The effect of myoelectric upper-extremity orthoses on rehabilitation outcomes in hemiplegic patients

K. A. Neely, MSOP; Geauga Rehabilitation Engineering O&P; neelykal@gmail.com

Creation Date: Dec 2022; Date for Reassessment: Dec 2027

	Pulos et al., 2021[8]	**Peters et al., 2017[2]**	**Page et al., 2020[5]**	**McCabe et al., 2019[6]**	**Pundik et al., 2022[4]**	**Hoppe-Ludwig et al., 2019[9]**
Population	Adult traumatic BPI patients from a specialized clinic who had failed to achieve antigravity elbow flexion following injury or reconstruction.	Chronic, stable, moderately impaired stroke survivors with UE hemiparesis.	Subjects with chronic, moderate, stable, post-stroke upper extremity hemiparesis.	Stroke patients > 6 months post stroke who underwent treatment at an outpatient OT department and had reached a plateau in functional performance following traditional OT.	Individuals with chronic moderate/severe arm weakness due to stroke (n=7) or TBI (n=6).	Individuals with stroke.
Study Design	Retrospective chart review from a single institution.	Observational cohort study.	Randomized, controlled, single-blinded design.	Retrospective analysis of data collected longitudinally.	Single group interventional study.	Single-session study.
N	19	18	34	9	13	18
Intervention	Orthotist-fit MyoPro used in therapy with a Certified Hand Therapist.	MyoPro Motion-G device.	MyoPro used 1 hour/day for 3 days/week over 8 weeks.	MyoPro used with group therapy 1-2 days/week and recommended at-home use.	MyoPro used with therapy 2 days/week for 9 weeks followed by an at-home prescribed exercise program for 9 weeks.	MyoPro fit and used for one session.
Comparison	Used paired t-test to compare before and after MUEO therapy.	UE impairment and function before wearing a MUEO and after.	MUEO and repetitive, task-specific practice; task specific practice only; MUEO only.	Plateau/pre-intervention levels versus scores over time.	No control group; outcomes collected baseline, weeks 3, 5, 7, 9, 12, 15, 18.	Performative, compared to baseline without device.

	Pulos et al., 2021[9]	Peters et al., 2017[2]	Page et al., 2020[5]	McCabe et al., 2019[6]	Pundik et al., 2022[4]	Hoppe-Ludwig et al., 2019[10]
Methodology	Therapy notes were reviewed to collect data on the three outcomes before and after MUEO therapy, as well as demographic information.	During one visit, participants were fit with the MUEO; during a second visit, subjects were administered the tests in the same order first without wearing the MUEO, and after completion were administered the tests after donning the MUEO. Same day, same rater for all subjects and all tests.	Participants randomized to one of the 3 treatment groups with treatment administered for 1 hour/day on 3 days/week over 8 weeks.	Fit with a MUEO after plateau and put into group therapy (supervised phase) and then a home exercise program (unsupervised phase).	In-clinic phase included 18 sessions (2 days/week for 9 weeks) plus a home exercise program, while home phase included practice of the home exercise program.	Single-session study in which participants were screened and tested for baseline functionality and after an acclimation period tested usability and functionality of the device.
Outcomes	BMRC-muscle strength, DASH-upper-extremity function, VAS-pain	FM, functional tasks, BB test	FM, Arm Motor Activity Test (AMAT)	FM, MAS	FM, MAS, ROM, Chedoke, O&P User's survey	Ability to activate the device, hold weights, ROM
Study Limitations	Did not control for device version.	Study used a not validated means of testing functional tasks.	Regimented therapy tests in the study versus self-selected relevant tasks in the clinic.	Therapy session attendance varied (inconsistent timing over which testing was completed); missing or incomplete data sets, especially in the unsupervised phase; periods of time in the unsupervised phase where patients may have been without the device waiting for an updated one.	No control group. No blinding. Small sample size.	Did not include patient reports. Used both custom and adjustable versions of the device. Impairment outside of MAS was not determined prior to the study. No baseline for holding weights. Small sample size.

	Pulos et al., 2021[9]	Peters et al., 2017[2]	Page et al., 2020[5]	McCabe et al., 2019[6]	Pundik et al., 2022[4]	Hoppe-Ludwig et al., 2019[10]
Key Findings	Participants demonstrated a statistically significant improvement in strength following MUEO therapy. Median time to device in patients that showed improvement was 18 months compared to 30 in patients who did not achieve improvement. At final follow-up, the DASH score showed a significant improvement of 11 points. There was a positive correlation between improvement in muscle grade and improvement in DASH.	There was a statistically significant difference in UE impairment as measured by the FM Scale($P<0.0001$, mean score increase of 8.72) when using a MUEO compared with while not wearing the MUEO. There were observed significant increases in median BB scores while wearing the MUEO versus while not wearing the MUEO ($P< 0.001$) Subjects increased ability to perform functional tasks, including significant increases in ability to grasp a utensil ($P= .024$) and bring it to their mouth ($P=0.003$) and grasp a cup ($P=0.001$).	All 3 cohorts exhibited score increases from pre-intervention scores to post-intervention FM scores of approximately +2 points, resulting in no differences in the amount of the change between groups. Average Arm Motor Activity Test (AMAT) scores between pre-intervention and post-intervention were approximately +1 for all three groups, resulting in no difference in the amount of change between groups.	For participants evaluated at about 12 weeks of working in the supervised phase, there was statistically significant change in FM of average 7.3 points ($P= 0.017$). At the conclusion of the supervised phase, a statistically significant change from initial FM was observed of 9 points ($P = 0.00053$). Seven out of nine patients demonstrated a FM change score >5 points at the end of the supervised phase. 4 patients followed into the unsupervised phase showed declines in FM as compared to post-supervised phase but were still improved compared to initial score.	Statistically significant changes from baseline were observed by week 3 of in-clinic phase, continued to improve after week 3 through the end of clinic phase, and were maintained during the home phase. Baseline FM nor injury type were associated. Difference in MAS at all time points compared to baseline was significant. MAS improved by week 3 and remained reduced through the end of the home phase. Higher baseline MAS scores saw greater reduction. A statistically significant improvement from baseline in the O&P User's Survey was observed by the end of the in-clinic phase and maintained at the end of the home phase.	71% of users were able to operate all three active modes during testing. Users were able to hold a range of wrist weights for a range of time. The MUEO was found to improve ROM in use. More patients were able to complete the active ROM task using the device than without it.

	Pulos et al., 2021[9]	Peters et al., 2017[2]	Page et al., 2020[5]	McCabe et al., 2019[6]	Pundik et al., 2022[4]	Hoppe-Ludwig et al., 2019[10]
Key Findings (Con't)		Subjects also showed a not statistically significant different but higher mean scores for grasping a laundry basket and turning on a light switch with the MUEO.		While no statistically significant pre to post change was observed with a group-wise comparison, improvements in elbow flexor and wrist flexor tone was seen in most patients. For 3 patients with MAS >1.5 at initial testing, there was a consistent improvement in MAS score during the supervised phase.	A statistically significant improvement from baseline in active ROM for elbow flexion was seen by week 5 and maintained through the end of the home phase. Elbow extension active ROM improved by week three and was maintained through the end of the in-clinic phase. Higher active ROM baselines saw less improvement. Statistically significant improvement from baseline was noted for CAHAI by week 3, and scores continued to improve through the end of the home phase. Compared with week 5 scores, statistically significant improvements were observed at the end of home phase, average change of 8.8 points.	