

Association between Salivary Hypofunction and Food Consumption in the Elderlies. A Systematic Literature Review

Carolina Muñoz-González, Mathilde Vandenberghe-Descamps, Gilles Feron, Francis Canon, Hélène Labouré, Claire Sulmont-Rossé

► **To cite this version:**

Carolina Muñoz-González, Mathilde Vandenberghe-Descamps, Gilles Feron, Francis Canon, Hélène Labouré, et al.. Association between Salivary Hypofunction and Food Consumption in the Elderlies. A Systematic Literature Review. *Journal of Nutrition, Health and Aging*, Springer Verlag (Germany), 2018, 22 (3), pp.407-419. 10.1007/s12603-017-0960-x . hal-02142405

HAL Id: hal-02142405

<https://hal-agrosup-dijon.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-02142405>

Submitted on 18 Feb 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 **ASSOCIATION BETWEEN SALIVARY HYPOFUNCTION AND FOOD**
2 **CONSUMPTION IN THE ELDERLIES. A SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEW**

3
4 Carolina Muñoz-González, Mathilde Vandenberghe-Descamps,
5 Gilles Feron, Francis Canon, Hélène Labouré, Claire Sulmont-Rossé*

6
7 Centre des Sciences du Goût CNRS, INRA, Université de Bourgogne Franche-Comté,
8 F-21000 Dijon, France

9
10
11 Mailing address: 17 rue Sully, F-21000 Dijon, France.

12
13 Telephone: +33 380 69 32 71^[1]_[SEP]

14
15 E-mail address: claire.sulmont-rosse@inra.fr

16
17 **Abstract**

18 Objective: This systematic literature review aims to summarize the existing scientific evidence
19 about the association between a reduced salivary function and food consumption in elderly
20 people. Methods: A validated search strategy in two databases (PubMed and ISI Web of
21 Knowledge) was carried out and retrieved papers together with their reference lists were
22 screened by two independent reviewers. The quality of the included studies was critically
23 appraised via the Quality Assessment Criteria for Evaluating Primary Research Papers. Results:
24 From the originally identified studies (n=391), only 15 articles (all cross-sectional studies) met
25 the pre-fixed inclusion/exclusion criteria. The methodological quality of the included studies
26 was in general good, although only 3 from 15 obtained the maximum score. The control of

27 confounding factors was the quality variable more poorly rated in the selected studies. Salivary
28 hypofunction was associated with a decrease of the objective chewing and swallowing abilities
29 and taste perception. Moreover, most of the selected studies showed a relationship between
30 salivary hypofunction and food consumption (in terms of appetite loss, unbalanced dietary
31 intake and malnutrition), although no causality could be established. Conclusions: This study
32 highlights the fact that salivary hypofunction definition and measurements are different across
33 the studies. Therefore, future research efforts should focus on establishing a gold standard to
34 define and identify salivary hypofunction throughout life and on performing longitudinal
35 studies controlling for confounding factors to establish causality.

36 **Keywords**

37 Hyposalivation, dietary intake, appetite, nutritional status, elderly

38 **1. Introduction**

39 Saliva is a complex biological fluid composed by water, inorganic and organic molecules (1).
40 Secreted by several salivary glands, saliva plays an important role in the preservation and
41 maintenance of oral health and functions (2). First, saliva is known to be essential in fulfilling
42 daily activities such as speaking. Second, it exerts a key role maintaining oral health under
43 normal conditions: tooth and oral mucosa integrity, protection against dental caries, periodontal
44 diseases, etc. (3; 4; 5). Third, as the first digestive fluid in contact with food, saliva is a key
45 factor assisting the oral processing of food, whereby food is transformed into a bolus to be
46 swallowed. During the mastication process, the lubrication function of saliva allows moistening
47 of food and supports the creation of a bolus which in turn facilitates the ability to chew (6).
48 Furthermore, some food components are released from the food matrix and dissolved in saliva,

49 where they can be influenced by the presence of salivary components such as salivary enzymes
50 that begin the process of food digestion (i.e. alpha-amylase) or metabolize flavor compounds
51 (i.e. esterases, glycosidases) (7; 8).

52 In consequence, an alteration in the composition or amount of saliva released to the human
53 mouth, produced as a consequence of a diminished salivary gland function, could have serious
54 consequences. A reduced salivary output could induce a defect in lubrication, compromising
55 the comfort while chewing and swallowing (3). These dysfunctions could be accompanied by
56 an unbalanced flavor perception that could provoke an unpleasant sensory experience. Besides
57 these effects, if the situation of dry mouth is maintained in the long term, the decline (or
58 absence) of salivation *per se* may change the oral environment, which could cause infections,
59 destruction of taste receptors (9) and formation of dental caries, which can derive in tooth losses
60 (4), thus compromising even more the food oral processing. The sum of these events could
61 therefore provoke a decline in food interest and a loss of appetite, resulting in a modification of
62 people's dietary habits. The quantity, quality and variety of food consumed could be altered,
63 thus contributing to a diminished nutritional status.

64 This cascade of reactions possibly induced by a reduced salivary output is of especial relevance
65 for elderly people, the population group most affected by salivary disorders. Older people are
66 more likely to take medications compared to other generations, which is a well-known factor
67 of hyposalivation as a side effect (10). A recent meta-analysis has shown that the aging process
68 is associated with reduced salivary flow *per se* in a salivary-gland-manner (11), and this
69 reduction can not be fully explained on the basis of medications (11) or dental status (12). In
70 the same time, this age group is frequently associated with poor appetite, weight loss and
71 malnutrition (13; 14). However, the relationship between food consumption and salivary
72 hypofunction in elderly population remains unclear. This could be due to the fact that very often

73 the studies on this topic have measured the subjective sensation of dry mouth (xerostomia)
74 instead of performing real measurements of saliva deficiencies (3; 15; 16; 17; 18; 19). Indeed,
75 xerostomia and hyposalivation are two separate entities, which are not always correlated (20;
76 21). Whereas xerostomia relates to a subjective evaluation of dry mouth, hyposalivation
77 represents a decrease in the amount of saliva secreted to the oral cavity. Therefore the aim of
78 this work was to systematically review the original articles studying the associations between
79 salivary hypofunction measured objectively and alterations in food consumption in elderly
80 population. In this review, food consumption has been addressed by the study of i) food oral
81 processing, ii) food behavior (appetite and dietary intake) and iii) nutritional status. Out of scope
82 of this article are external factors affecting food consumption such as food availability, cultural
83 factors, etc.

84 **2. Method**

85 **2.1. Search strategy**

86 A review of the literature was conducted in September 2016 for all published articles containing
87 information about the association between salivary hypofunction and i) food oral processing,
88 ii) food behavior (appetite and dietary intake), and iii) nutritional status in the elderlies. The
89 electronic databases PubMed and ISI Web of Knowledge were used to search for relevant
90 articles (without date restriction). The search strategy consisted of a set of Medical Subject
91 Headings (MeSH) terms and free text words subsequently combined. Following groups of key
92 words were introduced:

93 1) food oral processing, mastication, chewing, swallowing, flavo(u)r, taste, aroma, texture,
94 flavo(u)r perception, taste perception, aroma perception, texture perception, chemosensory

95 perception, orosensory perception, food sensory perception, texture modification, aroma
96 release, taste release, trigeminal sensation(s), food texture;

97 2) food consumption, food behavio(u)r, nutrition, appetite, food intake, malnutrition,
98 undernutrition, malnourishment, eating, nutrient intake, eating capability, food liking, dietary
99 pattern, meal frequency, eating frequency;

100 3) elderly, senior, ag(e)ing, old age, older adult(s), old(er) people, old(er) person(s);

101 4) saliva, hyposalivation, salivary flow, salivary composition, salivary protein(s), salivary
102 secretion(s), salivary hypofunction, xerostomia, dry mouth, oral mucosa, mucosal wetness,
103 mucosa dryness, oral dryness.

104 **2.2. Selection criteria and study selection**

105 Articles were included if they explored the association between an objective measure of salivary
106 deficiencies and i) food oral processing (mastication, swallowing, orosensory perception), ii)
107 food behavior (appetite and food intake) or iii) nutritional status. Only articles that defined
108 salivary hypofunction were included in this systematic literature review (SLR). Therefore
109 articles that did not explore populations with salivary disorders or that did not specify cut-off
110 values of saliva deficiencies were not included in this SLR. Study design and settings were not
111 defined as exclusion criteria because of the exploratory character of the review. Only articles
112 written in English were included, no date limitation was performed.

