed aspirators (PAS > 6) was 6% of all the patients and accounted for 15% of the SD patients (PAS > 2). Among the 59 patients who presented with shock, 51 (86%) presented with septic shock, 4 (7%) with hypovolemic or hemorrhagic shock and 4 (7%) with cardiogenic shock.

Test results

Thirty-three patients (42%) had swallowing dysfunction (FEES positive, using endoscopic criteria, **Figure 3**). BSSD was positive for 29/33 (37%) of them. Comparison of the results of

1 the fiberoptic endoscopic evaluation of swallowing (FEES) and bedside swallowing evaluation
2 (BSSD) is represented in Table 3. The BSSD showed a sensitivity of 88% (95% CI 0.72-0.97)
3
4 and a specificity of 91% (95% CI 0.79-0.98), a PVV of 88% (95% CI 0.72-0.97) and a NPV of
5
6
7 91% (95% CI 0.79-0.97). The accuracy of the BSSD is shown in **Figure 2**. The AUC reached
8
9 0.83 (95% CI 0.74-0.92). The BSSD value of zero was determined from the ROC as the most
10
11 accurate to detect a swallowing dysfunction.
12
13

14
15 Based on weighted Cohen's kappa statistics, we found a high level of interrater agreement with
16
17 $\kappa = 0.77$ (0.66-0.89) between the two physiotherapists.
18
19

20 21 **Risk factors for swallowing dysfunction**

22
23
24 The characteristics and comparison of patients with and without SD are shown in **Table 2**.
25
26 Swallowing dysfunction was significantly associated with longer duration of mechanical
27
28 ventilation, intubation for respiratory failure, and hemodynamic failure requiring vasopressor
29
30 infusion. Using multivariable analysis, independent risk factors for SD were duration of
31
32 intubation (OR=1.08; 95% CI 1.02-1.17, p=0.03) and hemodynamic failure requiring
33
34 vasopressor infusion (OR=4.46; 95% CI 1.27-21, p=0.03).
35
36
37
38
39

40 **28-Day follow-up**

41
42
43 Among the study population, 10 (12.7%) patients developed pneumonia during the follow-up
44
45 period. Five had SD assessed by FEES and 5 had no evidence of SD shown by FEES. Among
46
47 these 10 patients, 4 died within the 28 first days.
48
49

50
51 Among the 33 patients who presented with a swallowing dysfunction, 5 (15%) developed
52
53 pneumonia and 3 (10%) died within the first 28 days after extubation.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61

Discussion

We found that our BSSD was reproducible and presented a high accuracy and high negative predictive value to screen SD after extubation of critically ill patients ~~with SD after extubation.~~

This high NPV is important for diseases such as post-extubation SD where the risk of being undetected can lead to serious consequences of pneumonia, malnutrition and death. Since SD is frequent, its early identification can reduce the occurrence of pulmonary complications after extubation. For instance, Barquist reported the onset of aspiration pneumonia after extubation in 15% of patients[13], while others authors[11] found that up to 50% of patients had swallowing dysfunction after extubation. Contrarily, a recent study[7] evaluating the incidence of persistent SD after extubation showed clinical evidence of SD in 25% of patients ventilated for 7 days or more, but SD were not associated with an increased risk of pneumonia. Nevertheless, they focused in patients ventilated more than 7 days, and they acknowledged that the unblinded design might have contributed to the low number of complications related to SD. The largest prospective study to date on dysphagia frequency in a tertiary mixed medical-surgical ICU setting reported a lower incidence rate than in our study[30]. However, this incidence was likely underestimated due to exclusion of patients leaving the ICU alive with tracheostomy. Moreover, a recent study conducted by Moss et al. reported a prevalence of 33% of SD assessed by FEES[20], consistent with our results. The epidemiology of post-extubation SD is challenging, probably because of a high heterogeneity in its definition. The high probability and potential severity of aspiration pneumonia emphasize the need for the early screening of patients after extubation in ICU.

