

A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF RESONANT VOICE THERAPY

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Speech-Language Pathology</i>
Manuscript ID	TASL-2015-0171.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Paper
Keywords:	Dysphonia, Voice, Voice disorder

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF RESONANT VOICE THERAPY

ABSTRACT

Purpose To systematically review the literature on resonant voice therapy and to evaluate the level of evidence **on** the effectiveness of using resonant voice therapy in treating dysphonia.

Method Refereed journal papers from 1974 to 2014 were retrieved and reviewed by two independent reviewers using the **keywords** “Humming, Resonance, Resonant Voice, Semi-occluded or closed tube phonation” using available database systems. Quality of evidence was evaluated by using the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE).

Result Thirteen papers met the search criteria. Nine papers were selected by the two reviewers. Two of the papers were randomised-controlled studies and the other seven were observational studies. At least four types of resonant voice therapies were described. They included the Lessac-Madsen Resonant Voice Therapy, Y- Buzz, Resonance Therapy and Humming. The overall level of quality of evidence was graded as **“moderate”**.

Conclusion There were limited studies that investigated the effectiveness of resonant voice therapy. Most studies were small-scale uncontrolled observational studies with the inclusion of only small samples or specific populations. There is clearly a need for more large-scale randomized controlled studies with a wider range of populations to provide further evidence **on** the effectiveness of resonant voice training.

INTRODUCTION

Resonant voice is a common vocal facilitating treatment method used to treat voice problems (Boone, McFarlane & Von Berg, 2005; Colton, Casper & Leonard, 2006), specifically with individuals who have hyperfunctional or phonotraumatic voice disorders (Chen Hsiao, Hsiao, Chung, Chiang, 2007; Roy et al, 2003; Verdolini-Marston, Burke, Lessac, Glaze, Caldwell, 1995). It has been contended that resonant voice therapy aims at reducing the effect of vocal pathology by facilitating the production of a perceptually clear voice **using** relatively neutral or not over-**adducted vocal folds** during phonation (Verdolini-Marston et al, 1995; Verdolini, Druker, Palmer, & Samawi, 1998). It has been postulated that resonant voice production maximises vocal output while minimising **inter**-vocal fold impact on **vibration**, thus minimising new injury (Roy et al, 2003; Stemple, Glaze, Klaben, 2000, Verdolini et al, 1995). Recently, there is evidence to suggest that resonant voice production facilitates vocal fold tissue healing more so than merely voice rest or spontaneous speech (Verdolini Abbott, Li, Branski, Rosen, Grillo, Steinhauer, & Hebda, 2012).

Physiology and aerodynamic of resonant voice

In resonant voice production, the vocal folds are believed to be slightly adducted/abducted (neutral adduction with minimal force) during phonation (Verdolini-Marston et al, 1995; Verdolini et al, 1998; Peterson, Verdolini-Marston, Barkmeier, & Hoffman, 1994). Therefore, the impact force between the two vocal folds would be minimised and thus reduce the exacerbation of existing vocal fold pathology (Boone et al, 2005; Colton et al, 2006; Verdolini et al, 1998).

1
2
3 In a 2001 paper, Titze explained vocal fold vibration using the concept of 'inertance', which
4 is "an acoustic property of an air mass (usually a column of air in a tube) being accelerated or
5 decelerated by pressure" (p. 520). The inertive vocal tract facilitates the vibration of the vocal
6 folds. Titze (2001) found that the ease of production and vocal fold vibration associated with
7 resonant voice, is facilitated by a decrease in the phonation threshold pressure, which is the
8 lowest subglottal pressure required to initiate and sustain vocal fold vibration. It was found
9 that an increase in air column inertance would lead to a decrease in phonation threshold
10 pressure (Titze, 2001). A decrease in the cross-sectional area or an increase in the length of
11 the vocal tract would lead to an increase in air column inertance, thus facilitating an efficient
12 voice production and vocal fold vibration associated with resonant voice (Titze, 2001).

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 Titze (2006) reconstructed vocal fold vibration during resonant voice production using a
28 computer simulation model. The simulation showed the effects of epilarynx narrowing and a
29 semi-occluded vocal tract during resonant voicing. The intensity of voice produced, the vocal
30 fold impact force, and overall vocal economy during resonant voice production were
31 investigated using the simulation model. Titze (2006) found that the maximum flow
32 declination rate, which is associated with the voice output spectrum, occurred when the
33 epilarynx tube was narrowed and the opening of the mouth was widened. Titze (2006)
34 contended that in a properly produced resonant voice, the semi-occlusion of the vocal tract
35 increases the interaction between the source (vocal fold vibration) and filter (the
36 supralaryngeal resonance), therefore yielding a high vocal intensity, efficiency and economy.

37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52 Titze (2006) also found that the lowest maximum glottal area declination, which is associated
53 with low impact between the vocal folds, occurred when the epilarynx tube was widened
54 while the opening in mouth was narrow. The semi-occlusion at the mouth was believed to
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 increase the back pressure, thus lowering the amplitude of the vocal fold vibration, collision
4
5 velocity and subsequently lowering the impact force between the vocal folds. This allows
6
7 building up of high pressure in the vocal tract without excessive damage to the tissues. It has
8
9 been shown that the degree of the occlusion of the vocal tract would influence the amplitude
10
11 of the vocal fold vibration (Guzman, Laukkanen, Krupa, Horacek, Svec, & Geneid, 2013). It
12
13 was argued that the semi-occlusion at the mouth provides a kinaesthetic sensation of the
14
15 backpressure by the speaker (Titze, 2006). Therefore, semi-occlusion using the humming of
16
17 /m/ is commonly used for resonant voice practice (Titze, 2006).
18
19

20 21 22 23 **Use of resonant voice in voice therapy**

24
25 The use of resonant voice as a therapeutic method for voice disorders has been documented
26
27 in the literature. Resonant voice therapy focuses on the production of a strong and clear voice
28
29 with the least effort. The production generally involves a "forward tone" with vibratory
30
31 sensations on the alveolar ridge and the maxillary bones (Chen, Ma & Yiu, 2014; Chen et al,
32
33 2007; Verdolini-Marsron et al, 1995).
34
35

36
37
38 The effects of resonant voice therapy on voice disorders have been investigated using
39
40 different methodological approaches and a number of outcome measures. Outcome measures
41
42 used included changes in auditory-perceptual voice quality improvement (Chen et al, 2007;
43
44 Verdolini et al, 1995; Yiu & Ho, 2002), in the acoustic output of voice changes (Chen et al,
45
46 2007; Titze, 2001; Yiu & Ho, 2002), in vibrations in facial bones (Chen, Ma & Yiu, 2014), in
47
48 phonatory aerodynamic changes (Chen et al, 2007), in vocal fold vibratory pattern
49
50 (Barrichelo & Behlau, 2007; Chen et al, 2007), and in voice-related quality of life such as
51
52 those assessed with Jacobson et al's (1997) Voice Handicap Index (Chen et al, 2007; Roy et
53
54 al, 2003) and self-perceived voice severity by dysphonic individuals (Roy et al, 2003).
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Resonant voice therapy has been described using different names in the literature. It has been
6
7 called Resonant Voice Therapy (Verdolini-Marston, 1995); Lessac-Madsen Resonant Voice
8
9 therapy (LMRVT; Verdolini, 2000), Resonance Therapy (Stemple et al, 2000), Humming
10
11 (Boone et al, 2005; Colton et al, 2006; Yiu & Ho, 2002), and resonant voice based on
12
13 Lessac's (1997) Y-Buzz (Barrichelo & Behlau, 2007).
14
15

