

1 **The prediction of risk of penetration-aspiration via**
2 **hyoid bone displacement features**

3

4 Received: date / Accepted: date

5 **Abstract** Videofluoroscopic swallow studies are widely used in clinical and re-
6 search settings to assess swallow function and to determine physiological impair-
7 ments, diet recommendations, and treatment goals for people with dysphagia.
8 Videofluoroscopy can be used to analyze biomechanical events of swallowing, in-
9 cluding hyoid bone displacement, to differentiate between normal and disordered
10 swallow function. Previous research has found significant associations between hy-
11 oid bone displacement and penetration/aspiration during swallowing, but the pre-
12 dictive value of hyoid bone displacement during swallowing has not been explored.
13 The primary objective of this study was to build a model based on aspects of hyoid
14 bone displacement during swallowing to predict the extent of airway penetration or
15 aspiration during swallowing. Aspects of hyoid bone displacement from 1433 swal-
16 lows from patients referred for videofluoroscopy were analyzed to determine which
17 aspects predicted risk of penetration and aspiration according to the Penetration-
18 Aspiration Scale. A generalized estimating equation incorporating components of
19 hyoid bone displacement and variables shown to impact penetration and aspiration
20 (such as age, bolus volume, and viscosity), was used to evaluate penetration and
21 aspiration risk. Results indicated that anterior-horizontal hyoid bone displacement
22 was the only aspect of hyoid bone displacement predictive of penetration and as-
23 piration risk. Further research should focus on improving the model performance
24 by identifying additional physiological swallowing events that predict penetration

1 and aspiration risk. The model built for this study, and future modified models,
2 will be beneficial for clinicians to use in the assessment and treatment of people
3 with dysphagia, and potentially to track improvement in hyolaryngeal excursion
4 resulting from dysphagia treatment, thus mitigating adverse outcomes that can
5 occur secondary to dysphagia.

6 **Keywords:** hyoid bone, penetration/aspiration, deglutition, generalized estima-
7 tion equation, deglutition disorders

8 1 Introduction

9 Dysphagia affects approximately one in twenty-five adults in the United States
10 annually [1–5]. It can occur in patients secondary to a variety of etiologies such as
11 stroke, Parkinsons disease [6], head and neck cancer, and brain injuries [7], as well
12 as many other neurological, iatrogenic, and developmental conditions. Aspiration
13 may occur because of dysphagia, which can lead to adverse outcomes including
14 aspiration pneumonia, malnutrition, and dehydration [8–11]. Additionally, dys-
15 phagia and secondary medical complications often result in reduced quality of
16 life for patients. Because of this, it is necessary to rapidly identify dysphagia and
17 determine aspiration risk of patients through timely diagnosis and management.

18 Videofluoroscopy (VF) is one instrumental evaluation tool used to assess phys-
19 iological impairments of swallowing and reduced airway protection[12,13]. Clin-
20 icians rely on subjective interpretation of the biomechanical events of swallow-
21 ing observed during VF to determine patient risk of penetration and aspiration.
22 Standardized tools exist for categorizing swallow events during VF, such as the
23 Modified Barium Swallow Impairment Profile (MBSImP) and the Penetration-
24 Aspiration Scale (PAS). The MBSImP is a widely used clinical tool that allows
25 clinicians to evaluate 17 physiological components of swallowing using a subjective
26 ordinal scale. The PAS is an 8-point interval rating scale used to determine the
27 severity of penetration and aspiration. The PAS is used to determine how far ma-
28 terial enters the airway and whether or not patients are able to clear penetrated
29 or aspirated material from the airway. While these tools are useful in identifying
30 gross impairments in swallowing function, they involve subjectivity to quantify
31 the degree of swallowing impairment. Swallow kinematic analysis is an objective

1 way to quantify biomechanical events of swallowing, however it requires standard-
2 ized training and experience to perform with high levels of intra- and inter-rater
3 reliability and is not used in most settings.