Our BSSD presented a high sensitivity (88%) and negative predictive value (91%) to identify high-risk critically ill survivors for swallowing dysfunction after extubation. Subsequently,

1 these high-risk patients could be rapidly diagnosed by an instrumental test using FEES and
2 referred to speech-language pathologists. Moreover, a negative BSSD would allow
3
4 practitioners to resume oral feeding earlier in eligible patients and allow missing very few
5
6 “aspirators”, thus avoiding unnecessary instrumented examination.
7
8
9

10 Fiberoptic evaluation of swallowing is considered a gold standard test for the assessment of SD
11
12 in recently extubated survivors of critical illness[31]. This technique has several advantages:
13
14 first, it can be performed at the bedside and does not require patient transportation outside the
15
16 ICU. Second, it allows direct visualization of the larynx and of the movement of the pharyngeal
17
18 and glottic structures, including the vocal cords and the proximal trachea. However, FEES has
19
20 several limitations. Although it can be considered as invasive and uncomfortable by some
21
22 patients, equipment and otorhinolaryngologist availability are the most important barriers to the
23
24 routine use of FEES. For example, a national survey in the US showed that endoscopy is
25
26 available in only 41% of hospitals caring for recently extubated patients; furthermore, even
27
28 when available, FEES is used only 15% of the time in university hospitals and 8% of the time
29
30 in general hospitals[32]. A recent European survey reported that only 30% ICUs routinely
31
32 assessed for dysphagia following extubation, and only 8% used instrumental assessments[33].
33
34 Our study emphasizes this issue, as 74 (55% of the excluded patients) patients were excluded
35
36 because of unavailability of FEES operator. Consequently, a simple clinical bedside swallowing
37
38 screening test could be of benefit for intubated patients in the ICU. This evaluation is easy to
39
40 implement, cost-effective and non-invasive, which could make it available in all ICUs.
41
42 Additionally, a systematic and accurate method of detecting swallowing dysfunction might
43
44 decrease aspiration pneumonia by allowing modifications of the care of these patients, such as
45
46 implementing enteral feeding tube placement and providing rapid care by speech-language
47
48 practitioners. Finally, it could allow rapid oral feeding in patients whose swallowing evaluation
49
50 has been found normal. Indeed, caloric deficit has been reported to be associated with increased
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61

1 nosocomial infection rates, especially bloodstream infections[34] and pneumonia, as well as
2 higher mortality[35], longer ICU stays, and higher healthcare costs[36,37].
3
4

5 Many studies have previously proposed bedside swallowing assessments, mainly in stroke
6 patients[37–40]. One study has been conducted to develop an accurate bedside assessment of
7 swallowing function after extubation in non-stroke patients. This study reported the
8 development of a decision-tree algorithm to identify aspiration risk in acute respiratory failure
9 survivors, but the tool developed showed variable accuracy[20] and the algorithm still needs a
10 future external validation since the evaluation was performed 25 hours after extubation and the
11 reproducibility was not assessed. In our study, we only excluded stroke patients for whom
12 several screening tools exist, and patients with a known preexisting laryngeal disorder.
13 Therefore, our screening test is intended to be complementary with existing tools and used in a
14 general ICU population.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 We found that duration of intubation and hemodynamic failure requiring vasopressor infusion
30 were risk factors independently associated with SD. In a monocentre study focused on elderly
31 patients, El Sohl et al. found that up to 50% of patients had swallowing dysfunction after
32 extubation. Among the risk factors, duration of intubation and hemodynamic failure requiring
33 vasopressor infusion were associated with SD. Duration of endotracheal intubation has
34 previously been associated with laryngeal injuries that can promote swallowing dysfunction
35 along with loss of muscle strength attributable to non-use during intubation and loss of
36 proprioception[18,41]. Recently, Beduneau et al. found that the presence of persistent SD was
37 associated with longer duration of ICU stay after extubation[7]. Furthermore, the association
38 between a need for vasopressor (i.e., hemodynamic failure) and swallowing dysfunction ~~might~~
39 ~~be explained by the effects of vasopressor therapy, which induces neuronal dysfunction that~~
40 ~~can diminish both the sensitivity and mobility of laryngeal and pharyngeal structures~~[40,41]. is
41 controversial. The Dynamics trial[30] found an association between SD and the number of days
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61

1 on adrenaline, but not with noradrenaline. As highlighted in a recent review[31], studies
2 focusing on risk factors for dysphagia following endotracheal intubation are scarce and provide
3 conflicting results. They either support or reject the identified risk factors, such as intubation
4 duration, cardiac failure, etc. Although we found such association, it remains unclear whether
5 hemodynamic failure is a risk factor of swallowing disorders following endotracheal intubation.

