

Ultrasonography to detect age-related changes in swallowing muscles

著者	Takashi Mori, Shinichi Izumi, Yoshimi Suzukamo, Tatsuma Okazaki, Susumu Iketani
journal or publication title	European Geriatric Medicine
volume	10
page range	753-760
year	2019-08-16
URL	http://hdl.handle.net/10097/00128837

doi: 10.1007/s41999-019-00223-y

1 **Title**

2 Ultrasonography to detect age-related changes in swallowing muscles

3 **Authors**

4 Takashi Mori MS, SLP^{1,2}, Shinichi Izumi MD, PhD¹, Yoshimi Suzukamo, PhD¹, Tatsuma Okazaki MD, PhD¹, Susumu
5 Iketani DDS, PhD²

6

7 **A concise and informative title**

8 Age-related changes in swallowing muscles

9

10 **Affiliations**

11 1. Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Tohoku University graduate School of Medicine, Sendai-shi,
12 Miyagi, Japan

13 2. Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, Dysphagia Rehabilitation Center, Southern Tohoku General Hospital,
14 Koriyama-shi, Fukushima, Japan

15

16 **Corresponding author:**

17 Takashi Mori, Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, Dysphagia rehabilitation center, Southern Tohoku General
18 Hospital

19 963-8563 7-115 Yatsuyamada, Koriyama City, Fukushima Pref., Japan

20 Phone: +81-24-934-5322

21 E-mail: tmori0117@yhaoo.co.jp

22

23 **ORCID ID:** Takashi Mori 0000-0002-1566-119X

24

25 **Key summary points**

26 Aim: To measure age-related changes in swallowing muscles by ultrasonography as a non-invasive method.

27 Findings: By ultrasonography, we found that old people had a smaller geniohyoid muscle area and greater geniohyoid
28 muscle brightness than young people. Our analyses indicated that age and whole-body skeletal muscle mass were
29 associated with mass and quality of the geniohyoid muscle.

30 Message: Ultrasonography effectively identified the association between atrophy of the swallowing muscles and aging

1 and loss of whole-body skeletal muscle mass.

2

3 **Abstract**

4 Purpose: Sarcopenia of swallowing muscles is a potential cause of dysphagia. We investigated age-related changes in
5 mass and quality of swallowing muscles by ultrasonography as a non-invasive and convenient examination in subjects
6 without dysphagia.

7 Methods: A total of 104 subjects (34 males, 70 females) participated in this study. Age, physical status, and mass and
8 strength of skeletal and swallowing muscles were investigated. Ultrasonography was performed to measure cross-
9 sectional area and brightness of the geniohyoid muscle as a swallowing muscle. Calf circumference was measured to
10 evaluate skeletal muscle mass. Hand grip strength was measured to evaluate skeletal muscle strength. Subjects were
11 divided into two groups: young (< 65 years old) and old (\geq 65 years old). We performed univariate and multivariate
12 analyses to analyze the differences between the groups.

13 Results: The number of subjects in the young group was 35, and 69 in the old group. The mean \pm SD of measurements
14 in each group was as follows (young / old): age, $35.4 \pm 13.9 / 74.5 \pm 5.5$ years old; calf circumference, $37.4 \pm 4.1 / 33.9$
15 ± 2.7 cm ($p < 0.001$); hand grip strength, $35.6 \pm 10.2 / 25.8 \pm 7.6$ kg ($p < 0.001$); cross-sectional area of geniohyoid
16 muscle, $229.5 \pm 52.2 / 174.1 \pm 40.7$ mm² ($p < 0.001$); and brightness of geniohyoid muscle, $46.6 \pm 11.1 / 59.6 \pm 10.8$ (p
17 < 0.001). The old group had a significantly smaller geniohyoid muscle area and significantly greater geniohyoid muscle
18 brightness than the young group ($p < 0.01$). Age and calf circumference were independent explanatory factors for
19 geniohyoid muscle area ($p < 0.01$). Age and sex were independent explanatory factors for geniohyoid muscle brightness
20 ($p < 0.01$).

21 Conclusions: Ultrasonography revealed a smaller area and greater brightness, which suggested smaller mass and greater
22 infiltration of fat, in the geniohyoid muscle in old people than in young people.