113 Two reviewers (CMG and MVD) independently screened the titles and abstracts based on the
114 selection criteria. If the abstract did not provide enough information to decide upon
115 inclusion/exclusion, the full paper was retrieved for further screening. Disagreements about
116 inclusion or exclusion were discussed between the reviewers until consensus was reached.

117 **2.3. Data abstraction and synthesis**

118 Two reviewers (CMG and MVD) independently extracted data from the included articles. The
119 extracted data included study characteristics (author and year of publication, study design,
120 sample size, settings (living condition), determinant, outcome, methods, main results and
121 conclusions), and participant characteristics (age, gender, country/ethnicity, functional status).
122 A synthesis of the data is reported in Table 1.

123 **Table 1 about here**

124 **2.4. Quality assessment**

125 The quality assessment of the review is based on “The quality assessment criteria for evaluating
126 primary research papers from a variety of fields” (22). The used checklist contains the following
127 items:

- 128 1. Is the objective of the study sufficiently described?
- 129 2. Is the study design evident and appropriate?
- 130 3. Is the method of subject selection described and appropriate?
- 131 4. Are subject characteristics sufficiently described (functional status, health, etc.)?
- 132 5. Are outcome measures well defined and robust to measurement?
- 133 6. Is the sample size appropriate?
- 134 7. Are analytic methods described, justified and appropriate?
- 135 8. Is some estimate of variance reported for main results?
- 136 9. Are they controlled for confounding?

137 10. Are the results reported in sufficient detail?

138 11. Are the conclusions supported by results?

139 Each question can be answered with 'yes', 'partial', 'no' and 'not applicable'. The summary
140 score is the total sum ((number of 'yes' x 2) + (number of 'partial' x 1)) / total possible sum (28
141 – (number of 'not applicable' x 2). The associated scoring manual (22) was used to guide the
142 scoring process. When the quality of a paper was debatable, a discussion between two
143 independent reviewers was held until consensus was reached.

144 **3. Results**

145 **3.1. Selected articles**

146 Figure 1 shows the overview of the search strategy. A total of 391 articles were identified:
147 PubMed (n=219), and ISI Web of Knowledge (n=172). Duplicate articles (n=102) were
148 excluded. Additionally, 248 articles were excluded because the inclusion criteria (based on title
149 and/or abstract) were not met. The full texts of 41 articles were reviewed in detail. Twenty eight
150 articles were excluded due to different reasons: not an objective measurement of the saliva flow
151 but a subjective sensation of dry mouth (n=11), the relationship between the variables was not
152 explored (n=3), cut-off value to determine salivary hypofunction not specified (n=7), the
153 outcome measurements were not focused specifically on our research topic (n=3), redundant
154 information due to a publication on the same data (n=2), or not original papers but reviews
155 (n=2). The reference lists of all included articles were checked for additional articles. In
156 consequence, four new papers were found to be of interest for this review but two of them (23;
157 24) were not written in English, so not included in the final list. The final group consisted of 15
158 articles. All of them were subjected to a methodological quality assessment.

159

Figure 1 about here

160 **3.2. Methodological quality**

161 The methodological quality of the included studies was in general good: of the 15 selected
162 articles the quality scores varied between 0.77 and 1 in a 0-to-1 rating scale (Table 2). Three
163 articles (25; 26; 27) obtained the maximum score according to the above-mentioned manual
164 scoring (22). On the contrary, the lowest score was attributed to the study carried out by (28),
165 the one with the smallest sample size (n=51) (item n° 6). Moreover, in this work the study
166 design (item n° 2), the analytical methods employed (item n° 7) and the results (item n° 10)
167 were not sufficiently described. Furthermore, confounding factors (item n° 9) were partially
168 taken into account.

169 In fact, the control of confounding factors (item n° 9) was the quality variable more poorly rated
170 in the selected studies. This was due to the fact that most of the studies did not take into account
171 all the factors established as confounding in this study: age, gender, drug intake, diseases,
172 mental status, socio-economic status, dental status and place to live. Therefore this item was
173 often rated as “partial”.

174

Table 2 about here

175 **3.3. Study characteristics**

176 Table 1 gives an overview of the 15 selected articles. Publication year of the studies ranged
177 from 1998 to 2016, showing that the interest on this topic is held and even increased over time
178 (from 1998 to 2004: 4 studies; from 2005 to 2011: 4 studies; from 2012 to 2016: 7 studies). All
179 the studies had a cross-sectional design. The studies were based on populations from all over
180 the world (Brazil: 1, Finland: 2, Japan: 5, Norway: 1, Switzerland: 2, Thailand: 2; France:1;
181 India:1), with exception of the African and Oceanic continent and north America. The sample

182 size varied from 51 (28) to 640 (29) subjects. The gender distribution of subjects varied between
183 46% (30) and 78% (28) of females. Eighty per cent of the studies presented however, a higher
184 percentage of women compared to men. The mean age was highly dispersed in the selected
185 studies, ranging from 66 to 84 years old. The recruited populations were located either in
186 institutions (5 studies) or in their own homes (10 studies). The subjects recruited in the selected
187 studies were in good general health except for three studies: one study with hospitalized very
188 sick volunteers (31), one study which included subjects receiving home care nurses visits (28)
189 and one study (27) where the elderlies were living in their own homes prior to hospitalization
190 for acute medical problems.

191 **3.4. Analytical methods**

192 Salivary hypofunction was determined differently across the selected studies (Table 3).
193 Fourteen of the 15 studies measured the salivary flow rate either at rest, under stimulation by
194 chewing a piece of paraffin-wax during saliva collection or both at rest and under stimulation.
195 Most of these studies used the spitting method for the salivary collection but some preferred to
196 measure the salivary flow using the draining method or the sterile compress method. The
197 draining method consists in allowing saliva to drain out between parted lips into a test tube held
198 near the mouth. The sterile compress method consists in placing a sterile compress under the
199 tongue, then weighting the compress after a certain time to evaluate the amount of saliva
200 incorporated. These studies have defined salivary hypofunction when the salivary flow was
201 below a certain cut-off value. This reference value was 0.1 ml/min of saliva determined at rest
202 in all the selected studies. However, the cut-off values employed to define salivary
203 hypofunction under stimulation were not consensual and varied from 0.5 ml/min to 1.0 ml/min
204 in the different studies. Very few studies have determined salivary hypofunction using
205 alternative methods. Four over fifteen articles employed (besides the determination of salivary

206 flow) additional measures to determine salivary hypofunction, such as the mirror test (that
207 consists of measuring the stickiness of buccal mucosa when passing through it the back of a
208 dental mirror) or the registration of dry tongue (presence of moisture or not). Only one study
209 (32) did not use salivary flow to define hyposalivation. Authors measured the moisture of the
210 buccal mucosa by using a device that evaluates the weight percentage of water found in the
211 mucosa, and determined salivary hypofunction when the moisture of oral mucosa was below
212 28.3% according to a previous study that validated the method (33).

213 **Table 3 about here.**

214

215 **3. 5. Association between salivary hypofunction and food oral processing (8 studies)**

216 The relationship between a diminished salivary function and food oral processing
217 (mastication/chewing, swallowing, orosensory perception) has been examined in 8 articles (25;
218 27; 29; 30; 31; 32; 34; 35). Only 3 studies measured objectively chewing, swallowing and taste
219 abilities (27; 31; 34), while the others (n=5) employed questionnaires. The objective
220 measurements consisted of the determination of masticatory performance, signs of dysphagia
221 and taste ability. The evaluation of masticatory performance was achieved by measuring the
222 amount of dissolved glucose after the mastication of test gummy jellies. The signs of dysphagia
223 were reported using the water test during which the volunteers were asked to swallow four times
224 an increasing volume of water to report any abnormal signs (coughing or voice modification).
225 Finally, the taste ability test consisted in impregnating some strips with sweet, salty and bitter
226 taste, then asking the volunteers to identify the tastes by putting the strips in the anterior region
227 of the tongue.