16
17
18 Lessac-Madsen Resonant Voice Therapy was promoted by K. Verdolini Abbott (Orbello, Li,
19
20 & Verdolini Abbott, 2014; Verdolini, 2000) based on practices used to improve voice
21
22 production (Peterson et al., 1994; Verdolini et al., 1998). It is shown that in resonant voice,
23
24 an individual phonates with barely abducted vocal folds while proprioceptive feedback is
25
26 provided through the kinaesthetic sensations on the alveolar ridge and the facial bones
27
28 (Peterson et al., 1994; Verdolini et al., 1998).
29
30
31
32
33

34 The resonance therapy described by Stemple emphasizes on experiential and hierarchical
35
36 practice (Stemple et al, 2000). The aim of the program is to provide a context through a
37
38 hierarchy to facilitate resonant voice (Stemple et al, 2000). Proprioceptive feedback is given
39
40 to the client by means of vibratory sensations on the anterior alveolar ridge or other facial
41
42 areas (Stemple et al, 2000). Details of the therapeutic procedures based on these methods will
43
44 be described in the Results section later.
45
46
47
48

49 Humming technique has been described in a number of classical voice textbooks (e.g. Boone
50
51 et al, 2005; Colton et al, 2006). This technique involves the use of nasal consonants for
52
53 practice (Colton et al, 2006). Therapy usually begins with the production of a "hum", as in
54
55 acknowledging someone sincerely, at comfortable pitch with a gentle voice onset. The
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 humming promotes a phonation with gentle voice onset and provides proprioceptive feedback
4
5 through nasal and facial vibrations (Colton et al, 2006).
6
7

8
9
10 Barrichelo and Behlau (2007) reported the use of Y-Buzz, which is a combination of the
11 consonant Y (/j/) and the long vowel /i:/, in improving the voice of actors. Barrichelo and
12 Behlau (2007) developed this method based on the work of Arthur Lessac (1997). The
13 method focuses on proprioceptive sensations of vibration on the alveolar ridge and the nasal
14 bridge (Barrichelo & Behlau, 2007; Lessac, 1997).
15
16
17
18
19

20 21 22 23 24 25 **Effects of resonant voice therapy**

26
27 The effects of resonant voice have been investigated by a number of researchers (Barrichelo
28 & Behlau, 2007; Chen et al, 2007; Chen, Ma & Yiu, 2014; Ogawa et al, 2013, 2014; Roy et
29 al, 2003; Verdolini et al, 1995; Verdolini et al, 1998; Yiu & Ho, 2002). Different
30 methodological approaches have been used. Two major approaches have been used in
31 evaluating the effect of resonant voice therapy. One approach is concerned with the
32 evaluation of the effectiveness of resonant voice therapy with individuals with dysphonia
33 over a period of time (Chen et al., 2007; Chen, Ma & Yiu, 2014; Roy et al, 2003; Verdolini et
34 al, 1995; Yiu & Ho, 2002), while the other approach has focused on the acoustic and
35 physiological characteristics of resonant voice production (Barrichelo & Behlau, 2007;
36 Ogawa et al, 2013, 2014; Verdolini et al, 1998; Peterson et al, 1994). Studies also sampled
37 different subject types for their investigations. Some of them recruited healthy individuals
38 (Chen, Ma & Yiu, 2014) or vocally trained actors and singers as subjects (Barrichelo &
39 Behlau, 2007; Verdolini et al, 1998), while others targeted specific disorder groups such as
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 those with muscle tension dysphonia (Ogawa et al, 2013, 2014), or population groups such as
4
5 teachers (Roy et, al, 2003) and women (Chen et al, 2007; Verdolini et al, 1995).
6
7

8
9
10 The present investigation aimed at providing a comprehensive review and summary of
11
12 contemporary resonant voice therapy, to describe the contents of the different varieties of
13
14 resonant voice therapy and the therapeutic steps involved. The review also includes an
15
16 evaluation of the level of evidence of the effectiveness of using resonant voice therapy in
17
18 treating vocal pathology.
19

20 21 22 23 **Systems for evaluating level of evidence**

24
25 In relation to the evaluation of the level of evidence, a number of grading systems are
26
27 available in the literature for evaluating the level of evidence of health-related studies. They
28
29 include the Consolidation Standards of Reporting Trials (CONSORT; Schulz, Altman, &
30
31 Moher, 2010), Strength of Recommendation Taxonomy (SORT; Ebell et al, 2004), U.S.
32
33 Preventive Service Task Force (USPSTF; Barton et al, 2007) and the Grading of
34
35 Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluations (GRADE; Schünemann,
36
37 Brozek, Guyatt, & Oxman, 2013). The CONSORT provides a 25-item checklist guidance and
38
39 a flow chart diagram for assessing the evidence of parallel-group randomized controlled trial
40
41 (RCT) findings (Schulz et al, 2010). It is, however, neither a rating nor a ranking system.
42
43 The SORT provides a structured procedure to rate individual studies or bodies of evidence
44
45 using ratings 1, 2, or 3 according to quality, quantity and consistency of the evidence (Ebell
46
47 et al, 2004). The SORT, however, does not distinguish between good or bad observational
48
49 studies (Ebell et al, 2004). The USPSTF is designed to provide a standard way to evaluate the
50
51 effects of a preventive service on health outcomes (Barton et al, 2007). This system assigns
52
53 evidence to three levels: high, moderate and low, according to the certainty that the service
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 provided will be beneficial to the clients (Barton et al, 2007). The GRADE system is an
4
5 evidence grading system used by a wide range of organizations such as Cochrane
6
7 collaboration and World Health Organization groups (Schünemann et al, 2013). GRADE
8
9 grades the evidence into four levels: high, moderate, low and very low. The system also
10
11 allows for upgrade or downgrade of the overall level of evidence by further reviewing a
12
13 number of specific methodological factors (Schünemann et al, 2013).
14
15

16
17
18 It is generally agreed that well-implemented randomized controlled trials provide useful
19
20 evidence. Nevertheless, observational studies may also provide important information
21
22 especially when the number of studies with randomized controlled trials is limited (Barton et
23
24 al, 2007). Therefore, an evidence rating system which covers the evaluation of observational
25
26 studies would be necessary. The CONSORT system would not be appropriate since it is only
27
28 used to report parallel-group randomized controlled trials (Schulz et al, 2010). SORT is a less
29
30 comprehensive grading systems and it does not distinguish between good and bad
31
32 observational studies (Ebell et al, 2004). Both the GRADE and USPSTF employ similar
33
34 evaluation methods and also ascertain evidence from observational studies (Barton et al,
35
36 2007). The GRADE approach evaluates quality of evidence using four levels while the
37
38 USPSTF uses three levels (Barton et al, 2007). The criteria used to evaluate evidence for
39
40 GRADE are similar to that used by USPSTF (Barton et al, 2007). However, the GRADE
41
42 system has been used in diagnostic, treatment and prevention studies while the USPSTF was
43
44 designed primarily for prevention studies (Barton et al, 2007). Therefore, GRADE approach
45
46 would be the most suitable evidence grading system for studies that include both randomized
47
48 controlled and observational studies.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Again, the objectives of this study were:

- 4
5 1) to provide a systematic review of the contents of different resonant voice therapy types in
6
7 terms of definitions and the therapeutic steps involved;
8
9
10 2) to evaluate the level of evidence on the effectiveness of resonant voice therapy in treating
11
12 individuals with vocal pathology.
13