23

24 **Key words**

25 Swallowing, Muscle, Ultrasonography, Sarcopenia

26

27

28

29

30

31

1 **Main text**

2

3 **Background and Purpose**

4 Sarcopenia increases physical dysfunction [1, 2]. Previous research reported that sarcopenia might cause dysphagia
5 [3-7]. Sarcopenia and dysphagia are important problems among old people; particularly, the prevalence of sarcopenic
6 dysphagia was reported to be 32% in rehabilitation patients in Japan, a rapidly aging society [8]. Sarcopenic dysphagia
7 is defined as a swallowing disorder due to sarcopenia of whole-body skeletal and swallowing muscles [3, 9].

8 As sarcopenia can be treated [1, 2], confirming the status of muscles is important to prevent muscle dysfunction.
9 Feng et al. and Molfenter et al. reported that old people had lower geniohyoid and pharyngeal muscle mass than young
10 people when evaluated by CT or MRI, respectively [10, 11]. Compared with CT and MRI, ultrasonography is
11 characterized by being radiation-free, portable, easy to use, and having a low cost, and short examination time, thus,
12 making it useful for screening many people in order to confirm their muscle status. Several reports evaluated
13 swallowing muscle mass and brightness, later as a measure of muscle quality, by ultrasonography [12-19]. Muscle
14 brightness suggests infiltration of fat [20]. However, age related changes of these parameters measured by
15 ultrasonography are unclear.

16 In this study, we measured age-related changes in swallowing muscle mass and quality by ultrasonography. We
17 investigated the cross-sectional area and brightness of the geniohyoid muscle as a representative swallowing muscle and
18 compared between young (< 65 years old) and old (\geq 65 years old) people.

19

20 **Methods**

21 *Participants and parameters*

22 The study design was cross-sectional. Subjects were divided into two groups: young (< 65 years old) and old (\geq
23 65 years old). Old subjects were recruited from three preventative care services and one regional preventative care event
24 for older citizens, and young subjects were recruited from a medical facility. Inclusion criteria were independently
25 living subjects without severe illness that affected their physical function. Subjects with dysphagia were excluded
26 using Food intake LEVEL scale [21]. The study period was between Dec. 2017 and Feb. 2019. The ethical committees
27 of Southern Tohoku General Hospital and Tohoku University approved this study. All patients were given documents
28 and provided written informed consent prior to enrollment.

29 We assessed parameters concerning both skeletal and swallowing muscles. Age, sex, height, body weight, body
30 mass index (BMI), calf circumference, hand grip strength, and Mini Nutritional Assessment[®] short form (MNA-SF)

1 [22] score for nutritional status were assessed. The thickest part of the lower leg was assessed using a measure as a calf
2 circumference. Calf circumference was regarded as an indicator of whole-body skeletal muscle mass [23]. The hand
3 grip strength was measured using a Smedley hand dynamometer in the standing position. Hand grip strength was used
4 as an indicator of whole-body muscle strength [1, 2]. The maximum strength was taken as a result. MNA-SF was used
5 because nutritional status and dysphagia had a clear association [24]; it is a screening questionnaire to assess nutritional
6 status consisting of six questions. A total score of 12-14 points indicates a healthy condition, 8-11 means risk, and 0-7
7 malnutrition.

8 For swallowing muscles, Food Intake LEVEL Scale (FILS) was measured to evaluate swallowing function.
9 Maximum tongue pressure was measured to evaluate swallowing muscle strength. And, ultrasonography was
10 performed. FILS is a validated ranking scale for evaluating swallowing function [20]. A score of 10 indicates normal
11 function, 7-9 indicates mild dysphagia, 4-6 indicates moderate dysphagia and 1-3 indicates severe dysphagia. In this
12 study, we considered subjects with a FILS score of 10 to have normal swallowing function, and those with FILS score 9
13 and under, to have dysphagia. Maximum tongue pressure was assumed to demonstrate swallowing muscle strength [25].
14 A tongue pressure measurement instrument (JMS, Hiroshima, Japan) was used to measure tongue pressure [26].
15 Subjects were instructed to press a balloon to their palate folds with their tongues. Tongue pressure measurements were
16 performed three times for each subject, and the maximum score was taken as a result. The cross-sectional area of the
17 geniohyoid muscle was used as an indicator of swallowing muscle mass. Brightness of the geniohyoid muscle was used
18 as an indicator of swallowing muscle quality because high intensity in the muscle indicates the presence of fat [20].

