

1 **Psychometric properties of upper limb kinematics during functional tasks in children and**  
2 **adolescents with dyskinetic cerebral palsy**

3

4 Inti Vanmechelen<sup>1</sup>, Saranda Bekteshi<sup>1</sup>, Marco Konings<sup>1</sup>, Hilde Feys<sup>2</sup>, Kaat Desloovere<sup>3</sup>, Jean-Marie  
5 Aerts<sup>4</sup>, Elegast Monbaliu<sup>1</sup>

6

7 <sup>1</sup> KU Leuven Bruges, Department of Rehabilitation Sciences, Bruges, Belgium

8 <sup>2</sup> KU Leuven, Department of Rehabilitation Sciences, Leuven, Belgium

9 <sup>3</sup> KU Leuven, Department of Rehabilitation Sciences, Pellenberg, Belgium

10 <sup>4</sup> KU Leuven, Department of Biosystems, Division of Animal and Human Health Engineering,  
11 Measure, Model and Manage Bioresponse (M3-BIORES), Leuven, Belgium

12

13 Corresponding author:

14 Inti Vanmechelen; KU Leuven campus Bruges, Spoorwegstraat 12, 8200 Bruges, Belgium.

15 [inti.vanmechelen@kuleuven.be](mailto:inti.vanmechelen@kuleuven.be)

16 Author e-mail addresses:

17 [Saranda.bekteshi@kuleuven.be](mailto:Saranda.bekteshi@kuleuven.be); [marco.konings@kuleuven.be](mailto:marco.konings@kuleuven.be); [hilde.feys@kuleuven.be](mailto:hilde.feys@kuleuven.be);

18 [kaat.desloovere@uzleuven.be](mailto:kaat.desloovere@uzleuven.be); [jean-marie.aerts@kuleuven.be](mailto:jean-marie.aerts@kuleuven.be); [elegast.monbaliu@kuleuven.be](mailto:elegast.monbaliu@kuleuven.be)

19

20 **Contributions**

21 **IV**: Conceptualisation, methodology, software, formal analysis, investigation, data curation, writing-  
22 original draft, visualisation. **SB**: Methodology, writing-reviewing and editing. **MK**: Methodology,  
23 writing-reviewing and editing. **HF**: Conceptualisation, writing-reviewing and editing. **KD**:  
24 Conceptualisation, formal analysis, methodology, resources, writing-reviewing and editing. **J-MA**:  
25 Conceptualisation, writing-reviewing and editing. **EM**: Conceptualisation, methodology, data  
26 curation, resources, writing-reviewing and editing, supervision, project administration, funding  
27 acquisition.

28 **Funding**

29 IV received an FWO fellowship. The funder had no involvement in study design, collection, analysis  
30 and interpretation of data, writing of the report, or in the decision to submit the article for  
31 publication.

32

33 Declarations of interest: none

34

35

36

37

38 **Abstract**

39 **Aim**

40 Dyskinetic cerebral palsy (DCP) is characterised by involuntary movements, and the movement  
41 patterns of children with DCP have not been extensively studied during upper limb tasks. The aim of  
42 this study is to evaluate psychometric properties of upper limb kinematics in participants with DCP  
43 and typically developing (TD) participants.

44 **Methods**

45 Twenty TD participants and 20 participants with DCP performed three functional tasks: reaching  
46 forward, reach and grasp vertical and reach sideways during three-dimensional motion analysis.  
47 Joint angles at point of task achievement (PTA) and spatio-temporal parameters were evaluated  
48 within-and between sessions using intra-class correlation coefficients (ICC) and standard error of  
49 measurement (SEM). Independent t-tests/Mann-Whitney U tests were used to compare all  
50 parameters between groups.

51 **Results**

52 Within-session ICC values ranged from 0.55 to 0.99 for joint angles at PTA and spatio-temporal  
53 parameters for both groups during all tasks. Within-session SEM values ranged from 1.1° to 11.7° for  
54 TD participants and from 1.9° to 13.0° for participants with DCP. Eight within-session repetitions  
55 resulted in the smallest change in ICC and SEM values for both groups. Within-session variability was  
56 higher for participants with DCP in comparison with the TD group for the majority of the joint angles  
57 and spatio-temporal parameters. Intrinsic variability over time was small for all angles and spatio-  
58 temporal parameters, whereas extrinsic variability was higher for elbow pro/supination and scapula  
59 angles. Between-group differences revealed lower shoulder adduction and higher elbow flexion,  
60 pronation and wrist flexion, as well as higher trajectory deviation and a lower maximal velocity for  
61 participants with DCP.

62 **Conclusion**

63 This is the first study to assess the psychometric properties of upper limb kinematics in children and  
64 adolescents with DCP, showing that children with DCP show higher variability during task execution.  
65 However, their variable movement pattern can be reliably captured within- and between-sessions, if  
66 sufficient repetitions are taken into account within one session.

