

1 **High resolution cervical auscultation and data science: New tools to**
2 **address an old problem.**

3
4 **James L. Coyle, Ph.D., CCC-SLP, BCS-S**
5 **Department of Communication Science and Disorders, School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences**
6 **Department of Otolaryngology, School of Medicine**
7 **University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, USA**
8

9 **Ervin Sejdić, Ph.D.**
10 **Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Department of Bioengineering**
11 **Swanson School of Engineering**
12 **University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh PA, USA**
13
14
15

16 **Corresponding Author:**

17
18 James L. Coyle, PhD
19 University of Pittsburgh
20 Department of Communication Science and Disorders
21 6035 Forbes Tower
22 Pittsburgh, PA 15260
23 412.383.6608
24 jcoyle@pitt.edu
25

26 **Conflict of Interest Statement:**

27 Financial: The authors disclose that they receive financial support under two grants from the National
28 Institute of Child Health and Human Development (2R01HD074819-04, and 1R01HD092239-01), and the
29 National Science Foundation (NSF Career Award – E. Sejdic; grant #1652203).

30 Non-financial: the authors disclose that they have no non-financial conflicts of interest.
31

32 **Funding Statement:** This work was supported by grants from the National Institutes of Health –
33 National Institute of Child Health and Human Development: #2R01HD074819-04 (E. Sejdic, J. Coyle, co-
34 PI's), and 1R01HD092239-01 (E. Sejdic, PI), and NSF Career Award (E. Sejdic) #1652203.
35

39 **High resolution cervical auscultation and data science: New tools to address an old problem.**

40

41 **Abstract**

42 High resolution cervical auscultation (HRCA) is an evolving clinical method for noninvasive screening of
43 dysphagia that relies on data science, machine learning and wearable sensors to investigate of the
44 characteristics of disordered swallowing function in people with dysphagia. HRCA has shown promising
45 results in categorizing normal and disordered swallowing (i.e., screening) and independent of human
46 input, identifying a variety of swallowing physiologic events as accurately as trained human judges. The
47 system has been developed through a collaboration of data scientists, computer-electrical engineers and
48 speech-language pathologists. Its potential to automate dysphagia screening and contribute to evaluation
49 lies in its noninvasive nature (wearable electronic sensors) and its growing ability to accurately replicate
50 human judgments of swallowing data typically formed on the basis of videofluoroscopic imaging data.
51 Potential contributions of HRCA when VFSS may be unavailable, undesired, or not feasible for many
52 patients in various settings, is discussed along with the development and capabilities of HRCA. The use of
53 technological advances and wearable devices can extend the dysphagia clinician’s reach and reinforce
54 top-of-license practice for patients with swallowing disorders.

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63 **High resolution cervical auscultation and data science: New tools to address an old problem.**

64

65 **Introduction**

66 Why does the use of devices for measuring swallowing function matter? For many years, human
67 judgment of patient function was solely performed by empirical observation of the patient performing a
68 target activity or task. In fact, human judgment has been the gold standard for describing numerous
69 human functions for many decades. But, with the growth of technological advances in computer
70 sciences and sensor technology have come opportunities to meld two areas of science to accomplish
71 two common goals: 1. improving traditional screening, clinical assessment and treatment methods by
72 including technology, and 2. developing individualized treatments designed to address the nuances of a
73 specific patient's impairment patterns. The purpose of this manuscript is to 1) review the current and
74 past use of cervical auscultation in assessing individuals with dysphagia, 2) describe the complex
75 underpinnings of high resolution cervical auscultation (HRCA) and its application to dysphagia
76 assessment, and 3) to describe a current, ongoing project that integrates collaborative HRCA advances in
77 technology and clinical findings.

78

79 **Limitations of cervical auscultation and rationale for HRCA**

80 Cervical auscultation to observe swallowing function (CA) using ordinary stethoscopes has been a
81 common clinical practice for many years by dysphagia clinicians. Up to one-fourth of dysphagia
82 clinicians use CA in diagnostic and management activities (Bateman et al., 2007; Rumbach et al., 2018;
83 Vogels et al., 2015). The use of CA was implemented following the observation that sounds emanate
84 from the neck during swallowing, and that these sounds may reflect physiologic events occurring during
85 swallowing (Borr et al., 2007). CA is based on the principle that a stethoscope can transmit all available
86 acoustic information from the anterior neck during swallowing, and that a human observer can

87 accurately interpret those sounds into a timeline of physiologic events. This also assumes the ability to
88 form an impression as to the “normalness” of those events. This concept is germane to dysphagia
89 clinical practice, given the longstanding interest in developing inexpensive and noninvasive methods of
90 evaluating swallowing function. Support for CA was first described more than 20 years ago by Cichero &
91 Murdoch (1998), in a theoretical paper in which a cardiac analogy theory was proposed. Briefly, this
92 theory proposes that the upper aerodigestive tract is analogous to the heart. Both consist of several
93 tubes and valves that open and close in a certain pattern, and pumps that squeeze and propel fluids
94 during the cardiac cycle and during swallowing. Furthermore, the theory suggests that ordinary
95 auscultation with a stethoscope, as is used in clinical evaluation of cardiac sounds, should translate to an
96 equivalent interpretation of swallowing function that would be derived from an imaging study. Because
97 of its convenience and low cost, interest in adding stethoscope-based observations has grown in the
98 past 20 years, and many clinicians rely on cervical auscultation in diagnostic assessments, sometimes as
99 a replacement for imaging. Several studies have reported data indicating that specific “sounds”
100 occurring during swallowing represent discrete physiologic and kinematic events, and that these
101 observations may be useful surrogates for videofluoroscopic (VF) imaging studies (Borr et al., 2007;
102 Leslie et al., 2007; Zenner et al., 1995).