19 *Ultrasonography*

20 We used a LOGIQ e V2 (GE Health Care Japan, Tokyo, Japan) and convex-array probe (Model No. is 4C-RS) for
21 ultrasonography. We created a parameter setting button on the screen of the ultrasound machine for this study, labeled as
22 “swallow” mode. In the swallow mode, the parameters were set as follows: gain, 60; dynamic range, 78; frequency, 4.0
23 MHz; depth, 7 cm. Before every measurement, the tester set the ultrasound machine to “swallow” mode. The
24 parameters were recorded with each ultrasound image simultaneously, and we checked the status of parameters in the
25 image analyses. Subjects were instructed to sit on a chair, face forward, keep a neutral position, and close the mouth.
26 We instructed the subjects not to move or swallow while the US pictures were being taken. A probe was set under the
27 jaw in the central sagittal plane. Ultrasonography measurements were performed three times, and the mean score was
28 taken as a result. The area and brightness of the geniohyoid muscles in the sagittal plane were calculated using image J
29 (Fig. 1, All images belong to author T.M.). An area of interest was set in the manual polygon mode. Brightness was
30 assessed by the mean echo level of the area of interest, and the range was 0-255. Ultrasonography and analysis were

1 performed by one speech therapist (T.M.) to reduce any potential bias caused by different testers.

2 *Statistical analysis*

3 The means of age, height, weight, BMI, calf circumference, hand grip strength, MNA-SF, maximum tongue
4 pressure, and the cross-sectional area and brightness of the geniohyoid muscle were calculated. The median FILS scores
5 were also calculated. We evaluated the relationships among the parameters using Pearson's product moment correlation
6 coefficient. The subjects were divided into two groups: young (< 65 years old) and old (\geq 65 years old). Univariate
7 analyses were performed to investigate differences between the two groups using the Student's t-test. Conditions for
8 sample size calculation were set as follows: α error, 0.05; power, 0.8. The required sample size to detect differences in
9 area and brightness of the geniohyoid muscle between the young and old groups was 11 in the young group and 22 in
10 the old group. In multiple regression analysis, age, sex, height and calf circumference were chosen as explanatory
11 variables for the area and brightness of the geniohyoid muscle because these parameters can affect skeletal muscle mass.
12 All analyses were performed using EZR software [27, 28], p - values < 0.05 were considered significant.

13

14 **Results**

15 A total of 104 subjects participated in this study, 34 males and 70 females. There were 35 subjects (18 males and
16 17 females) in the young group and 69 subjects (16 males and 53 females) in the old group. Table 1 shows significant
17 differences between young and old groups in age, height, weight, calf circumference, hand grip strength, maximum
18 tongue pressure, and geniohyoid muscle area and brightness. Table 2 shows differences between young and old groups
19 in each gender. There were significant differences in area and brightness of the geniohyoid muscles between young and
20 old subgroups of both the male and female groups. The old group had smaller area and greater brightness of the
21 geniohyoid muscle (Figs. 2 and 3). The area of the geniohyoid muscle was correlated with height, calf circumference,
22 hand grip strength, and maximum tongue pressure, and was negatively correlated with age and brightness of the
23 geniohyoid muscle (Table 3). The brightness of the geniohyoid muscle was correlated with age, and negatively
24 correlated with height, calf circumference, hand grip strength and area of geniohyoid muscle (Table 3).

25 Tables 4 and 5 show the results of the multivariate regression models for the area and brightness of the geniohyoid
26 muscle. Age and calf circumference were independent explanatory factors for a small geniohyoid muscle area. Age and
27 sex were independent explanatory factors for great brightness of the geniohyoid muscle.