228 Six of the eight studies investigated the association between salivary hypofunction and the
229 chewing and/or swallowing abilities (25; 30; 31; 32; 34; 35). Ikebe and coworkers (2006)(34)

230 found a significant association between lower values of masticatory performance and
231 hyposalivation in independently living older adults. In another study with hospitalized very sick
232 older patients, Poisson and collaborators (2014)(31) found a strong relationship at univariate
233 level between individuals presenting a low salivary flow (<0.1 g/min) and dysphagia. However
234 this effect was not observed at multivariate level, when considering other independent variables
235 in the model. The rest of the studies evaluated chewing and/or swallowing abilities through
236 questionnaires. Two works (25; 35) found a significant association between reduced saliva flow
237 rate and perceived chewing and swallowing difficulties. Ikebe and collaborators (2002)(30) also
238 found a relationship between hyposalivation and poor self-assessed chewing ability though it
239 was not of statistical level. Finally, Shinkawa et al., (2009)(32) found a significant association
240 between oral dryness (measured via the level of moisture of oral mucosa) and poor self-assessed
241 chewing ability but no with swallowing.

242 The association between salivary gland hypofunction and orosensory perception was evaluated
243 in four studies (27; 29; 30; 35). However, it is important to notice that all of them were only
244 focused on one modality of flavor perception: taste. In these studies, taste ability was evaluated
245 either objectively (taste detection through the filter-paper disc method) or by questionnaires
246 considering taste as a marker for oral function (dissatisfaction with tasting). Only Solemdal et
247 al., (2012)(27) studied the association of salivary hypofunction on the objective taste ability.
248 These authors reported a significant and markedly reduced total taste score, particularly for
249 sweet and salty taste, in patients with objective dry mouth (measured by the friction with mirror
250 and dry tongue tests). Low sum score for salty taste was also related to low stimulated salivary
251 flow rate. The rest of the studies evaluated taste ability through global questionnaires including
252 self-assessed items on oral function, with contradictory results. Two studies (30; 35) found that
253 hyposalivation was negatively and significantly correlated to self-assessed taste satisfaction,

254 whilst Yoshinaka and coworkers (2007)(29) failed to find this correlation. In addition to the
255 measure of salivary flow rate, Ikebe et al., (2002)(30) measured the pH of the stimulated saliva
256 but no correlation between the pH and taste satisfaction could be established.

257 In summary, most of the studies on this topic have shown a relationship between a reduced
258 salivary function and alterations in food oral processing (mastication, swallowing, orosensory
259 perception). It should be noted that this relationship seems clearer when the outcomes were
260 measured objectively rather than by questionnaires.

261 **3.6. Association between salivary hypofunction and food behavior (4 studies)**

262 Two studies (36; 37) examined the possible relationship between hyposalivation and appetite,
263 and two others between hyposalivation and dietary intake (25; 31). For both categories, the
264 outcomes were evaluated throughout the use of four different questionnaires: a questionnaire
265 related to dietary intakes/nutrition and masticatory function (36), a single question-item on
266 appetite (37); a 3-day record on food intake (31); a brief-type self-administered diet history
267 questionnaire (25). The use of questionnaires could be justified by the fact that appetite is the
268 subjective desire of eating foods. In 1999, Dormenval and coworkers(36) found that lack of
269 appetite was associated with hyposalivation (stimulated salivary flow rate < 0.5 ml/min) in
270 hospitalized Swiss patients. More recently, Samnieng (2014)(37) also found a positive
271 correlation between lack of appetite and low resting salivary flow in independently living older
272 Norwegians.

273 Regarding dietary intake, the two selected studies found no association between total energy
274 intake and hyposalivation. However, when studying specific nutrient and food intake, Iwasaki
275 and collaborators (2016)(25) found that the hyposalivation group had significantly lower intake
276 of n-3 poly-unsaturated fatty acids, potassium, vit E, D, B6 and folate, which was in line with

277 the observed reduction in the consumption of vegetables, fish and shellfish. Moreover, mean
278 dietary intake of protein and vitamin B12 in the hyposalivation group tended to be lower than
279 in the control group ($0.05 < P < 0.10$).

280 In summary, the scarce literature available on this topic showed an association between
281 hyposalivation and appetite loss and unbalanced dietary intake in elderly people.

282 **3.7. Association between salivary hypofunction and nutritional status (7 studies)**

283 The association between salivary gland hypofunction and nutritional status has been evaluated
284 in 7 studies. Five of them (26; 28; 35; 38; 39) evaluated the nutritional status using the Mini
285 Nutritional Assessment (MNA). Meanwhile, Dormenval and coworkers, (1998) (40) assessed
286 the nutritional status by quantifying biological malnutrition markers (BMI, level of serum
287 albumin) and anthropometric measurements. Finally, Poisson et al., (2014) (31) employed both
288 the MNA and the values of serum albumin concentration.

289 The results showed that hyposalivation was significantly associated with malnutrition in 4
290 studies (26; 35; 39; 40). Additionally, Syrjälä and co-workers (2013)(38) showed that subjects
291 with low salivary flow (at rest or under stimulation) were slightly more at risk of malnutrition
292 than subjects with normal salivary flow though their results were not statistically significant.
293 Besides, Soini et al., (2003)(28) stated that no relation was found between hyposalivation and
294 malnutrition. However, they found a significant association between the clinical dentist
295 evaluation of dry mouth and the risk of malnutrition ($p=0.049$). On the contrary, Poisson and
296 coauthors (2014)(31) did not find any relationship between hyposalivation (determined as
297 salivary flow under the tongue <0.1 g/min) and MNA and/or biological malnutrition either at
298 univariate or multivariate level. In addition to the measure of salivary flow rate, Srinivasulu et
299 al., (2014)(39) measured the pH, the buffer capacity, the total protein and the total calcium of

300 saliva samples. However, the authors did not highlight any significant correlation between the
301 saliva composition and nutritional status.

302 In summary, five studies found a correlation between hyposalivation and malnutrition. Another
303 study observed a relationship between the objective evaluation of dry mouth and the risk of
304 malnutrition. Only one article did not find any association between the two variables. Therefore,
305 and although most of the studies have shown some associations between salivary hypofunction
306 and nutritional status, up to date this relationship is still controversial.

307 **4. Discussion**

308 Salivary hypofunction refers to alterations in the quality (composition) or quantity (salivary
309 flow, residual saliva in the mouth) of saliva secreted into the human mouth (41). This situation
310 could alter the orosensory perception while eating, which is one of the most recognized
311 determinants for consumer's preferences and food consumption (7). As a result, the appetite,
312 dietary intake and nutritional status of an individual could be compromised. This is of special
313 relevance for elderly people, a population group frequently affected by both salivary and
314 nutritional deficiencies. The aim of this work was to systematically review all the existing
315 papers on this topic, in order to explore the relationships between a reduced salivary output and
316 food consumption in the elderlies. In this paper only objective measurements of salivary
317 hypofunction were considered, since the subjective complaint of dry mouth (xerostomia) is not
318 always associated with an objective evidence of reduced salivary secretions (20; 42).

319 In total, 15 articles met the criteria for inclusion in this work (see Table 1). Eight of them studied
320 the relationship of salivary hypofunction with food oral processing, 2 with appetite, 2 with
321 dietary intake and 7 with nutritional status. In general, the selected studies clearly showed some
322 associations between salivary hypofunction and the studied parameters. However, some

323 controversial results have also been observed. It should also be noticed that the study
324 characteristics are very different from one study to another, and the presence of not controlled
325 confounding factors or methodological issues should be taken into account to interpret the
326 results.

327 *Discussion on the methods used to measure salivary hypofunction*

328 This review focuses on studies that objectively measured symptoms of salivary hypofunction.
329 The prevalence of the population suffering these symptoms ranged from 14% (35) to around
330 50% (26; 28) in the selected articles. These differences were most likely dependent to the
331 different characteristics of the studied populations (such as age, race, living place (community,
332 institutions, and hospitals), functional status (healthy vs ill), drugs consumption, etc.) but also
333 on the methods and cut-off values employed to determine salivary hypofunction.

334 For most of the selected studies (14 out of 15), the determination of the salivary flow below a
335 cut-off value was the tool used to determine salivary hypofunction (see Table 3). However, a
336 lack of consensus was observed regarding the type of saliva collected (at rest or under
337 stimulation), the protocol employed to measure the salivary flow rate (spitting, draining
338 method, cotton roll), and the cut-off value to determine hyposalivation. Of the 14 studies that
339 measured saliva flow, five of them performed both resting and stimulated measurements (28;
340 35; 36; 38; 40), seven studies based their results on the measure of stimulated salivary flow (25;
341 26; 27; 29; 30; 34; 39), one study only measured the resting salivary flow rate (37) whilst one
342 study performed the measure of salivary flow under the tongue (31). The use of resting or
343 stimulated salivary flow rates provides different information since saliva is not delivered to the
344 human mouth by the same salivary glands and in the same proportions under the two conditions.
345 Therefore, whole saliva at rest, where the submandibular gland predominates, differs from that
346 secreted during stimulation (more related to parotid gland function). Consequently, and in spite

347 of the scarce literature on this topic, it is not surprising that the two measures are not always
348 correlated (43).

