

# INPLASY

## Self-assessment of dysphagia in patients with multiple sclerosis –a protocol for the systematic review and meta-analysis

INPLASY2024110078

doi: 10.37766/inplasy2024.11.0078

Received: 18 November 2024

Published: 18 November 2024

### Corresponding author:

Jelena Bartolovic Vuckovic

jbartolo@kbsd.hr

### Author Affiliation:

Clinic for otorhinolaryngology and head and neck surgery, University Hospital "Sveti Duh", Zagreb, Croatia.

Bartolović Vučković, J; Kolundžić, Z; Šimunjak, B; Vodanović, D.

### ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

**Support** - This study was not supported by a sponsor or funder.

**Review Stage at time of this submission** - Preliminary searches.

**Conflicts of interest** - None declared.

**INPLASY registration number:** INPLASY2024110078

**Amendments** - This protocol was registered with the International Platform of Registered Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (INPLASY) on 18 November 2024 and was last updated on 18 November 2024.

### INTRODUCTION

**Review question / Objective** The population (P) are patients diagnosed with multiple sclerosis (MS) who are included in the self-assessment (I) of dysphagia, which is compared to (C) the objective assessment procedure or other validated dysphagia assessment. The objective (O) of this systematic review and meta-analysis is to define the validity and accuracy of available self-assessment diagnostic tools for dysphagia as subjective diagnostic methods for dysphagia in MS.

**Rationale** Diagnosis of dysphagia varies according to subjective and objective assessment tools from 37.21% to 58.47%, and the total prevalence of dysphagia is 43.33%. According to the systematic review of nine self-assessment dysphagia tools in progressive neurodegenerative diseases, there is a need for evaluation, validation, and greater availability and routine use of diagnostic tools for dysphagia. Thus, an accurate evaluation and comparison of self-assessment diagnostic

methods for dysphagia in MS will be made to identify the best tools for diagnosing dysphagia in MS and easy application of these assessment tools due to the need for regular follow-up assessments according to the nature of MS. Also, an additional reason why regular follow-up assessments are necessary is the great variety of dysphagia symptoms during the course of the disease.

**Condition being studied** Multiple sclerosis (MS) is an inflammatory autoimmune degenerative central nervous system (CNS) disease. It causes demyelination and axonal loss with the formation of plaques. The clinical course of the disease is heterogeneous and associated with demyelization and plaque localization. One of the common disabilities is dysphagia.

Dysphagia in earlier stages of MS (EDSS<6) is often an undiagnosed clinical symptom, mostly because it is present in the form of subclinical dysphagia in 30% of patients with mild or moderate MS. Pharyngeal phase of swallowing is

mostly affected in patients with mild to moderate MS.

Dysphagia is the number one cause of fatal outcomes in MS. Dysphagia prevalence in severely disabled patients ranges from 65% (EDSS 8-9) to 95% (EDSS 9.5). It is generally accepted that dysphagia occurs in the advanced phase of MS. However, the literature showed that the prevalence of dysphagia is 33-43% in early phases of MS, while it is diagnosed in 30% of patients with relapse-remitting multiple sclerosis (RRMS), mostly in later phases. The onset of dysphagia is typical for advanced phases of MS, but according to some researchers it can occur in early phases with EDSS score 2-3 with prevalence of 9,95 to 20%. There is a presence of heterogeneity in the previous prevalence study, and a recent meta-analysis showed heterogeneity in the geographical location of patients, according to different diagnostic procedures and undefined disease severity score (EDSS).

## METHODS

**Search strategy** In the literature search, a combination of the following keywords will be used: Dysphagia, swallowing, oropharyngeal dysphagia, neurogenic dysphagia, multiple sclerosis, demyelination disease, neurodegenerative disease, self-assessment questionnaires.

**Participant or population** People with diagnosed MS, aged 18 and above. The exclusion criteria are the presence of other neurological conditions that are not connected to MS.

