# The effect of two speech and language approaches on speech problems in people with Parkinson's disease: the PD COMM RCT

Catherine M Sackley,<sup>1,2\*</sup> Caroline Rick,<sup>3,4</sup> Marian C Brady,<sup>5</sup> Christopher Burton,<sup>6,7</sup> Sue Jowett,<sup>8</sup> Smitaa Patel,<sup>4</sup> Rebecca Woolley,<sup>4</sup> Patricia Masterson-Algar,<sup>7</sup> Avril Nicoll,<sup>5</sup> Christina H Smith,<sup>9</sup> Zainab Abdali,<sup>8</sup> Natalie Ives,<sup>4</sup> Gillian Beaton,<sup>10</sup> Sylvia Dickson,<sup>5</sup> Ryan Ottridge,<sup>4</sup> Helen Nankervis<sup>1</sup> and Carl E Clarke;<sup>11,12</sup> on behalf of the PD COMM Collaborative Group

**Disclaimer:** This report contains transcripts of interviews conducted in the course of the research and contains language that may offend some readers.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Population Health Sciences, Addison House, King's College London, Guy's Campus, London, UK

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>School of Health Science, University of Nottingham, QMC, Nottingham, UK

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Nottingham Clinical Trials Unit, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>Birmingham Clinical Trials Unit, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>Nursing, Midwifery and Allied Health Professions Research Unit, Glasgow Caledonian University, Glasgow, UK

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>School of Allied and Public Health Professions, Canterbury Christ Church University, Canterbury, UK

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup>School of Health Sciences, Bangor University, Bangor, UK

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup>Health Economics Unit, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup>Division of Psychology and Language Science, Faculty of Brain Sciences, University College London, London, UK

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup>Queen Elizabeth Hospital, NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde, Glasgow, UK

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup>Institute of Applied Health Research, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup>Department of Neurology, Sandwell and West Birmingham Hospitals NHS Trust, Birmingham, UK

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author catherine.sackley@nottingham.ac.uk

Published October 2024 DOI: 10.3310/ADWP8001

## Plain language summary

The effect of two speech and language approaches on speech problems in people with Parkinson's disease: the PD COMM RCT

Health Technology Assessment 2024; Vol. 28: No. 58

DOI: 10.3310/ADWP8001

NIHR Journals Library www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

## **Plain language summary**

Most people with Parkinson's disease develop difficulties with their speech and voice. Communicating becomes difficult. This affects their relationships, work, social life and how they feel about themselves. Our PD COMM trial compared two types of speech and language therapy to find out if they helped the speech and voice problems people with Parkinson's have. We measured changes in the way their voice and speech problems affected their lives and how much therapy cost the National Health Service and families.

Everyone taking part had speech or voice problems because of their Parkinson's disease. People could not take part if they had dementia, evidence of laryngeal pathology or previous laryngeal surgery or received speech and therapy for Parkinson's disease in the last 2 years.

People who agreed to take part joined one of three groups, which were alike except for the therapy they received. A computer decided which group they joined by chance.

- National Health Service speech and language therapy
- Lee Silverman Voice Treatment LOUD
- No speech and language therapy for 12 months

The 388 people who took part came from 41 outpatient clinics in Scotland, England and Wales. Most were older men. The people that received Lee Silverman Voice Treatment LOUD felt better about their speech and voice after 3 months compared to people in the other groups. A year later, they still felt better about it. People that received National Health Service therapy had no benefit compared to people with no access to therapy. Analysis of cost-effectiveness indicated that Lee Silverman Voice Treatment LOUD did not offer value for money and the intervention cost more because more speech and language therapy time was needed to deliver it. Our next question is to ask how we can provide Lee Silverman Voice Treatment LOUD in a way that costs less, for example, using therapy assistants and computer packages or at home. Clear speech and language therapy approaches for people with Parkinson's disease and speech or voice problems should be tested in trials that measure changes in people's lives.

## **Health Technology Assessment**

ISSN 2046-4924 (Online)

Impact factor: 3.6

A list of Journals Library editors can be found on the NIHR Journals Library website

Launched in 1997, *Health Technology Assessment* (HTA) has an impact factor of 3.6 and is ranked 32nd (out of 105 titles) in the 'Health Care Sciences & Services' category of the Clarivate 2022 Journal Citation Reports (Science Edition). It is also indexed by MEDLINE, CINAHL (EBSCO Information Services, Ipswich, MA, USA), EMBASE (Elsevier, Amsterdam, the Netherlands), NCBI Bookshelf, DOAJ, Europe PMC, the Cochrane Library (John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, USA), INAHTA, the British Nursing Index (ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, USA), Ulrichsweb™ (ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, USA) and the Science Citation Index Expanded™ (Clarivate™, Philadelphia, PA, USA).

This journal is a member of and subscribes to the principles of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (www.publicationethics.org/).

Editorial contact: journals.library@nihr.ac.uk

The full HTA archive is freely available to view online at www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/hta.

#### Criteria for inclusion in the Health Technology Assessment journal

Manuscripts are published in *Health Technology Assessment* (HTA) if (1) they have resulted from work for the HTA programme, and (2) they are of a sufficiently high scientific quality as assessed by the reviewers and editors.

Reviews in *Health Technology Assessment* are termed 'systematic' when the account of the search appraisal and synthesis methods (to minimise biases and random errors) would, in theory, permit the replication of the review by others.

### **HTA** programme

Health Technology Assessment (HTA) research is undertaken where some evidence already exists to show that a technology can be effective and this needs to be compared to the current standard intervention to see which works best. Research can evaluate any intervention used in the treatment, prevention or diagnosis of disease, provided the study outcomes lead to findings that have the potential to be of direct benefit to NHS patients. Technologies in this context mean any method used to promote health; prevent and treat disease; and improve rehabilitation or long-term care. They are not confined to new drugs and include any intervention used in the treatment, prevention or diagnosis of disease.

The journal is indexed in NHS Evidence via its abstracts included in MEDLINE and its Technology Assessment Reports inform National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidance. HTA research is also an important source of evidence for National Screening Committee (NSC) policy decisions.

#### This article

The research reported in this issue of the journal was funded by the HTA programme as award number 10/135/02. The contractual start date was in December 2015. The draft manuscript began editorial review in June 2022 and was accepted for publication in February 2023. The authors have been wholly responsible for all data collection, analysis and interpretation, and for writing up their work. The HTA editors and publisher have tried to ensure the accuracy of the authors' manuscript and would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments on the draft document. However, they do not accept liability for damages or losses arising from material published in this article.

This article presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR). The views and opinions expressed by authors in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the NHS, the NIHR, the HTA programme or the Department of Health and Social Care. If there are verbatim quotations included in this publication the views and opinions expressed by the interviewees are those of the interviewees and do not necessarily reflect those of the authors, those of the NHS, the NIHR, the HTA programme or the Department of Health and Social Care.

This article was published based on current knowledge at the time and date of publication. NIHR is committed to being inclusive and will continually monitor best practice and guidance in relation to terminology and language to ensure that we remain relevant to our stakeholders.

Copyright © 2024 Sackley *et al.* This work was produced by Sackley *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This is an Open Access publication distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution CC BY 4.0 licence, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, reproduction and adaptation in any medium and for any purpose provided that it is properly attributed. See: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/. For attribution the title, original author(s), the publication source – NIHR Journals Library, and the DOI of the publication must

Published by the NIHR Journals Library (www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk), produced by Newgen Digitalworks Pvt Ltd, Chennai, India (www.newgen.co).