349 Moreover, two studies used additional methods (dentist evaluation, mirror test and tongue
350 moisture) to measure salivary hypofunction besides the determination of the salivary flow (27;
351 28). These methods could show a more advance phase of salivary hypofunction where the oral
352 integrity (mucosa, tongue) has already been affected due to a prolonged hyposalivation situation
353 held over time. In addition, only two studies (30; 39) reported, additionally to the measure of
354 stimulated salivary flow, changes in saliva composition. This could be due to the fact that these
355 analyses are time consuming and expensive, and therefore difficult to be performed to study
356 big populations, as those employed in the selected articles.

357 Otherwise, one study (32) did not use the measure of salivary flow to determine salivary
358 hypofunction but evaluated it by measuring the moisture of the buccal mucosa. The device used
359 for this evaluation determined the weight percentage of water found in the mucosa. Originally
360 developed to measure the moisture of the skin, the device was modified specifically for this
361 study. As it is not a common method used to measure hyposalivation, it is not possible to
362 compare the results of this study to the results of the other selected studies.

363 In addition to the different parameters employed to determine hyposalivation (salivary flow at
364 rest or under stimulation, moisture of mucosa, etc), within the same parameter, the protocol was
365 not always performed in the same way. Table 3 highlights the differences observed in collection
366 times (from 1 to 6 minutes), hours of collection (respecting or not the circadian rhythms),
367 collection protocols (free spitting vs controlled), etc., employed to measure salivary
368 hypofunction. Moreover, only three articles (32; 36; 40) measured the selected parameters two
369 or three times, whilst the other studies only performed the measures once. Therefore, no

370 information about the accuracy of the methods could be obtained, that in the worst scenario
371 could be traduced in a misclassification of people across the groups.

372 The cut-off value to determine salivary hypofunction was consensual across the studies for the
373 saliva at rest. A value lower than 0.1 ml/min was considered hyposalivation. However for the
374 salivary flow under stimulation a high dispersion on the cut-off values was encountered among
375 studies. Indeed, there is no universally accepted reference value to determine hyposalivation
376 using stimulated salivary flow rate. Most of the authors employed a cut-off value of 0.5 ml/min
377 to define hyposalivation (25; 26; 29; 34; 35; 36; 40), whilst others employed values ranged from
378 0.5 to 1 ml/min (27; 38). The differences in the cut-off points could derive in an erroneous
379 assignation of the participants to the groups and in a misinterpretation of the results, making
380 difficult the comparison of the studies. This was displayed in the study of Mesas et al., (2010)
381 (26). Authors employed two cut-off levels (stimulated salivary flow rate < 0.5 and stimulated
382 salivary flow rate < 0.7 ml/min) to define hyposalivation, and they only found a significant
383 association with nutritional status when using the value of 0.7 ml/min. For the other methods
384 employed to define salivary hypofunction, like the “mirror test” and dry tongue methods, the
385 comparison across studies is difficult because they are less frequently employed and dependent
386 on the dentist’s criteria. The moisture of oral mucosa cannot be either compared since the
387 method was only employed in one article.

388 All these remarks highlight the idea that the diagnosis of salivary hypofunction is not
389 consensual across the studies. Therefore, guidelines to measure salivary flow hypofunction with
390 one or several complementary methods to evaluate the degree of dysfunction would be
391 appropriate to allow an international standardization and a better comparison across the studies.
392 Moreover longitudinal studies observing secretory function over time are required to establish
393 causality. This would acknowledge setting up normal ranges or cut-off points to distinguish

394 normal from abnormal salivary function. That amount is probably different across cultures
395 (depending on gland sizes) (44).

396 *Discussion on the relationship between salivary hypofunction with food oral processing, food*
397 *behavior and nutritional status*

398 Figure 2 represents schematically the associations between salivary hypofunction and food
399 consumption found in the 15 selected articles. As a consequence of the cross-sectional design
400 employed in the studies, no causal-effect relation can be established. Therefore, it cannot be
401 concluded if salivary hypofunction is a cause or a consequence of the studied consumption
402 parameters.

403 **Figure 2 about here**

404 As can be seen in Figure 2, salivary hypofunction was related to food oral processing, and in
405 particular to mastication. It has been shown that elderly with hyposalivation had a reduced
406 ability to break down foods into discrete portions by chewing to permit swallowing (34). This
407 effect was more important in denture wearers with a lack of posterior occlusal contacts.
408 Moreover, a relationship between hyposalivation and poor self-assessed chewing ability has
409 been shown in four articles. Authors suggested that although presenting an altered masticatory
410 performance is a multifactorial problem, salivary flow is a critical factor for masticatory
411 function. However, the associations with dysphagia or swallowing have been less studied and
412 results were controversial (31; 32).

413 In spite of chemosensory perception is a key factor for food enjoyment and one of the factors
414 that motivate food consumption, its association with salivary gland hypofunction in the elderlies
415 have received little attention. This could be due to the fact that food science has historically
416 focused on the food and only in the later years some research groups have started to consider

417 the interaction between food and human physiology to explain food perception. Moreover, to
418 date most of the studies regarding the relation between the role of saliva on flavor release and
419 perception have been conducted on healthy and young individuals (<65 y/o), while elderly
420 population remains underexplored. Therefore only 4 articles met the inclusion criteria and they
421 were all based on taste. While it has been found that salivary hypofunction is related to the
422 objectively measured taste perception (27; 45), for the self-assessed taste ability results are
423 controversial. However, most epidemiological studies do not include objective measurements
424 of taste perception, probably because the evaluation through tests is more time-consuming than
425 performing questionnaires.

426 To the author's knowledge the association between hyposalivation and texture or other
427 modalities of orosensory perception (e.g aroma) in the elderlies has not been addressed by the
428 scientific community yet. Some studies reported age-related loss of texture sensation (46; 47)
429 and ultimately texture preference changes (48), but these studies have not investigated the role
430 of a diminished saliva secretion in the observed results.

431 Assuming that a reduced salivary output produces an impaired food experience, the desire for
432 food or drink known as appetite could be altered. This is in agreement with the findings of the
433 two selected articles on this topic which shown a relationship between hyposalivation and loss
434 of appetite (37; 40), even when the settings employed were very different in both of them.
435 Consequently, this appetite loss could provoke a diminished food intake. However, the two
436 studies on this topic found that the total energy intake was not impaired in elderly with
437 hyposalivation. Nevertheless, when specific nutrients and/or group of foods were studied, the
438 hyposalivator group presented a reduced consumption of vegetables, fish and seafood which
439 was related to the lower intake of n-3 polyunsaturated fatty acids, potassium, vit C, E, B6 and
440 folate after adjusting for confounders (number of teeth, denture use, sex, income, education,

441 body mass index, smoking status, alcohol use, diabetes, medication, activities of daily living,
442 depression and total calorie intake) (25). A reduced consumption of such specific nutrients/or
443 groups of food, which are recognized for their health benefits (49; 50; 51), could have a negative
444 impact on the health of this population.

445 Finally, an alteration of the dietary intake (quantitative or qualitative) could provoke an
446 impairment of the nutritional status of the elderly population. Numerous studies have been
447 conducted during the last decade to study the relationship between nutritional status and oral
448 conditions in elderly, but to the authors' knowledge, only 7 studies have assessed the
449 relationship between salivary hypofunction and nutritional status. However, some contradictory
450 results have been found. While four articles found a significant correlation between MNA and
451 hyposalivation, one did not. Although the method used to measure salivary flow was similar in
452 the five studies, the cut-off values differed among them, which could explain the differences
453 found in their results. On the other hand, the other two selected articles (28; 38) encountered
454 only weak associations between nutritional status and hyposalivation or the dentist's estimation
455 of dry mouth. Although other reasons (different cut-off levels, circadian rhythms not controlled,
456 differences across populations) could explain these differences, it is interesting to observe that
457 in these last two studies none of the subjects were malnourished but at risk of malnutrition. This
458 is of importance since probably nutritional disturbances held over time can cause atrophy of
459 salivary glands (39), producing a reduction of their function. If this is truth, alterations on saliva
460 would be a consequence of an altered nutritional status. Unfortunately, as all the selected studies
461 presented a cross sectional design no causality could be established and more studies are needed
462 to validate this hypothesis.