67 *Keywords:* dyskinetic cerebral palsy; upper limb kinematics; psychometric properties; functional  
68 tasks

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76 **Introduction**

77 Cerebral palsy (CP) is ‘a group of permanent disorders of the development of movement and  
78 posture, attributed to non-progressive disturbances that occurred in the developing fetal or infant  
79 brain.’ (1). Based on the predominant movement disorders, patients with CP are classified into  
80 spastic, dyskinetic, ataxic, or mixed forms of CP (2). Dyskinetic CP (DCP) is the second most common  
81 type of CP with a prevalence of 14.4% and is characterized by a combination of disturbed movement  
82 control and a varying muscle tone (2, 3). Since 50% of the patients with DCP are wheelchair-bound,  
83 an optimal function of the upper limbs, ensuring wheelchair propulsion or cutlery handling, is of  
84 paramount importance to maintain an independent lifestyle (4). DCP includes two major movement  
85 disorders: dystonia and choreoathetosis (5). Dystonia is defined as ‘a movement disorder  
86 characterized by sustained or intermittent muscle contractions causing abnormal, often repetitive  
87 movements, postures or both’ (6). Choreoathetosis is characterized by hyperkinesia and muscle tone  
88 fluctuation, leading to jerky and constantly changing movements (5).

89 Dystonia and choreoathetosis in patients with DCP is currently evaluated through the use of clinical  
90 assessment tools. Several qualitative assessment tools have recently been presented to evaluate  
91 dystonia (7, 8), of which some specifically for dystonia in CP (8). Only one assessment scale is  
92 currently available to assess both dystonia and choreoathetosis in DCP (9). However, the ordinal  
93 scoring in such qualitative assessments diminishes the score variability and induces a lower  
94 responsiveness (10). Moreover, a score is defined based on video measurements and consensus  
95 definitions, making data analyses time-consuming and subjective. Last, these qualitative assessment  
96 tools focus on the presence and severity of dystonia and choreoathetosis, but do not yield  
97 information on specific movement patterns. The latter is, however, considered crucial for goal-  
98 directed training towards improved upper limb performance and to evaluate the effect of  
99 treatments.

100 Over the past years, there have been several attempts to establish objective measurements in the  
101 CP population. Gordon et al., (11) attempted to discriminate dystonia and spasticity in the arm  
102 where spasticity was expressed as the amount of force necessary to passively extend the elbow joint  
103 as measured with a rigidity analyser and dystonia was characterized as the amount of overflow  
104 movement in the contralateral arm. However, evaluating the amount of dystonia only by overflow  
105 movements of the contralateral arm does not capture the full aspect of dystonia and its action-  
106 specific aspect. Sanger et al., (12) demonstrated an increased movement variability and a lack of  
107 straight-line trajectories in participants with DCP during outward reaching. While these results  
108 indicate the ability to quantitatively measure movement characteristics of the upper limb using  
109 position diodes attached to eight points of the body, they do not provide any information regarding  
110 joint angles or movement patterns. When focusing on hemiplegic spastic CP, several upper limb  
111 protocols have been developed and validated over the past years (13-17). While all studies  
112 presented moderate to good results, the upper limb joints included in the analyses were limited to  
113 trunk, shoulder, elbow and wrist angles. The study of Jaspers et al. was the only protocol so far that  
114 has additionally presented scapular angles, allowing to investigate the role of the scapula position in  
115 upper arm movements (18, 19). In all abovementioned protocols, analysis of joint kinematics  
116 demonstrated significant differences between typically developing (TD) children and children with  
117 hemiplegic spastic CP (17, 20-22), most frequently in elbow extension and elbow supination angles.  
118 To date, only one study on kinematic analysis of upper limb movements included children with DCP,  
119 representing only a small sub-group of the patient cohort (23).

120

121 As dyskinetic CP is characterized by involuntary movements, it is expected that their movement  
122 patterns will be less consistent compared to TD children or children with spastic CP. In this  
123 perspective, we strive towards reliably capturing a pattern that is inherently inconsistent, which may  
124 thus require a higher number of repetitions within one session before parameter calculation.

125

126 Since novel assessments need to be reliable and valid before they can be transferred to clinical  
127 practice, the objective of this study is to evaluate the psychometric properties of upper limb  
128 kinematics in children and adolescents with and without DCP. The first sub-goal is to define the  
129 within-session repeatability of joint angles and spatio-temporal parameters and to explore the  
130 number of repetitions that are necessary within one session to obtain a representative and robust  
131 representation of the movement pattern for participants with and without DCP. The hypothesis is  
132 that a higher number than the predefined three is necessary for a robust representation (12). The  
133 second sub-goal is to assess the variability between TD participants and participants with DCP for  
134 this specified number of repetitions. We hypothesize that participants with DCP show higher  
135 variability in comparison with their TD peers. The third sub-goal is to assess between-session  
136 repeatability of these joint angles and spatio-temporal parameters, as this is an important first step  
137 toward responsiveness of these measures. The hypothesis is that joint angles and spatio-temporal  
138 parameters can be reliably captured over time. The fourth sub-goal is to assess their content validity  
139 defining the differences in upper limb kinematics between children and adolescents with and  
140 without DCP. The hypothesis is that the joint angles and spatio-temporal parameters will differ  
141 significantly between the TD and DCP group.

142

## 143 **Methods**

### 144 **Participants**

145 Participants were recruited from special education schools across Belgium for children with multiple  
146 disabilities, and from the University Hospitals Leuven. Inclusion criteria were: a diagnosis of DCP,  
147 aged between 5-25 years old and a Manual Ability Classification System (MACS) level I-III (24).  
148 Exclusion criteria were a neurological disorder other than DCP, botulinum toxin injections in the  
149 upper limb muscles in the past 6 months and neurological or orthopaedic surgery in the last year  
150 before assessment. TD participants were recruited from a peripheral network. All participants  
151 and/or their parents provided written consent prior to participation in accordance with the  
152 Declaration of Helsinki. The study was approved by the Ethics committee research UZ / KU Leuven,  
153 S-number S62093.

