Does Prophylactic Replacement of Voice Prosthesis Make Sense? A Study to Predict Prosthesis Lifetime
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Abstract

Objective. Voice prosthesis leakage significantly affects the quality of life of patients undergoing laryngectomy, causing insecurity and frequent unplanned hospital visits and costs. In this study, the concept of prophylactic voice prosthesis replacement was explored to prevent leakages.

Study Design. Retrospective cohort study.

Setting. Tertiary hospital.

Methods. This study included all patients who underwent laryngectomy between 2000 and 2012 in the Netherlands Cancer Institute. Device lifetimes and voice prosthesis replacements of a retrospective cohort were used to calculate the number of needed voice prostheses per patient per year to prevent 70% of the leakages by prophylactic replacement. Various strategies for the timing of prophylactic replacement were considered: adaptive strategies based on the individual patient’s history of replacement and fixed strategies based on the results of patients with similar voice prosthesis or treatment characteristics.

Results. Patients used a median 3.4 voice prostheses per year (range, 0.1-48.1). We found high inter- and intrapatient variability in device lifetime. When prophylactic replacement is applied, this would become a median 9.4 voice prostheses per year, which means replacement every 38 days, implying >6 additional voice prostheses per patient per year. The individual adaptive model showed that preventing 70% of the leakages was impossible for most patients and only a median 25% can be prevented. Monte-Carlo simulations showed that prophylactic replacement is not feasible due to the high coefficient of variation (SD/mean) in device lifetime.

Conclusion. Based on our simulations, prophylactic replacement of voice prostheses is not feasible due to high inter- and intrapatient variation in device lifetime.
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In most Western countries, the most successful technique for voice restoration after total laryngectomy (TL) is tracheoesophageal prosthetic speech.¹ The most commonly used voice prostheses (VPs) are indwelling VPs, which can be categorized as regular and problem-solving VPs. Regular VPs are the most commonly used for patients with laryngectomy. In case of frequent short device lifetimes, the so-called problem-solving VPs are indicated. Regular VPs are expected to have a median lifetime ranging from 2 to 6 months.²,³ Soolsma et al showed that problem-solving VPs have a 16-fold longer device lifetime than regular VPs (median device lifetime, 337 days).⁴

The main reason for VP replacements is transprosthetic leakage (55%-80%), followed by periprosthetic leakage (5%-30%).⁵-⁸ The frequent replacements significantly affect the patient’s quality of life, causing insecurity and unplanned hospital visits and costs.⁹ The standard policy for replacements is “wait to leak,” but possibly the replacements can be planned to prevent leakage (prophylactic replacement). The principle of prophylactic replacement has been used in pacemaker users for years. This has given pacemaker users the security of a continuously working device.¹⁰,¹¹ The device lifetime of
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pacemakers depends on the battery. The device lifetime of VPs depends on many more aspects, such as the ability of a patient to clean the VP properly, the type of VP, biofilm formation, shrinking tracheo-oesophageal puncture, hypertrophy, and infection. Distance to the hospital, voice problems, diet, having a partner, and country of origin have also been found to be related to device lifetime.

The aim of the present study was to explore the possibility of prophylactic VP replacement (PVPR) by predicting VP lifetime and by calculating the needed number of VPs when applying PVPR through these predictions.

Materials and Methods

In this study, a retrospective database was used. All included patients (N = 242) were laryngectomized between January 2000 and December 2012 and in regular follow-up in the Netherlands Cancer Institute. The last date of follow-up was January 5, 2017.

After the initial inclusion of 242 patients, patients with <2 VP replacements or no follow-up data were excluded. This resulted in 194 patients (Figure 1). Patients were analyzed by the type of VP used and the indication for TL. All VPs analyzed in this article were manufactured by Atos Medical AB. Analyses were done for the total group and 2 subgroups. The following data were collected for each VP replacement: date of insertion, replacement or removal, type and size, and reason for replacement or removal. VPG1 was composed of patients using only regular VPs (Provox2 or Provox Vega). VPG2 consisted of patients alternating between regular and problem-solving VPs (ActiValve Light, Strong or Xtra Strong). There were no patients using only problem-solving VPs.