14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

METHODOLOGY

Identifying published papers

Papers published in peer-reviewed journals that reported the effects of resonant voice therapy between 1974 and 2014 were identified through a database search that included the Elsevier ScienceDirect Complete, Medline and Proquest Medical Library New Platform. Keywords used for searching included: “Forward Focus, Hum, Humming, Nasal Consonant, Nasal Resonance, Resonance, Resonance Therapy, Resonant Voice Therapy, Resonant Voice, Semi-occluded Vocal Tract, Closed Tube Phonation, and Effectiveness of Resonance Voice Therapy”. Dissertations, theses, books, non-refereed articles were not included. Only journal papers published in English were reviewed. Two final year speech therapy students of the Division of Speech and Hearing Sciences, at The University of Hong Kong were involved in searching the published journal papers. The two reviewers conducted the search independently and came up with an initial LIST of papers based on scanning the title and the abstract of journal articles. The two reviewers then selected a SET of papers that satisfied the criteria of “studies that investigated resonant voice, resonance voice or humming. The full-text of the journal papers selected as the SET were read in detail by the two reviewers independently. The two reviewers were asked to select a CORE of papers using the criteria “studies that investigated primarily the long term or immediate treatment effect”. The selected papers should also report detailed therapeutic procedures and also quantitative

1
2
3 outcome measures. These CORE papers were comprehensively reviewed to decide on a
4
5 grading of quality of evidence subsequently. Any disagreements regarding the selection of
6
7 CORE papers for comprehensive review were resolved by discussion and a consensus **was**
8
9 **achieved**. The 27-point PRISMA guidelines (www.prismastatement.org) were used
10
11 **throughout** for the selection and inclusion processes (Moher et al, 2009).
12
13

14 15 16 **Grading of quality of evidence**

17
18 The selected CORE papers were independently graded by the two reviewers according to the
19
20 level of evidence using the GRADE system (Higgins & Green, 2011). Evidence is classified
21
22 into high, moderate, low or very low category based on the methodological design of the
23
24 study. Randomized clinical trial would be given a high level of evidence rating while an
25
26 observational study would be given a low level of evidence (see Table 1). The overall quality
27
28 rating was then upgraded or downgraded, depending on a number of factors. The
29
30 downgrading factors include 1) study limitations, 2) possible risks of bias, 3) indirectness of
31
32 evidence, 4) discrepancies across studies without plausible explanations, 5) imprecision of
33
34 results, and 6) suspicion of publication bias. Factors to be included for possible upgrading the
35
36 level of evidence include 1) dose-response gradient, 2) large magnitude of effect, and 3) bias
37
38 in studies that could have underestimated the demonstrated effect. These factors are described
39
40 in more details in Table 2. Generally, the rating could rise or fall by one level for each factor.
41
42 Nevertheless, downgrading two levels because of one factor is also possible if the factor is
43
44 significant enough to severely affect the quality of the body of evidence. Downgrading one
45
46 level because of the presence of two factors is also possible if one factor is not significant
47
48 enough to downgrade one level. The overall grading **determined** by the two reviewers was
49
50 further reviewed by the co-author (EY) using the same criteria and procedure.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Put Tables 1 & 2 about here
4
5
6

7 **RESULTS**

11 **Papers selected for review**

12
13
14 More than 900 published papers were initially identified (LIST of papers) using the keywords
15
16 through the different database system. From this LIST, 13 journal papers that were
17
18 potentially relevant at the level of abstract were selected by the two reviewers as the SET of
19
20 papers for review (see Table 3). After reading the full-text article, one reviewer selected nine
21
22 papers while the other selected ten papers for consideration to be included in the CORE
23
24 papers. With the agreement on the nine papers to be selected and three papers not to be
25
26 selected, the inter-rater reliability (agreement) in identifying the CORE papers was 92.3%
27
28 ([9+3]/13). The disagreement was resolved by discussion and a consensus was reached on
29
30 selecting nine CORE papers, which provide information on the treatment effects of resonant
31
32 voice therapy or immediate effects of resonant voice were finally included (see Table 3
33
34 papers marked with asterisk). The four papers that were not selected were either non-
35
36 experimental reviews of resonant voice therapy (Roy, 2008; Schneider & Sataloff, 2007;
37
38 Ziegler, Gillespie, & Verdolini Abbott, 2010), or **used** resonant voice as as one of the
39
40 components of their therapy regime (Schindler, et al., 2008). **The selection process is outlined**
41
42 **in Figure 1.** The different types of resonant voice techniques described in these nine papers
43
44
45
46
47 are summarized and reviewed in the following sections.
48
49
50

51
52 Put Figure 1 and Table 3 about here
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Description of resonant voice therapy

Resonant voice therapy is a neuromuscular training approach that aims at training individuals with voice disorders to produce voice in a resonant and **easy** manner (Roy et al, 2003; Verdolini-Marston et al, 1995; Yiu & Ho, 2002). It facilitates the production of the strongest possible voice with minimal effort (Chen et al, 2007; Verdolini-Marston et al, 1995; Verdolini et al, 1998). When resonant voice is produced correctly, the vocal folds are **shown** to be barely adducted or barely abducted (Verdolini et al, 1998). **This** phonatory gesture **minimises** the impact **pressure between the** vocal folds (Roy et al, 2003; Stemple et al 2000, Verdolini-Marston et al, 1995) and facilitates wound healing (Verdolini Abbott 2012).

Types of resonant voice therapy

The techniques to facilitate resonant voice have been described by different researchers using different names. The names used by the different studies reported in the CORE papers include Lessac-Madsen Resonant Voice Therapy (LMRVT; Chen et al 2007; Verdolini-Marston et al, 1995), Humming (Chen, Ma & Yiu, 2014; Ogawa et al, 2013, 2014; Yiu & Ho, 2002), Stemple's Resonance Therapy reported by Roy et al, (2003), and Lessac's Y-Buzz (Barrichelo & Behlau, 2007). These four types of resonant voice therapy will be described below.

LMRVT, Humming, Stemple's Resonance Therapy and Y-Buzz share similar basic training procedures. They direct learners' attention to vibratory sensations in facial areas that provide proprioceptive feedback and employ a stepwise hierarchy of practices. There are, however, some procedural differences among the four therapies. LMRVT allows an individual to discover the production of resonance through a series of stretching and vocal exercises, while Humming, Stemple's Resonance Therapy and Y-Buzz techniques introduce the concept of

1
2
3 resonance through formal exploratory stages. LMRVT does not specify the pitch to be used
4
5 in the practice, but Stemple's Resonance Therapy, Humming and Y-Buzz involve assigning a
6
7 comfortable pitch for practice. LMRVT and Stemple's Resonance Therapy allow the client to
8
9 chant on musical notes but the Humming and Y-Buzz techniques do not rely on the musical
10
11 concept. Detailed instructional procedures for each of these techniques are given in Tables 4
12
13 to 7.