### 154 **Movement protocol**

155 All participants were asked to perform three upper limb tasks: reaching forward (RF), reaching  
156 sideways (RS) and reach and grasp vertical (RGV). RF, RS and RGV were executed at shoulder height  
157 (acromion) and reaching distance was determined according to arm length (from acromion to caput  
158 metacarpal III). All tasks were performed at self-selected speed with the non-preferred arm (the  
159 hemiplegic arm in participants with unilateral DCP and the non-preferred arm in TD participants) and  
160 with both arms in participants with bilateral DCP. Start position (the ipsilateral knee) was indicated  
161 with an elastic band above the knee. Every task was executed 10 times per trial with a total of three  
162 trials for every task. Participants were seated in a chair with adjustable height and a custom-made  
163 reaching system was developed to perform the tasks in a standardized way (Figure 1; to view figure  
164 1, the reader is requested to contact the corresponding author). The reference position was 90°  
165 flexion in hip and knees and the hands placed on the ipsilateral knee (19).

### 166 **Kinematic model**

167 Seventeen reflective markers were placed over the body in 5 clusters: two cuffs of 4 markers were  
168 placed respectively on the upper arm and forearm, one cluster of 3 markers was placed on the hand  
169 and two tripods with 3 markers were placed respectively on the trunk and the scapula. Five  
170 segments were thus included (trunk, scapula, humerus, forearm, hand) and four joints were  
171 considered (scapulothoracic (scapula), humerothoracic (shoulder), elbow, wrist). Anatomical  
172 coordinate systems and joint rotation sequences were defined according to the ISB-guidelines (25).  
173 The currently used protocol has been previously validated in TD participants and participants with  
174 hemiplegic spastic CP (18, 19).

#### 175 **Test procedure**

176 Every child was evaluated twice on the same day with a minimum of one hour and a maximum of  
177 two hours between sessions at the WE-lab for Health, Technology and Management (KU Leuven,  
178 campus Bruges) or the Clinical Movement Analysis Laboratory (CMAL, UZ Leuven, Pellenberg) by the  
179 same assessors. Anatomical landmarks were palpated according to precise definitions and digitized  
180 using a pointer with four linear markers (19). Static and dynamic calibrations were subsequently  
181 performed for the calculation of anatomical landmarks, during which passive assistance was given  
182 where needed. 3D marker tracking was done with 12 infra-red Vicon optical motion capture cameras  
183 sampling at 100 Hz and 2 high-definition video cameras, with a typical measurement error of 0.4 mm  
184 (Vicon Motion Systems, Oxford Metrics, UK).

#### 185 **Data analysis**

186 Movement cycles were identified and segmented in Vicon Motion Capture System. One movement  
187 cycle was defined from hand on ipsilateral knee to point of task achievement (PTA), where PTA is  
188 considered the final point of the reaching or reach-and-grasp cycle (19). The first and last movement  
189 cycles were disregarded as they could be influenced by stop and start strategies, resulting in 8  
190 repetitions for each trial, with a total of 24 repetitions for each task. Joint angle at PTA was obtained  
191 by selecting the last value of the angular waveform for the joint angles. Subsequently, maximal  
192 velocity and trajectory deviation were obtained for each repetition. Trajectory deviation is a  
193 dimensionless parameter, but a value of 1 implies a perfect straight line trajectory, whereas the  
194 higher the trajectory deviation, the more the movement deviates from a straight line.

195 To evaluate how many repetitions of a task execution represented a stable movement pattern, an  
196 incremental number of repetitions was randomly selected for each task and the change in outcome  
197 values was evaluated for both TD participants and participants with DCP.

#### 198 **Statistical analysis**

199 *Within-session repeatability: Sub-goal 1* - For both groups, 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10 repetitions were  
200 randomly selected for each task for each participant. Subsequently, intra-class correlation coefficient  
201 (ICC) values and standard error of measurement (SEM) were calculated for each number of  
202 repetitions for the joint angle at PTA and the spatio-temporal parameters for each functional task.  
203 SEM calculations were based on the square root of the within-group mean square value of the one-  
204 way ANOVA (26).

205 The change in both the ICC and SEM values for the different repetitions was expressed in percentage  
206 (%) of change in comparison with the highest SEM or ICC value for all number of repetitions. The cut-  
207 off value for a stable ICC or SEM value was defined as the difference between incrementing  
208 repetitions being less than or equal to 10%. The SEM defining the cut-off value will hereafter be

209 referred to as ‘consistency measure’, since we assume that this margin of error defines a consistent  
210 performance within one session.

211 *Assessment of variability: Sub-goal 2:* To evaluate whether the variability was higher for participants  
212 with DCP in comparison with their TD peers, standard deviations for the selected number of  
213 repetitions were calculated and compared between groups using an independent t-test/Mann  
214 Whitney-U test depending on the data distribution.

215 *Between-session repeatability: Sub-goal 3* – To evaluate repeatability over time in patients with DCP,  
216 it is important to differentiate between internal variability (the difference in consistency only related  
217 to the participants’ performance) and external sources of variability (e.g. marker placement and  
218 palpation differences). To evaluate internal variability, we compared the consistency measure  
219 between session 1 and session 2 for each task. To evaluate external variability we compared the  
220 mean of the consistency measures of session 1 and session 2 with the between-session standard  
221 error for all joint angles and spatio-temporal parameters.

222 *Between-group differences: Sub-goal 4* - Joint angles at PTA and spatio-temporal parameters  
223 averaged over repetitions were assessed for normality and compared between groups with an  
224 independent t-test/Mann Whitney-U test. Additionally, absolute differences (the difference between  
225 the mean of the TD and DCP group) were compared with the between-session standard error to  
226 evaluate for which parameters the absolute difference exceeds the standard error.