6
7
8
9
10
11
12 Our study has several limitations. ~~First, although FEES is considered as the gold standard test~~
13 ~~to assess SD for recently extubated survivors of critical illness, we cannot rule out missed~~
14 ~~diagnoses of SD.~~ First, 133 patients were excluded mainly due to a lack of availability
15 of otorhinolaryngologists to perform FEES. This fact emphasizes that FEES availability is the
16 most important barrier to its routine use[32]. Third, we did not assess the evolution of
17 swallowing dysfunction using a second FEES, which could have been of interest. Few studies
18 have focused on the duration of swallowing dysfunction in survivors of critical illness. El Solh
19 et al.[11] showed that at day 5 and day 14 after extubation, 40% and 14% of elderly patients
20 had endoscopically confirmed aspiration, respectively and another study showed an
21 improvement in swallowing delay in all patients at 7 days after extubation[41]. More recently,
22 a ~~retrospective-prospective~~ cohort showed persistent swallowing dysfunction in ~~35~~40% of SD
23 ~~patients at hospital discharge~~ within a maximum of 3 days after extubation[7]. Moreover, as we
24 aimed to develop a screening test, we wanted to focus on the sensitivity and negative predictive
25 value and assigned a pass/fail response to each item. Nevertheless, we cannot rule out that using
26 a different ponderation for some items could have enhanced the accuracy of our BSSD. Also,
27 we defined SD as a PAS > 1, which could be debatable, as it can overestimate the incidence
28 and mislead on clinically-relevant SD. Indeed, it is not clear if a patient with a PAS score of 2-
29 3 must not be fed. Finally, we designed our BSSD as a physical examination tool, and did not
30 include known risk factors of SDs such as mechanical ventilation duration[31] ~~and those~~
31 ~~identified in our study.~~ The combination of these parameters with the BSSD ~~might would have~~

1 ~~been interesting to~~ increase the accuracy of the tool. ~~Future studies could assess the accuracy~~
2 ~~of our BSSD in combination with known risk factors for SDs in critically ill survivors.~~

3
4
5 This study presents a simple and accurate bedside swallow evaluation providing a previously
6
7
8
9
10
11
12 ~~unreached level of sensitivity and specificity. Although still needing external validation, we~~
13 ~~believe that our BSSD could be a useful screening test in ICU. We believe that our BSSD could~~
14 ~~be a useful screening test.~~ A negative test would allow to resume oral feeding earlier in eligible
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3 **References**
4
5
6
7
8
9

- 10 [1] Loeb M, McGeer A, McArthur M, Walter S, Simor AE. Risk factors for pneumonia and
11 other lower respiratory tract infections in elderly residents of long-term care facilities.
12 *Arch Intern Med* 1999;159:2058–64.
- 13 [2] Marik PE, Kaplan D. Aspiration pneumonia and dysphagia in the elderly. *Chest*
14 2003;124:328–36.
- 15 [3] Martin BJ, Corlew MM, Wood H, Olson D, Golopol LA, Wingo M, et al. The
16 association of swallowing dysfunction and aspiration pneumonia. *Dysphagia* 1994;9:1–
17 6.
- 18 [4] Dobak S, Kelly D. Tough Pill to Swallow: Postextubation Dysphagia and Nutrition
19 Impact in the Intensive Care Unit. *Nutr Clin Pract Off Publ Am Soc Parenter Enter Nutr*
20 2021;36:80–7. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ncp.10602>.
- 21 [5] Apostolakis LW, Funk GF, Urdaneta LF, McCulloch TM, Jeyapalan MM. The
22 nasogastric tube syndrome: two case reports and review of the literature. *Head Neck*
23 2001;23:59–63. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-0347\(200101\)23:1<59::aid-hed9>3.0.co;2-](https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-0347(200101)23:1<59::aid-hed9>3.0.co;2-)
24 a.
- 25 [6] Smithard DG, O’Neill PA, Parks C, Morris J. Complications and outcome after acute
26 stroke. Does dysphagia matter? *Stroke* 1996;27:1200–4.
- 27 [7] Beduneau G, Souday V, Richard JC, Hamel JF, Carpentier D, Chretien JM, et al.
28 Persistent swallowing disorders after extubation in mechanically ventilated patients in
29 ICU: a two-center prospective study. *Ann Intensive Care* 2020;10:138.
30 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13613-020-00752-x>.
- 31 [8] Goldsmith T. Evaluation and treatment of swallowing disorders following endotracheal
32 intubation and tracheostomy. *Int Anesthesiol Clin* 2000;38:219–42.
- 33 [9] DeVita MA, Spierer-Rundback L. Swallowing disorders in patients with prolonged
34 orotracheal intubation or tracheostomy tubes. *Crit Care Med* 1990;18:1328–30.
- 35 [10] Tadié J-M, Behm E, Lecuyer L, Benhmamed R, Hans S, Brasnu D, et al. Post-intubation
36 laryngeal injuries and extubation failure: a fiberoptic endoscopic study. *Intensive Care*
37 *Med* 2010;36:991–8. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-010-1847-z>.
- 38 [11] El Solh A, Okada M, Bhat A, Pietrantonio C. Swallowing disorders post orotracheal
39 intubation in the elderly. *Intensive Care Med* 2003;29:1451–5.
40 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-003-1870-4>.
- 41 [12] Barker J, Martino R, Reichardt B, Hickey EJ, Ralph-Edwards A. Incidence and impact
42 of dysphagia in patients receiving prolonged endotracheal intubation after cardiac
43 surgery. *Can J Surg J Can Chir* 2009;52:119–24.
- 44 [13] Barquist E, Brown M, Cohn S, Lundy D, Jackowski J. Postextubation fiberoptic
45 endoscopic evaluation of swallowing after prolonged endotracheal intubation: a
46 randomized, prospective trial. *Crit Care Med* 2001;29:1710–3.
- 47 [14] Tolep K, Getch CL, Criner GJ. Swallowing dysfunction in patients receiving prolonged
48 mechanical ventilation. *Chest* 1996;109:167–72.
- 49 [15] Ajemian MS, Nirmul GB, Anderson MT, Zirlen DM, Kwasnik EM. Routine fiberoptic
50 endoscopic evaluation of swallowing following prolonged intubation: implications for
51 management. *Arch Surg Chic Ill* 1960 2001;136:434–7.