28

29 **Discussions**

30 In this study, the area of the geniohyoid muscle was associated with calf circumference, grip strength, and

1 maximum tongue pressure. This muscle moves the hyoid bone and elevates the larynx in the swallowing motion [29].
2 Loss of geniohyoid muscle mass suggests atrophy of swallowing muscles. Calf circumference is an indicator of whole-
3 body skeletal muscle mass [22] and grip strength is an indicator of whole-body skeletal muscle strength [1, 2].
4 Maximum tongue pressure is an indicator of swallowing muscle strength [24]. In the univariate analysis, the area of the
5 geniohyoid muscle was correlated with calf circumference ($r = 0.58, p < 0.01$), hand grip strength ($r = 0.68, p < 0.01$),
6 and maximum tongue pressure ($r = 0.39, p < 0.01$). These results indicated that the area of the geniohyoid muscle, as a
7 representative of swallowing muscle mass, was associated with whole-body skeletal muscle mass, and whole-body and
8 swallowing muscle strength. These results are consistent with those of previous research. Yoshimi et al. reported that
9 geniohyoid muscle area in the coronal plane correlated with trunk muscle mass index and tongue pressure [30]. Tamura
10 et al. reported that tongue thickness in the coronal plane correlated with arm muscle area [14]. Baba et al. reported that
11 geniohyoid muscle area in the coronal plane correlated with maximum tongue pressure [17].

12 Our data suggested that the area of the swallowing muscle decreased with aging. Old people had a smaller
13 geniohyoid muscle area and greater brightness than young people. The sample size to detect a significant difference
14 between the two groups in this study was sufficient (Calculated size was 33, and the actual size was 104). These results
15 indicated that swallowing muscle mass and quality decreased with age and whole-body muscle mass. In the multivariate
16 analyses, age ($p < 0.01$) and calf circumference ($p < 0.01$) were independent explanatory factors for loss of geniohyoid
17 muscle mass. These results indicated that swallowing muscle mass was affected by age and whole-body skeletal muscle
18 mass. Age ($p < 0.01$) and sex ($p < 0.01$) were independent risk factors for the low quality of the geniohyoid muscles.
19 These results are consistent with those of previous research. Feng et al. used CT and reported that old people had a
20 smaller geniohyoid muscle area in the sagittal plane than young people [10]. Molfenter et al. used MRI and reported
21 that old people had a smaller pharyngeal muscle area in the horizontal plane than young people [11]. Baba et al. used
22 ultrasonography and reported that geniohyoid muscle area in the coronal plane correlated with age [17]. As far as we
23 know, there has been no previous research showing age-related changes in brightness of the geniohyoid muscle by
24 ultrasonography, suggesting infiltration of fat into the muscle.

25 Our study showed that ultrasonography can measure the differences in the geniohyoid muscle area in the sagittal
26 plane between young and old people and is the first to demonstrate the differences in geniohyoid muscle brightness
27 between young and old people.

28 Sarcopenia can be treated by resistance training and nutrition. [1, 2]. Feng et al. and Baba et al. reported a
29 correlation between swallowing function and swallowing muscle mass [10, 17]. If sarcopenia of the swallowing
30 muscles is detected at an early stage, swallowing muscle training should be started to prevent sarcopenic dysphagia.

1 There are two limitations in this study. First, muscle area measurement by ultrasonography was reported to be
2 correlated with MRI measurement [31, 32]. However, for geniohyoid muscle area, an association between
3 ultrasonography and MRI is not clear. In this study, we did not examine the association between ultrasonography and
4 MRI for the measurement of geniohyoid muscle area. Second, effects of thoracic kyphosis or cervical lordosis on US
5 measurements were not evaluated. To avoid stretching the geniohyoid muscle, neck position of the subjects was
6 adjusted to central position. However, the presence of thoracic kyphosis or cervical lordosis was not assessed.

7 In conclusion, we suggest that atrophy and fatty change of the swallowing muscles are associated with aging and
8 loss of whole-body skeletal muscles, and efficacy of the ultrasonography in their evaluation.

9

10 **Compliance with ethical standards**

11 Conflict of interest: Takashi Mori, Shinichi Izumi, Yoshimi Suzumkamo, Tatsuma Okazaki, and Susumu Iketani declare
12 no conflicts of interest.

13 Ethical approval: Ethical committee of Southern Tohoku General Hospital and Tohoku University was approved this
14 study.