14
15
16
17
18 Put Tables 4-7 about here
19

20 21 22 23 **Effects of resonant voice therapy**

24 25 26 Long-term effectiveness

27
28 From the CORE papers, there were five papers identified that reported the long-term
29
30 effectiveness of resonant voice therapy. A summary of the review is listed in Table 8. Among
31
32 these five studies, there were three uncontrolled cohort studies and two randomised
33
34 controlled trials. All of them showed positive outcomes followed resonant voice therapy
35
36 despite a number of limitations in their methodological designs.
37
38

39
40
41
42 Put Table 8 about here
43
44

45
46 *Uncontrolled studies* Chen, Ma and Yiu (2014) investigated the effects of resonant
47
48 voice training, using humming, on facial bone vibration. Twelve non-dysphonic normal
49
50 individuals were recruited and were given four sessions of resonant voice therapy within a
51
52 week (Chen, Ma & Yiu, 2014). The participants were asked to produce nasal consonant /m/
53
54 and vowels /a/, /i/, /u/ before and after the resonant voice training. The level of vibration on
55
56 the face (nasal bridge and upper lip) and around the perilaryngeal area were compared using
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 piezoelectric accelerometers (Chen et al., 2014). Two-way repeated Analysis of Variance
4
5 (ANOVA) showed there was a significant main effect of training on facial bone vibration ($p <$
6
7 0.0001), but not in the perilaryngeal area (Chen et al., 2014). This showed that the increased
8
9 vibration in facial region was not due to increased energy emitted by the larynx but from the
10
11 effect of resonant voice therapy training on the facial bone vibration (Chen et al., 2014). This
12
13 increased bone vibration reflects the extent of resonant voice and could therefore be
14
15 considered as a feedback indicator for resonant voice. Given that there were only four
16
17 sessions of therapy given and the effects of the therapy were demonstrated in a group of
18
19 healthy subjects in whom there might have been ceiling effect in voice production, the level
20
21 of evidence deserves an upgrade.
22
23
24
25
26

27 Another uncontrolled clinical study conducted by Chen et al. (2007) investigated the effects
28
29 of resonant voice therapy (LMRVT) on 24 female teachers with voice disorders using
30
31 perceptual, physiological, acoustic, aerodynamic and functional measures. The participants
32
33 had one 90-minute treatment session per week for eight weeks (Chen et al., 2007). Paired t
34
35 tests were used to compare the results before and after the treatment. It was found that the
36
37 severity of auditory-perceptual ratings (roughness, strain, monotone resonance, hard attack,
38
39 glottal fry and vocal fatigue); acoustic measures (speaking fundamental frequency and
40
41 maximum range of speaking intensity); laryngo-stroboscopic findings (vocal fold pathology,
42
43 mucosal wave and amplitude, and vocal fold closure); phonation threshold pressure, all
44
45 improved significantly ($p < 0.05$) following therapy. A number of methodological issues
46
47 negatively affected the level of evidence. This study was an observational study with no
48
49 control group and small sample size ($N=24$). The study also did not control for blinding of
50
51 participants. There was also alpha inflation in calculating the statistics for more than 12
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 outcome measures.

1
2
3
4
5 The third uncontrolled study was reported by Yiu and Ho (2002), in which they investigated
6
7 the therapeutic effects of humming on the vocal quality of 16 subjects (eight with dysphonia
8
9 and eight with normal voice) after two sessions of humming practices. Significant
10
11 improvement was found in auditory-perceptual roughness in both the dysphonic and non-
12
13 dysphonic group ($p=0.02$). However, the acoustic measures did not show any significant
14
15 improvement ($p>0.05$) (Yiu & Ho, 2002). Despite the small sample size ($N=16$), the positive
16
17 effect demonstrated just within two sessions of practice pointed to the effectiveness of this
18
19 technique.
20
21
22
23
24

25 *Randomised control trial* Roy et al. (2003) conducted a randomised clinical trial
26
27 to compare three treatment programs: amplifier, Stemple's Resonance Therapy, and
28
29 respiratory muscle training. A total of 64 teachers with voice disorders were randomly
30
31 assigned into one of these three treatment groups. The groups that used the voice amplifier
32
33 and Resonance Therapy showed significant pre-post-therapy improvement on the Voice
34
35 Handicap Index (VHI; Jacobson et al, 1997) score and on self-perceived voice severity (Roy
36
37 et al, 2003). A number of issues in methodological design lowered the level of evidence of
38
39 this study. For example, there were a disproportionate number of dropouts in the Resonance
40
41 Therapy group (11, when compared to four and seven dropouts from the voice amplifier
42
43 group and respiratory muscle training groups, respectively), and participants and assessors
44
45 were not blind to the procedures. Nonetheless, these negative factors were balanced by a
46
47 number of positive factors and the overall level of evidence remained stable. These positive
48
49 factors included the positive therapy effect despite a relatively high attrition rate, fewer
50
51 therapy sessions than originally planned, and also the therapists were general speech
52
53 pathology practitioners who were not dealing with patients with voice disorders on a day-to-
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 day basis. The reviewers of the present study considered them as generalists rather than voice
4
5 experts (Roy et al, 2003).
6
7

8
9
10 Another randomised controlled trial was reported by Verdolini-Marston et al (1995). They
11 compared the effects of Lessac-Madsen Resonant Voice Therapy (LMRVT) and Confidential
12 Voice Therapy on women with laryngeal nodules using auditory perceptual and phonatory
13 effort measurements. Significant improvements ($p < 0.05$) were found in the LMRVT group
14 (N=3) and also in the Confidential Voice Therapy group (N=5) but not in the control group
15 with vocal hygiene given (N=5). The study also found better compliance led to better
16
17 outcomes, regardless of therapy type. The sample size was admittedly small, and there was
18 also a high attrition rate, with three out of six participants in the resonant voice therapy
19 groups who dropped out of from the study. Despite these, the small sample size still
20 demonstrated a positive outcome and this warrants an upgrade of the evidence.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 Immediate effects

35
36 Four studies were identified that reported the immediate effects of resonant voice. They are
37
38 all uncontrolled studies and they are summarized in Table 9.
39
40
41
42

43 Put Table 9 about here
44
45
46

47
48 Barrichelo and Behlau (2007) conducted an uncontrolled longitudinal study to investigate the
49 resonant voice technique based on Lessac's Y-Buzz using perceptual and acoustic outcome
50 measures. Nine newly graduated actors were recruited as participants. Productions of Y-Buzz
51 and habitual voice using /i/ were compared using auditory-perceptual and acoustic
52 evaluations (Barrichelo & Behlau, 2007). Y-Buzz productions of /i/ were perceived as more
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 resonant 74% of the time when compared with /i/ productions with habitual voice. There
4
5 were also significant reductions in **acoustic jitter** (p=0.002) and shimmer (p=0.038) following
6
7 Y-buzz training. The study design was, however, limited by the small sample size (N=9).
8
9 Furthermore, the subjects were allowed to repeat the Y-Buzz productions until they were
10
11 satisfied with the resonant effect (Barrichelo & Behlau, 2007). **This factor** might have
12
13 introduced a bias in the measurements.
14
15