- 1 [16] Zuercher P, Schenk NV, Moret C, Berger D, Abegglen R, Schefold JC. Risk Factors for
2 Dysphagia in ICU Patients After Invasive Mechanical Ventilation. *Chest* 2020.
3 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chest.2020.05.576>.
- 4 [17] Hafner G, Neuhauser A, Hirtenfelder S, Schmedler B, Eckel HE. Fiberoptic endoscopic
5 evaluation of swallowing in intensive care unit patients. *Eur Arch Oto-Rhino-Laryngol*
6 *Off J Eur Fed Oto-Rhino-Laryngol Soc EUFOS Affil Ger Soc Oto-Rhino-Laryngol -*
7 *Head Neck Surg* 2008;265:441–6. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00405-007-0507-6>.
- 8 [18] Macht M, White SD, Moss M. Swallowing dysfunction after critical illness. *Chest*
9 2014;146:1681–9. <https://doi.org/10.1378/chest.14-1133>.
- 10 [19] Perren A, Zürcher P, Schefold JC. Clinical Approaches to Assess Post-extubation
11 Dysphagia (PED) in the Critically Ill. *Dysphagia* 2019;34:475–86.
12 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00455-019-09977-w>.
- 13 [20] Moss M, White SD, Warner H, Dvorkin D, Fink D, Gomez-Taborda S, et al.
14 Development of an Accurate Bedside Swallowing Evaluation Decision Tree Algorithm
15 for Detecting Aspiration in Acute Respiratory Failure Survivors. *Chest* 2020;158:1923–
16 33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chest.2020.07.051>.
- 17 [21] Cohen JF, Korevaar DA, Altman DG, Bruns DE, Gatsonis CA, Hooft L, et al. STARD
18 2015 guidelines for reporting diagnostic accuracy studies: explanation and elaboration.
19 *BMJ Open* 2016;6:e012799. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2016-012799>.
- 20 [22] Le Gall JR, Lemeshow S, Saulnier F. A new Simplified Acute Physiology Score (SAPS
21 II) based on a European/North American multicenter study. *JAMA J Am Med Assoc*
22 1993;270:2957–63.
- 23 [23] Vincent JL, de Mendonça A, Cantraine F, Moreno R, Takala J, Suter PM, et al. Use of
24 the SOFA score to assess the incidence of organ dysfunction/failure in intensive care
25 units: results of a multicenter, prospective study. Working group on “sepsis-related
26 problems” of the European Society of Intensive Care Medicine. *Crit Care Med*
27 1998;26:1793–800.
- 28 [24] Thille AW, Richard J-CM, Brochard L. The decision to extubate in the intensive care
29 unit. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2013;187:1294–302.
30 <https://doi.org/10.1164/rccm.201208-1523CI>.
- 31 [25] Chastre J, Fagon J-Y. Ventilator-associated pneumonia. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*
32 2002;165:867–903. <https://doi.org/10.1164/ajrccm.165.7.2105078>.
- 33 [26] McCaffrey J, Farrell C, Whiting P, Dan A, Bagshaw SM, Delaney AP. Corticosteroids to
34 prevent extubation failure: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Intensive Care Med*
35 2009;35:977. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-009-1473-9>.
- 36 [27] Matsuo K, Palmer JB. Anatomy and physiology of feeding and swallowing: normal and
37 abnormal. *Phys Med Rehabil Clin N Am* 2008;19:691–707, vii.
38 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmr.2008.06.001>.
- 39 [28] Rosenbek JC, Robbins JA, Roecker EB, Coyle JL, Wood JL. A penetration-aspiration
40 scale. *Dysphagia* 1996;11:93–8.