227 All analyses were performed in SPSS 28.0.0.0 with the significance level set at  $p < 0.05$  (SPSS Inc.,  
228 Chicago, IL).

## 229 **Results**

### 230 **Participants**

231 Twenty participants with DCP (mean age 16y6m, age range 8-25y) were available for a first data  
232 collection, 16 of these participants were also evaluated in the second session. For four participants  
233 with bilateral DCP, both arms were measured and included as separate data subjects. Since  
234 dyskinetic CP is characterized by asymmetry and involuntary movements, we assured that inclusion  
235 of the second arm did not distort the results on a group level. Twenty TD participants (mean age  
236 17y1m, age range 9-24y) were available for a first data collection, from which six TD participants  
237 were also recorded for a second session. Participant characteristics are summarized in table S1  
238 (supplementary material). Fourteen participants from the DCP group were right-handed and six  
239 participants were left-handed, 17 participants from the TD group were right-handed, three were  
240 left-handed.

### 241 **Within-session repeatability**

242 The ICC values for joint angles at PTA ranged from 0.52 to 0.98 for TD participants and from 0.45 to  
243 1.0 for participants with DCP for all tasks (figure 2). For both groups, there were no changes higher  
244 than 10% in ICC value after four repetitions (table S2). The SEM values for joint angles at PTA ranged  
245 from 1.1° to 11.7° for TD participants and from 1.9° to 13.0° for participants with DCP (figure 3). For  
246 the TD group, there were no changes higher than 10% in SEM after six repetitions for RF, after four  
247 repetitions for RS and after eight repetitions for RGV. For the DCP group, there were no changes

*Figure 2: Within-session intra-class correlation coefficients for joint angles at point of task achievement for TD participants (A,B,C) and participants with dyskinetic cerebral palsy (DCP) (D, E, F). Fl = flexion; Ext = extension; Scap = scapular; Pro = protraction; REP = repetitions.*

*Figure 3: Within-session standard error of measurement for joint angles at point of task achievement for TD participants (A,B,C) and participants with dyskinetic cerebral palsy (DCP) (D, E, F). Fl = flexion; Ext = extension; Scap = scapular; Pro = protraction; REP = repetitions.*

248 higher than 10% in SEM after eight repetitions for all tasks (table S2).

249 For the spatio-temporal parameters (figure 4), ICC values for trajectory deviation ranged from 0.72  
250 to 0.85 during RF and from 0.51 to 0.63 during RGV and RS for TD participants. For participants with  
251 DCP, ICC values ranged from 0.64 to 0.85 during all functional tasks. ICC's for maximal velocity  
252 ranged from 0.71-0.92 for all functional tasks for TD participants. For participants with DCP, ICC's for  
253 maximal velocity ranged from 0.52 to 0.73 during RF, and from 0.74-0.86 during RGV and RS. For  
254 both groups, there was no increase in ICC value higher than 10% for any of the parameters after six  
255 repetitions (table S3). For the DCP group, SEM values for trajectory deviation ranged from 0.09 to  
256 0.23 and from 0.15 to 0.18 for maximal velocity. For the TD group, SEM values for trajectory  
257 deviation ranged from 0.02 to 0.05 and from 0.07 to 0.15 for maximal velocity. For both groups,  
258 there was no increase in ICC value higher than 10% for any of the parameters after six repetitions

*Figure 4: Within-session Intra-class correlation coefficients (ICC's) and standard error of measurement (SEM) for spatio-temporal parameters for TD participants and participants with DCP. TrDeV = trajectory deviation; Vmax = maximal velocity; RF = reach forward; RGV = reach and grasp vertical; RS = reach sideways.*

259 (table S3).

260

261 Since the majority of the standard deviations was not normally distributed, groups were compared  
262 with the Mann Whitney-U test. The standard deviations for the joint angles were significantly higher  
263 for the DCP group in comparison with the TD group during RF for all joint angles except shoulder  
264 rotation, scapula pro/retraction and scapular tilting (figure 5, table S4). During RGV, standard  
265 deviations were significantly higher for elevation plane, shoulder elevation, elbow pro/supination  
266 and all scapula and trunk angles and during RS, standard deviations were higher for the DCP group  
267 for all angles except elevation plane, shoulder rotation, elbow flexion/extension and pro/supination.  
268 For the spatio-temporal parameters, both maximal velocity and trajectory deviation showed higher  
269 standard deviations for the DCP group for all tasks.

*Figure 5: Boxplots of standard deviations of joint angles at PTA and spatio-temporal parameters for the TD and DCP group. Fl = flexion; ext = extension; RF = reach forward; RGV = reach and grasp vertical; RS = reach sideways.*

270

### 271 **Between-session repeatability**

272 As the SEM values did not change after eight repetitions for the DCP group, variability between  
273 sessions will be based on the consistency measure from eight repetitions.

274 The intrinsic variability between sessions was obtained by comparing the consistency measure of  
275 session 1 and session 2 for joint angles at PTA (figure 6A). Consistency measures were higher for the  
276 DCP group in comparison with the TD group for all shoulder angles, elbow pro/supination, wrist  
277 flexion/extension, wrist deviation, trunk lateral flexion and trunk axial rotation. Overall, consistency  
278 measures were below 10° for all angles except wrist flexion/extension for the DCP group, whilst  
279 there were no task-dependent differences.