103
104 Initially, research regarding CA produced results indicating its ability to identify when a swallow
105 occurred, but this quickly spawned research into the nature of those sounds. These studies described
106 and named the sounds, often using a variety of labels (e.g., “lub,” “dub,” “first and second sound,” “pre-
107 click,” “click,” “swish,” Greek alphabet characters, etc.) to reflect what seemed to be associated with
108 swallowing events. These events were observed with concurrent imaging including opening and closing
109 of laryngopharyngeal valves, ventilatory sounds, and bolus flow (Borr et al., 2007). Leslie and colleagues
110 (2007) investigated CA by using an electronic microphone to standardize data acquisition during

111 concurrent imaging studies of swallowing. They described the many inconsistencies in the assumptions
112 underlying CA's utility. The study identified associations between some sounds and observed kinematic
113 events, while also noting an astonishingly broad range of patterns of CA sounds during swallowing in
114 healthy participants. The authors also demonstrated poor inter-judge agreement for CA while
115 underscoring the conflict between the convenience benefits of stethoscope-based CA and its accuracy,
116 cautioning readers that "there is no robust evidence cervical auscultation of swallowing sounds should
117 be adopted in routine clinical practice..." (p. 296). Both studies relied on human interpretation of the
118 sounds produced during the swallows. Regardless of the obvious limitations of the method, CA has
119 persisted in clinical dysphagia work.

120
121 CA's limited value as an adjunct to dysphagia assessment lies in the stethoscope's inability to collect and
122 transmit, the entire spectrum of acoustic and vibratory information emanating from the pharynx and
123 larynx during swallowing (Nowak & Nowak, 2018), as well as the human auditory system's limitations in
124 perceiving and interpreting in a standardized manner, the obtained sounds. Stethoscopes are designed
125 for specific purposes and tuned for specific frequency ranges based on those purposes (e.g., heart
126 sounds, ventilatory sounds; adults, children), and likewise, the range of human auditory acuity across
127 independent judges varies widely. To illustrate the challenges presented by auscultation with
128 stethoscopes, Favrat and colleagues (2004) investigated the accuracy of cardiologists, internists, family
129 practitioners, and residents, in identifying cardiac sounds and generation of an accurate diagnosis based
130 on chest auscultation. The expert practitioners were 69% accurate recognizing heart sounds, and
131 correctly diagnosed 62% of the cases, while the residents were 40% and 24% accurate, respectively. This
132 underscores the degree of observation and interpretation imprecision based on auscultation for an
133 actual disorder for which stethoscopes were developed. Since there has been an explosion in the

134 development of electronic data acquisition and analyses over the past 10-15 years, potential
135 alternatives to stethoscope-based CA have received increased attention.

136
137 The growth of computerized signal processing capabilities and development of a variety of electronic
138 sensors has delivered an opportunity to investigate the principles underlying CA using techniques that
139 do not rely completely on human judgment, and to capitalize on advanced algorithm-based signal
140 processing, machine learning, and artificial intelligence methods developed by our partners in related
141 Engineering fields. Though other research groups have explored sensor based swallowing observation
142 over the past several years using surface electromyography, piezoelectric sensors, and accelerometers,
143 Sejdíć and colleagues described the first steps toward development of a sensor-based HRCA system for
144 use in dysphagia screening (Sejdic, Steele, et al., 2010).

145
146 High resolution cervical auscultation (HRCA) was described by Dudik and colleagues (2015) following
147 three years of research that deployed a tri-axial accelerometer and high resolution microphone to
148 accrue the signals. Preliminary studies examining the signal processing of swallowing accelerometry
149 data indicated significant differences in signal features obtained during various bolus conditions and
150 bolus head position during swallowing. In 2013, the authors of this manuscript embarked on a long-
151 term NIH sponsored project that is ongoing, and the results of which have been published or are under
152 analysis, submission, review, or revisions, as well as cited elsewhere in this manuscript. In this study,
153 patients with suspected dysphagia underwent concurrent videofluoroscopy and HRCA signal acquisition.
154 The goals of the study are to 1) develop an autonomous HRCA screening system and test its efficacy in
155 the clinical setting, and 2) compare the accuracy of autonomous and semi-autonomous HRCA prediction
156 of various commonly analyzed swallowing temporal and spatial measurements to gold standard human
157 judgment and raise that accuracy to acceptable levels, in an effort to improve clinical workflow, and to

158 provide a surrogate to VFSS when VFSS is not available, feasible, or desired by the patient. To date, the
159 study methodology has involved the use of three signal sources (VFSS, tri-axial accelerometry, high-
160 resolution microphone) collected simultaneously. Consented participants were comprised of patients
161 referred for a VFSS due to suspected dysphagia. All participants were from an acute, tertiary care
162 teaching hospital. From this cohort, approximately 4,000 imaged swallows were captured and stored.
163 The authors (JC and ES) continue to collect the same type of data, using the same methodology, from a
164 cohort of 200 healthy community dwelling adults. This collaborative clinical and engineering based
165 endeavor permits the 1) development of an automated dysphagia screen while speeding clinical
166 workflow of screening (e.g., nurse dysphagia screens) without compromising accuracy, 2) improvement
167 of objectivity of judgments of swallowing function from imaging data, , and 3) capitalization on the
168 advantages of advanced signal processing techniques within the dysphagia diagnostic process. To
169 develop such a system, traditional human-mediated manual measurement methods of VFSS data
170 measurement serve as the gold standard, and machine learning is deployed to more quickly produce
171 accurate measurements that reflect the same judgments and measurements performed by the human
172 judges.

173

174 **Current Project: Protocol**

175 To date, we have accrued data from 274 adult patients who were referred for VFSS at the University of
176 Pittsburgh Medical Center campus hospitals, and from 80 healthy community dwelling, age-matched
177 adults recruited from community registries. Patients were referred over the course of routine care due
178 to confirmed or suspected dysphagia, and the examination procedures were controlled by the
179 examining clinicians (i.e., SLP, Radiologist). Data accrual was performed by two SLP's (VFSS) and two
180 engineers (HRCA) during each examination. All procedures were approved by the Institutional Review
181 Board at the University of Pittsburgh.