**Intervention** Application of any self-assessment questionnaire for dysphagia in patients with MS.

**Comparator** Comparison to other dysphagia assessment procedures that are considered standard in clinical assessment.

**Study designs to be included** Original scientific papers, cross-sectional studies, diagnostic accuracy studies, and systematic reviews will be included.

**Eligibility criteria** The papers included for full review need to have information on the development or validation process of subjective or self-reported dysphagia questionnaires, population description and the results. All assessment tools included in the review need to be used in the MS population. The main inclusion criteria for the population are the presence and diagnose of MS.

All articles published in English language will be assessed for full-text analysis, without any time-based restrictions.

Exclusion criteria will be case studies and case reports, non-validated assessment procedures, unclear diagnostic methods.

**Information sources** Published papers will be searched in scientific databases: Ovid, Scopus, and Web of Science.

**Main outcome(s)** The main outcome is to identify which self-assessment, subjective questionnaire is easy to use, valid and reliable for dysphagia screening in MS patients.

**Additional outcome(s)** Additional outcomes will be the factors which contribute to easy applicability and cost-effectiveness of the questionnaire.

**Data management** Two reviewers will individually screen the papers according to the title and abstract of all articles included in the review. In case there is no consensus of two reviewers, the third reviewer will decide on the inclusion of the screened papers. After consensus for paper eligibility, full-text articles will be observed.

Data will be extracted using a developed extracting form tailored to the needs of this systematic review. Two reviewers will independently extract all data to avoid biases. One reviewer will extract all the data, and the other one will assess it independently to avoid biases. After data extraction, all forms will be analyzed and summarized by the whole team of authors to avoid disagreements. Abstracted data will include demographic information, information about the diagnostic procedures, statistical results extracted from validation, and positive and negative aspects of assessment elaborated in the article. If any uncertainties occur, the reviewers will contact the study authors directly.

**Quality assessment / Risk of bias analysis** Each study included in the systematic review will be assessed for possible bias using the QUADAS-2 protocol. For each study included, all tool domains will be analyzed from the extracted data. The risk of bias will be assessed by two reviewers independently to avoid further biases. In case of a disagreement between reviewers, there will be a discussion about the assessment, or a third author will be asked to assess the study independently. The assessment of study quality will be presented graphically.

---

**Strategy of data synthesis** Collected data will be analyzed using qualitative and quantitative approaches. Qualitative analysis will be made for every diagnostic tool included in the systematic review in a narrative form including tables and figures to aid in data presentation where appropriate. Meta-analysis procedures will be made in quantitative analysis using RevMan 5.4 software (Cochrane Collaboration).

Reliability and validity, including sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value and negative predictive value, will be extracted directly from the source papers. If this is not possible, values will be calculated from the data provided. Positive and negative likelihood ratios, diagnostic odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals will be calculated. The data will be displayed on Forest and ROC plots.

Heterogeneity will be assessed statistically using the standard Chi-square and also explored using subgroup analyses based on different study designs included in this review. When synthesizing diagnostic outcomes, it is essential to plot sensitivity-specificity pairs for each included study. The relationship between a sensitivity-specificity pair shows if significant heterogeneity differences exist and helps define the appropriate approach to synthesizing outcomes.

**Subgroup analysis** None.

**Sensitivity analysis** The influence of a single study on overall results will be estimated by a sensitivity analysis.

**Language restriction** Articles published in English language will be assessed for full-text analysis.

**Country(ies) involved** Croatia.

**Keywords** Multiple sclerosis, dysphagia, self-assessment, questionnaire, systematic review, meta-analysis.

#### **Contributions of each author**

Author 1 - Jelena Bartolović Vučković.

Email: [jbartolo@kbsd.hr](mailto:jbartolo@kbsd.hr)

Author 2 - Zdravko Kolundžić.

Author 3 - Boris Šimunjak.

Author 4 - Dinah Vodanović.