280 Extrinsic variability was obtained by comparing the mean of the consistency measure of session 1  
281 and 2 with the between-session standard error for joint angles at PTA (figure 6B). Highest between-  
282 session differences were found for elbow pro/supination and scapular angles for both groups.

283 Overall, between-session standard error was below 10° except for shoulder rotation, elbow angles,  
284 wrist flexion/extension and scapular tilting.

*Figure 6: Intrinsic variability (A) between session 1 (S1) and 2 (S2) and extrinsic variability (B) for within (WS) –and between-session (BS) for participants with DCP and TD participants for all tasks. Fl = flexion; ext = extension; Wr = wrist; pro = protraction; retr = retraction; lat fl = lateral flexion; ax rot = axial rotation; RF = reach forward; RGV = reach and grasp vertical; RS = reach sideways. (Lines serve for visualisation purposes only)*

285

286 For the spatio-temporal parameters (figure 8A), intrinsic variability was very similar for session 1 and  
287 session 2, with consistency measures below 0.2 for trajectory deviation and maximal velocity for  
288 both groups. Both parameters were higher for the DCP group in comparison with the TD  
289 participants. For extrinsic variability (figure 8B), both trajectory deviation and maximal velocity  
290 showed higher consistency measures within-session in comparison with between-session, but there  
291 were no task-specific differences.

*Figure 8: Intrinsic variability (A), extrinsic variability (B) and the comparison absolute difference and between-session measurement error (C) for spatio-temporal parameters. RF = reach forward; RGV = reach and grasp vertical; RS = reach sideways. ABS DIFF = absolute difference; BS SEM = between-session measurement error. (Lines serve for visualisation purposes only)*

292

### 293 **Between-group differences**

294 Mean and standard deviations of joint angles at PTA and spatio-temporal parameters are reported in  
295 table 1. During RF, participants with DCP showed higher external shoulder rotation (-46.3° versus -  
296 31.7°; p=0.004), higher elbow flexion (34.4° versus 12.9°; p=0.000) and higher trunk axial rotation  
297 (10.9° versus 7.0°; p=0.042). During RGV, participants with DCP showed lower shoulder adduction  
298 (73.63° versus 89.06°) and elevation (73.6° versus 89.1°), higher elbow flexion (36.5° versus 17.8°;  
299 p=0.000) and pronation (102.2° versus 76.7°; p=0.000) and higher trunk axial rotation (15.6° versus  
300 9.1°; p=0.001). During RS, participants with DCP showed less shoulder abduction (12.9° versus 21.3°;  
301 p=0.020); higher external shoulder rotation (-43.8° versus -29.32°; p=0.008), higher elbow flexion  
302 (31.2° versus 15.0°; p=0.000) and higher elbow pronation (132.0° versus 106.2°; p=0.000).

303

304

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313



**Table 1: Mean and standard deviations of joint angles at point of task achievement as well as the p-value for the between-group differences.**

	REACH FORWARD			REACH AND GRASP VERTICAL			REACH SIDEWAYS		
	TD Mean (STD)	DCP Mean (STD)	p-value	TD Mean (STD)	DCP Mean (STD)	p-value	TD Mean (STD)	DCP Mean (STD)	p-value
Elevation plane	79.99° (6.48)	73.01° (12.72)	0.021	89.06° (8.65)	73.63° (11.92)	<0.001**	12.86° (9.40)	21.29° (14.94)	0.020*
Shoulder elevation	-75.44° (7.47)	-72.27° (10.06)	0.264	-79.82° (7.96)	-71.16° (10.39)	0.006**	-64.38 (8.65)	-63.64 (10.47)	0.405
Shoulder rotation	-31.71° (14.33)	-46.34° (17.14)	0.004**	-42.60° (15.89)	-52.86° (16.87)	0.421	-29.32° (16.38)	-43.79° (19.47)	0.008**
Elbow flexion/extension	12.94° (9.20)	34.43° (14.67)	<0.001**	17.78° (8.14)	36.49° (14.48)	<0.001**	14.97° (12.82)	31.18° (16.47)	<0.001**
Elbow pro/supination	120.10° (21.36)	124.71° (16.75)	0.228	76.67° (21.37)	102.22° (23.04)	0.001**	106.17° (21.29)	131.98° (23.06)	<0.001**
Wrist flexion/extension	7.19° (10.47)	16.00° (17.40)	0.030*	-14.67° (11.84)	-8.19° (21.16)	0.245	6.45° (11.99)	17.69° (26.09)	0.045*
Wrist deviation	1.40° (4.46)	1.59° (11.44)	0.473	-1.02° (7.99)	-2.12° (13.48)	0.760	3.85° (5.28)	7.59° (12.22)	0.109
Scapular pro/retraction	43.46° (9.85)	39.09° (10.48)	0.091	42.87° (8.57)	39.24° (8.21)	0.191	17.62° (13.70)	19.43° (14.81)	0.347
Scapular rotation	-14.33° (12.10)	-13.70° (14.38)	0.441	-10.60° (10.58)	-9.79° (15.80)	0.853	-15.52° (10.46)	-14.32° (16.38)	0.393
Scapular tilting	-1.19° (10.73)	1.08° (12.39)	0.270	1.04° (10.19)	0.39° (13.46)	0.867	-1.45° (11.65)	3.65° (14.78)	0.119
Trunk flexion/extension	-3.01° (4.24)	-0.64° (9.40)	0.155	-2.34° (5.24)	-0.31° (8.87)	0.389	-1.18° (5.86)	-0.82° (9.17)	0.442
Trunk lateral flexion	-0.08° (4.64)	-2.86° (5.98)	0.055	-1.22° (3.74)	-3.07° (5.88)	0.250	-0.81° (4.36)	0.13° (5.96)	0.288
Trunk axial rotation	7.00° (4.56)	10.85° (8.62)	0.042*	9.06° (4.67)	15.58° (7.71)	0.001**	-7.56° (4.40)	-13.71° (11.03)	0.013*
Trajectory deviation	1.19 (0.08)	1.51 (0.41)	0.002**	1.07 (0.03)	1.43 (0.40)	<0.001**	1.15 (0.05)	1.36 (0.22)	<0.001**
Maximal velocity (m/s)	1.36 (0.25)	1.00 (0.31)	<0.001**	1.25 (0.23)	0.90 (0.25)	<0.001**	1.63 (0.26)	1.24 (0.34)	<0.001**