Patient group 1 (PG1) underwent primary laryngectomy with or without additional treatment. Patient group 2 (PG2) had a salvage laryngectomy for recurrence or second primary tumor or a laryngectomy for a functional reason.

All VP replacements were performed by qualified and trained speech-language pathologists, residents, or head and neck surgeons.

Statistical Analysis

Descriptive analysis was used to summarize patient and device characteristics. The VP lifetime was measured in days, calculated from the insertion date to the date of removal or last follow-up. Kaplan-Meier analyses were used to assess device lifetimes and a moment for prophylactic replacement. Device lifetime of VPs ongoing at the end of the observation period were right-censored, as well as device lifetimes of VPs still in situ when the patient was lost to follow-up or died. Standard deviations were used to describe variability in device lifetime, and Mann-Whitney U was used to test for differences in device lifetime and variability. Statistical analyses were performed in R version 4.1.0 and SPSS version 27.0 (IBM).

PVPR Prediction Model

In this study, PVPR was considered feasible if at least 70% of VPs were replaced before leaking, allowing a 30% leakage fraction as acceptable. This cutoff point was chosen by consensus of the research team and called DeviceLife70 (DL70; expressed in days). The current standard policy (wait to leak) has a 100% leakage fraction. To train the prediction model, the DL70 was chosen as the number of days at which the Kaplan-Meier curve for device lifetime in the different groups of patients crossed the 70% boundary. Several models were considered: 1 DL70 for all patients, separate DL70s for type of VPs used (VPG1 and VPG2), and separate DL70s for indication TL (PG1 and PG2). All models assumed that problem-solving VPs would never be prophylactically replaced.

For evaluation of the prediction models, we counted how many VPs received by the patients would be prophylactically replaced and how many would still have been replaced because of leakage if the various prediction models had been used at the time. VPs with a device lifetime shorter than DL70 were considered "replaced because of leakage." VPs with a device lifetime at DL70 or higher were considered "prophylactically replaced." Time in situ of additional VPs (that would be used in case of PVPR) was estimated from known history of VP use per year. Thus, for each patient, the number of needed VPs per year under the various prediction models was calculated. In the evaluation of the model that used different DL70s for VPG1 and VPG2, we assumed that all patients started in VPG1 and switched to VPG2 as soon as they had their first problem-solving VP. The data are displayed in medians and ranges.

Individual Adaptive Simulations

As there is a high device lifetime variability, an individual adaptive model per patient was made. This model used the device lifetime of the first 3 used VPs to calculate the replacement moment for the coming VP, as the DL70 based on these 3 VPs. After each replacement because of leakage, the moment of replacement for the next VP would be calculated as the DL70 on the last 3 VPs. When the current VP reached this moment and hence would be replaced prophylactically, the next moment of replacement would be the DL70 based on the last 3 VPs, increased with 17% to correct for the fact that the actual lifetime of the last VP was longer than its in situ time. The 17% value of this correction factor was found by trial and error. Problem-solving VPs are not prophylactically replaced because of their longevity.

Figure 1. Flowchart of included patients and subgroups. TL, total laryngectomy; VP, voice prosthesis.
Monte Carlo Simulations

Since VP replacement data are sparse, the possibilities for leakage reduction by simulating device lifetimes through Monte Carlo simulations were investigated. The main unknown factor in formulating an optimal device change policy is the probability distribution of the in vivo device lifetimes. These Monte Carlo simulations were used to investigate the relationship between variability in device lifetime (inter- and intrapatients) and the limits of PVPR. The relevant parameter of this unknown probability distribution is the coefficient of variation (CV = SD/mean). The Monte Carlo simulations model the average time between leakage events, relative to the default policy and the associated number of device replacements as a function of the simulated CV. The simulations are repeated for 4 probability distributions. For details, see Supplemental Material (available online).

Ethical Considerations

This study does not fall under the scope of the Medical Research Involving Human Subjects Act and was approved by the review board of the Netherlands Cancer Institute (IRBd21-092).