- 41 [29] Flahault A, Cadilhac M, Thomas G. Sample size calculation should be performed for
42 design accuracy in diagnostic test studies. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2005;58:859–62.
43 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2004.12.009>.
- 44 [30] Schefold JC, Berger D, Zürcher P, Lensch M, Perren A, Jakob SM, et al. Dysphagia in
45 Mechanically Ventilated ICU Patients (DYnAMICS): A Prospective Observational
46 Trial. *Crit Care Med* 2017;45:2061–9. <https://doi.org/10.1097/CCM.0000000000002765>.
- 47 [31] Zuercher P, Moret CS, Dziewas R, Schefold JC. Dysphagia in the intensive care unit:
48 epidemiology, mechanisms, and clinical management. *Crit Care* 2019;23:103.
49 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13054-019-2400-2>.
- 50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- [32] Macht M, Wimbish T, Clark BJ, Benson AB, Burnham EL, Williams A, et al. Diagnosis and treatment of post-extubation dysphagia: results from a national survey. *J Crit Care* 2012;27:578–86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrc.2012.07.016>.
- [33] Spronk PE, Spronk LEJ, Egerod I, McGaughey J, McRae J, Rose L, et al. Dysphagia in Intensive Care Evaluation (DICE): An International Cross-Sectional Survey. *Dysphagia* 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00455-021-10389-y>.
- [34] Ekpe K, Novara A, Mainardi J-L, Fagon J-Y, Faisy C. Methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* bloodstream infections are associated with a higher energy deficit than other ICU-acquired bacteremia. *Intensive Care Med* 2014;40:1878–87. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-014-3502-6>.
- [35] Faisy C, Lerolle N, Dachraoui F, Savard J-F, Abboud I, Tadie J-M, et al. Impact of energy deficit calculated by a predictive method on outcome in medical patients requiring prolonged acute mechanical ventilation. *Br J Nutr* 2009;101:1079–87. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007114508055669>.
- [36] Berger MM, Pichard C. Best timing for energy provision during critical illness. *Crit Care* 2012;16:215. <https://doi.org/10.1186/cc11229>.
- [37] Villet S, Chiolerio RL, Bollmann MD, Revely J-P, Cayeux R N M-C, Delarue J, et al. Negative impact of hypocaloric feeding and energy balance on clinical outcome in ICU patients. *Clin Nutr Edinb Scotl* 2005;24:502–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clnu.2005.03.006>.
- [38] McCullough GH, Wertz RT, Rosenbek JC. Sensitivity and specificity of clinical/bedside examination signs for detecting aspiration in adults subsequent to stroke. *J Commun Disord* 2001;34:55–72.
- [39] Martino R, Silver F, Teasell R, Bayley M, Nicholson G, Streiner DL, et al. The Toronto Bedside Swallowing Screening Test (TOR-BSST). *Stroke* 2009;40:555–61. <https://doi.org/10.1161/STROKEAHA.107.510370>.
- [40] Park KD, Kim TH, Lee SH. The Gugging Swallowing Screen in dysphagia screening for patients with stroke: A systematic review. *Int J Nurs Stud* 2020;107:103588. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2020.103588>.
- [41] de Larminat V, Montravers P, Dureuil B, Desmonts JM. Alteration in swallowing reflex after extubation in intensive care unit patients. *Crit Care Med* 1995;23:486–90.