TD = typically developing; DCP = dyskinetic cerebral palsy; \* = p-value < 0.05; \*\* = p-value < 0.01

315 The absolute difference between the TD and DCP group exceeded the between-session standard  
316 error for shoulder rotation and elbow flexion/extension during RF (figure 7). During RGV, this was  
317 the case for elbow flexion/extension, elbow pro/supination and trunk axial rotation and during RS,  
318 the absolute difference exceeded the between-session standard error for elevation plane, shoulder  
319 rotation, elbow flexion/extension, elbow pro/supination and wrist flexion/extension.

*Figure 7: Absolute difference (TD vs DCP) and between-session measurement error for joint angle at PTA. El = elevation; Rot = rotation; Fl = flexion; Ext = extension; Dev = deviation; Pro = protraction; Scap = scapula; Retr = retraction; Rot = rotation; Tilt = tilting; Lat fl = lateral flexion. Absolute diff = absolute difference. BS SEM = between-session measurement error.*

320

321 For the spatio-temporal parameters, trajectory deviation was significantly higher for participants  
322 with DCP for all tasks (RF: 1.5 versus 1.2;  $p=0.002$ ; RGV: 1.4 versus 1.1;  $p=0.000$ ; RS: 1.4 versus 1.2;  
323  $p=0.000$ ). Similarly, maximal velocity was lower for participants with DCP for all tasks (RF: 1.0 m/s  
324 versus 1.4 m/s;  $p=0.000$ ; RGV: 0.9 m/s versus 1.3 m/s;  $p=0.000$ ; RS: 1.2 m/s versus 1.6 m/s;  $p=0.000$ ).

325 The absolute difference between the TD and DCP group exceeded the between-session standard  
326 error for all parameters and all tasks (figure 8C).

## 327 **Discussion**

328 The aim of this study was to assess the psychometric properties of upper limb kinematics in children  
329 and adolescents with and without DCP. Only one study has previously included participants with DCP  
330 in a three-dimensional upper limb motion protocol during the reach and grasp cycle (23), but the  
331 reliability of the protocol in the abovementioned study has not yet been assessed for participants  
332 with DCP. For children with hemiplegia, several studies investigated the reliability of upper limb  
333 kinematics, but all of them used a fairly small amount of repetitions, ranging from three (13, 14, 17)  
334 to six (18). As the movement patterns of children and adolescents with DCP are characterized by  
335 involuntary movements, it is likely that more repetitions are required to properly capture and  
336 describe the most representative patient-specific motion pattern.

337 As such, the first sub-goal was to explore how many repetitions of a functional upper limb task  
338 should be recorded in order to capture all movement variability when evaluating children and  
339 adolescents with DCP. For the joint angles at PTA, ICC values were above 0.60 for all joint angles for  
340 the TD participants for all number of repetitions, except for wrist deviation during RF. The lower ICC  
341 value for wrist deviation seems to reflect natural variability, as eight out of 20 participants had a  
342 range of more than 10° in joint angle at PTA between repetitions in the same session. Furthermore,  
343 these findings corroborate previous results in an upper limb kinematics reliability study, showing  
344 high within-session reliability for all angles except wrist flexion/extension and deviation (19). For  
345 participants with DCP, ICC values were above 0.60 for all joint angles, except trunk lateral flexion  
346 during RF, where the ICC value increased from 0.34 to 0.59 when increasing the number of  
347 repetitions from two to six. For the SEM, highest values were found for shoulder rotation in the TD  
348 group and wrist flexion/extension in the DCP group, with overall higher SEM values for the DCP  
349 group for all joint angles and all tasks. These results are in agreement with Jaspers et al. (18) for  
350 children with hemiplegic spastic CP, with slightly higher values for shoulder rotation, elbow  
351 flexion/extension and pro/supination and wrist flexion/extension for all tasks in our study. Overall,  
352 these results imply that joint angles at PTA are reliable over multiple repetitions within one session,  
353 where a minimum of eight repetitions is advised for both TD participants and participants with DCP.  
354 The lack of task-specific differences in both ICC and SEM values implies that the variability we found

355 is truly intrinsic due to the fluctuating movements in dyskinetic CP, rather than task-specific or  
356 methodological.

357 For the spatio-temporal parameters, maximal velocity was shown to be a reliable parameter for both  
358 groups for all tasks, whereas trajectory deviation showed good reliability for participants with DCP  
359 but somewhat lower values for TD participants during RGV and RS. Overall, the variability in  
360 trajectory deviation between participants with DCP (i.e., values ranging between 1.1 and 3.3) was  
361 much higher compared to TD participants (1.0-1.5) for all tasks. It is thus possible that the lower ICC  
362 values in the TD participants are the consequence of a small range in trajectory deviation values  
363 between participants, as the ICC value is known to perform less well in the absence of variability  
364 (26). SEM values were higher for the DCP group in comparison with the TD group, and higher for  
365 maximal velocity in comparison with trajectory deviation for both groups.