16
17
18 Ogawa et al. (2013) reported a cohort study that investigated the immediate effects of
19
20 humming on supraglottic compression in 23 subjects with muscle tension dysphonia (MTD).
21
22 Laryngoscopic evaluations of false vocal fold (FVF) and antero-posterior (AP) compression
23
24 were compared among natural phonation, humming phonation and um-hum phonation
25
26 (Ogawa et al, 2013). The study found that humming phonation demonstrated significantly
27
28 less FVF and AP compression **than pre-humming therapy phonation** (p<0.05). In another
29
30 investigation, Ogawa et al. (2014) reported their findings on another group of subjects (28
31
32 **with dysphonia**, 20 **without dysphonia**) using electroglottographic (EGG) measures.
33
34 Perturbation, closed quotient (CQ), and vocal fold contact duration extracted from the
35
36 electroglottographic (EGG) signals were compared across natural, humming and um-hum
37
38 phonations (Ogawa et al., 2014). **Data from seven** of the 28 **subjects with dysphonia** were
39
40 excluded from the analysis as they did not produce a major reduction in roughness (less than
41
42 1-scale point) using humming **or** um-hum. **A** two-way repeated ANOVA showed that the
43
44 variability (in terms of standard deviation) of CQ and perturbation decreased following
45
46 humming and um-hum in both the dysphonic and non-dysphonic groups (p <0.05) (Ogawa et
47
48 al, 2014). Nevertheless, the exclusion of the outliers in the analysis might have resulted in an
49
50 attrition bias and inflated the effectiveness.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Verdolini et al. (1998) conducted a cohort study using videostroboscopy to examine laryngeal
4
5 adduction in resonant voice. Twelve vocally trained singers or actors were recruited. Six of
6
7 them were healthy with normal voice and six of them had vocal nodules. They were asked to
8
9 produce resonant, pressed, normal and breathy voices under video-laryngo-stroboscopy
10
11 (Verdolini et al, 1998). Blinded visual-perceptual ratings using an ordinal scale were made on
12
13 the degree of laryngeal adductions. Both the dysphonic and non-dysphonic groups produced
14
15 resonant voice with barely adducted or abducted laryngeal configuration that was
16
17 significantly distinctive from those of pressed and breathy voices. The authors admitted that
18
19 the presence of the endoscopy during the phonation could have confounded the laryngeal
20
21 configurations (Verdolini et al, 1998). Furthermore, the recruited subjects were all vocally
22
23 trained singers or actors. This makes it difficult to generalize the results to a general
24
25 population.
26
27
28
29

30 Level of evidence

31
32 Table 10 lists the factors that were considered by the reviewers for each study to evaluate the
33
34 overall level of evidence of resonant voice therapy. Among the nine studies, seven (77.8%)
35
36 were observational or cohort studies and two were randomised clinical trial. Level of
37
38 evidence was graded by the two reviewers as “low” initially based on the methodological
39
40 designs in these studies. After discussing with the third reviewer (EY), and reconsidered the
41
42 designs and also the outcomes of the studies, they reached a consensus that the initial overall
43
44 level of evidence should be graded as “moderate”.
45
46
47
48

49
50 A number of methodological limitations were prevalent across these studies. These include a
51
52 lack of blinding of participants, which was found in all studies (100%). Overall risk of bias
53
54 across studies was high, with indirectness of evidence (difference between desired outcome
55
56 and measured outcome) found in five studies (55.5%), restricted population (gender,
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 occupation, vocally trained) in five studies (55.5%), risk of attrition bias found in four studies
4
5 (44.4%), and the risk of co-intervention effect found in one study (11.1%). Thus, there is a
6
7 limitation in generalising the findings to a wider population such as different age, gender and
8
9 occupational groups. None of these studies showed any publication bias or result imprecision
10
11 and inconsistency. Therefore, reviewers agreed the overall evidence should be downgraded
12
13 by one level.
14
15

16
17
18 Factors that could be considered for upgrading were then considered. There was no dose
19
20 response gradient found. Bias that might have underestimated the demonstrated effects was,
21
22 however, noticed in three studies (33.3%). The overall evidence was therefore upgraded one
23
24 level. During the grading process, the two reviewers agreed on the downgrade factor “study
25
26 limitations” and the upgrade factor “bias underestimating demonstrated effect”. There was an
27
28 initial disagreement on the presence of the “indirectness of evidence” factor. After discussion,
29
30 consensus was reached and both reviewers agreed on the presence of this “indirectness of
31
32 evidence” factor. The third reviewer agreed with the two reviewers on all the downgrading
33
34 and upgrading evaluation. With the downgrade and upgrade cancelling each other, all three
35
36 reviewers agreed the final overall level of evidence of resonant voice therapy in treating
37
38 vocal pathology should be graded as “moderate”.
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Put Table 10 about here
46
47

48 DISCUSSION

49
50
51
52
53
54 A review of the nine studies found a consistent result that resonant voice therapy brought
55
56 about changes in perceptual voice quality and overall efficiency of production. However,
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 some of these changes cannot be confidently attributed to resonant voice training *per se*, as
4
5 many of these studies did not include a control group for comparison. Overall, the grading of
6
7 effectiveness of resonant voice therapy based on current available literature is “moderate” as
8
9 the upgrading factors nullified the downgrading factors. There is thus a moderate level of
10
11 confidence in the effectiveness of resonant voice therapy in treating vocal pathology.
12
13

14
15
16 This review clearly shows that the literature only has a limited number of high-quality studies
17
18 and therefore could only provide a moderate level of evidence to support the effectiveness of
19
20 resonant voice therapy in treating voice problems. Indeed, this observation could well be
21
22 applied equally to other similar voice treatment techniques. Hence, there is a need to develop
23
24 further high-quality clinical studies to provide more evidence to determine the effectiveness
25
26 of resonant voice therapy. Most of the studies reviewed were observational in nature without
27
28 the inclusion of control groups for comparison. Hence, more randomised controlled studies
29
30 are needed to produce a higher level of evidence. A majority of the studies reviewed were
31
32 based on a small sample size. Larger sample size using power statistics to assist in estimating
33
34 the needed sample size would be essential. Attrition rate should also be taken into
35
36 consideration in determining the sample size. The present review also found that most studies
37
38 were restricted to a narrow population, by including only one gender (Chen et al, 2007;
39
40 Verdolini-Marston et al, 1995), specific occupational groups (Barrichelo & Behlau, 2007;
41
42 Roy et al 2003) or vocally trained participants (Verdolini et al, 1998). Multicentre trials will
43
44 also be needed to determine whether these therapy types are effective for different
45
46 populations and different age groups, and whether they are effective when conducted by
47
48 different clinicians. Dysphonic populations should continue to be the focus for future studies
49
50 of resonant voice therapy. This is essential, as the findings will need to show that the effects
51
52 of resonant voice therapy are not restricted to a specific gender, occupation or vocally trained
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 individuals. The present review also found that more randomised controlled trials with a
4
5 stringent methodological design such as blinding of participants and assessors should be
6
7 conducted so that performance and assessment biases can be reduced or eliminated. In
8
9 summary, available data showed that resonant voice therapy has a moderate level of evidence
10
11 to support its use in clinical practice. Nevertheless, with the limitations in the methodology
12
13 used in these studies, researchers and clinicians who are interested in the effectiveness of
14
15 resonant voice therapy should carry out more randomised controlled studies with a larger
16
17 sample size of sufficient power and specifically defined population groups.
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 REFERENCES