182 After providing informed consent, patients and healthy participants were prepared to undergo a VFSS
183 (GE Ultimax system). Prior to initiation of the VFSS, two sensors were attached to the anterior neck. The
184 tri-axial accelerometer (ADXL 327, Analog devices, Norwood, MA) was positioned at the anterior
185 midline overlying the arch of the cricoid cartilage (based on palpation by the SLP investigators)The
186 microphone (model C111L, AKG, Vienna, Austria) was placed approximately 1cm lateral (right) and
187 inferior to the accelerometer to avoid interfering with the necessary VFSS imaging of the upper airway
188 (Figure 1). For the patient data collection, bolus administration was dictated by the examining clinical
189 speech-language pathologist (SLP) and no effort to modify the VFSS protocol was made by the research
190 team. This ensured that the data set would be consistent with VFSS data obtained during typical
191 conditions that occur during routine clinical VFSS. Patients swallowed varying numbers of boluses of
192 multiple standardized textures and volumes of contrast (Varibar products, Bracco Diagnostics, Monroe
193 Township, N.J.) in a neutral head position, as well as in various postural modifications based on clinician
194 intervention efficacy trial needs. Continuous, written logging by investigators during all data accrual
195 ensured specification of bolus conditions. For the healthy participants (age 18 – 92), a standard research
196 protocol of 10 swallows per participant was followed to minimize x-ray exposure durations (average
197 fluoro time = 0.66 minutes per examination). We also sought to accrue as much data from healthy
198 participants as possible that would align with data accrued from patients to enable a sufficiently robust
199 sample size for the machine learning components of the research. Healthy participants were
200 administered 10 boluses each in the neutral head position. Trials were comprised of the following: 1)
201 five 3mL thin liquid (Varibar Thin, Bracco) boluses, administered by the research SLP from a spoon with a
202 swallow command used to prompt swallows and 2) five unmeasured, self-selected volume boluses of
203 thin liquid, self-administered by participants from a cup without verbal or other prompts to swallow.
204 These bolus size conditions were included in order to capture swallowing under both controlled and
205 natural swallowing conditions, which have been shown to produce different temporal activity during

206 swallowing (Nagy et al., 2013). The rationale for inclusion of a 3ml bolus condition was that this was the
207 most common bolus condition to challenge the patient participants. The order of presentation of the 10
208 boluses was randomized for each healthy participant.

209
210 Fluoroscopy was performed at a pulse rate of 30PPS and images were accrued to a frame grabber card
211 at 60 FPS and later down-sampled to 30FPS to eliminate duplicate frames (Bonilha et al., 2013;
212 Oppenheim & Schafer, 2014). Simultaneously, acoustic and accelerometric signals were accrued directly
213 to a hard drive, time linked to corresponding VFSS imaging data. The sensor placement is illustrated in
214 figure 1, and the details of signal acquisition methods and hardware/software used are described by
215 Dudik and colleagues (2018), as well as in other publications by this research group.

216
217 Insert Figure 1 here

218

219 **Fundamentals of HRCA**

220 The overall aim in developing HRCA is to produce a system that is capable of independently performing
221 some temporal, spatial and kinematic measurements that are traditionally performed by clinicians.
222 After establishing HRCA's accuracy in screening (Dudik, Coyle, et al., 2015), machine learning algorithms
223 are deployed in order to test HRCA's ability to accurately perform some temporal and spatial
224 measurements as accurately as trained human judges. Machine learning is an iterative process by which
225 gold-standard data are first generated (e.g. human temporal and spatial measurements), after which
226 some of that data is used to train computer algorithms to accurately produce acceptably similar
227 judgments as the human judges, and the rest of the data, which is novel to the algorithms, is used to
228 test their accuracy. Training is a computationally expensive but necessary process required to enable
229 algorithms to detect characteristics of signal features that correspond to human-identified temporal or

230 spatial events. As we accrue more data, the training sets grow, resulting in increased precision across an
231 expanding range of conditions and extraneous confounds.

232

233 *HRCA Data Acquisition*

234 Several commonly used parameters were selected to characterize swallowing impairments. These
235 parameters have been widely reported in the literature over the years. . The general scheme of HRCA
236 data acquisition and analysis is illustrated in Figure 2. All swallow videos were segmented to identify the
237 swallow segments that would be entered into the machine learning processes by trained human judges
238 using image processing software (ImageJ, NIH). Temporal and spatial event measurements were
239 performed based on the methods of others (Lof & Robbins, 1990) to ensure compatibility of measures
240 with historical, published data. Data were recorded manually into spreadsheets and through
241 customized Matlab modules during measurement. All judges underwent standardized training in each
242 measure they were to perform, and their inter- and intra-rater reliability was tested prior to online
243 analysis of study data. All judges returned high inter- and intra-rater reliability (e.g., 80% exact
244 agreement within three frames (0.1 seconds) (Lof & Robbins, 1990) for frame selection during temporal
245 analyses, and excellent intraclass correlation coefficients of 0.90 or greater for pixel-based spatial
246 measures) for each measure. These criteria were also applied during data analyses using to eliminate
247 judgment drift during ongoing measurement/judgment. Events and scores from images that have been
248 coded include categorical measurements (e.g., scores on the penetration aspiration scale (Rosenbek et
249 al., 1996) and measurements of vallecular and pyriform sinus residue using the normalized residue ratio
250 scale (Pearson et al., 2013)). Temporal measurements relying on frame selection include: the video
251 frames indicating first entry of bolus into the pharynx (bolus crosses ramus of mandible) and completion
252 of bolus clearance through the UES (segment duration), onset of hyoid displacement, frame of maximal
253 hyoid displacement, hyoid return to lowest position at the end of the swallow (duration of hyoid

254 displacement), onset and offset of UES opening, and onset and offset of laryngeal closure,. Specific
255 measurement methods for performing temporal measures of VFSS images have been described by
256 Kurosu et al. (2019). Spatial, pixel-based measurements include the position of the hyoid body on each
257 frame (hyoid kinematics), the diameter of the UES at maximal distension, and the position and area of
258 the bolus and its components on each video frame. This latter measurement is being performed in
259 ongoing efforts to develop algorithms to identify and quantify the proportion of boluses that enter the
260 esophagus and that are retained in pharyngeal recesses or that enter the airway. After processing the
261 signals, the VFSS-derived data are entered into the machine learning process to train algorithms.