Results

Patient Characteristics

The patient, tumor, and treatment characteristics of the 194 patients are shown in Table 1. The majority of the patients were male (79%), and the mean age was 63 years (SD, 10.8). Most patients had laryngeal carcinoma (72%), and the majority were treated with (chemo)radiotherapy (67%) before TL. Half of the patients underwent a bilateral neck dissection during TL.

The median overall survival was 60.8 months (95% CI, 38.7-82.9). The mean follow-up time was 66.4 months (95% CI, 58.5-74.3).

Voice Prostheses

The 194 patients used 3265 VPs in total during this study period. VPs with in situ times <1 day (n = 92), VPs of an unknown type (n = 25), and VPs replaced for developmental study purposes (n = 86) were excluded, leaving 3062 VPs for analysis.

Device Lifetime

The median device lifetime of all VPs (N = 3062) was 69 days. The median number of used VPs per patient per year was 3.4 (range, 0.2-48.1).

Of the 194 patients, 125 used only regular VPs (VPG1), and 69 used regular and problem-solving VPs (VPG2). The median device lifetime of regular VPs was 67 days in VPG1 and 57 days in VPG2. This difference was significant (Mann-Whitney U, P < .01). The longevity of problem-solving VPs was 2.5 times longer than regular VPs, namely 168 days.

VPG1 (regular VP users) was divided into 2 groups: PG1, primary laryngectomy with or without additional treatments; PG2, salvage laryngectomy for recurrence or second primary tumor or a laryngectomy for a functional reason (Figure 1). The median device lifetime was 81 days in PG1 and 65 days in PG2. The Mann-Whitney U test showed a significant difference in device lifetime (P < .01).

Device Lifetime Cutoff Points

For all groups, the 70% cutoff point (DL70) was calculated, which was used for the calculations in the prophylactic replacement model (Table 2).

Variability in Device Lifetime

Device lifetimes showed great variability, within and between patients. The median within-patient SD of device lifetime in
**Table 2. DeviceLife70 Cutoff Points for the Prophylactic VP Replacement Model.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient group</th>
<th>Cutoff, days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All patients</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPG1</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPG2</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG1</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG2</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: PG1, primary laryngectomy; PG2, salvage, second primary, and dysfunctional larynx laryngectomy; VP, voice prosthesis; VPG1, regular VP users; VPG2, problem-solving VP users.

**PVPR in an Individual Adaptive Model**

As described in the methods, the timing of prophylactic replacement was chosen to prevent 70% of leakages under the assumption that the lifetime of the next VP would be similar to that of the previous 3 VPs in the same patients. In our data, we found a high intrapatient variability. We calculated the CV and found a median 0.8 (range, 0.02-3.01). Due to this high intrapatient variability and the fact that the first 3 VPs would not be prophylactically replaced, in practice the prevention of 70% of leakage events was not reached in most study patients. Of 194 patients, just 9 (4.6%) reached 70% prevented leakages. The median percentage leakage prevented by this method was 36% (range, 0%-81%). In the subgroup of patients with only regular VPs (VPG1), the numbers were even worse: a median 25% of leakages prevented (range, 81%-100%). The patients in whom 70% of the leakage events could be prevented were patients with a high number of used VPs (range, 21-57) during the study period.

**PVPR in Monte Carlo Simulations**

Monte Carlo simulations were run for the DL70 case varying the CV between 0 and 1 (Supplemental Material, available online). The results showed that for a CV >0.5 the benefits in terms of decreased number of leakage events per year (<50%) decreased considerably while the costs in terms of additional VPs increased significantly (>163%). For a median CV of 0.8 as found in our patient base, there were around 20% fewer leakages per year requiring some 170% more devices. In this simulation, increasing the DL70 to a higher value can marginally decrease the number of leakage events but with a mounting increase in the number of devices needed.