15 Informed consent: All patients were given documents and provided written informed consent prior to enrollment.

16

17 **Acknowledgments:**

18 We are grateful to Yumi Yamada, Tatsuya Bando, Yutaro Ohira, Yukari Ishikawa, Hidenori Oriuchi and Ippei Izumi for
19 their support with data collection.

20

21 **References**

- 22 1. Cruz-Jentoft AJ, Landi F, Schneider SM, et al. (2014). Prevalence of and interventions for sarcopenia in aging
23 adults: a systematic review. Report of the International Sarcopenia Initiative (EWGSOP and IWGS). *Age Aging*
24 43(6):748-759. [https://doi: 10.1093/ageing/afu115](https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afu115)
- 25 2. Cruz-Jentoft AJ, Bahat G, Bauer J, et al. (2019). Sarcopenia: revised European consensus on definition and
26 diagnosis. *Age Aging* 48(1):16-31. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afy169>
- 27 3. Wakabayashi H (2014). Presbyphagia and sarcopenic dysphagia: association between aging, sarcopenia, and
28 deglutition disorders. *J Frailty Aging* 3(2): 97-103. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14283/jfa.2014.8>

- 1 4. Wakabayashi H, Sakuma K (2014). Rehabilitation nutrition for sarcopenia with disability: a combination of both
2 rehabilitation and nutrition care management. *J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle* 5(4):269-277. [https://doi:](https://doi.org/10.1007/s13539-014-0162-x)
3 10.1007/s13539-014-0162-x
- 4 5. Maeda K, Akagi J (2015). Decreased tongue pressure is associated with sarcopenia and sarcopenic dyspha
5 gia in the older. *Dysphagia*; 30(1):80-87. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00455-014-9577-y>
- 6 6. Maeda K, Takaki M, Akagi J (2017). Decreased Skeletal Muscle Mass and Risk Factors of Sarcopenic D
7 ysphagia: A Prospective Observational Cohort Study. *Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 27(9):1290-1294. [http](http://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/glw190)
8 [s://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/glw190](http://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/glw190)
- 9 7. Fujishima I, Fujii-Kurachi M, Arai H, et al. (2019). Sarcopenia and dysphagia: Position paper by four pr
10 ofessional organizations. *Geriatr Gerontol Int* 19:91–97. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ggi.13591>
- 11 8. Wakabayashi H, Takahashi R, Murakami M (2019). The Prevalence and Prognosis of Sarcopenic
12 dysphagia in Patients Dysphagia in Patients Who Require Dysphagia Rehabilitation. *J Nutrition, health &*
13 *aging* 23(1):84-88. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12603-018-1117-2>
- 14 9. Mori T, I Fujishima, H Wakabayashi, et al. (2017). Development, reliability, and validity of a diagnostic algorithm
15 for sarcopenic dysphagia. *JCSM Clinical Reports* 2 (2):1-10. [https://jcsm-clinical-reports.info/index.php/jcsm-](https://jcsm-clinical-reports.info/index.php/jcsm-cr/article/view/17/18)
16 [cr/article/view/17/18](https://jcsm-clinical-reports.info/index.php/jcsm-cr/article/view/17/18)
- 17 10. Feng X, Todd T, Lintzenich CR, et al. (2013). Aging-related geniohyoid muscle atrophy is related to
18 aspiration status in healthy older adults. *Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 68(7):853-860. [https://doi.org/10.1](https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/gls225)
19 [093/gerona/gls225](https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/gls225)
- 20 11. Molfenter SM, Amin MR, Branski RC et al. (2015). Age-Related Changes in Pharyngeal Lumen Size: A
21 Retrospective MRI Analysis. *Dysphagia* 30(3): 321-327. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00455-015-9602-9>
- 22 12. Watkin KL, Diouf I, Gallagher TM, et al. (2001). Ultrasonic quantification of geniohyoid cross-sectional area and
23 tissue composition: a preliminary study of age and radiation effects. *Head Neck* 23(6):467-474.
24 <https://doi.org/10.1002/hed.1061>
- 25 13. Feng X, Cartwright MS, Walker FO, et al. (2015). Ultrasonographic evaluation of geniohyoid muscle and hyoid
26 bone during swallowing in young adults. *Laryngoscope* 125(8):1886-1891. <https://doi.org/10.1002/lary.25224>
- 27 14. Tamura F, Kikutani T, Tohara T, et al. Tongue thickness relates to nutritional status in the elderly. *Dysphagia* 2012;
28 27: 556-561. [https://doi: 10.1007/s00455-012-9407-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00455-012-9407-z)
- 29 15. Shimizu S, Hanayama K, Nakato K, et al. (2016). Ultrasonographic evaluation of geniohyoid muscle mass in