262

263 Insert figure 2 here.

264 *HRCA Data Processing: Pre-processing Deglutition Signals*

265 It is critical to understand the basic data science and engineering definitions used in signal processing. A
266 signal typically represents a quantity recorded via various instruments that represents changes in values.
267 In statistics, signals are typically referred as time series, but in engineering, these recordings as referred
268 as signals as they typically represent a measurable physical quantity. Importantly, signal artifacts must
269 be considered during signal processing. The two artifacts discussed here are related to noise and
270 disturbances.

271

272 Signal noise represents physical quantities that contaminate information present in these signals. In
273 many cases, it is assumed that it stems from a random process (e.g., white Gaussian noise), while
274 disturbances also represent signal contaminants that are not stemming from a random process (e.g.,
275 coughing, breathing sounds). There is also a major difference between noise and disturbances. Noise
276 typically occupies all frequencies captured by signals, while disturbances are based in specific frequency

277 bands. Sounds and vibrations represents vibration signals that are acquired by microphones and
278 accelerometers, respectively.

279 Swallowing-related signals such as HRCA signals (i.e., swallowing vibrations or swallowing sounds) or
280 surface electromyography signals are typically contaminated with various disturbances and noise (Dudik,
281 Coyle, et al., 2015). Noise typically originates in electronic equipment used to acquire these signals or
282 elsewhere in the immediate vicinity of data collection, while signal disturbances are caused by
283 physiologic events that occur during the swallowing event (e.g., displacement of structures, bolus flow,
284 breathing, head motions, vasomotion of major arteries). All these additional and simultaneously
285 occurring signal components “contaminate” the targeted swallowing-related signal components and
286 make any subsequent analysis difficult to carry out. This is because it is difficult to understand whether
287 trends observed in the raw data are due to swallowing or due to disturbances and/or noise, or the
288 combination of both. Hence, the first priority is to preprocess these swallowing signals, and remove as
289 much as possible of the contaminating signal components (Sejdic et al., 2019). Steps in the
290 preprocessing and feature extraction of HRCA signals are also illustrated in figure 2.

291

292 HRCA Data Processing: Data Reduction

293 The first task in the signal processing method is to remove any confounding effects of the data
294 acquisition system via a process called whitening (Sejdic, Komisar, et al., 2010). Here, the idea is to
295 develop filters mimicking the frequency behavior of the data acquisition system, and the inverses of
296 these filters are then applied to acquired data to remove any contaminating effects of the data
297 acquisition system. Next, noise needs to be removed from the deglutition signals, and this is typically
298 achieved via a process called denoising (Sejdic, Steele, et al., 2010). Most efficient denoising algorithms
299 are based on wavelets which are state-of-the-art mathematical functions that divide the signal data into
300 components based on their frequency range, to enable each component to be analyzed using a scale

301 that is matched to its resolution (Graps, 1995). Once whitening and denoising steps are completed, one
302 would carry out any normalization steps (e.g., amplitude normalization), and lastly signal segmentation
303 is completed.

304

305 Segmentation is the process of identifying the components of the recorded data that represent the
306 event of interest (i.e., a swallow event) and separating the segment from pre- and post-swallow
307 recorded events. For any automated method of segmentation to succeed, a segmentation gold
308 standard must be used to provide the criterion for the onset and offset of any individual swallow, in
309 order to enable comparison of the signal-derived predictions to the actual event duration, ensure face
310 validity of the electronic measurement predictions, and to facilitate machine learning procedures which
311 with multiple iterations of cross validation increase the efficiency and accuracy of the algorithms.

312 Segmentation involves human frame-by-frame viewing and selection of the video frame in which the
313 bolus head enters the pharynx (crosses the plane of the shadow of the mandible), and the frame in
314 which the bolus tail clears through the UES, by trained dysphagia researchers in the swallowing research
315 lab. These results are used to train the algorithms to detect the duration of the swallow.

316 A number of different algorithms have been proposed over the years to segment swallowing signals
317 into individual swallows (Damouras et al., 2010; Dudik, Kurosu, et al., 2015; Sejdic et al., 2009). The main
318 reason for the variety of algorithms is that this is one of the crucial steps in the analysis of signals, since
319 incorrectly identifying a swallowing segment will obviously skew any subsequent analysis steps.

320

321 HRCA Data Processing: Feature Extraction

322 Once swallowing signals are segmented into individual swallows, signal features are identified and
323 extracted. Most of the current literature considers features in various mathematical domains such as the
324 time domain, frequency domain or the time-frequency domain. Features of segmented swallow signals

325 range in complexity between those that are more common (e.g., standard deviations of these
326 swallowing signals), to more advanced features, such as the entropy rate of these signals, denoting the
327 amount of randomness in these signals. Extracted features can be then used to form various statistical
328 models to examine dependence between independent variables, in this case signal features, and various
329 dependent variables, such as penetration-aspiration scores, hyoid bone displacements in the anterior,
330 posterior, superior and inferior directions (Dudik et al., 2016; Dudik, Kurosu, et al., 2018; Kurosu et al.,
331 2019; Movahedi, Kurosu, Coyle, Perera, & Sejdić, 2017; Rebrion et al., 2019).

332
333 On the surface, signal features based on mathematical domains do not appear germane to analysis of
334 clinical data traditionally obtained solely through imaging methods and analyzed by human judges. They
335 are highly relevant from a computational point of view, because extracting features that are directly
336 related to various physiological events that occur during swallowing is of particular relevance to
337 clinicians. However, extracting physiologically identifiable features from swallowing signals requires the
338 use of modern data analytics tools, such as machine learning, which will be described next. Moreover,
339 human judges cannot perceive, nor can their judgment account for, many features of movement-related
340 signals. That is, there are numerous components embedded within signals and images generated during
341 a swallowing VFSS, that a human judge is not capable of identifying and/or discriminating.

342
343 *HRCA and Machine Learning: Fundamentals*

344 Machine learning is the study of algorithms and various statistical models that can be used to infer
345 about specific patterns in a data set, in a supervised or unsupervised manner. While this scientific
346 discipline has been around for more than 50 years, it has gained much more attention in recent years
347 due to the advances in available computational resources that make the use of these computationally
348 intensive algorithms to solve various problems possible.