**Discussion**

With this study, we found that PVPR in patients with laryngectomy is not feasible. PVPR would optimally reduce unexpected VP leakages and consequent aspiration and improve the quality of life of patients. To prevent at least 70% of all leakages in regular VP users, on average an additional 6 VPs per patient per year are needed, which is not desirable given the costs and additional hospital visits.

Device lifetime differed significantly between primary TL (PG1) and salvage TL (PG2), but the number of additional VPs in PVPR was similar. The device lifetime of regular VPs in patients using only regular VPs (VPG1) was significantly longer than in patients alternating between regular and problem-solving VPs (VPG2), as explained by the indication for problem-solving VPs (a short device lifetime with regular VPs).

The high inter- and intrapatient variability in device lifetime (Figure 2) makes it impossible to apply the concept of PVPR in daily practice. The device lifetimes are widely spread, and there is no clear trend visible. This is supported by the high standard deviation in device lifetime (median, 64.5 days), which is around the median device lifetime, causing the high CV (median, 0.8). The individual adaptive simulations...
showed that just 25% to 36% of the leakages could be prevented. The Monte Carlo simulations showed that PVPR would be valuable only if the CV were <0.5, again stating that PVPR is not possible in real life.

As mentioned, prophylactic replacement has been successful for pacemaker users. The main reason why pacemakers are suitable for prophylactic replacement is the low variability in the device lifetime of batteries. The device life of VPs depends on many more aspects causing unpredictable, early VP leakage and a high variability in device lifetime. With problem-solving VPs, device life did become longer, but because of the high costs, they are not available worldwide for patients and, when available, are mostly used in patients with a short device lifetime.\(^9\)\(^,\)\(^{20}\) Variability in device life is a problem found in all types and brands of VPs and different countries,\(^{16}\) making the results of this study generalizable for all patients using a VP worldwide.

The ultimate goal in PVPR would be to replace VPs at a set moment just before leakage, predicted by previous device lifetime and known patient or treatment variables. With such a policy, one could reduce the number of unexpected VP replacements and potentially prevent aspirations. This would likely provide patients more security and peace of mind and possibly increase quality of life. Planned replacements are also more convenient for the treating physician or speech-language pathologist. However, replacing VPs too early implies that patients would need extra VPs and would thus visit the clinics more often, which would increase costs. The total costs of VPs and their replacements are variable and depend on, for example, the type of VP used, hospital costs, number and type of health care professionals involved, travel expenses, and health care system. Therefore, a cost analysis was not made.

Data on complications of leakage, such as aspiration pneumonia, were not available in our database, though they are important for decision making in VP replacements. The review of Hutcheson et al gives a nice overview of pneumonia rates in patients with laryngectomy. The authors stated that aspiration pneumonia due to leakage is relatively rare but could have serious (fatal) consequences.\(^{21}\)

In Poland, there is an ongoing randomized controlled trial comparing the effect of replacing VPs every 3 months against a wait-to-leak policy, investigating complications, fistula colonization, and patient satisfaction.\(^{22}\) Results are not yet available. If results show fewer leakages in the replacement arm and comparable or fewer complications and high patient satisfaction, this might be a step in prophylactic replacement of VPs.

**Limitations**

The concept of PVPR in this article is hypothetical. Our results are based on analysis in a retrospective data set and Monte Carlo simulations, mainly investigating regular Provox VPs. It is well known that other brands of VPs suffer from an inconsistent device lifetime,\(^{16}\) so it is unlikely that prophylactic replacement is an option for other brands. We investigated a cutoff point of 70% because of reached consensus on the profitability for patients.

**Conclusion**

This is the first study exploring multiple policies to prevent VP leakage using hypothetical prophylactic VP changes in patients with laryngectomy. To prevent 70% of all occurred leakages during the study period, on average >6 additional VPs would be necessary annually per patient. The variability in device lifetime between, but most of all within, patients makes it impossible to predict device lifetime and set the interval for VP replacements. There are significant differences in device lifetime in subgroups for the used type of VP and indication for TL. These differences do not contribute to a better predictability of leakage. Based on the presented results, prophylactic replacement of VPs is not a feasible policy.
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