463 Finally, the measure of the food consumption parameters was mostly performed by using
464 subjective than objective methods. This could be due to the fact that the use of self-report

465 questionnaires is less time consuming than performing objective determinations. However, as
466 many studies have shown no correlation between the subjective feeling of dry mouth
467 (xerostomia) and hyposalivation, there are no evidences of links between objective and
468 subjective evaluations of the outcomes (29).

469 *Limitations and strengths of the present SLR*

470 The main strength of this work is that it is a solid literature search, with a complete overview
471 of the relationship between an objective measurement of salivary hypofunction and the
472 determinants of food consumption among the elderly population. Moreover, the selected studies
473 represent the wide heterogeneity found in this population group (from healthy elderly
474 individuals to chronically ill hospitalized old-people). The analysis of the quality of the selected
475 articles let us to identify the most frequent risks across the studies and suggest new ideas for
476 future works. For example, future studies on this topic should control better for confounding
477 factors like gender, age, drug intake, diseases, mental status, socioeconomic status, dental status
478 and place to live, because they are well-known factors that can alter salivary function (52; 53;
479 54; 55; 56; 57; 58).

480 However, this study presents some limitations. Unfortunately, we were not able to perform a
481 meta-analysis due to the obvious heterogeneity among the studies in relation to definitions and
482 measurements as explained above. Also, we could not establish causality due to the cross-
483 sectional nature of the selected studies. Therefore it cannot be concluded if hyposalivation is a
484 cause or a consequence of the selected food consumption parameters.

485 *Implication of this study*

486 The implications for research of this study are: firstly, the need to introduce and implement
487 universal guidelines to assess salivary hypofunction; secondly, the necessity of performing

488 cohort studies with comparable groups following the same population for a longer period of
489 time and statistical control of the confounding factors to establish causality.

490 **5. Conclusions**

491 The main findings of this review can be summarized in the following points: 1) to date, salivary
492 hypofunction is mainly based on measures of salivary flow 2) definition and measures of
493 hyposalivation are different across the studies; 3) salivary hypofunction has been related to a
494 decrease of objective chewing and swallowing abilities and taste perception; very little is
495 known about other modalities of chemosensory perception (e.g. aroma) 4) hyposalivation has
496 been associated with appetite loss; 5) hyposalivation has been related to an unbalanced dietary
497 intake but not with total intake; 6) it has been seen a relationship between saliva deficiencies
498 and malnutrition, though some controversial results have also been shown. Although it is not
499 possible to completely eliminate the potential effects of underlying methodological issues and
500 in spite of the scarce number of publications on this topic it is suggested a relationship between
501 salivary hypofunction and food consumption in the elderlies. Unfortunately, due to the cross-
502 sectional nature of the articles, no causality could be established. Therefore longitudinal studies
503 on this topic controlling for confounding factors are needed.

504 **Acknowledgments**

505 CMG thanks the support of the Agreenskills fellowship program which has received funding
506 from the EU's Seventh Framework Program under grant agreement N° FP7-609398
507 (AgreenSkills+ contract). Authors thank the French National Research Agency for financial
508 support through the AlimaSSenS project [ANR-14-CE20-0003-01] and the MuFFIn project
509 [ANR-14-CE20-0001-01].

510 **References**

511

512 (1) Mese H, Matsuo R. (2007). Salivary secretion, taste and hyposalivation. *J Oral Rehabil*,
513 34, 711-723.

514 (2) Mandel I D. (1989). The role of saliva in maintaining oral homeostasis. *J Am Dental*
515 *Assoc*, 119, 298-304.

516 (3) Loesche W J, Schork A, Terpenning M S, Chen Y M, Stoll J. (1995). Factors which
517 influence levels of selected organisms in saliva of older individuals. *J Clin Microb*, 33,
518 2550-2557.

519 (4) Caplan D J, Hunt R J. (1996). Salivary flow and risk of tooth loss in an elderly
520 population. *Commun Dent Oral Epidemiol*, 24, 68-71.

521 (5) Narhi T O, Kurki N, Ainamo A. (1999). Saliva, salivary micro-organisms, and oral
522 health in the home-dwelling old elderly - A five-year longitudinal study. *J Dent Res*, 78,
523 1640-1646.

524 (6) Prinz J F, Lucas P W. (1997). An optimization model for mastication and swallowing
525 in mammals. *Proceed Royal Society B-Biol Sci*, 264, 1715-1721.

526 (7) Buettner A. (2002). Influence of human saliva on odorant concentrations. 2. aldehydes,
527 alcohols, 3-alkyl-2-methoxypyrazines, methoxyphenols, and 3-hydroxy-4,5-dimethyl-
528 2(5H)-furanone. *J Agric Food Chem*, 50, 7105-7110.

529 (8) Buettner A. (2002). Influence of human salivary enzymes on odorant concentration
530 changes occurring in vivo. 1. Esters and thiols. *J Agric Food Chem*, 50, 3283-3289.

531 (9) Spielman A I. (1990). Interaction of saliva and taste. *J Dent Res*, 69, 838-843.

532 (10) Sreebny L M, Schwartz S S. (1986). A reference guide to drugs and dry mouth.
533 *Gerodontology*, 5, 75-99.

534 (11) Affoo R H, Foley N, Garrick R, Siqueira W L, Martin R E. (2015). Meta-Analysis of
535 Salivary Flow Rates in Young and Older Adults. *J Am Geriatr Soc*, 63, 2142-2151.

536 (12) Vandenberghe-Descamps M, Laboure H, Prot A, Septier C, Tournier C, Feron G,
537 Sulmont-Rosse C. (2016). Salivary flow decreases in healthy elderly people
538 independently of dental status and drug intake. *J Texture St*, 47, 353-360.

539 (13) Mowe M, Bohmer T, Kindt E. (1994). Reduced nutritional-status in an elderly
540 population (greater-than-70y) is probable before disease and possibly contributes to the
541 development of disease. *Am J Clin Nut*, 59, 317-324.

- 542 (14) McWhirter J P, Pennington C R, Jebb S A. (1994). Incidence and recognition of
543 malnutrition in-hospital. *Clin Nut*, 13, 267-268.
- 544 (15) Quandt S A, Chen H Y, Bell R A, Savoca M R, Anderson A M, Leng X Y, Kohrman T,
545 Gilbert G H, Arcury T A. (2010). Food Avoidance and Food Modification Practices of
546 Older Rural Adults: Association With Oral Health Status and Implications for Service
547 Provision. *Gerontologist*, 50, 100-111.
- 548 (16) Quandt S A, Savoca M R, Leng X Y, Chen H Y, Bell R A, Gilbert G H, Anderson A
549 M, Kohrman T, Arcury T A. (2011). Dry Mouth and Dietary Quality in Older Adults in
550 North Carolina. *J Am Geriatr Soc*, 59, 439-445.
- 551 (17) Stenman U, Ahlqwist M, Bjorkelund C, Hakeberg M. (2012). Oral health-related quality
552 of life - associations with oral health and conditions in Swedish 70-year-old individuals.
553 *Gerodontology*, 29, E440-E446.
- 554 (18) Nykanen I, Lonnroos E, Kautiainen H, Sulkava R, Hartikainen S. (2013). Nutritional
555 screening in a population-based cohort of community-dwelling older people. *Eur J*
556 *Public Health*, 23, 405-409.
- 557 (19) Porter J, Ntouva A, Read A, Murdoch M, Ola D, Tsakos G. (2015). The impact of oral
558 health on the quality of life of nursing home residents. *HQLF*, 13.
- 559 (20) Narhi T O, Meurman J H, Ainamo A. (1999). Xerostomia and hyposalivation - Causes,
560 consequences and treatment in the elderly. *Drugs Aging*, 15, 103-116.
- 561 (21) Ohara Y, Hirano H, Yoshida H, Obuchi S, Ihara K, Fujiwara Y, Mataka S. (2016).
562 Prevalence and factors associated with xerostomia and hyposalivation among
563 community-dwelling older people in Japan. *Gerodontology*, 33, 20-27.
- 564 (22) Kmet L M, Robert C. Lee, and Linda S. Cook. (2004). Standard quality assessment
565 criteria for evaluating primary research papers from a variety of fields.
- 566 (23) Satoh-Kuriwada S, Sasano, T., Saito, M., Hasimoto, K., Simeno, Y., Oba, M.,
567 Sakamoto, M., Aizawa, K. and Watanabe, M. (2003). Epidemiological study on taste
568 disorders in the elderly. Part 1: Influence of systemic disease and medication on
569 gustatory disorder. *Jpn. J. Oral Diag. Oral Med.*, 16, 1-8.
- 570 (24) Satoh-Kuriwada S, Sasano, T., Saito, M., Simeno, Y., Oba, M., Sakamoto, M., Aizawa,
571 K. and Watanabe, M. (2005). Epidemiological study on gus- tatory disorders in the
572 elderly. Part 2: Influence of hyposalivation on gustatory disorder. *Jpn. J. Oral Diag. Oral*
573 *Med.*, 18, 14-18.