349

350 Most machine learning algorithms rely on two phases: training and testing phases. During the training
351 phase, one provides data to these algorithms to enable the algorithms to compute and infer about
352 patterns in the dataset, much like the process of inference. The training data from the VFSS images
353 which have been labelled by human judges, (i.e., each data point is labelled as belonging to one of the
354 classes present in the dataset). These classes represent the VFSS measurement parameters described
355 earlier. The training phase typically continues until training conditions, such as the accuracy of the
356 algorithms in identifying human-identified events above a certain a priori percentage criterion, are met.
357 Once the machine learning algorithm achieves desired performance on the training set, the algorithm is
358 then applied to a testing set, (i.e., novel data to which the algorithms have not previously been
359 exposed). The performance metrics such as sensitivity, specificity or recall are then reported.

360 It is important here to clarify that training and testing data need to be separate. In other words, we
361 cannot use the same data points for training and testing phases. In an ideal situation, the training phase
362 is conducted using a dataset that was initially collected specifically for the purpose of training the
363 machine learning algorithm, while the testing phase is conducted on a completely new dataset collected
364 specifically for testing the accuracy of the proposed/used algorithm.

365

366 Unfortunately, this is not always possible, especially, in ordinary and often chaotic clinical settings due
367 to a number of different issues such as funding, availability of staff, insufficient numbers of exemplars of
368 the events of interest (e.g., swallows), and other constraints of clinical setting. In these cases, one can
369 use a process called cross-validation in which the available data is randomly split into training and
370 testing data, and the training phase is then completed only using the training data, and the testing phase
371 is completed only using the testing data. This method of developing training and testing data sets from
372 a large mass of clinically-derived data increases the external validity of the resultant algorithms and

373 systems because all factors present in clinical testing environments that are mitigated in controlled
374 studies are present during ordinary data collection and therefore, are components of the data sets.

375

376 *Clinical Application of Machine Learning*

377 While machine learning algorithms are much more complicated to use and more computationally
378 intensive than other algorithms, they enable us to achieve various tasks that otherwise would be
379 impossible to achieve by humans or other algorithms. For example, machine learning algorithms have
380 been successfully applied in classifying swallowing signals to identify and differentiate swallows
381 exhibiting no aspiration and those with aspiration with a very high accuracy (Celeste et al., 2012; Sejdić
382 et al., 2013). Certainly the ability to noninvasively and continuously monitor and identify adequate from
383 inadequate airway protection during swallowing has clinical applications, but efforts to extend machine
384 learning of HRCA signals to determine the potential diagnostic utility of the system has begun to
385 demonstrate compelling results. For instance, it was recently demonstrated that a combination of
386 machine learning techniques, using non-invasive HRCA acceleration signals, can track the movement of
387 the hyoid bone solely from the HRCA signals with a similar accuracy as trained human judges performing
388 measurements using VFSS images (Mao et al., 2019). This study represents seminal work as it offers an
389 alternative and widely available method for online hyoid bone movement tracking without any radiation
390 risks and provides a pronounced and flexible approach for identifying clinically useful characteristics of
391 dysphagia.

392

393 Machine learning has other potential applications that may also increase the speed of interpretation of
394 VFSS imaging data by the clinician. Zhang, Coyle, & Sejdić (2018) recently sought to determine whether
395 machine learning techniques could be used as a surrogate to manual spatial analysis to detect structural
396 features of VFSS data from the video images themselves, demonstrating that unsupervised (i.e., without

397 human input) advanced machine learning algorithms can identify the location of at least half of the body
398 of the hyoid bone, at any point in time of a VFSS sequence. The height of the human hyoid body ranges
399 from 0.6 – 1.2cm (across adult males and females) (Loth et al., 2015). We produced square bounding
400 boxes surrounding the hyoid body on every VFSS frame based on the human judges' frame-by-frame
401 plotting annotations. Through machine learning, a second bounding box denoting the predicted
402 location of the human-determined hyoid body bounding box was generated by the algorithms. The
403 HRCA-generated bounding boxes exhibited >50% overlap with the human-measurement generated
404 bounding boxes 89% of the time continuously throughout the swallow sequences. We acknowledge
405 that routinely 50% does not sound like a very good value; however, given the small dimensions of the
406 hyoid body, accurately locating >50% of a 6-10 mm object is a reasonable preliminary result which we
407 are refining with additional machine learning.

408 A benefit to this result is a reduction in the time required to analyze this data from 15-20 minutes per
409 swallow required by a human judge to annotate the two hyoid body landmarks on each frame of the
410 swallow, to less than 30 seconds per swallow.

411

412 Other findings that we have published have demonstrated that HRCA signals combined with signal
413 processing and machine learning techniques can detect a variety of swallow kinematic events with
414 similar accuracy to trained human judges and can differentiate between safe (scores of 1, 2) and unsafe
415 swallows (scores of 3 – 8), as determined by the penetration-aspiration scale, with a high degree of
416 accuracy (Dudik, Coyle, et al., 2018; Dudik, Coyle, et al., 2015; Dudik, Jestrović, et al., 2015; Dudik,
417 Kurosu, et al., 2015; Jestrović et al., 2013; Movahedi, Kurosu, Coyle, Perera, & Sejdic, 2017; Sejdic et al.,
418 2013). We have examined the association between HRCA signals and component scores of various
419 swallow kinematic events from the Modified Barium Swallow Impairment Profile (MBSImP) (Martin-
420 Harris et al., 2008) and found strong associations between HRCA signals and anterior hyoid bone

421 movement (component #9), pharyngoesophageal segment opening (component #14), and pharyngeal
422 residue (component #16) (Donohue et al., 2019; Donohue et al., 2018; Sabry et al., 2019). We have also
423 found a strong association between HRCA signal features and hyoid bone displacement (He et al., 2019;
424 Rebrion et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2018).