4 VF exposes patients to radiation, which forces clinicians to conduct swallowing
5 evaluations in a short period of time. Because of these time constraints, swallowing
6 evaluations may not fully capture a patients risk of penetration and aspiration.
7 For this reason, clinicians would benefit from having a tool that objectively and
8 automatically measures physiological events that occur during swallowing, such as
9 hyoid bone displacement, to more accurately quantify patient risk of penetration
10 or aspiration.

11 While differences in hyoid bone displacement are known to exist among healthy,
12 especially aging, individuals [14–16], it is known to be associated with an increased
13 risk of penetration and aspiration [17] and can be measured in both horizontal
14 and vertical planes, as described in previous research [18]. However, the exact
15 relationship between hyoid bone displacement and penetration and aspiration risk
16 remains unknown due to conflicting research [19–23].

17 We previously investigated six aspects of hyoid bone displacement using coord-
18 inates based on anatomical landmarks of the vertebral column. Results revealed
19 that reduced anterior-horizontal displacement was the only aspect of hyoid bone
20 displacement associated with higher scores on the PAS [24]. The primary aim of
21 the current study was to determine which aspects of hyoid bone displacement
22 predict the risk of penetration and aspiration. We also investigated the effect of
23 patient demography and clinical variables in the model. We hypothesized that a
24 predictive model would reasonably predict penetration and aspiration risk using
25 aspects of hyoid bone displacement and important clinical variables that are as-
26 sociated with penetration and aspiration risk. To test this hypothesis, we built a
27 generalized estimating equation (GEE) model by extracting aspects of hyoid bone
28 displacement data from VF images.

29 **2 Methods**

1 2.1 Data Acquisition

2 Two hundred and sixty-five patients with suspected dysphagia were enrolled in
3 this prospective study and underwent VF at the University of Pittsburgh Medical
4 Center Presbyterian Hospital. The protocol for the study was approved by the
5 Institutional Review Board at the University of Pittsburgh and all participants
6 provided informed consent. Patients with tracheostomies or anatomical abnormal-
7 ities of the head and neck were excluded from the study.

8 The data for this study was collected in the course of standard clinical care
9 rather than solely for research purposes. We intentionally did not interfere with
10 clinical decision-making in the conduct of the VF examinations. Clinicians who
11 conducted VF modified the protocol for the administration of boluses (e.g. num-
12 ber of swallows, bolus consistencies, head positions, etc.) based on clinical hy-
13 potheses and the patients clinical presentation of dysphagia. The following consis-
14 tencies were used: E-Z-EM Canada, Inc. Varibar thin (Bracco Diagnostics, Inc.)
15 (<5cPs viscosity), Varibar nectar (300 cPs viscosity), Varibar pudding (5000 cPs
16 viscosity), and Keebler Sandies Mini Simply Shortbread Cookies (Kellogg Sales
17 Company). Clinicians administered boluses by spoon (3-5mL) or had participants
18 self-administer a comfortable volume by cup. Head positions included neutral and
19 chin down. Participant characteristics and methods for VF data collection can be
20 found in Table 1.

21 VF was conducted in the lateral plane using a 30PPS pulse rate and recorded
22 at 60FPS by a video card (AccuStream Express HD, Foresight Imaging, Chelms-
23 ford, MA) and recorded to a hard drive with a LabVIEW program. Videos were
24 converted into digital movie clips of 720 x 1080 resolution and then down-sampled
25 to 30 frames per second to eliminate duplicate frames.

26 2.2 Image Analysis

27 Over 3000 video clips were obtained from VF swallow evaluations. The final data
28 set used for analysis included 1434 video clips because over half of the original clips
29 were unacceptable for tracking hyoid bone displacement due to poor image quality

Fig. 1 The landmarks for hyoid bone, C2, C3, C4 and established coordinate.