366 The second sub-goal was to compare variability between the TD and DCP group using standard  
367 deviations. For the majority of the angles and tasks, the participants with DCP showed more  
368 variability in comparison with their TD peers. This finding agrees with the hypothesis that individuals  
369 with DCP present with a more variable movement pattern with less consistency over multiple  
370 repetitions. In the wrist joint, this variability was task-dependent as the variability between both  
371 groups was significantly different during RF and RS, but not during RGV. This may be a consequence  
372 of the more specific grasping movement during RGV, allowing for somewhat less variability during  
373 task execution while additionally requiring wrist extension. Similar to the wrist joint, the DCP group  
374 showed higher variability at the level of the scapula during RGV and RS, but not RF. During RS, higher  
375 variability could be the consequence of movement outside of the sagittal plane while during RGV,  
376 scapula movement may be the consequence of trunk compensation for incomplete wrist and elbow  
377 extension.

378 The third sub-goal was to assess between-session repeatability of these joint angles and spatio-  
379 temporal parameters, as this is an important first step towards the definition of responsiveness of  
380 these measures. Intrinsic variability between-sessions was evaluated by comparing the consistency  
381 measure (based on eight repetitions) from session 1 and session 2. Extrinsic variability was evaluated  
382 by comparing the mean consistency measure of session 1 and 2 with the between-session SEM  
383 value.

384 Intrinsic variability showed few differences between sessions for both the TD and DCP group for  
385 both joint angles and spatio-temporal parameters, implying that intrinsic variability is rather low,  
386 even in participants with DCP. When comparing consistency over time, factors such as fatigue and a  
387 learning effect could possibly influence time-dependent performance. With a learning effect, one  
388 would expect a more consistent performance during the second session, while fatigue is expected to  
389 decrease the consistency over time. It is thus possible that both effects are present, but neither has  
390 a significant effect because of their counterbalancing impact or that both effects are significant, but  
391 the overall effect is not.

392 Extrinsic variability showed larger differences between test and test-retest, indicating that  
393 methodological aspects influence the results to a certain extent. Specifically for elbow  
394 pro/supination and scapula angles, SEM values were higher between-sessions in comparison with  
395 within-session SEM values. These differences imply that the influence of marker placement,  
396 palpation differences and positioning should be taken into account when interpreting the results of  
397 upper limb kinematics between different sessions. The higher between-session SEM values for the  
398 scapula angles agree with previous findings in hemiplegic spastic CP (18), which implies that caution  
399 is warranted when interpreting these joint angles over a longer period of time. For the spatio-

400 temporal parameters, both intrinsic and extrinsic variability were low, implying that both are reliable  
401 parameters to assess within and between sessions. The good between-session results for the  
402 majority of the parameters allow for a reliable measurement of upper limb movement  
403 characteristics before and after intervention, or for longitudinal follow-up of patients.

404 The fourth sub-goal of this study was to assess the differences in upper limb kinematics between  
405 children and adolescents with and without DCP, reflecting the construct validity of the test protocol.  
406 For the joint angles at PTA, elbow flexion/extension and pro/supination were most discriminative  
407 between participants with and without DCP, as participants with DCP showed higher elbow flexion  
408 and pronation in all three tasks, except for elbow pronation during RF. These results are in  
409 agreement with previous findings for children with hemiplegic spastic CP (20-22). Additionally, wrist  
410 flexion was significantly higher in participants with DCP during RF and RS, which is in agreement with  
411 Jaspers et al. (20). However, wrist flexion was not significantly different between both groups during  
412 RGV, which is in contradiction with the previous results (20). This finding agrees with the clinical  
413 presentation that children and adolescents with DCP have less range of motion restrictions but  
414 rather have a more variable kinematic pattern due to intermittent muscle contractions (5). Trunk  
415 axial rotation was higher for participants with DCP in comparison with the TD participants for all  
416 tasks. Trunk compensation in CP during grasping and sideways reaching has been reported before  
417 (13, 20, 27) and is described as a compensation mechanism for kinematics deficits at the level of the  
418 elbow and wrist. However, since none of our participants showed passive range of motion deficits  
419 and DCP is characterized by variable movement patterns, it is possible that our participants used  
420 these compensation strategies, but less frequently than their peers with spastic CP.

421 For a selection of joint angles, the absolute difference between TD and DCP exceeded the between-  
422 session standard error, which implies that those angles are most sensitive when comparing  
423 individuals with DCP and TD individuals. This is a clinically important finding as for those specific joint  
424 angles, the clinical pattern between TD participants and participants with DCP is more distinct than  
425 the measurement error occurring over time. This pattern was task-specific, with the most sensitive  
426 joint angles during RF being shoulder rotation and elbow flexion/extension. During RGV, elbow  
427 flexion/extension and pro/supination as well trunk axial rotation were most sensitive. During RS,  
428 elevation plane, shoulder rotation, elbow flexion/extension and pro/supination as well as wrist  
429 flexion were most sensitive. For wrist flexion during RF, the absolute difference TD-DCP was only  
430 slightly smaller than the between-session standard error, and since wrist flexion was significantly  
431 different between the TD and DCP group, this angle should also be considered a parameter of  
432 interest during RF. For the spatio-temporal parameters, the difference between the TD and DCP  
433 group was much higher than the between-session measurement error for both maximal velocity and  
434 trajectory deviation, implying that both are reliable and discriminative parameters between TD  
435 participants and participants with DCP, which is in line with previous results in hemiplegic spastic CP  
436 (16, 27) and DCP (12). Overall, these differences show that the abnormal postures caused by  
437 intermittent muscle contractions interfere with typical movement and that joint angles at PTA and  
438 trajectory deviation and maximal velocity are useful parameters to assess these differences.