425

426 **Conclusions and future directions**

427 Incorporation of technology into everyday life is a common practice. Our smart devices, automobiles,
428 and numerous other ordinary and common tools continue to demonstrate that developments in
429 electrical and computer engineering can positively impact ordinary human activities. Likewise,
430 wearable, personalized machine-learning based technologies that provide real-time monitoring of
431 ordinary activities and health conditions (e.g., smart watches, continuous glucose monitoring systems,
432 wearable sweat sensors for endurance athletes) and assist with daily clinical work (e.g., dictation-
433 transcription software) are contributing real-time information that can improve the accuracy and depth
434 of health information needed to provide screening, diagnostic and treatment data to individuals and
435 clinicians in health care settings. Many of these technologies produce similar results as a human judge
436 but significantly more quickly, and many expand clinician capabilities beyond the limits of human
437 judgment.

438

439 In the same way that we strive to change the disordered physiology of swallowing in our patients
440 through our observations, developments in advanced signal processing and machine learning in a variety
441 of contexts enrich our observations. These advances show promise in augmenting our ability to not only
442 perform services and procedures more efficiently, but also to perform them with greater depth of
443 inference. But, adoption of new technologies is often met with skepticism. During development of our
444 HRCA system and methods, and after collecting a few hundred samples of acoustic data obtained using

445 HRCA high resolution microphones, we played these audio files to dysphagia experts with experience in
446 the use of stethoscope-based cervical auscultation. Their response was almost universally “that’s not
447 what swallows sound like.” The sensors had obtained broader spectral and frequency ranges than are
448 possible with a stethoscope. This disbelief is likely rooted in the assumption that the human auditory
449 system has complete receptive and processing capabilities, and that there is no additional information in
450 the acoustic signals because “we can’t hear it.” It will take time for many technological developments to
451 be accepted in mainstream clinical work, and for medicine to embrace the contributions of these new
452 and relatively unfamiliar fields of science are to our own profession and clinical practice, and to fully
453 develop their potential. We are embarking on a clinical trial of our HRCA system to assess its screening
454 effectiveness, in an effort to extend screening beyond the acute care setting. Likewise, we continue
455 testing HRCA’s accuracy in predicting a variety of temporal and spatial measurements in an effort to
456 strengthen clinicians’ impact on patient care. Automated signal-processing based measurements can
457 help shift clinician resources toward actual intervention by reducing some of the tedium of manual
458 measurements that consume so much of the clinical process while increasing their depth.

459

460 Numerous devices and systems are under development that capitalize on advances in other areas of
461 science that carry the potential of extending the reach of clinicians. Our own HRCA research is
462 developing results with the hope that such a system that can (in the future) noninvasively analyze some
463 aspects of deglutition on a swallow-by-swallow basis in real time. This could be done either with imaging
464 to expedite measurements and interpretations, or without the use of imaging when it is unavailable, to
465 identify swallowing disorders and impairments, and potentially inform the clinician regarding
466 intervention options when traditional information (e.g., imaging data) is not available. This will broaden
467 the clinician’s capacity to interpret more information more efficiently while extending deployment of
468 the scope of practice to patients who a) have no access to imaging centers for economic or other

469 logistical reasons, b) do not want imaging studies, c) do not have immediate or any access to imaging
470 studies (e.g., underserved regions), , and d) who are physically unable to undergo imaging tests.
471 Moreover, such developments are promising in that they enable clinicians to produce top-of-license
472 practice patterns more efficiently and with comparable accuracy. Collaborations between dysphagia
473 researchers and clinicians, computer and electrical engineers, and many other disciplines, represent the
474 future of development of personalized methods to improve the screening, diagnosis and
475 treatment/management of people with dysphagia.

476

477

478

479

480

481 ***Acknowledgements***

482 This work is supported by grants from the National Institutes of Health (Eunice Kennedy Shriver Institute
483 for Child Health and Human Development, grant numbers 1R01HD092239-01 and 2R01HD074819-04),
484 and from the National Science Foundation (career award number 1652203). We appreciate our
485 collaborations with the participant registry of the Claude D. Pepper Older Americans Independence
486 Center, and the Pitt+Me Registry. The authors acknowledge and appreciate the contributions of the
487 participants in the described research, the Department of Radiology of the University of Pittsburgh
488 Medical Center, and those of our doctoral, graduate and undergraduate student research associates in
489 the execution of this ongoing work. The authors acknowledge and appreciate the assistance of PhD
490 students Erin Lucatorto and Cara Donohue in the preparation of this manuscript.

491

492

493 **References**

- 494 Bateman, C., Leslie, P., & Drinnan, M. J. (2007). Adult dysphagia assessment in the UK and Ireland: are
495 SLTs assessing the same factors? *Dysphagia*, 22(3), 174-186. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00455-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00455-006-9070-3)
496 [006-9070-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00455-006-9070-3)
- 497
- 498 Bonilha, H. S., Blair, J., Carnes, B., Huda, W., Humphries, K., McGrattan, K., Michel, Y., & Martin-Harris, B.
499 (2013). Preliminary investigation of the effect of pulse rate on judgments of swallowing
500 impairment and treatment recommendations. *Dysphagia*, 28(4), 528-538.
501 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00455-013-9463-z>
- 502
- 503 Borr, C., Hielscher-Fastabend, M., & Lücking, A. (2007). Reliability and validity of cervical auscultation.
504 *Dysphagia*, 22(3), 225-234. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00455-007-9078-3>
- 505
- 506 Celeste, M., Azadeh, K., Sejdić, E., Berall, G., & Chau, T. (2012). Quantitative classification of pediatric
507 swallowing through accelerometry. *J Neuroeng Rehabil*, 9(1), 34. [https://doi.org/10.1186/1743-](https://doi.org/10.1186/1743-0003-9-34)
508 [0003-9-34](https://doi.org/10.1186/1743-0003-9-34)
- 509
- 510 Cichero, J. A., & Murdoch, B. E. (1998). The physiologic cause of swallowing sounds: Answers from heart
511 sounds and vocal tract acoustics. *Dysphagia*, 13(1), 39-52. <https://doi.org/10.1007/pl00009548>
- 512
- 513 Damouras, S., Sejdic, E., Steele, C. M., & Chau, T. (2010). An online swallow detection algorithm based
514 on the quadratic variation of dual-axis accelerometry. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*,
515 58(6), 3352-3359. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSP.2010.2043972>
- 516
- 517 Donohue, C., Khalifa, Y., Sejdic, E., & Coyle, J. L. (2019). How closely do machine ratings of duration of
518 UES opening during videofluoroscopy approximate clinician ratings using kinematic analysis and
519 the MBSImP? Dysphagia Research Society Annual Scientific Meeting, San Diego, CA.
- 520
- 521 Donohue, C., Zhang, Z., Mahoney, A., Perera, S., Sejdic, E., & Coyle, J. L. (2018). Do machine ratings of
522 hyoid bone displacement during videofluoroscopy match clinician ratings using the MBSImP?
523 American Speech Language Hearing Association Convention, Orlando, FL.
- 524
- 525 Dudik, J. M., Coyle, J. L., El-Jaroudi, A., Mao, Z.-H., Sun, M., & Sejdić, E. (2018). Deep learning for
526 classification of normal swallows in adults. *Neurocomputing*, 285, 1-9.
527 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neucom.2017.12.059>
- 528
- 529 Dudik, J. M., Coyle, J. L., & Sejdic, E. (2015). Dysphagia screening: Contributions of cervical auscultation
530 signals and modern signal-processing techniques. *IEEE Transactions on Human Machine*
531 *Systems*, 45(4), 465-477. <https://doi.org/10.1109/thms.2015.2408615>
- 532