- 1 perioperative patients. *Kawasaki Med J* 42: 47-56. [https://doi.org/10.11482/KMJ-E42\(2\)47](https://doi.org/10.11482/KMJ-E42(2)47)
- 2 16. Shimizu S, Hanayama K, Metani H, et al. (2016). Retest reliability of ultrasonic geniohyoid muscle measurement
3 Japanese *Jpn J Compr Rehabil Sci* 55-60. <https://doi.org/10.11336/jjcrs.7.55>
- 4 17. Baba T, Goto T, Fujimoto, et al. (2017). Age-related changes in geniohyoid muscle morphology predict reduced
5 swallowing function. *J Oral Health Biosci* 30: 18-25. https://doi.org/10.20738/johb.30.1_18
- 6 18. Tamura F, Kikutani T, Furuya H, et al. (2017). A study of tongue thickness in older people in Japan. *Med Res Arch*
7 5: 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00455-012-9407-z>
- 8 19. Ogawa N, Mori T, Fujishima I, et al. (2018). Ultrasonography to Measure Swallowing Muscle Mass and Quality in
9 Older Patients With Sarcopenic Dysphagia. *JAMDA* 19 (6): 516-522. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jamda.2017.11.007>
- 10 20. Reimers K, Reimers CD, Stefen Wagner et al. (1993). Skeletal muscle sonography: a correlative study of
11 echogenicity and morphology. *J Ultrasound Med*, 12: 73–77. <https://doi.org/10.7863/jum.1993.12.2.73>
- 12 21. Kunieda K, Ohno T, Fujishima I, et al. (2013). Reliability and Validity of a Tool to Measure the Severit
13 y of Dysphagia. The Food Intake LEVEL Scale. *J Pain Symptom Management* 46(2):201-206. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2012.07.020>
- 14 22. Kaiser M, Bauer J, Ramsch C, et al. (2009). Validation of the mini nutritional assessment short-form (MNA®-SF);
15 a practical tool for identification of nutritional status. *J Nutr Heal Aging*;13:782 - 88.
16 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12603-009-0214-7>
- 17 23. Kawakami R, Murakami H, Sanada K et al. (2015). Calf circumference as a surrogate marker of muscle mass for
18 diagnosing sarcopenia in Japanese men and women. *Geriatr Gerontol Int.* 15:969 - 76.
19 <https://doi.org/10.1111/ggi.12377>
- 20 24. Serra-Prat M, Palomera M, Gomez C et al (2012). Oropharyngeal dysphagia as a risk factor for malnutrition and
21 lower respiratory tract infection in independently older persons: a population -based prospective study. *Age Ageing*
22 41(3): 376-81. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afs006>
- 23 25. Steel MC (2013). Optimal Approaches for Measuring Tongue-Pressure Functional Reserve. *J Aging Res* 2013:
24 542909. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2013/542909>
- 25 26. Utanohara Y, Hayashi R, Yoshikawa M, et al (2008). Standard values of maximum tongue pressure taken using a
26 newly developed disposable tongue pressure measurement device, *Dysphagia* 23, 286-290.
27 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00455-007-9142-z>
- 28