- 25
26
27 Barrichelo, V.M., Behlau, M. (2007). Perceptual identification and acoustic measures of the
28
29 resonant voice based on ‘‘Lessac’s Y-Buzz’’- a preliminary study with actors. *Journal*
30
31 *of Voice*, 21(1), 46–53.
32
33
34 Barton, M. B., Miller, T., Wolff, T., Petitti, D., LeFevre, M., Sawaya, G., Yawn, B., Guirguis-
35
36 Blake, J., Calonge, N. & Harris, R. (2007). How to read the new recommendation
37
38 statement: methods update from the US Preventive Services Task Force. *Annals of*
39
40 *Internal Medicine*, 147(2), 123-127.
41
42
43 Boone, D. R., McFarlane, S. C., & Von Berg, S. (2005). *The voice and voice therapy* (7th ed.).
44
45 Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
46
47
48 Chen, F. C., Ma, E. P. M., & Yiu, E. M. L. (2014). Facial Bone Vibration In Resonant Voice
49
50 Production. *Journal of Voice*, 28(5), 596-602.
51
52
53
54 Chen, S.H., Hsiao, T.Y., Hsiao, L.C., Chung, Y.M., Chiang, S.C. (2007). Outcome of
55
56 resonant voice therapy for female teachers with voice disorders: perceptual,
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 physiological, acoustic, aerodynamic, and functional measurements. *Journal of Voice*.
4
5 21 (4), 415–425.
6
7
- 8 Colton, R., Casper, J. K., & Leonard, R. (2006). *Understanding voice problems: A*
9
10 *physiological perspective for diagnosis and treatment* (3rd ed.). Baltimore: William &
11
12 Wilkins.
13
- 14
15
16 Ebell, M. H., Siwek, J., Weiss, B. D., Woolf, S. H., Susman, J., Ewigman, B., & Bowman, M.
17
18 (2004). Strength of recommendation taxonomy (SORT): a patient-centered approach
19
20 to grading evidence in the medical literature. *The Journal of the American Board of*
21
22 *Family Practice*, 17(1), 59-67.
23
24
- 25
26 Guzman, M., Laukkanen, A. M., Krupa, P., Horacek, J., Svec, J. G., & Geneid, A. (2013).
27
28 Vocal tract and glottal function during and after vocal exercising with resonance tube
29
30 and straw. *J Voice*, 27(4), 523 e519-534.
31
32
- 33 Higgins, J. P. T. & Green, S. (2011). *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of*
34
35 *Interventions* Version 5.1.0. The Cochrane Collaboration. Retrieved January, 2, 2015.
36
37 from www.cochrane-handbook.org.
38
39
- 40 Jacobson, B. J., Johnson, A., Grywalski, C., Silbergleit, A., Jacobson, G., Benninger, M. S.,
41
42 et al. (1997). The Voice Handicap Index (VHI): Development and validation.
43
44 *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 6(3), 66-70.
45
46
- 47
48 Lessac, A. (1997). *The Use and Training of the Human Voice: A Practical Approach to*
49
50 *Speech and Voice Dynamics*. 3rd ed. New York: Mayfield Publishing Company.
51
52
- 53 Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred
54
55 *Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement*.
56
57 *BMJ*, 339:b2535.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Ogawa, M., Hosokawa, K., Yoshida, M., Yoshii, T., Shiromoto, O., & Inohara, H. (2013).
4
5 Immediate effectiveness of humming on the supraglottic compression in subjects with
6
7 muscle tension dysphonia. *Folia Phoniatrica et Logopaedica*, 65(3), 123-128.
8
9
10 Ogawa, M., Hosokawa, K., Yoshida, M., Iwahashi, T., Hashimoto, M & Inohara, H. (2014).
11
12 Immediate effects of humming on computed electroglottographic parameters in
13
14 patients with muscle tension dysphonia, *Journal of Voice*, 28(6), 733-741.
15
16
17
18 Orbelo, D. M., Li, N. Y.-K., & Verdolini Abbott, K. (2014). Lessac-Madsen Resonant Voice
19
20 Therapy in the Treatment of Secondary MTD. In J. C. Stemple & E. R. Hapner (Eds.),
21
22 Voice Therapy: Clinical Case Studies. San Diego: Plural Publishing.
23
24
25 Peterson, K. L., Verdolini-Marston, K., Barkmeier, J. M., & Hoffman, H. T. (1994).
26
27 Comparison of aerodynamic and electroglottographic parameters in evaluating
28
29 clinically relevant voicing patterns. *Annals of Otology, Rhinology and Laryngology*,
30
31 103, 335-346.
32
33
34
35 Roy, N. (2008). Assessment and treatment of musculoskeletal tension in hyperfunctional
36
37 voice disorders. *International Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 10(4), 195-209.
38
39
40 Roy, N., Weinrich, B., Gray, S.D., Tanner, K., Stemple, J.C., Sapienza, C.M. (2003). Three
41
42 treatments for teachers with voice disorders: a randomized clinical trial. *Journal of*
43
44 *Speech Language Hearing Research*, 46 (3), 670-688.
45
46
47
48 Schindler, A., Bottero, A., Capaccio, P., Ginocchio, D., Adorni, F., & Ottavianai, F. (2008).
49
50 Vocal improvement after voice therapy in unilateral vocal fold paralysis. *Journal of*
51
52 *Voice*, 22(1), 113-118.
53
54
55 Schneider, S.L. & Sataloff, R.T. (2007). Voice therapy for the professional voice.
56
57 *Otolaryngologic Clinics of North America*, 40(5), 1133-1149.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Schünemann, H., Brożek, J., Guyatt, G., & Oxman, A. (2013) *GRADE Handbook for*
4
5 *Grading Quality of Evidence and Strength of Recommendations*. The GRADE
6
7 Working Group. Retrieved January 1, 2015,
8
9 from www.guidelinedevelopment.org/handbook.
10
11
12 Schulz, K. F., Altman, D. G., & Moher, D. (2010). CONSORT 2010 statement: updated
13
14 guidelines for reporting parallel group randomised trials. *BMC Medicine*, 8(1), 18.
15
16
17
18 Stemple, J.C., Glaze, L.E., Klaben, B.G. (2000). *Clinical Voice Pathology: Theory and*
19
20 *Management*. 3rd ed. San Diego, CA: Singular Publishing Group.
21
22
23 Titze, I.R. (2001). Acoustic Interpretation of Resonant Voice. *Journal of Voice*, 15 (4), 519-
24
25 528.
26
27
28 Titze, I.R. (2006). Voice Training and Therapy With a Semi-Occluded Vocal Tract:
29
30 Rationale and Scientific Underpinning, *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing*
31
32 *Research*, 49 (2), 448-459.
33
34
35
36 Verdolini, K. (2000). Case Study: Resonant Voice Therapy. In J. Stemple, *Voice therapy:*
37
38 *Clinical Studies (2nd ed., pp.46-62)*. San Diego: Singular Publishing Group.
39
40
41 Verdolini, K., Druker, D.G., Palmer, P.M., Samawi, H. (1998). Laryngeal adduction in
42
43 resonant voice. *Journal of Voice*, 12(3), 315–327.
44
45
46 Verdolini Abbott, K. (2008) *Lessac-Madsen Resonant Voice Therapy: Clinician Manual*. San
47
48 Diego: Plural Publishing.
49
50
51 Verdolini Abbott, K., Li, N. Y. K., Branski, R. C., Rosen, C. A., Grillo, E. G., Steinhauer, K.
52
53 & Hebda, P. A. (2012). Vocal exercise may attenuate acute vocal fold inflammation.
54
55 *Journal of Voice*, 26(6), 814. e811-813.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Verdolini-Marston, K, Burke, M.K., Lessac, A., Glaze, L., Caldwell, E. (1995). Preliminary
4
5 study of two methods of treatment for laryngeal nodules. *Journal of Voice*, 9(1), 74–
6
7 85.
8

9
10 Yiu, E.M.-L. & Ho, E.Y.-Y. (2002) Short-term effect of humming on vocal quality. *Asia*
11
12 *Pacific Journal of Speech Language Hearing*, 7,123–137
13

14
15 Ziegler, A., Gillespie, A.I., & Verdolini Abbott, K.V. (2010). Behavioural treatment of voice
16
17 disorder in teachers. *Folia Phoniatica et Logopaedica*, 6(1-2), 9-23.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 1. PRISMA Flow chart (Moher et al, 2009) showing selection process




Table 1. Level of quality of evidence according to GRADE (Schünemann et. al, 2013)

Level of evidence	Definition
High (Randomised Clinical Trial)	There is much confidence that true effect lies close to that of the estimate of the effect
Moderate	The true effect is likely to be close to the estimate of the effect, but there is a possibility that it is substantially different
Low (Observational Studies)	There is limited confidence in the effect estimate
Very Low	The true effect is likely to be substantially different from the estimate of effect