533 Dudik, J. M., Jestrović, I., Luan, B., Coyle, J. L., & Sejdic, E. (2015). A comparative analysis of swallowing
534 accelerometry and sounds during saliva swallows. *Biomed Eng Online*, 14, 3.
535 <https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-925x-14-3>

536
537 Dudik, J. M., Kurosu, A., Coyle, J. L., & Sejdic, E. (2015). A comparative analysis of DBSCAN, K-means, and
538 quadratic variation algorithms for automatic identification of swallows from swallowing
539 accelerometry signals. *Computers in Biology and Medicine*, 59, 10-18.
540 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.combiomed.2015.01.007>

541
542 Dudik, J. M., Kurosu, A., Coyle, J. L., & Sejdić, E. (2016). A statistical analysis of cervical auscultation
543 signals from adults with unsafe airway protection. *Journal of NeuroEngineering and*
544 *Rehabilitation*, 13(1), 7. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12984-015-0110-9>

545
546 Dudik, J. M., Kurosu, A., Coyle, J. L., & Sejdić, E. (2018). Dysphagia and its effects on swallowing sounds
547 and vibrations in adults. *Biomedical Engineering Online*, 17(1), 69.
548 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12938-018-0501-9>

549
550 Favrat, B., Pecoud, A., & Jaussi, A. (2004). Teaching cardiac auscultation to trainees in internal medicine
551 and family practice: does it work? *BMC Med Educ*, 4, 5. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6920-4-5>

552
553 Graps, A. (1995). An introduction to wavelets. *IEEE Computational Science and Engineering*, 2(2), 50-61.
554 <https://doi.org/10.1109/99.388960>

555
556 He, Q., Perera, S., Khalifa, Y., Zhang, Z., Mahoney, A. S., Sabry, A., Donohue, C., Coyle, J. L., & Sejdić, E.
557 (2019). The association of high resolution cervical auscultation signal features with hyoid bone
558 displacement during swallowing. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation*
559 *Engineering*, 27(9), 1810-1816. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TNSRE.2019.2935302>

560
561 Jestrović, I., Dudik, J. M., Luan, B., Coyle, J. L., & Sejdic, E. (2013). Baseline characteristics of cervical
562 auscultation signals during various head maneuvers. *Comput Biol Med*, 43(12), 2014-2020.
563 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.combiomed.2013.10.005>

564
565 Kurosu, A., Coyle, J. L., Dudik, J. M., & Sejdic, E. (2019). Detection of swallow kinematic events from
566 acoustic high-resolution cervical auscultation signals in patients with stroke. *Archives of Physical*
567 *Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 100(3), 501-508. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2018.05.038>

568
569 Leslie, P., Drinnan, M., Zammit-Maempel, I., Coyle, J., Ford, G., & Wilson, J. A. (2007). Cervical
570 auscultation synchronized with images from endoscopy swallow evaluations. *Dysphagia*, 22(4),
571 290-298. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00455-007-9084-5>

572
573 Lof, G. L., & Robbins, J. (1990). Test-retest variability in normal swallowing. *Dysphagia*, 4(4), 236-242.

574
575 Loth, A., Corny, J., Santini, L., Dahan, L., Dessi, P., Adalian, P., & Fakhry, N. (2015). Analysis of hyoid-
576 larynx complex using 3D geometric morphometrics. *Dysphagia*, 30(3), 357-364.
577 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00455-015-9609-2>

578
579 Mao, S., Zhang, Z., Khalifa, Y., Donohue, C., Coyle, J. L., & Sejdic, E. (2019). Neck sensor-supported hyoid
580 bone movement tracking during swallowing. *Royal Society Open Science*, 6(7), 181982.
581 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.181982>

582
583 Martin-Harris, B., Brodsky, M. B., Michel, Y., Castell, D. O., Schleicher, M., Sandidge, J., Maxwell, R., &
584 Blair, J. (2008). MBS measurement tool for swallow impairment—MBSImp: Establishing a
585 standard. *Dysphagia*, 23(4), 392-405. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00455-008-9185-9>

586
587 Movahedi, F., Kurosu, A., Coyle, J. L., Perera, S., & Sejdic, E. (2017). A comparison between swallowing
588 sounds and vibrations in patients with dysphagia. *Comput Methods Programs Biomed*, 144, 179-
589 187. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmpb.2017.03.009>

590
591 Movahedi, F., Kurosu, A., Coyle, J. L., Perera, S., & Sejdić, E. (2017). Anatomical directional dissimilarities
592 in tri-axial swallowing accelerometry signals. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and*
593 *Rehabilitation Engineering*, 25(5), 447-458. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TNSRE.2016.2577882>

594
595 Nagy, A., Leigh, C., Hori, S. F., Molfenter, S. M., Shariff, T., & Steele, C. M. (2013). Timing differences
596 between cued and noncued swallows in healthy young adults. *Dysphagia*, 28(3), 428-434.
597 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00455-013-9456-y>

598
599 Nowak, L. J., & Nowak, K. M. (2018). Sound differences between electronic and acoustic stethoscopes.
600 *Biomedical Engineering Online*, 17(1), 104-104. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12938-018-0540-2>

601
602 Oppenheim, A. V., & Schaffer, R. W. (2014). *Discrete-Time Signal Processing*. Pearson.

