Glottal Motion and its Impact on the Respiratory Flow

A. Scheinherr^{*a,b,c}, L. Bailly^{b,c}, O. Boiron^{a,b}, T. Legou^{c,d}, A. Giovanni^{c,d,e},
G. Caillibotte^f, M. Pichelin^f

a. Centrale Marseille, IRPHE, 13451, Marseille, France

b. CNRS, IRPHE, 13384, Marseille, France

c. Aix-Marseille Univ, IRPHE, 13384, Marseille, France

d. CNRS, LPL UMR6057, Aix-en-Provence, France

e. Service ORL Hôpital de La Timone, CHU Marseille

f. Air Liquide Santé International, Groupe Gaz Médicaux, CRCD, Jouy-en-Josas, France

Keywords: Glottis; Breathing; Laryngofiberscopy; Image processing; CFD simulations

1 Introduction

Advantages of inhaled therapies as *a priori* targeted supply of drugs make them particularly convenient for the treatment of lung diseases. Nevertheless, several physical and anatomical factors can largely influence treatment efficiency. In particular, upper airways (UA) anatomic arrangement acts as an unwanted filter, which limits the amount of drug delivered to the lung [5]. More specifically, the glottis, defined by vocal folds aperture within the larynx, causes airways to narrow in a minimal transition cross-section. This anatomical singularity yields to a complex jet-like tracheal flow [4, 9, 11], which can be determinant on particles deposition by inertial impaction. However, current studies are limited by two main issues:

- Glottal dynamics during human breathing have been barely investigated so far, and despite a few reference *in vivo* studies [1, 3], the relationship between glottal area and inhaled airflow is still poorly understood.

- The aerodynamic influence of the glottal geometrical changes during breathing is often discarded in numerical works. Instead, a static glottis is often considered together with steady flow conditions [4, 9]. Therefore, the aim of the present study is (i) to characterize the glottal dynamics during human breathing *in vivo* using laryngofiberscopy and synchronized airflow recordings; (ii) to quantify the effects of a mobile glottis and unsteady flow conditions on laryngeal jet-flow dynamics using CFD modeling.

2 Methods

In vivo study. *In vivo* experiments were conducted in the ENT department of La Timone Hospital. One healthy female volunteer (LB, age 29) and one healthy male volunteer (OB, age 48) were recorded while performing two 30s breathing tasks: normal breathing (*eupnea*) and forced breathing (*tachypnea*). Laryngofiberscopic investigations were made using a flexible nasofiberscope (Storz 202220 20 tricam camera) with a continuous cold light source and a color CCD camera. Laryngeal images were captured with a camera frame rate of 25frames/s and an image resolution of 768x288 pixels. The oral airflow signal was simultaneously registered by means of a pneumotachograph placed at the mouth, EVA2 [7].

In silico study. As a first approximation of the glottal

geometry was built a 2D rectangular moving constriction with a triangular dynamic mesh of 24000 el. The mesh density ensures grid-independent results. CFD simulations were conducted using Fluent 6.3.26 under laminar air-flow conditions, assuming an incompressible Newtonian gas of viscosity ν equal to $1.789 \cdot 10^{-5}$ kg/ms. A pressure outlet boundary condition was set to 0 Pa. Unsteady boundary conditions comprising the glottal width $d_g(t)$ and the velocity inlet were parametrically varied in agreement with the *in vivo* study. A no-slip shear boundary condition was applied at solid walls. Initially, zero velocities and pressures were assumed at all points. Equations were solved using a first-order time and spatial discretization schemes, and a time step set to 0.12s.

3 Results and discussion

Airflow rate. *In vivo* measurements yielded to about 30 respiratory cycles during *eupnea* and 40 during *tachypnea*. Every respiratory cycle was detected using a zero-tracking method developed in Matlab R2011b. Each airflow signal Q was normalized with respect to the maximum value achieved within the cycle, $Q_{\max}$. Time t was normalized by corresponding respiratory period, $T = 2\pi/\omega$. The maximal period registered within each 30s sequence is noted $T_{\max}$. Signals were finally averaged into one mean flow-rate, herein noted $\langle Q/Q_{\max} \rangle$. Figure 1a illustrates the typical flow-rate $\langle Q/Q_{\max} \rangle$ as a function of ωt , produced by subject OB during *eupnea* (maximal $Q_{\max} = 1.9$ dm³/s, $T_{\max} = 0.62$ s) and *tachypnea* (maximal $Q_{\max} = 4.3$ dm³/s, $T_{\max} = 4.8$ s). In comparison, a sinusoidal evolution is plotted. Conventionally, positive (resp. negative) flow-rate values correspond to expiration (resp. inspiration) phase. During *eupnea*, the inspiration and expiration curves are similar (up to sign) and their durations are approximately equal, as commonly found in the literature [6]. During *tachypnea*, the mean flow-rate curve deviates from the harmonic signal although inspiration and expiration durations remain roughly equal. A phase difference of about 22° in flow-rate maximal occurrences has been measured between sinusoid and *eupnea* curve, which corresponds to 6% of the breathing period. The phase difference increases during *tachypnea* up to 58°, namely 16% of the cycle duration. LB breathing shows similar characteristics.