Figure Legends

Figure 1: Diagram flowchart of patients included in the study. *Definition of abbreviations:* FE = fiberoptic endoscopy, SD = swallowing dysfunction.

Figure 2: Receiver-operating characteristics (ROC) plot of the cohort. True positive fraction is plotted on y-axis and the true-negative fraction is plotted on x-axis. The BSSD threshold value of 0 was determined as the most accurate to detect a SD

Figure 3: Fiberoptic endoscopic evaluation of swallowing after extubation before administration of semi-liquid bolus (A) and after administration (B): the material (dashed line) entered the airway, contacted the vocal folds (*), and was not ejected from the airway.




Figure 2




Table 2: Baseline characteristics of the patients and comparison between patients with and without swallowing disorder.

Characteristics	All population (n=79)	No swallowing disorder (n=46)	Swallowing disorder (n=33)	p value
Male	43 (54.4)	27 (58.7)	16 (48.5)	0.4
Age, years	64 [55-70]	63 [53.5-69]	65 [56-70]	0.41
BMI	25.9 [22.5-30.3]	24.5 [22.2-30.5]	26.9 [23.4-30.3]	0.5
Shock	59 (74.7)	29 (63)	30 (90.9)	0.01
SAPS II	52 [37-61.5]	49.5 [36.3-59.8]	57 [38-68]	0.14
SOFA at intubation	9 [6-12]	8 [6-11]	9 [8-12]	0.18
SOFA at extubation	2 [1-3.5]	2 [0-3.8]	2 [1-3]	0.48
Intubation				0.16
Emergency	71 (89.9)	39 (84.8)	32 (97)	
Planned	8 (10.1)	7 (15.2)	1 (3)	
Steroid therapy	35 (44.3)	21 (45.7)	14 (42.4)	0.8
Duration of intubation, days	8 [4.5-13]	6 [3.3-10.8]	11 [7-20]	0.001
History of self-extubation	3 (3.8)	2 (4.3)	1 (3)	0.8
Number of intubations	1 [1-1]	1 [1-1]	1 [1-2]	0.63
Height/ETT ratio	228.6 [220-235.7]	230 [221.3-236.9]	228.6 [217.9-235.5]	0.85
Setting of intubation				0.9
Pre-hospital	6 (7.6)	3 (6.5)	3 (9.1)	
Hospital	73 (92.4)	43 (93.5)	30 (90.9)	
Use during intubation				
Myorelaxant drug	77 (97.5)	46 (100)	31 (93.9)	0.9
Sedation	77 (97.5)	46 (100)	31 (93.9)	0.9
Main indication for intubation				0.04
Surgery	8 (10.1)	7 (15.2)	1 (3)	
Neurologic failure	23 (36.7)	20 (43.5)	9 (27.3)	
Acute respiratory failure	35 (44.3)	17 (37)	18 (54.5)	
Hemodynamic failure	7 (8.9)	2 (4.3)	5 (15.2)	
Aspirators (PAS > 6)	5 (6)	0 (0)	5 (15.2)	0.02

Definition of abbreviations: BMI = Body mass index, SAPS = Simplified Acute Physiologic Score, SOFA = Sequential Organ Failure Assessment, ETT = Endotracheal Tube, PAS = Penetration Aspiration Scale. Data are median [interquartile range] for continuous variables and number (%) for categorical variables.

Credit author statement

Adel Maamar: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis, Investigation, Writing - Original Draft, Writing - Review & Editing, Visualization. Valentine Parent: Conceptualization, Investigation, Writing - Original Draft. Emmanuelle Prudhomme: Investigation. Emmanuel Guérot: Conceptualization, Investigation, Formal analysis. Pauline Berneau: Investigation, Formal analysis. Aurélien Frérou: Investigation, Formal analysis. Yves Le Tulzo: Investigation. Franck Jégoux: Conceptualization. Arnaud Gacouin: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis, Investigation, Writing - Original Draft, Writing - Review & Editing, Visualization. Jean-Marc Tadié: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis, Investigation, Writing - Original Draft, Writing - Review & Editing, Supervision, Visualization.





Click here to access/download
Supplementary Material
TRODEG_SupplementaryAppendix1.docx