603
604 Pearson, W. G., Jr., Molfenter, S. M., Smith, Z. M., & Steele, C. M. (2013). Image-based measurement of
605 post-swallow residue: the normalized residue ratio scale. *Dysphagia*, 28(2), 167-177.
606 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00455-012-9426-9>

607
608 Rebrion, C., Zhang, Z., Khalifa, Y., Ramadan, M., Kurosu, A., Coyle, J. L., Perera, S., & Sejdić, E. (2019).
609 High resolution cervical auscultation signal features reflect vertical and horizontal displacement
610 of the hyoid bone during swallowing. *Journal of Translational Engineering in Health and*
611 *Medicine*, 7(1), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JTEHM.2018.2881468>

612
613 Rosenbek, J. C., Robbins, J. A., Roecker, E. B., Coyle, J. L., & Wood, J. L. (1996). A penetration-aspiration
614 scale. *Dysphagia*, 11(2), 93-98.

615
616 Rumbach, A., Coombes, C., & Doeltgen, S. (2018). A survey of Australian dysphagia practice patterns.
617 *Dysphagia*, 33(2), 216-226. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00455-017-9849-4>

618
619 Sabry, A., Mahoney, A., Perera, S., Sejdic, E., & Coyle, J. L. (2019). Are HRCA signal features associated
620 with clinical ratings of pharyngeal residue using the MBSImp? Dysphagia Research Society
621 Annual Scientific Meeting, San Diego, CA.

622
623 Sejdic, E., Komisar, V., Steele, C. M., & Chau, T. (2010). Baseline characteristics of dual-axis cervical
624 accelerometry signals. *Ann Biomed Eng*, 38(3), 1048-1059. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10439-009-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10439-009-9874-z)
625 [9874-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10439-009-9874-z)

626
627 Sejdic, E., Malandraki, G. A., & Coyle, J. L. (2019). Computational deglutition: Using signal- and image-
628 processing methods to understand swallowing and associated disorders. *IEEE Signal Processing*
629 *Magazine [Life Sciences]*, 36(1), 138-146. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MSP.2018.2875863>

630
631 Sejdic, E., Steele, C. M., & Chau, T. (2009). Segmentation of dual-axis swallowing accelerometry signals in
632 healthy subjects with analysis of anthropometric effects on duration of swallowing activities.
633 *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, 56(4), 1090-1097.
634 <https://doi.org/10.1109/TBME.2008.2010504>

635
636 Sejdic, E., Steele, C. M., & Chau, T. (2010). A procedure for denoising dual-axis swallowing accelerometry
637 signals. *Physiological Measurement*, 31(1), N1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1088/0967-3334/31/1/n01>

638
639 Sejdic, E., Steele, C. M., & Chau, T. (2013). Classification of penetration-aspiration versus healthy
640 swallows using dual-axis swallowing accelerometry signals in dysphagic subjects. *IEEE*
641 *Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, 60(7), 1859-1866.
642 <https://doi.org/10.1109/TBME.2013.2243730>

643
644 Vogels, B., Cartwright, J., & Cocks, N. (2015). The bedside assessment practices of speech-language
645 pathologists in adult dysphagia. *International Journal of Speech Language Pathology*, 17(4), 390-
646 400. <https://doi.org/10.3109/17549507.2014.979877>

647
648 Zenner, P. M., Losinski, D. S., & Mills, R. H. (1995). Using cervical auscultation in the clinical dysphagia
649 examination in long-term care. *Dysphagia*, 10(1), 27-31.
650 [http://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&CSC=Y&NEWS=N&PAGE=fulltext&D=med3&AN=7859](http://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&CSC=Y&NEWS=N&PAGE=fulltext&D=med3&AN=7859529)
651 [529](http://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&CSC=Y&NEWS=N&PAGE=fulltext&D=med3&AN=7859529)

652
653 Zhang, Z., Coyle, J. L., & Sejdic, E. (2018). Automatic hyoid bone detection in fluoroscopic images using
654 deep learning. *Scientific Reports*, 8(1), 12310. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-30182-6>

655

656 **Figure legends**

657 Figure 1 Legend. The sensors on a videofluoroscopic image. Adapted from Kurosu, A., Coyle, J. L.,
658 Dudik, J. M., & Sejdic, E. (2019). Detection of swallow kinematic events from acoustic high-resolution
659 cervical auscultation signals in patients with stroke. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*,
660 *100*(3), 501-508.

661

662

663

664

665

666

667

668

669

670

671

672

673

674

675

676

677

678 Figure 2 legend. Typical setup of HRCA data acquisition and signal processing (top), and examples of
679 acoustic (left) and vibratory (three axes) signals accrued during a sample swallow. Adapted from Sejdic,
680 E., Malandraki, G. A., & Coyle, J. L. (2019). Computational deglutition: Using signal- and image-
681 processing methods to understand swallowing and associated disorders. *IEEE Signal Processing*
682 *Magazine [Life Sciences]*, 36(1), 138-146. Open access.

683

684

685

686

687

688

689

690

691

692

693

694

695

696

697

698

699

700

701

702

703

704

705

706

707

708 Figure 3 legend. Steps in the preprocessing (above) and feature extraction (bottom) of the signals from
709 each axis of the triaxial accelerometer (A-P = anterior-posterior axis, S-I = superior-inferior axis, M-L =
710 medial-lateral axis). Adapted from Movahedi, F., Kurosu, A., Coyle, J. L., Perera, S., & Sejdić, E. (2017).
711 Anatomical directional dissimilarities in tri-axial swallowing accelerometry signals. *IEEE Transactions on*
712 *Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, 25(5), 447-458. Open access.

713

714

715

716