- 1 27. Kanda Y (2013). Investigation of the freely available easy-to-use software ‘EZR’ for medical statistics. *Bone*
2 *Marrow Transplantation* 48: 452–458. [https:// 10.1038/bmt.2012.244](https://doi.org/10.1038/bmt.2012.244)
- 3 28. Institute for Statistics and Mathematics of Wirtschaftsuniversität Wien. The Comprehensive R Archive Network.
4 (2019). [http://cran.r - project.org/](http://cran.r-project.org/) Accessed 22 Feb. 2019.
- 5 29. Palmer JB, Rudin NJ, Lara G et al. (1992). Coordination of mastication and swallowing. *Dysphagia* 7: 187-200.
6 PMID: 1308667
- 7 30. Abe T, Kondo M, Kawakami Y et al. (1994). Prediction Equations for Body-Composition of Japanese Adults by B-
8 Mode Ultrasound. *Am J Hum Biol* 6: 161-170. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajhb.1310060204>
- 9 31. Sanada K, Kearns CF, Midorikawa T et al. (2006). Prediction and validation of total and regional skeletal muscle
10 mass by ultrasound in Japanese adults. *Eur J Appl Physiol* 96: 24-31. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00421-005-0061-0>
- 11 32. Yoshimi K, Hara K, Tohara H et al. (2018). Relationship between swallowing muscles and trunk muscle mass in
12 healthy elderly individuals: A cross-sectional study. *Achieves of Gerontology and Geriatrics* 79: 21-26.
13 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.archger.2018.07.018>

1 **Tables**

2

3

4

Table. 1

	Total (<i>N</i> = 104)	Young (<i>N</i> = 35)	Old (<i>N</i> = 69)	<i>p</i>
Sex, male, n (%)	70 (67.3)	18 (51.4)	16 (23.2)	0.007
Age, years, mean (SD)	61.3 (20.5)	35.4 (13.9)	74.5 (5.5)	< 0.001
Height (cm), mean (SD)	157.4 (10.0)	164.7 (7.6)	153.7 (10.1)	< 0.001
Weight (kg), mean (SD)	56.6 (10.8)	61.5 (12.9)	54.2 (8.8)	0.004
BMI, mean (SD)	22.7 (3.1)	22.5 (3.6)	22.9 (2.9)	0.647
Calf circumference (cm), mean (SD)	35.1 (3.5)	37.4 (4.1)	33.9 (2.7)	< 0.001
Hand grip strength, (kg), mean (SD)	29.1 (9.7)	35.6 (10.2)	25.8 (7.6)	< 0.001
MNA-SF, score, median (IQR)	13 (12-14)	13 (12-14)	13 (12-14)	0.26*
FILS, score, median (IQR)	10 (10-10)	10 (10-10)	10 (10-10)	n, s**
Maximum tongue pressure (kPa), mean (SD)	37.1 (7.9)	41.2 (7.7)	35.1 (7.3)	< 0.001
Geniohyoid muscle area (mm ²), mean (SD)	192.7 (51.4)	229.5 (52.2)	174.1 (40.7)	< 0.001
Geniohyoid muscle brightness, mean (SD)	55.2 (12.3)	46.6 (11.1)	59.6 (10.8)	< 0.001

5

6

Table 1: Characteristics of the subjects

7

p indicates the *p* value of the Student's t-test except for MNA-SF and FILS, * indicates the *p* value of the Mann-Whitney U test, ** FILS scores for all the subjects were 10 points.

8

9

1

2 Table.2

3

4 (a) Male

	Young (n = 18)	Old (n = 16)	<i>p</i> value
Age, years, mean (SD)	33.9 (12.1)	76.6 (5.3)	<0.001
Height, cm, mean (SD)	172.5 (4.3)	163.2 (7.5)	<0.001
Weight, kg, mean (SD)	70.8 (8.0)	63.1 (8.3)	0.009
BMI, mean (SD)	23.9 (3.2)	23.6 (2.1)	0.796
Calf Circumference, cm, mean (SD)	40.0 (3.4)	35.2 (1.8)	<0.001
Hand grip strength, kg, mean (SD)	44.1 (5.8)	34.6 (8.7)	0.001
MNA-SF, score, median (IQR)	14 (13-14)	12.5 (12-14)	0.016
FILS, score, median (IQR)	10 (10-10)	10 (10-10)	n, s**
Maximum Tongue Pressure, kPa, mean (SD)	43.4 (9.2)	33.7 (6.3)	0.001
Geniohyoid muscle area, mm ² , mean (SD)	262.8 (42.1)	190.7 (49.1)	<0.001
Geniohyoid muscle brightness, mean (SD)	40.6 (8.7)	54.2 (8.6)	<0.001