- 574 (25) Iwasaki M, Yoshihara A, Ito K, Sato M, Minagawa K, Muramatsu K, Watanabe R,
575 Manz M C, Ansai T, Miyazaki H. (2016). Hyposalivation and dietary nutrient intake
576 among community-based older Japanese. *Geriatr Gerontol Int*, 16, 500-507.
- 577 (26) Mesas A E, Andrade S M, Cabrera M A, Bueno V L. (2010). Oral health status and
578 nutritional deficit in noninstitutionalized older adults in Londrina, Brazil. *Rev Bras*
579 *Epidemiol*, 13, 434-445.
- 580 (27) Solemdal K, Sandvik L, Willumsen T, Mowe M, Hummel T. (2012). The impact of oral
581 health on taste ability in acutely hospitalized elderly. *PLoS One*, 7, e36557.
- 582 (28) Soini H, Routasalo P, Lauri S, Ainamo A. (2003). Oral and nutritional status in frail
583 elderly. *Spec Care Dentist*, 23, 209-215.
- 584 (29) Yoshinaka M, Yoshinaka M F, Ikebe K, Shimanuki Y, Nokubi T. (2007). Factors
585 associated with taste dissatisfaction in the elderly. *J Oral Rehabil*, 34, 497-502.
- 586 (30) Ikebe K, Sajima H, Kobayashi S, Hata K, Morii K, Nokubi T, Ettinger R L. (2002).
587 Association of salivary flow rate with oral function in a sample of community-dwelling
588 older adults in Japan. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod*, 94, 184-190.
- 589 (31) Poisson P, Laffond T, Campos S, Dupuis V, Bourdel-Marchasson I. (2014).
590 Relationships between oral health, dysphagia and undernutrition in hospitalised elderly
591 patients. *Gerodontology*, 33, 161-168.
- 592 (32) Shinkawa T, Hayashida N, Mori K, Washio K, Hashiguchi K, Taira Y, Morishita M,
593 Takamura N. (2009). Poor chewing ability is associated with lower mucosal moisture
594 in elderly individuals. *Tohoku J Exp Med*, 219, 263-267.
- 595 (33) Yamada H, Nakagawa Y, Nomura Y, Yamamoto K, Suzuki M, Watanabe N Y, Saito I,
596 Seto K. (2005). Preliminary results of moisture checker for Mucus in diagnosing dry
597 mouth. *Oral Dis*, 11, 405-407.
- 598 (34) Ikebe K, Matsuda K, Morii K, Furuya-Yoshinaka M, Nokubi T, Renner R P. (2006).
599 Association of masticatory performance with age, posterior occlusal contacts, occlusal
600 force, and salivary flow in older adults. *Int J Prosthodont*, 19, 475-481.
- 601 (35) Samnieng P, Ueno M, Shinada K, Zaitso T, Wright F A, Kawaguchi Y. (2012).
602 Association of hyposalivation with oral function, nutrition and oral health in
603 community-dwelling elderly Thai. *Community Dent Health*, 29, 117-123.
- 604 (36) Dormenval V, Mojon P, Budtz-Jorgensen E. (1999). Associations between self-assessed
605 masticatory ability, nutritional status, prosthetic status and salivary flow rate in
606 hospitalized elders. *Oral Dis*, 5, 32-38.

- 607 (37) Samnieng P. (2014). Appetite loss and related factors in community-dwelling elderly
608 thai. *Int. J Clin. Prev. Dent.*, 10, 23-30.
- 609 (38) Syrjala A M, Pussinen P I, Komulainen K, Nykanen I, Knuuttila M, Ruoppi P,
610 Hartikainen S, Sulkava R, Ylostalo P. (2013). Salivary flow rate and risk of malnutrition
611 - a study among dentate, community-dwelling older people. *Gerodontology*, 30, 270-
612 275.
- 613 (39) Srinivasulu G, Fareed, N., Sudhir, K.M., Kumar, K. (2014). Relationship between
614 Stimulated Salivary Factors, Dental Caries Status and Nutritional Condition among
615 Institutionalized Elderly People. *OHDM*, 13, 49-53.
- 616 (40) Dormenval V, Budtz-Jorgensen E, Mojon P, Bruyere A, Rapin C H. (1998).
617 Associations between malnutrition, poor general health and oral dryness in hospitalized
618 elderly patients. *Age Ageing*, 27, 123-128.
- 619 (41) Glore R J, Spiteri-Staines K, Paleri V. (2009). A patient with dry mouth. *Clinical*
620 *Otolaryngology*, 34, 358-363.
- 621 (42) Villa A, Abati S. (2011). Risk factors and symptoms associated with xerostomia: a
622 cross-sectional study. *Aust Dent J*, 56, 290-295.
- 623 (43) Neyraud E, Palicki O, Schwartz C, Nicklaus S, Feron G. (2012). Variability of human
624 saliva composition: Possible relationships with fat perception and liking. *Arch Oral*
625 *Biol*, 57, 556-566.
- 626 (44) Ship J A, Fox P C, Baum B J. (1991). How much saliva is enough - normal function
627 defined. *J Am Dental Assoc*, 122, 63-69.
- 628 (45) Satoh-Kuriwada S, Shoji N, Kawai M, Uneyama H, Kaneta N, Sasano T. (2009).
629 Hyposalivation Strongly Influences Hypogeusia in the Elderly. *J Health Sci*, 55, 689-
630 698.
- 631 (46) Kremer S, Bult J H F, Mojet J, Kroeze J H A. (2007). Compensation for age-associated
632 chemosensory losses and its effect on the pleasantness of a custard dessert and a tomato
633 drink. *Appetite*, 48, 96-103.
- 634 (47) Kremer S, Mojet J, Kroeze J H A. (2005). Perception of texture and flavor in soups by
635 elderly and young subjects. *J Texture St*, 36, 255-272.
- 636 (48) Forde C G, Delahunty C M. (2002). Examination of chemical irritation and textural
637 influence on food preferences in two age cohorts using complex food systems. *Food*
638 *Qual Pref*, 13, 571-581.