30 or obstruction of hyoid bone landmarks by the shoulder or other medical equipment
1 such as cardiac monitor lines, pacemaker leads, etc. Videos were segmented into
2 individual swallow events based on the frame in which the head of the bolus reached
3 the ramus of the mandible (onset), and the frame in which the bolus tail passed
4 the upper esophageal sphincter (UES) (offset) [25]. Swallows were categorized into
5 single (one swallow per bolus), multiple 1 (two swallows per bolus), and multiple
6 2 (more than two swallows per bolus).

7 As shown in Fig. 1, an expert judge, trained in swallow kinematic rating,
8 initially identified the following points of interest in each video frame: (1) anterior-
9 inferior corner of C2 vertebral body; (2) anterior-inferior corner of the C4 vertebral
10 body; (3) anterior-inferior corner of the body of the hyoid bone; (4) posterior-
11 superior corner of the body of the hyoid bone; (5) anterior-inferior corner of C3
12 vertebral body; (6) anterior-superior corner of C3 vertebral body. The anterior-
13 inferior corner of the C4 vertebral body (2) was defined as the origin. The straight
14 line connecting (2) and (1) was defined as the y-axis. The x-axis was defined as the
15 horizontal line perpendicular to the y-axis and intersecting with (2). To normalize
16 patients with different heights to a common anatomical referent, the anatomical
17 scaling factor for displacement measures was defined as the length between (5) and
18 (6) (i.e. the height of the C3 vertebral body). Image pixels were used to measure
19 distance.

20 Three raters trained in swallow kinematic analysis identified anatomical points
21 of interest in each of the 1434 swallows, and tracked hyoid displacement using
22 frame-by-frame analysis in MATLAB (R2015b, The MathWorks, Inc., Natick, MA,
23 USA). Reliability was established on 10% of the videos with ICCs of over .99 and
24 intra-rater reliability was maintained throughout testing to avoid judgment drift.
25 Two clinicians trained in PAS analysis established a priori inter- and intra-rater
26 reliability with ICCs of 0.99. All raters were blinded to participant age, sex and
27 diagnosis.

28 2.3 Statistical Analysis

1 SAS ® version 9.3 (SAS Institute, Inc., Cary, North Carolina) was used for all
2 statistical analyses with the GENMOD procedure for obtaining the main results.
3 A dichotomous (normal; disordered) operational definition of PAS scores (1-2, and
4 3-8 respectively) was used for analyses, because there was a skewed distribution of
5 PAS scores. Logistic regression models that are typically used with dichotomous
6 data could not be used, because the independence criterion was not met due to
7 having multiple swallows in the data set from each patient. Therefore, a GEE
8 model [26] with a binomial distribution, a logit link function, and an exchange-
9 able working correlation structure (which is an extension of a logistic regression
10 model suitable for analyzing auto-correlated data) was used. Age, gender, swal-
11 low type (single/multiple 1/multiple 2), viscosity (thin/nectar/pudding/cookie),
12 utensil (cup/spoon), head position (neutral/chin down), and swallow duration were
13 used as forced-in independent variables based on face validity and prior knowledge
14 of their dependence on PAS scores. In addition to these independent variables,
15 we examined various aspects of hyoid bone displacement using a forward selection
16 strategy with an entry criterion of $p < 0.05$. The measurement of these landmarks
17 (superior hyoid bone and anterior hyoid bone) includes maximal displacement,
18 maximal peak position, velocity, acceleration and duration in horizontal and ver-
19 tical direction. To assess the predicted and observed disordered PAS scores, we
20 created a contingency table based on the predicted probability deciles. The deciles
21 were formed by sorting and separating the predicted probabilities into ten sub-
22 groups based on each patients risk profile, from lowest to highest risk (1-10). We
23 examined the observed percentage of disordered PAS swallows (3-8) within each
24 decile compared to the predicted percentage according to the model. See Appendix
25 A for the predictive model.