5

6 (b) Female

	Young (n = 17)	Old (n = 53)	<i>p</i> value
Age, years, mean (SD)	36.9 (15.8)	73.8 (5.5)	<0.001
Height, cm, mean (SD)	156.4 (7.6)	150.(4.8)	0.001
Weight, kg, mean (SD)	51.7 (9.7)	51.5 (7.1)	0.938
BMI, mean (SD)	21.1 (3.7)	22.7 (3.1)	0.1
Calf Circumference, cm, mean (SD)	34.5 (2.7)	33.5 (2.8)	0.189
Hand grip strength, kg, mean (SD)	26.7 (4.4)	23.1 (4.8)	0.009
MNA-SF, score, median (IQR)	38.9 (5.0)	35.5 (7.5)	0.091
FILS, score, median (IQR)	10 (10-10)	10 (10-10)	n, s**
Maximum Tongue Pressure, kPa, mean (SD)	12 (12-13)	13 (12-14)	0.259
Geniohyoid muscle area, mm ² , mean (SD)	194.2 (36.8)	169.0 (36.9)	0.017
Geniohyoid muscle brightness, mean (SD)	53.0 (10.0)	61.2 (10.9)	0.007

7

8 Table. 2: Comparison between young and old group in each gender

9 *p* indicates the *p* value of the Student's *t*-test except for MNA-SF and FILS, * indicates the *p* value of the Mann-Whitney U test, ** FILS scores for all the subjects were 10 points.

10

11

1
2

Table 3

	Age	Height	Weight	BMI	CC	HG	MTP	GH area	GH br.
Age	1	-0.54*	-0.06	0.02	-0.49*	-0.49*	-0.39*	-0.58*	0.52*
Height		1	-0.03	-0.18	0.56*	0.76*	0.24*	0.59*	-0.50*
Weight			1	0.987*	0.15	0.05	0.12	0.04	0.03
BMI				1	0.04	-0.07	0.07	-0.06	0.10
CC					1	0.58*	0.43*	0.58*	-0.30*
HG						1	0.33*	0.68*	-0.51*
MTP							1	0.39*	-0.14
GH area								1	-0.47*
GH br.									1

3
4
5
6
7
8
9

Table 3: Univariate correlations

Results show Pearson's correlation coefficients, * indicates the p value < 0.05 , CC, calf circumference; HG, hand grip strength; MTP, maximum tongue pressure; GH area, cross-sectional area of the geniohyoid muscle in the sagittal plane; GH br., brightness of the geniohyoid muscle in the sagittal plane

1
2

Table 4

	Estimated regression coefficient	Lower 95% confidence interval	Upper 95% confidence interval	Standard error	<i>p</i> value
(Intercept)	26.58	-228.71	281.86	128.66	0.84
age	-0.87	-1.33	-0.40	0.23	< 0.01
sex	-19.22	-44.72	6.27	12.84	0.14
height	0.69	-0.65	2.03	0.68	0.31
CC	-29	-46.586	-10.492	9.097	< 0.01

3 Adjusted R² = 0.48, *p* value < 0.001

4

5 Table 4: Multivariate regression analysis for area of the geniohyoid muscle
6 CC, calf circumference.

7

8

Table 5

	Estimated regression coefficient	Lower 95% confidence interval	Upper 95% confidence interval	Standard error	<i>p</i> value
(Intercept)	7.74	-59.52	75.00	33.90	0.82
age	0.30	0.18	0.42	0.06	< 0.01
sex	11.40	4.68	18.12	3.39	< 0.01
height	0.00	-0.35	0.36	0.18	0.99
CC	0.59	-0.10	1.28	0.35	0.09

9 Adjusted R² = 0.39, *p* value < 0.001

10

11 Table 5: Multivariate regression analysis for brightness of the geniohyoid muscle
12 CC, calf circumference.

13

14

Figure Legends

15

16 Fig. 1: Ultrasonography method

17 (a) posture during ultrasonography, (b) ultrasonography image of the geniohyoid muscle in the sagittal plane, (c)
18 detection of an area of interest using image J. All images belong to author T.M.

19

20 Fig. 2: Cross-sectional area of the geniohyoid muscle in the young and old groups.

21 *p* value by Student's t-test

22

23 Fig. 3: Brightness of the geniohyoid muscle in the young and old groups.

24 *p* value by Student's t-test

25