- 639 (49) Carr A C, Frei B. (1999). Toward a new recommended dietary allowance for vitamin C
640 based on antioxidant and health effects in humans. *Am J Clin Nut*, 69, 1086-1107.
- 641 (50) Lemaitre R N, King I B, Mozaffarian D, Kuller L H, Tracy R P, Siscovick D S. (2003).
642 n-3 polyunsaturated fatty acids, fatal ischemic heart disease, and nonfatal myocardial
643 infarction in older adults: the Cardiovascular Health Study. *Am J Clin Nut*, 77, 319-325.
- 644 (51) Rimm E B, Willett W C, Hu F B, Sampson L, Colditz G A, Manson J E, Hennekens C,
645 Stampfer M J. (1998). Folate and vitamin B-6 from diet and supplements in relation to
646 risk of coronary heart disease among women. *JAMA*, 279, 359-364.
- 647 (52) Bardow A, Nyvad B, Nauntofte B. (2001). Relationships between medication intake,
648 complaints of dry mouth, salivary flow rate and composition, and the rate of tooth
649 demineralization in situ. *Arch Oral Biol*, 46, 413-423.
- 650 (53) Kreher J M, Graser G N, Handelman S L. (1987). The relationship of drug-use to
651 denture function and saliva flow-rate in a geriatric population. *J Prosthetic Dent*, 57,
652 631-638.
- 653 (54) Ship J A, Baum B J. (1990). Is reduced salivary flow normal in old-people. *Lancet*, 336,
654 1507-1507.
- 655 (55) Ship J A, Decarli C, Friedland R P, Baum B J. (1990). Diminished submandibular
656 salivary flow in dementia of the alzheimer type. *J Gerontology*, 45, M61-M66.
- 657 (56) Caplan D J, Hunt R J. (1996). Salivary flow and risk of tooth loss in an elderly
658 population. *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol*, 24, 68-71.
- 659 (57) Glazar I, Urek M M, Kuis D, Prpic J, Miskovic I, Pavicic D K, Pezelj-Ribaric S. (2016).
660 Salivary flow rate, oral yeast colonization and dental status in institutionalized and non-
661 institutionalized elderly. *Acta Clin Croatica*, 55, 390-395.
- 662 (58) Percival R S, Challacombe S J, Marsh P D. (1994). Flow-rates of resting whole and
663 stimulated parotid-saliva in relation to age and gender. *J Dent Res*, 73, 1416-1420.
- 664 (59) Sreebny L M, Yu A, Green A, Valdini A. (1992). Xerostomia in diabetes-mellitus.
665 *Diabetes Care*, 15, 900-904.
- 666 (60) Flink H, Bergdahl M, Tegelberg A, Rosenblad A, Lagerlof F. (2008). Prevalence of
667 hyposalivation in relation to general health, body mass index and remaining teeth in
668 different age groups of adults. *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol*, 36, 523-531.
- 669 (61) Hirotsomi T, Yoshihara A, Ogawa H, Ito K, Igarashi A, Miyazaki H. (2006). A
670 preliminary study on the relationship between stimulated saliva and periodontal
671 conditions in community-dwelling elderly people. *J Dent*, 34, 692-698.

- 672 (62) Sreebny L M, Zhu W T. (1996). Anti-SS-A and anti-SS-B Ab's in the saliva and blood
673 of patients with dry mouth and dry eyes. *J Dent Res*, 75, 2031-2031.
- 674 (63) Michael E C D, Denis O. (2004). *Saliva and oral health*. London.
- 675 (64) Cabrera M A S, Mesas A E, Rossato L A, De Andrade S M. (2007). Salivary flow and
676 psychoactive drug consumption in elderly people. *Revista Da Associacao Medica*
677 *Brasileira*, 53, 178-181.
- 678 (65) Narhi T O, Tenovuo J, Ainamo A, Vilja P. (1994). Antimicrobial factors, sialic-acid,
679 and protein-concentration in whole saliva of the elderly. *Scand J Dent Res*, 102, 120-
680 125.
- 681 (66) Henricsson V, Svensson A, Axell T. (1990). Evaluation of some electrical methods for
682 objective assessment of oral mucosal dryness. *Scand J Dent Res*, 98, 520-528.
- 683 (67) Navazesh M. (1993). Methods for collecting saliva. *Annals of the New York Academy*
684 *of Sciences*, 694, 72-77.
- 685 (68) Navazesh M, Kumar S K S. (2008). Measuring salivary flow - Challenges and
686 opportunities. *Journal of the American Dental Association*, 139, 35S-40S.
- 687 (69) Osterberg T, Landahl S, Hedegard B. (1984). Salivary flow, saliva, ph and buffering
688 capacity in 70-year-old men and women - correlation to dental-health, dryness in the
689 mouth, disease and drug-treatment. *J Oral Rehabil*, 11, 157-170.
- 690

691 **Table 1.** Description of the 15 selected studies concerning salivary hypofunction and associated parameters related to food consumption.

692

Reference	Study design*	Study population	Country	Functional status**	Parameter studied and method(s)	Results
Dormenval et al., 1998	CS	sample size: 99 mean age \pm SD (years) 82.5 ± 4.0 gender (% female): 70	Switzerland	H	Nutritional status: Anthropometric (BMI, triceps skinfold thickness and mid-arm circumference), and biological measurements (serum albumin concentration)	A low unstimulated salivary flow (< 0.1 ml/min) was associated with a BMI <21 , a severe malnutrition according to triceps skinfold thickness ($P<0,05$) and mid-arm circumference ($P<0,05$). A low stimulated salivary flow ($<0,5$ ml/min) was associated with severe malnutrition according to triceps skinfold thickness ($P = 0,01$), mid-arm circumference ($P < 0,05$), and the serum albumin concentration ($P=0,01$).
Dormenval et al., 1999	CS	sample size: 99 mean age \pm SD (y/o): 82.5 ± 4.0 gender (% female): 70	Switzerland	H	Appetite: questionnaire	Lack of appetite was associated with a stimulated salivary flow $< 0,5$ ml min $^{-1}$ ($P=0,05$).
Samnieng et al., 2012	CS	sample size: 612 mean age \pm SD (y/o): 68.8 ± 5.9 gender (% female): 74	Thailand	C	i) Oral function (tasting, speaking, swallowing, chewing): questionnaire ii) Nutritional status: MNA	Hyposalivation in both edentate and edentulous subjects was significantly associated with tasting, speaking swallowing and chewing difficulty. The hyposalivation group had a lower mean MNA score than the normal salivation group ($p<0,05$).
Syrjälä et al., 2013	CS	sample size: 157 mean age \pm SD (y/o): 79.2 ± 3.6 gender (% female): 70	Finland	C	Nutritional status (risk of malnutrition): MNA-SF	Subjects with a low unstimulated salivary flow rate or stimulated salivary flow rate, when compared with those with normal salivary flow, were at slightly increased risk of malnutrition (NS)
Samnieng, 2014	CS	sample size: 612 mean age \pm SD (y/o) : 68.8 ± 5.9 gender (% female): 74	Thailand	C	Appetite: questionnaire	Subjects with appetite loss had significantly lower mean number of the salivary flow rate than those with the normal appetite ($p<0,05$)
Iwasaki et al., 2016	CS	sample size: 352 mean age \pm SD (y/o): 80.0 ± 0.0 gender (% female): 51	Japan	C	i)Dietary intake: validated food frequency questionnaire ii) Subjective capacities to eat and swallow: questionnaire	The hyposalivation group had significantly more self-reported chewing ($p<0,001$) and swallowing ($p<0,036$) difficulties. The total energy intake was not different between the two groups. The hyposalivation group had significantly lower intake of n-3 polyunsaturated fatty acid, potassium, vitamin D, vitamin E, vitamin B6 and folate than the group without hyposalivation ($P < 0,05$) after adjusting for confounders. Vegetable, fish and shellfish

						consumption was significantly lower in the hyposalivation group (P < 0,05).
Ikebe et al., 2006	CS	sample size: 328 mean age ± SD (y/o): 66.2 ± 4.1 gender (% female): 47	Japan	C	Masticatory performance: Gummy jellies test	Masticatory ability was significantly associated with hyposalivation (P=0,006) at bivariate and multivariate level (P=0,046) (after controlling with others variables). When separating the subjects by the Eichner index (related to number of posterior occlusal contacts of the natural dentition), hyposalivation had a significant relationship with masticatory performance in the group with no support zone at all (P < 0,003) and the group with contact in 1 to 3 zones (P = 0,047) but not in the group with contacts in 4 support zones.
Yoshinaka et al., 2007	CS	sample size: 640 mean age ± SD (y/o): 66.0 ± 4.2 gender (% female): 50	Japan	C	Subjective dissatisfaction with taste ability: questionnaire	No correlation was found between hyposalivation and dissatisfaction with taste ability
Mesas et al., 2010	CS	sample size: 267 mean age ± SD (y/o): 66.5 ± 4.1 gender (% female): 60	Brazil	C	Nutritional status: MNA	Hyposalivation (stimulated salivary flow < 0,5 ml/min) was more frequent among participants with nutritional deficit, even though there was no statistically negative association. However, stimulated salivary flow < 0,7 ml/min was associated with nutritional deficit independently of adjusted confounding factors.
Poisson et al., 2014	CS	sample size : 159 mean age ± SD (y/o): 85.3 ± 5.7 gender (% female): 68	France	H	i) Dysphagia: swallowing abilities ii) Nutritional status: BMI, serum albumin concentration, MNA-SF iii) Dietary intake: 3-day records	Salivary hypofunction was related to dysphagia (p < 0,001) at univariate level, but not to malnutrition. Low saliva flow was not related to protein and energy intake.
Soini et al., 2003	CS	sample size: 51 mean age ± SD (y/o): 83.7 ± 4.4 gender (% female): 78	Finland	C	Nutritional status (risk of malnutrition): MNA	Saliva secretion was not found to be related to the MNA, but the clinical evaluation of dry mouth was related to the risk of malnutrition (p = 0,049). Subjects at risk of malnutrition had as well a significantly more chewing and swallowing problems (p = 0,015).
Solemdal et al., 2012	CS	sample size: 174 mean age ± SD (y/o): 83.5 ± 6.1 gender (% female): 68	Norway	H	Taste ability: taste strips method	Total taste score, and particularly sweet and salty taste, were significantly and markedly reduced in patients with dry mouth. Furthermore, the salty sum score was positively