Table 2. Upgrading and downgrading factors for GRADE rating

Downgrading Factors	Descriptions
1. <u>Study Limitations</u>	-Lack of random sequence generation This limitation reduces the likelihood that comparable groups are produced
	-Lack of allocation concealment This limitation would introduce examiners' biases
2. <u>Risks of bias</u>	-Lack of blinding of participants and assessors Risk of performance or assessment bias
	-Attrition bias Exclusion of participants from reports of analysis or withdrawal of participants would create bias
	-Selective reporting of a subset of the original variables Risk of reporting bias
3. <u>Indirectness of evidence</u>	Difference between desired outcome and measured outcome
4. <u>Unexplained inconsistency of results</u>	Results across studies are found to be inconsistent without reasonable explanation
5. <u>Imprecision of result</u>	Wide confidence intervals imply uncertainty in the estimate
6. <u>Publication bias</u>	Publishing only from a number of small or commercially funded studies may present biased views
Upgrading Factors	Descriptions
1. <u>Dose-response gradient</u>	Different levels of exposure of therapy result in different levels of effectiveness
2. <u>Large magnitude of effect</u>	Studies demonstrate at least 2 times the magnitude of intervention effect than other reported studies
3. <u>Biases underestimating a result</u>	Despite possible biases that would underestimate a result, intervention effect is still shown

Table 3. Initial set of 13 journal papers selected by the two reviewers

Authors / Year of publication	Title of the paper	Journal name/ pages	Study design	Therapy name
*Barrichelo, V.M. & Behlau, M. (2007)	Perceptual identification and acoustic measures of the resonant voice based on “Lessac’s Y-Buzz”—a preliminary study with actors.	<i>Journal of Voice</i> 21 (1), 46–53.	Observational	Lessac’s Y-Buzz
*Chen, F. C., Ma, E. P.-M., & Yiu, E. M.-L. (2014)	Facial Bone Vibration In Resonant Voice Production.	<i>Journal of Voice</i> , 28(5), 596-602.	Observational	Humming
*Chen, S.H., Hsiao, T.Y., Hsiao, L.C., Chung, Y.M., & Chiang, S.C. (2007)	Outcome of resonant voice therapy for female teachers with voice disorders: perceptual, physiological, acoustic, aerodynamic, and functional measurements.	<i>Journal of Voice</i> . 21 (4) 415–425	Observational	Lessac-Madsen Resonant Voice Therapy
*Ogawa, M., Hosokawa, K., Yoshida, M., Yoshii, T., Shiromoto, O., & Inohara, H. (2013)	Immediate effectiveness of humming on the supraglottic compression in subjects with muscle tension dysphonia.	<i>Folia Phoniatica Et Logopaedica</i> , 65(3), 123-128.	Observational	Humming
*Ogawa, M., Hosokawa, K., Yoshida, M., Iwahashi, T., Hashimoto, M & Inohara, H. (2014).	Electroglottographic Parameters in Patients With Muscle Tension Dysphonia.	<i>Journal of Voice</i> , 1-9	Observational	Humming
*Roy, N., Weinrich, B., Gray, S.D., Tanner, K., Stemple, J.C., & Sapienza, C.M. (2003)	Three treatments for teachers with voice disorders: a randomized clinical trial.	<i>Journal of Speech Language Hearing Research</i> , 46 (3), 670–688.	Randomised controlled trial	Stemple’s Resonance Therapy

To be continued

Table 3 (con't). Initial set of 13 journal papers selected by the two reviewers

Roy, N. (2008)	Assessment and treatment of musculoskeletal tension in hyperfunctional voice disorders.	<i>International Journal of Speech-Language Pathology</i> , 10(4), 195-209.	Non-experimental review	Resonant Voice Therapy
Schindler, A., Bottero, A., Capaccio, P., Ginocchio, D., Adorni, F., & Ottaviani, F. (2008)	Vocal improvement after voice therapy in unilateral vocal fold paralysis.	<i>Journal of Voice</i> , 22(1), 113-118.	Observational	Humming/resonant voice
Schneider, S.L., & Sataloff, R.T. (2007)	Voice therapy for the professional voice	<i>Otolaryngologic Clinics of North America</i> , 40(5), 1133-1149.	Non-experimental review	Resonance exercise/Buzz
*Verdolini-Marston, K., Burke, M.K., Lessac, A., Glaze, L., & Caldwell, E. (1995)	Preliminary study of two methods of treatment for laryngeal nodules	<i>Journal of Voice</i> , 9(1), 74-85.	Randomised controlled trial	Lessac-Madsen Resonant Voice Therapy
*Verdolini, K., Druker, D.G., Palmer, P.M., & Samawi, H. (1998)	Laryngeal adduction in resonant voice.	<i>Journal of Voice</i> , 12(3), 315-327.	Observational	Resonant Voice
*Yiu, E.M.-L. & Ho, E.Y.-Y.. (2002)	Short-term effect of humming on vocal quality.	<i>Asia Pacific Journal of Speech Language Hearing</i> , 7,123-137	Observational	Humming
Ziegler, A., Gillespie, A.I., & Verdolini Abbott, K.V. (2010)	Behavioral treatment of voice disorders in teachers.	<i>Folia Phoniatica et Logopaedica</i> , 62(1-2), 9.	Non-experimental review	Resonant Voice Therapy
* Studies selected as CORE papers				

**Table 4. Basic elements of Lessac-Madsen Resonant Voice Training (LMRVT)
(Verdolini Abbott, 2008)**

-
1. Stretches: Basic body stretches of chest, shoulders, neck, jaws, lips, tongue, mouth and throat.

 2. Resonant Voice Core Exercises:
 - /m/ - “mmmmm” (other voiced continuants are used in subsequent sessions)
 - /m/ words
 - /m/ phrases

 3. Resonant Voice Chant:
 - /m/ + vowel sounds, e.g. /mi mi mi mi mi mi/
 - nasal + Non-nasal sounds, e.g. /mi mi pi pi mi mi/
 - (other consonants/vowels are used in subsequent sessions)
 - /m/ loaded phrases, e.g. “Meet me Peter, meet me”

 4. Resonant Voice Vocal Communicator:
 - Conversational speech: “m-hmmm”, “really”, “right”, “yeah”, “no”

 5. Resonant Voice Mini:
 - Change from old voice to resonant voice

 6. Resonant Voice Messa di Voice:
 - /m/+ /j/+ vowel, e.g. /mmmjjjiii/, /mmmjjjaaa/, /mmmjjjuuu/ using crescendo/descrescendo (other consonants/vowels are used in subsequent sessions)
 - Words using crescendo/descrescendo

 7. Resonant Voice Conversation:
 - Conversational in a variety of contexts

 8. Own treatment:
 - Planning functional goals and practice
-

Table 5. Instructional steps for Y-Buzz (Barrichelo & Behlau, 2007)

1. To produce “shhh” like asking someone to be quiet.
2. To produce “shhh” with a Y-Buzz sound linked to it.
3. To explore the Y-buzz and find a pitch that can result in maximum resonance with minimal effort.
4. To check nasality of Y-buzz not altered by pressing the nostrils together.
5. To continue exploring, improving and refining the tonal and vibrational quality.
6. To practice Y-buzz while gently shaking one hand and to observe how the action enhances pulsation of the Y- buzz sound into the facial bones; then to continue the Y- Buzz without shaking the hand.
7. To produce the Y-Buzz sound like siren sound.
8. To move from practicing Y-Buzz with words, to phrases and natural speech.