26 3 Results

27 Table 1 illustrates the descriptive statistics and participant characteristics. The
28 swallow analysis data was presented in this study for 1433 swallows from 265
29 distinct patients. Ninety-one swallows were excluded from the analysis due to

Table 1 Statistics and characteristics of patients involved in the investigation

Features	Frequency(%)	Features	Frequency(%)		
PA	1	687(47.94%)	thin liquid by teaspoon	264(18.4%)	
	2	442(30.84%)	thin liquid by cup	614(42.8%)	
	3	138(9.63%)	not recorded utensil with nectar	1(0.007%)	
	4	48(3.35%)	Viscosity& Volume	nectar by teaspoon	195(13.6%)
	5	29(2.02%)		nectar by cup sip	209(14.6%)
	6	33(2.30%)		pudding by spoon	94(6.6%)
	7	23(1.61%)		cookie	42(2.9%)
	8	33(2.30%)	Gender	male	155(58.49%)
Type	single	498(34.73%)		female	110(41.51%)
	multiple(1)	360(25.10%)	Head Position	neutral	1136(79.22%)
	multiple(2)	534(37.24%)		chin down	252(17.57%)
	not record	42(2.93%)		not record	46(3.21%)

Table 2 Final model with forward selection with 0.05 entry criterion

Parameter	Estimate	P value	Odds ratio	Odds 95% CI
type: multiple(1)	0.4545	0.0040*	1.58	1.16-2.15
max. dis. of anterior in horizontal direction	-0.0583	0.0064*	0.94	0.90-0.98
viscosity: thin	1.2862	0.0096*	3.62	1.37-9.58
age	0.0265	0.0178*	1.03	1.00-1.05
type: single	-0.4435	0.0708	0.64	0.40-1.04
viscosity: nectar	0.7049	0.1664	2.02	0.75-5.49
utensil: spoon	0.1622	0.3538	1.18	0.83-1.66
viscosity: pudding	-0.5334	0.3789	0.59	0.18-1.92
sex: male	0.1398	0.6998	1.15	0.57-2.34
head position: neutral	0.0994	0.7104	1.18	0.65-1.87
swallow duration	-0.0004	0.9549	1.00	0.99-1.01
type: multiple(2)	0.0000	.	1.00	1.00
sex: female	0.0000	.	1.00	1.00
viscosity: cookie	0.0000	.	1.00	1.00
utensil: cup	0.0000	.	1.00	1.00
head position: chin down	0.0000	.	1.00	1.00

30 missing information or incorrect recording. The age range of the subjects was
1 from 19 to 94 and the average \pm standard variation age was 64.8 ± 13.6 years.
2 1129 swallows had PA scores of 1 or 2 and 304 swallows had PA scores greater or
3 equal to 3.

4 Table 2 illustrates the statistical results of focused-in clinical variables and as-
5 pects of hyoid bone displacement that met the 0.05 entry criterion for the model.
6 Clinical variables shown in Table 2 were forced-in to the model with forward
7 selection. Maximum anterior-horizontal hyoid bone displacement was the only as-
8 pect of hyoid bone displacement that was significantly predictive of normal versus

Fig. 2 The predicted probability and the actual observed probability. The dot represents the actual observed probability in each subgroup and predicted probability are presented as intervals.

9 disordered PAS scores and included in the model. Patient age was significantly
10 predictive of normal versus disordered PAS scores, although the confidence inter-
11 val included $OR = 1.00$. For each additional year of age, the odds of a disordered
12 PAS score increased by 3% ($OR=1.03$, 95% C.I. = 1.00-1.05; $p=0.0178$). There was
13 a trend toward a single swallow being less likely (36%) to have a disordered PAS
14 score compared to multiple swallows, ($OR=.64$, 95% C.I. = .40-1.04; $p=0.0708$).
15 Two swallows per bolus (multiple 1) was significantly more likely to have a disor-
16 dered PAS score ($OR=1.58$, 95% C.I. = 1.16-2.15; $p=0.0040$) than more than two
17 swallows per bolus (multiple 2). There was strong evidence that swallows of thin
18 liquid had a significantly greater odds of a disordered PAS score than a cookie
19 swallow ($OR=3.62$, 95% C.I. = 1.37-9.58; $p=0.0096$). The model predicted the
20 risk of penetration and aspiration for each patient based on the variables included
in the model. Table 3 shows the predicted probability of having a disordered PAS
score in each decile compared to the observed percentage of disordered PAS scores
in each decile. For instance, as shown in the table, the predicted probability for
decile 1 indicates that 0.7% of the swallows will be disordered. The predictive
model effectively captured patient risk profiles for this decile because 6.72% of the
swallows had a disordered PAS score. Similar observations can be made for deciles
2, 4, 8, and 9. Deciles 3, 5, 6, 7, and 10 captured the increasing probability trend
of penetration and aspiration, although the observed percentage of swallows with
disordered PAS scores were slightly outside of the predicted ranges.