						associated with a stimulated salivary flow < 0,6 g/min (p = 0,023).
Srinivasulu et al 2014	CS	sample size: 81 mean age ± SD (y/o): 70.0 ± 7.1 gender (% female): 58	India	I	Nutritional status: MNA	Salivary flow rate decreased among malnourished subjects (0,50 ± 0,100) when compared to well-nourished subjects (0,93 ± 0,260). The other parameters (total protein content, total calcium, pH, buffer capacity) were not statistically significant
Ikebe et al., 2002	CS	sample size: 351 mean age ± SD (y/o): 66.7 ± 4.3 gender (% female): 46	Japan	C	Dissatisfaction with tasting; self-assessed chewing ability: questionnaire	Hyposalivation (stimulated salivary flow < 0,5 ml/min) was associated with dissatisfaction with tasting food (P < 0,05) and self-assessed chewing ability (NS). No correlation was found between pH of stimulated saliva and oral function.
Shinkawa et al, 2009	CS	sample size: 502 mean age ± SD (y/o): 72.3 ± 6.7 gender (% female): 51	Japan	C	Satisfaction with chewing and swallowing abilities: questionnaire	A lower mucosal moisture was significantly associated with the subjective chewing ability but not with swallowing

693 * CS: cross-sectional studies

694 ** C: community dwelling volunteers (independently living); I: Institutionalized volunteers; H: hospitalized patients

695

696 **Table 2.** Quality assessment of the 15 selected studies

Reference	Question/objective sufficiently described?	Study design evident and appropriate?	Method of subject selection is described and appropriate?	Subject characteristics are sufficiently described?	Outcome measures(s) well defined and robust to measurement/misclassification bias? Means of assessment reported?	Sample size appropriate?	Analytic methods described/justified and appropriate?	Some estimate of variance is reported for main results?	Controlled for confounding? (age, gender, drug intake, diseases, mental status, socio-economic status, dental status and place to live)	Results reported in sufficient detail?	Conclusions supported by results?	Sum Score
Dormenval et al., 1998	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial	Partial	Yes	0.91
Dormenval et al., 1999	Yes	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial	Yes	Partial	Yes	Partial	0.82
Samnieng et al., 2012	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial	Yes	Yes	0.95
Syrjälä et al., 2013	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial	Partial	Partial	0.86
Samnieng, 2014	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0.95
Iwasaki et al., 2016	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1.00
Ikebe et al., 2006	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial	Yes	Yes	0.91
Yoshinaka et al., 2007	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial	Yes	Yes	Partial	Yes	Partial	Partial	Yes	0.82
Mesas et al., 2010	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1.00

Poisson et al., 2014	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial	Partial	Yes	0.91
Soini et al., 2003	Yes	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial	Partial	Yes	Partial	Partial	Yes	0.77
Solemdal et al., 2012	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1.00
Srinivasulu et al 2014	Yes	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	0.82
Ikebe et al., 2002	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial	Yes	Partial	Yes	Yes	0.91
Shinkawa et al, 2009	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial	Yes	Partial	Yes	Yes	0.91

697

698

699 **Table 3.** Objectives measurements to determine salivary hypofunction and corresponding cut-off values in the 15 selected studies

Article	Parameters measured	Methodology	Number of measures	Cut-off value to determine hyposalivation	References of the methodology
Articles that performed the measure of salivary flow to determine hyposalivation					
Dormenval et al., 1998	Unstimulated salivary flow rate, stimulated salivary flow rate	Measured during 6 min, spitting out each 2 min; collected between 9h and 11h	2	Unstimulated salivary flow rate < 0,1ml/min, Stimulated salivary flow rate < 0,5ml/min	(Sreebny et al. 1992)
Dormenval et al., 1999	Unstimulated salivary flow rate, stimulated salivary flow rate	Measured during 6 min, spitting out each 2 min; Collected between 9h and 11h	2	Unstimulated salivary flow rate < 0,1ml/min, Stimulated salivary flow rate < 0,5ml/min	(Sreebny et al. 1992)
Samnieng et al., 2012	Unstimulated salivary flow rate, stimulated salivary flow rate	Measured during 5 minutes	1	Unstimulated salivary flow rate < 0,1 ml/min Stimulated salivary flow rate < 0,5 ml/min	-
Syrjälä et al., 2013	Unstimulated salivary flow rate, stimulated salivary flow rate	Measured during 5 minutes (draining method)	1	Unstimulated salivary flow rate < 0,1ml/min, stimulated salivary flow rate < 1ml/min	(Dormenval et al. 1998, Flink et al. 2008)
Samnieng, 2014	Unstimulated salivary flow rate	Measured during 5 minutes	1	Unstimulated salivary flow rate < 0,1 ml/min	

Iwasaki et al., 2016	Stimulated salivary flow rate	Measured during 3 minutes; Collected between 9h to 15h	1	Stimulated salivary flow rate < 0,5 ml/min	(Hirotoomi et al. 2006)
Ikebe et al., 2006	Stimulated salivary flow rate	Measured during 2 minutes at their own pace; collected between 10:00 am and 3:00 pm	1	Stimulated salivary flow rate < 0,5 ml/min	(Sreebny and Zhu 1996, Ikebe et al. 2002)
Yoshinaka et al., 2007	Stimulated salivary flow rate	Measured during 2 minutes at their own pace	1	Stimulated salivary flow rate < 0,5 ml/min	(Michael E 2004)
Mesas et al., 2010	Stimulated salivary flow rate	No information provided	1	Stimulated salivary flow rate < 0,5 ml/min Stimulated salivary flow rate < 0,7ml/min	(Dormenval et al. 1999, Ikebe et al. 2002, Cabrera et al. 2007, Flink et al. 2008)
Poisson et al., 2014	flow under the tongue	Measured by placing a sterile compress under the tongue for 5 min	1	Salivary flow < 0,1 g/min	-
Articles that combined the measure of salivary flow rate with other measures of oral dryness					

Soini et al., 2003	Unstimulated salivary flow rate, stimulated salivary flow rate, Objective dry mouth	Measured during 5 min (Unstimulated salivary flow rate: let the saliva flow into the tube ; Stimulated salivary flow rate: spitting out each 1 min) ; collected between 9h and 11h	1	Unstimulated salivary flow rate < 0,1 ml/min, stimulated salivary flow rate < 0,8 ml/min Clinical dentist criteria	(Narhi et al. 1994)
Solemdal et al., 2012	Stimulated salivary flow rate, mirror test, dry tongue	Measured during 3 minutes at their own pace	1	Stimulated salivary flow rate < 0,6 g/min Dental mirror stucked to the mucosa Tongue completely devoid of moisture	(Henricsson et al. 1990, Navazesh 1993)
Srinivasulu et al 2014	Stimulated salivary flow rate, Total protein content, calcium, pH, buffering capacity	Measured during 5 minutes at their own pace; collected early in the morning	1	Stimulated salivary flow rate < 0,5ml/min	(Navazesh and Kumar 2008)
Ikebe et al., 2002	Stimulated salivary flow rate, pH of saliva	Measured during 2 minutes at their own pace: Collected between 10:00 am and 3:00 pm	1	Stimulated salivary flow rate < 0,5 ml/min	(Osterberg et al. 1984, Loesche et al. 1995, Sreebny and Zhu 1996, Narhi et al. 1999)
Articles that used other method to determine hyposalivation					
Shinkawa et al., 2009	Moisture of oral mucosa	Measured at the right buccal mucosa, during 2 sec	3	28,3% of the MCM value	(Yamada et al. 2005)