*Corresponding author. Email: Scheinherr@irphe.univ-mrs.fr

Glottal motion. Glottal motion was extracted from the laryngoscopic images using Matlab Image Processing Toolbox and different phases: (i) Focus on a region of interest using a cross-correlation technique, (ii) Smoothing using a specific filter function [10], (iii) Detection of the glottal contours using a segmentation method [2] (iv) Measurement of the glottal antero-posterior diameter AP_g , glottal area A_g and glottal width d_g (see Fig. 1b), (v) Normalization by comparing AP_g diameter with the initial value AP_g^0 , assumed as a geometrical invariant [8], (vi) Conversion from pixels to millimeters, assuming $AP_g = 22\text{mm}$ [5].

Figure 1: (a) Mean flowrate $\langle Q/Q_{\max} \rangle$ measured during cycles of eupnea and tachypnea (subject OB) and comparison with sinusoid. (b) Illustration of glottal image post-processing. (c) Detected glottal area A_g and glottic width d_g and flowrate Q .

Fig. 1c illustrates the evolution of the glottal dynamics measured during a typical eupnea cycle. Glottal area A_g and glottal width d_g are displayed as function of time, together with synchronized airflow-rate Q . It is shown that the glottis progressively widens during inspiration and narrows during expiration. Area A_g varies in the range 90 - 240mm² (mean value 165mm²) during the cycle, while d_g varies in the range 4 - 13mm (mean value 7.8mm), thus achieving a peak value during inspiration nearly three times greater than that measured during expiration. This ratio is in line with previous studies [1, 3]. Above measurements allowed to assess a Reynolds number ($Re = \{d_g Q\} / \{\nu A_g\}$) ranging from 500 to 2500.

CFD simulations. Unsteady flow simulations were conducted considering Q and d_g measured during the typical eupnea cycle (Fig. 1c). Fig. 2 shows the development of the glottal jet at 4 shot-instants at first during inspiration and consequently during expiration phase of breathing (crosses in Fig. 1c). Inertial effects associated to flow-rate variations yield to the jet instability and fluctuations of the reattachment area during the breathing cycle but the flow despite $Re \approx 2500$ stays laminar as already noticed in [12].

Figure 2: 2D unsteady simulations of velocity field through the moving glottis during a breathing cycle.

4 Conclusions

The *in vivo* study showed that the glottis can be extremely variable during breathing and hence influence airflow characteristics. A glottal area widening was quantified during inspiration, with a typical ratio of 3:1 as compared to expiration. Airflow rate variations differ from harmonic signal during eupnea as well as tachypnea. The correlation between flow-rate and glottal area will be discussed and compared to previous clinical investigations. Preliminary 2D CFD simulations of the glottal jet were performed, based on the measured flow-rate and glottal changes during eupnea. Impact of unsteady flow conditions on the jet development is demonstrated.

References

- [1] Baier, H., Wanner, A., Zarzecki, S., Sackner, M.A., 1977. Relationships among glottis opening, respiratory flow and upper airway resistance in humans. *J Appl Physiol*, **43**, 603–611.
- [2] Bernard O., Friboulet D., Thévenaz P., Unser M., 2009. Variational B-Spline level-set: A linear filtering approach for fast deformable model evolution. *IEEE Trans. Image Process*, **18**, 1179–1191.
- [3] Brancatisano T., Collett P., Engel L., 1983. Respiratory movements of the vocal cords. *J Appl Physiol*, **54** (5), 1269–1276.
- [4] Brouns M., Verbanck S., Lacor C., 2007. Influence of glottal aperture on the tracheal flow. *J Biomech*, **40**, 165–172.
- [5] Conway et al., 2012. Controlled, Parametric, Individualized, 2-D and 3-D Imaging Measurements of Aerosol Deposition in the Respiratory Tract of Healthy Human Subjects for Model Validation. *J Aerosol Sci* submitted.
- [6] Fenn W. O., Rahn H., 1965. Handbook of Physiology, Section 3: Respiration, *Ame Physio Soc, Washington, DC*.
- [7] Ghio A., Teston B., 2004. Evaluation of the acoustic and aerodynamic constraints of a pneumotachograph for speech and voice studies. *ICVPB, Marseille, France*, 55–58.
- [8] Higenbottam T., 1980. Narrowing of glottis opening in humans associated with experimentally induced bronchoconstriction. *J Appl Physiol*, **49**, 403–407.
- [9] Katz, I., Martonen, T., Flaa, W., 1997. Three-dimensional computational study of inspiratory aerosol flow through the larynx: the effect of glottal aperture modulation. *J Aerosol Sc* **28**, 1073–1083.
- [10] Kroon D.J., 2009. Hessian based Frangi Vesselness filter – Matlab code. *University of Twente, Hollande*.
- [11] Renotte C., Bouffieux V., Wilquem F., 2000. Numerical analysis of oscillatory flow in the time-varying laryngeal channel. *J. Biomech*, **33**, 1637–1644.
- [12] Boiron O., Deplano V., Pelissier R., 2007. Experimental and numerical studies on the starting effect on the secondary flow in a bend. *JFM*, **574**, 109–129.