21 4 Discussion

22 This study found that a predictive model that included maximum anterior-horizontal
23 hyoid bone displacement and other variables known to affect penetration and aspi-
24 ration risk can reasonably predict the risk of penetration and aspiration in patients
25 with dysphagia. While this predictive model accurately captured the increasing
26 probability trend of penetration and aspiration risk of patients, the predicted and

Table 3 Predicted probability decile cut-off and observed percentage based on the model (* actual% of swallows with disordered PA scores was within the predicted probability range based on hyoid displacement features)

Predicted Probability Decile	Predicted Percentage of High PA swallows	Number of Swallows	Actual Number (Percentage) of High PA Swallows
1	0.0 – 7.0	134	9(6.72)*
2	7.0 – 10.4	134	13(9.70) *
3	10.4 – 13.9	134	20(14.93)
4	13.9 – 16.9	135	21(15.67)*
5	16.9 – 19.7	134	21(15.56)
6	19.7 – 22.8	134	37(27.61)
7	22.8 – 25.7	134	27(20.15)
8	25.7 – 30.0	134	38(28.36)*
9	30.0 – 36.4	134	41(30.60)*
10	36.4 – 100	135	44(32.59)

27 observed probabilities did not always match. Current clinical practice is for clin-
 1 cians to assess physiological impairments of swallowing and reduced airway pro-
 2 tection by subjectively interpreting VF images. However, one limitation of using
 3 VF as an assessment tool is that aspiration may not be observed during VF due to
 4 the time constraints of the examination to minimize radiation exposure. Creating
 5 a predictive model based on objective measurements of physiological swallowing
 6 events, such as the measurements of hyoid bone displacement that were used in
 7 this study, would allow clinicians to more accurately capture patient risk profiles
 8 of penetration and aspiration. This model could be used to improve assessment
 9 of swallow function, effectively track progress in therapy, and proactively and ob-
 10 jectively identify physiologic markers of elevated risk of adverse events that occur
 11 secondary to dysphagia, such as aspiration pneumonia.

12 5 Limitation

13 The GEE model in this study used anterior-horizontal hyoid bone displacement
 14 and other independent variables to reasonably predict penetration and aspiration
 15 risk for patients with dysphagia. However, swallowing and airway protection are
 16 complex, multifactorial processes. It is probable that the variables included in

17 this model are not the only predictors of aspiration. One limitation of the current
1 predictive model is that it underestimates the risk of penetration and aspiration for
2 patients with disordered PAS scores. The predictive model will likely be improved
3 by including other swallow kinematic measurements.

4 **6 Conclusion**

5 This research work developed a preliminary GEE model that can reasonably pre-
6 dict penetration and aspiration risk for patients with dysphagia. This is an impor-
7 tant and necessary first step toward developing a more sophisticated and accurate
8 predictive model that can be used in clinical settings. In the future, clinicians
9 could use a predictive model based on physiological aspects of swallow function to
10 calculate penetration and aspiration risk profiles for patients by entering patient
11 specific information into the equation. By objectively determining patient risk
12 profiles, clinicians could develop individualized treatment plans to prevent ad-
13 verse outcomes (i.e. dehydration, malnutrition, and aspiration pneumonia) based
14 on risk severity level, and objectively track the effectiveness of dysphagia treat-
15 ment on functional patient outcome measures. Future research should examine the
16 predictive ability of additional swallow kinematic measures on penetration and as-
17 piration risk in patients with dysphagia. Variables such as hyoid bone velocity,
18 initiation of the pharyngeal swallow, laryngeal elevation, laryngeal vestibular clo-
19 sure, UES duration, and other physiological parameters related to swallow function
20 should be investigated. Including these kinematic events in the predictive model
21 may increase the models predictive value, which would further improve its clinical
22 application.

