

Introduction

- Typical methods for eliciting voice during the clinical voice evaluation require the use of speech samples which are varied in their phonetic contexts.
 - These same speech samples are often acoustically analyzed as part of voice evaluation methods.
- One instrument used in clinical voice evaluation is the Consensus Auditory-Perceptual Evaluation of Voice (CAPE-V)¹. The CAPE-V includes multiple sentences with varied phonetic contexts.
- Due to time constraints, speech-language pathologists often choose only one of the CAPE-V sentences to analyze acoustically.
 - It is unclear, however, which of the sentences may be the most useful in better understanding the characteristics of a voice disorder through acoustic analysis.
- We set out to investigate the relationship between the voice acoustic measure associated with clarity, known as Cepstral Peak Prominence (CPP), and the auditoryperceptual (how it sounds) measure of overall dysphonia severity in different phonetic contexts.

Name:				Date:	
 The following parame Sustained vowels, Sentence production a. The blue b. How hard c. We were Spontaneous speed 	eters of voice of /a/ and /i/ for on: e spot is on the rd did he hit h e away a year a ch in response	quality will be rated upor 3-5 seconds duration eac e key again. im? ago. to: "Tell me about your	d. We eat eggs every Eas e. My mama makes leme f. Peter will keep at the voice problem." or "Tell m	ng tasks: nter. on muffins. peak. ne how your vo	
		Legend: C = Consistent MI = Mildly Dev MO =Moderately SE = Severely De	I = Intermittent viant Deviant eviant		
Overall Severity _	MI	MO	SE	C	
Roughness _				C	
C -	MI	MO	SE		
Breathiness _	MI	MO	SE	C	
Strain _	M	MO	9E	C	
Pitch (Inc	dicate the na	ature of the abnormal	ity):	_	
-	MI	MO	SE	C	
Loudness (Inc	dicate the na	ature of the abnormal	ity):	_	
-	MI	MO	SE	C	
	MI	MO	SE	C	
_				C	
	MI	MO	SE		

ADDITIONAL FEATURES (for example, diplophonia, fry, falsetto, asthenia, aphonia, pitch instability, tremor, wet/gurgly, or other relevant terms)

Simplifying Acoustic Analysis of Voice during Voice Evaluation

Beau Braun, B.S., Sarah Incorvaia, B.S., & Dr. Patrick R. Walden, Ph.D., CCC-SLP Monmouth University, West Long Branch, NJ

SCORE /100 /100 ____/100 /100 /100

is functioning.

- ____/100
- /100
- ____/100

Methods

- 294 voice samples from the Perceptual Voice Quality Database (PVQD)² were used to complete this study. The PVQD includes voice samples from adults with and without diagnosed dysphonia as they complete the CAPE-V speech samples. reported³ a range of voice quality severities that were reliably measured. CPP measures were analyzed for this project using Praat⁴ and a script developed by Murray and colleagues⁵.All parts of the speech sample were used in analysis. speech stimuli and the auditory-perceptual rating of overall severity was determined through the use of
- The PVQD is publicly available and has • The relationship between CPP values for all CAPE-V
- Pearson Correlations. Further, the CPP values were used as predictor variables in a linear regression analysis to predict overall severity.

Results

- Pearson Correlations showed a weak negative correlation between auditory-perceptual rating for severity and the CPP value for prolonged vowel /a/.
- All other utterances, except for prolonged /i/, were moderately negatively correlated. /i/ was not significantly correlated.
- **Regression analysis showed only one utterance's CPP** value to be predictive of auditory-perceptual severity rating: the all-voiced sentence, "We were away a year ago."
- The regression model using the CPP value for the all-voiced sentence was only weakly predictive (adjusted R^2 =.148).

Discussion

Only the all-voiced CAPE-V sentence, "We were away a year ago" was significantly predictive of overall voice severity. Although it was only weakly predictive, the all-voiced sentence is the most appropriate choice if clinicians are to acoustically analyze only one utterance from the CAPE-V





- https://doi.org/10.17632/9dz247gnyb.3
- http://www.praat.org/



MONMOUTH

SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGY

References

Kempster, G. B., Gerratt, B. R., Verdolini-Abbott, K., Barkmeier-Kraemer, J., & Hillman, R. E. (2009). Consensus Auditory-Perceptual Evaluation of Voice: Development of a Standardized Clinical Protocol. Am. J. Speech. Lang. Pathol., 18(2), 124–132. https://doi.org/10.1044/1058-0360(2008/08-0017).

2. Walden, P. (2020). Perceptual Voice Qualities Database (PVQD). 3.

3. Walden, P. R. (2020). Perceptual Voice Qualities Database (PVQD): Database Characteristics. J. Voice. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvoice.2020.10.001

4. Boersma, Paul & Weenink, David (2024). Praat: doing phonetics by computer [Computer program]. Version 6.4.06, retrieved 25 February 2024 from

5. Murray, E.H., Chao, A., & Colletti, L.A. (2022). A practical guide to calculating cepstral peak prominence in Praat. https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/yvp4s