Table 6. Instructional steps for Humming (Yiu & Ho, 2002)

-
1. To produce a hum like sincerely acknowledging someone in a relaxed manner.

 2. To glide up and down the musical scale to find a comfortable pitch that can result in maximum resonance with minimal effort.

 3. To use a finger to feel the resonance of the hum over the area of nasal bridge, and to attend to the feedback given by the clinician.

 4. To hum at a comfortable pitch with a sustained vowel at the end of /m/: /m/.../a/.

 5. To hum with words, phrases and natural speech.
-

Table 7. Instructional steps for Stemple's Resonance Therapy (Stemple, Glaze & Klaben, 2000)

1. To begin with choosing the appropriate pitch, then to count from "1 to 5" and match the pitch to the closest note on a pitch pipe. Then use one note higher on the pitch pipe throughout the training.
2. To produce "Hmm-molm- molm..." as a sigh, then with a forward focus, using adequate abdominal breathing in a relaxed manner (Basic Gesture).
3. Advanced Gesture:
 - Stage 1- To produce voiced consonants i.e. "molm-molm..." by varying the rate; then varying the rate and intensity; then to produce with the intonation of spoken phrases; then to chant real voiced phrases on a musical note.
 - Stage 2 - To repeat tasks in Stage 1, adding voiceless consonants and voiced consonants. (Stemple, Glaze & Klaben, 2000).
 - Stage 3 - To chant phrases with extra forward focus and exaggerated articulation.
 - Stage 4 - To read paragraphs with exaggerated articulation and natural production.
 - Step 5 - To generalise to normal conversations.
 - Step 6 - To generalise to various environmental settings in daily life.
 - Step 7 - To generalise to a variety of emotional contexts.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Table 8. Studies investigating the long-term effectiveness of resonant voice therapy

Study	Study Design	Resonant voice therapy type	Subjects /Grouping	Therapy duration	Outcome measures	Findings
Chen, Ma & Yiu, 2014	Uncontrolled longitudinal study	Resonant voice therapy type: Humming	12 subjects with dysphonia 1 group	30 minutes per session, total 4 training sessions	Facial bone vibration	Significant increase in facial bone vibration
Chen et al, 2007	Uncontrolled longitudinal study	Lessac-Madsen Resonant Voice Therapy	24 females with dysphonia 1 group	90 minutes per session, 1 session per week for 8 weeks	Perceptual voice Physiological Acoustic Aerodynamic Functional	Reduced auditory perceptual severity of roughness, strain, monotone, resonance, hard attack, glottal fry and vocal fatigue Reduced severity vocal fold pathology, improved mucosal wave, amplitude, and vocal fold closure Increased speaking fundamental frequency, maximum range of speaking intensity Reduced phonation threshold pressure Reduced physical scale score

(To be continued)

Table 8 (con't) Studies investigating the long-term effectiveness of resonant voice therapy

Study	Study Design	Resonant voice therapy type	Subjects /Grouping	Therapy duration	Outcome measures	Findings
Roy et. al, 2003	Randomised controlled trial	Stemple's Resonance Therapy	64 teachers with dysphonia 3 groups: 1.Voice amplifier (N=25) 2.Resonance Therapy (N=19) 3.Respiratory muscle training (N=20)	1 session in 2 weeks, for 6 weeks	Voice Handicapped Index (VHI) & Voice Severity Rating	Significant improvements in VHI scores and voice severity self-ratings
Verdolini-Marston et. al., 1995	Randomised controlled trial	Lessac-Madsen Resonant Voice Therapy (LMRT)	13 females with dysphonia 3 groups: 1.Vocal hygiene & LMRT (N=3) 2.Vocal hygiene & Confidential Voice therapy (N=5) 3.Vocal hygiene (Control): (N=5)	9 sessions within 2 weeks	Auditory-perceptual voice quality Visual perceptual (laryngoscopy) Phonatory effort	Overall improvements in auditory-perceptual, visual-perceptual ratings and phonatory effort measures
Yiu & Ho, 2002	Uncontrolled cohort	Humming	8 subjects with hyperfunctional dysphonia and 8 with normal voice 2 groups: Dysphonic vs non-dysphonic	2 sessions, 45 minutes per session	Auditory-perceptual voice quality Acoustic analysis	Significant reduction in auditory-perceptual roughness in both dysphonic and non-dysphonic group No change in acoustic measures

Table 9. Studies investigating the immediate effects of resonant voice

Study	Study Design	Resonant voice therapy type	Subjects/Grouping	Outcome measurement	Findings
Barrichelo & Behlau, 2007	Uncontrolled longitudinal study	Y-Buzz Repeated measures Y-Buzz vs habitual voice	9 newly graduated actors, (6 males & 3 females)	-Auditory-perceptual evaluation of /i/ -Acoustic	Perceptual measures: Y- Buzz more resonant (74% of the time) Y-Buzz demonstrated significant decrease in acoustic irregularity and shimmer
Ogawa et al., 2013	Cohort	Humming Repeated measures: natural phonation vs humming phonation vs um-hum phonation	23 subjects with muscle tension dysphonia & 15 subjects with normal voice	Supraglottic compression: -false vocal fold -anterior-posterior indices	Significant reduction in false vocal fold and antero-posterior compression in both subject groups using humming
Ogawa et al., 2014	Cohort	Humming Repeated measures: natural phonation vs humming phonation vs um-hum phonation	21 subjects with muscle tension dysphonia & 20 subjects with normal voice	Electroglottographic signals: -Perturbation parameters -Contact quotient	Significantly lower variability in the perturbation and contact quotient during humming and um-hum in both subject groups
Verdolini et al., 1998	Cohort	Resonant voice Repeated measures: resonant vs pressed vs normal vs breathy voice	12 vocally trained singers or actors (6 with laryngeal nodules, 6 with normal voice)	Videostroboscopy: Ordinal visual-perceptual ratings	Resonant voice was distinctive from configurations for pressed and breathy voice

Table 10. Factors determining/affecting the level of evidence of resonant voice therapy studies

Study	Factors that lowered the quality of evidence	Factors that raised the quality of evidence
Chen, Ma & Yiu, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small sample size • No blinding of participants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrated intervention effect even with limited number of sessions
Chen et. al, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small sample size • No blinding of participants • Low generalizability to a wider population 	
Roy et. al, 2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No blinding of participants and assessors • Risk of attrition bias (Disproportionate number of dropout in resonant voice therapy group) • Low generalizability to a wider population 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrated intervention effect even with low compliance • Demonstrated intervention effect even with non-expert therapists • Demonstrated intervention effect even with limited number of sessions
Verdolini-Marston et. al., 1995	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small sample size and no blinding of participants • Risk of attrition bias • Risk of co-intervention effect • Low generalizability to a wider population 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrated intervention effect even with only 3 subjects • Demonstrated intervention effect even within 2 weeks
Yiu & Ho, 2002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small Sample size • No blinding of participants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrated intervention effect even with two sessions
Barrichelo & Behlau, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small sample size and no blinding of participants • Indirectness of evidence • Post-treatment performance measures were selective • Low generalizability to a wider population 	
Ogawa et. al., 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No blinding of participants • Risk of attrition bias 	
Ogawa et. al., 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No blinding of participants • Risk of attrition bias (subjects without making changes were excluded from the analysis) 	
Verdolini et. al., 1998	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No blinding of participants • Low generalizability from vocally trained to wider population • Rigid endoscopy may affect result 	