23 **Compliance with Ethical Standards**

- 24 1. Conflict of Interest: We have no conflict of interest to declare.
- 25 2. Ethical approval: All procedures performed in studies involving human par-
26 ticipants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional
27 and/or national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration
28 and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards.

- 29 3. Informed consent: Informed consent was obtained from all individual partici-
1 pants included in the study.

2 References

- 3 1. P. Clavé and R. Shaker, “Dysphagia: current reality and scope of the problem,” *Nature*
4 *Reviews Gastroenterology and Hepatology*, vol. 12, no. 5, pp. 259–270, 2015.
- 5 2. J. M. Dudik, J. L. Coyle, A. El-Jaroudi, M. Sun, and E. Sejdić, “A matched dual-tree
6 wavelet denoising for tri-axial swallowing vibrations,” *Biomedical Signal Processing and*
7 *Control*, vol. 27, pp. 112–121, 2016.
- 8 3. A. J. Miller, “The neurobiology of swallowing and dysphagia,” *Developmental Disabilities*
9 *Research Reviews*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 77–86, 2008.
- 10 4. F. Movahedi, A. Kurosu, J. L. Coyle, S. Perera, and E. Sejdić, “Anatomical directional
11 dissimilarities in tri-axial swallowing accelerometry signals,” *IEEE Transactions on Neural*
12 *Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, vol. 25, no. 5, pp. 447–458, 2017.
- 13 5. N. Bhattacharyya, “The prevalence of dysphagia among adults in the United States,”
14 *Otolaryngology–Head and Neck Surgery*, vol. 151, no. 5, pp. 765–769, 2014.
- 15 6. J. Murray, *Manual of dysphagia assessment in adults*. Cengage Learning, 1999.
- 16 7. C. Lazarus and A. Logemann, “Swallowing disorders in closed head trauma patients.”
17 *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, vol. 68, no. 2, pp. 79–84, 1987.
- 18 8. I. J. Cook and P. J. Kahrilas, “AGA technical review on management of oropharyngeal
19 dysphagia,” *Gastroenterology*, vol. 116, no. 2, pp. 455–478, 1999.
- 20 9. C. Gordon, R. L. Hewer, and D. T. Wade, “Dysphagia in acute stroke.” *British Medical*
21 *Journal*, vol. 295, no. 6595, pp. 411–414, 1987.
- 22 10. I. A. Humbert and J. Robbins, “Dysphagia in the elderly,” *Physical Medicine and Reha-*
23 *ilitation Clinics of North America*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 853–866, 2008.
- 24 11. J. M. Gorell, C. C. Johnson, and B. A. Rybicki, “Parkinson’s disease and its comorbid
25 disorders An analysis of Michigan mortality data, 1970 to 1990,” *Neurology*, vol. 44, no. 10,
26 pp. 1865–1865, 1994.
- 27 12. J. L. Coyle, L. A. Davis, C. Easterling, D. E. Graner, S. Langmore, S. B. Leder, M. A.
28 Lefton-Greif, P. Leslie, J. A. Logemann, L. Mackay, B. Martin-Harris, J. T. Murray,
29 B. Sonies, and C. M. Steele, “Oropharyngeal Dysphagia Assessment and Treatment Effi-
30 cacy: Setting the Record Straight (Response to Campbell-Taylor),” *Journal of the Amer-*
31 *ican Medical Directors Association*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 62–66, 2009.
- 32 13. M. Rugiu, “Role of videofluoroscopy in evaluation of neurologic dysphagia,” *Acta Otorhi-*
33 *nolaryngologica Italica*, vol. 27, no. 6, p. 306, 2007.
- 34 14. S. M. Molfenter and C. M. Steele, “Physiological variability in the deglutition literature:
35 hyoid and laryngeal kinematics,” *Dysphagia*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 67–74, 2011.
- 36 15. Y. Kim and G. H. McCullough, “Maximum hyoid displacement in normal swallowing,”
37 *Dysphagia*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 274–279, 2008.

- 38 16. B.-S. Kang, B.-M. Oh, I. S. Kim, S. G. Chung, S. J. Kim, and T. R. Han, "Influence of
1 aging on movement of the hyoid bone and epiglottis during normal swallowing: a motion
2 analysis," *Gerontology*, vol. 56, no. 5, pp. 474–482, 2010.
- 3 17. B. Martin-Harris and B. Jones, "The videofluorographic swallowing study," *Physical
4 Medicine and Rehabilitation Clinics of North America*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 769–785, 2008.
- 5 18. Z. Zhang, A. Kurosu, J. Coyle, S. Perera, and E. Sejdíć, "Hyoid displacement during
6 swallowing is related to penetration-aspiration scores," *Under Review*.
- 7 19. K. A. Kendall and R. J. Leonard, "Hyoid movement during swallowing in older patients
8 with dysphagia," *Archives of Otolaryngology–Head & Neck Surgery*, vol. 127, no. 10, pp.
9 1224–1229, 2001.
- 10 20. A. L. Perlman, B. Booth, and J. Grayhack, "Videofluoroscopic predictors of aspiration in
11 patients with oropharyngeal dysphagia," *Dysphagia*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 90–95, 1994.
- 12 21. J. Su, C. Yuan, and K. Shu, "Hyoid bone displacement during swallowing have no as-
13 sociation with penetration/aspiration severity in dysphagic stroke patients," *Archives of
14 Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, vol. 95, no. 10, e16, 2014.
- 15 22. S. M. Molfenter and C. M. Steele, "Kinematic and temporal factors associated with
16 penetration–aspiration in swallowing liquids," *Dysphagia*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 269–276, 2014.
- 17 23. H. G. Seo, B.-M. Oh, and T. R. Han, "Swallowing kinematics and factors associated
18 with laryngeal penetration and aspiration in stroke survivors with dysphagia," *Dysphagia*,
19 vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 160–168, 2016.
- 20 24. J. C. Rosenbek, J. A. Robbins, E. B. Roecker, J. L. Coyle, and J. L. Wood, "A penetration-
21 aspiration scale," *Dysphagia*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 93–98, 1996.
- 22 25. G. L. Lof and J. Robbins, "Test-retest variability in normal swallowing," *Dysphagia*, vol. 4,
23 no. 4, pp. 236–242, 1990.
- 24 26. M. Wang, "Generalized estimating equations in longitudinal data analysis: A review and
25 recent developments," *Advances in Statistics*, vol. 2014, 2014.

26 Appendix A

27 Prediction Equation Steps:

- 28 1. Let $XB = -3.479 - 0.0583 \times (x_{1_{min2max_distance}}) + 0.0265 \times (age) - -0.0004 \times$
29 $(duration)$
- 30 2. Subtract from XB 0.4435 if the swallow is single, add to XB 0.4545 if the
31 swallow is multiple 1, or do nothing if multiple 2.
- 32 3. Subtract from XB 0.1398 if the sex=2(female?), or do nothing if sex=1(male?).
- 33 4. Add 1.2862 to XB if viscosity=thin, add 0.7049 if nectar, subtract 0.5334 if
34 pudding, and do nothing if cookie.
- 35 5. Add to XB 0.1622 if spoon, or do nothing if cup.

-
- ³⁶ 6. Add to XB 0.0994 if chin down, or do nothing if head position is neutral.
- ¹ 7. Compute the probability of a high PA swallow as $\exp(XB)/(1 + \exp(XB))$.