439 This study warrants some critical reflections. As DCP is much less prevalent than spastic CP and the  
440 children with DCP who have sufficient reaching and grasping possibilities to execute functional upper  
441 limb tasks are a minority within the DCP group, the age range of the participants was large, as it is  
442 not straightforward to obtain a large sample size. Multicentre efforts may help to increase the  
443 sample size in future studies, allowing for a larger representation of dyskinetic movement patterns  
444 and an age-related group analyses. Due to the large age range, a distinction could not be made  
445 between immature and mature movement patterns, as the latter were previously found to occur at

446 the age of 12 years old (28). Second, the high ratio between-within session errors for the scapula  
447 joint means that palpation inaccuracies at the level of the scapula influence the scapulothoracic joint  
448 angles to a large extent, suggesting that these angles may be slightly less reliable when evaluated  
449 over time. A possibility to improve errors in future measurements could be to palpate the  
450 anatomical landmarks of the scapula twice and use an averaged value of two palpations for each  
451 session.

## 452 **Conclusion**

453 This is the first study to report the psychometric properties of upper limb kinematics in participants  
454 with DCP during functional tasks, yielding excellent within-session, moderate to good between-  
455 session repeatability and good content validity. Thereby, this study provides a first step towards an  
456 optimisation of the current treatment strategies by examining the movement patterns using  
457 objective features in children and adolescents with DCP. As previous studies mainly focused on  
458 upper limb kinematics in children with spastic hemiplegic CP, our results emphasized the importance  
459 of a personalized approach for children and adolescents with DCP. We advise to include a minimum  
460 of eight repetitions when recording the upper limb movement patterns in children and adolescents  
461 with DCP, as to capture the full variability present in the movement pattern when executing  
462 functional tasks.

## 463 **Declaration of interests**

464 The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships  
465 that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

## 466 **Acknowledgements**

467 The author would like to thank the participants and their parents for the time and effort to  
468 participate in this study.

469

470

471

472

473

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

485 **References**







- 486 1. Rosenbaum P, Paneth N, Leviton A, Goldstein M, Bax M, Damiano D, et al. A report: the  
487 definition and classification of cerebral palsy April 2006. *Developmental Medicine & Child*  
488 *Neurology*.49(109):8-14.
- 489 2. Cans C, Dolk H, Platt MJ, Colver A, Prasauskiene A, Krageloh-Mann I, et al. Recommendations  
490 from the SCPE collaborative group for defining and classifying cerebral palsy. *Dev Med Child Neurol*.  
491 2007;49:35-8.
- 492 3. Bax M, Tydeman C, Flodmark O. Clinical and MRI correlates of cerebral palsy: the European  
493 Cerebral Palsy Study. *Jama*. 2006;296(13):1602-8.
- 494 4. Himmelmann K, Hagberg G, Wiklund LM, Eek MN, Uvebrant P. Dyskinetic cerebral palsy: a  
495 population-based study of children born between 1991 and 1998. *Dev Med Child Neurol*.  
496 2007;49(4):246-51.
- 497 5. Monbaliu E, Himmelmann K, Lin J-P, Ortibus E, Bonouvrié L, Feys H, et al. Clinical  
498 presentation and management of dyskinetic cerebral palsy. *The Lancet Neurology*. 2017;16(9):741-9.
- 499 6. Albanese A, Bhatia K, Bressman SB, Delong MR, Fahn S, Fung VS, et al. Phenomenology and  
500 classification of dystonia: a consensus update. *Mov Disord*. 2013;28(7):863-73.
- 501 7. Burke RE, Fahn S, Marsden CD, Bressman SB, Moskowitz C, Friedman J. Validity and reliability  
502 of a rating scale for the primary torsion dystonias. *Neurology*. 1985;35(1):73-7.
- 503 8. Barry MJ, VanSwearingen JM, Albright AL. Reliability and responsiveness of the Barry-  
504 Albright Dystonia Scale. *Dev Med Child Neurol*. 1999;41(6):404-11.
- 505 9. Monbaliu E, Ortibus ELS, de Cat JOS, Dan B, Heyrman L, Prinzie P, et al. The Dyskinesia  
506 Impairment Scale: a new instrument to measure dystonia and choreoathetosis in dyskinetic cerebral  
507 palsy. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology*. 2012;54(3):278-83.
- 508 10. Stewart K, Harvey A, Johnston LM. A systematic review of scales to measure dystonia and  
509 choreoathetosis in children with dyskinetic cerebral palsy. *Dev Med Child Neurol*. 2017;59(8):786-95.
- 510 11. Gordon LM, Keller JL, Stashinko EE, Hoon AH, Bastian AJ. Can spasticity and dystonia be  
511 independently measured in cerebral palsy? *Pediatric neurology*. 2006;35(6):375-81.
- 512 12. Sanger TD. Arm trajectories in dyskinetic cerebral palsy have increased random variability. *J*  
513 *Child Neurol*. 2006;21(7):551-7.
- 514 13. Reid S, Elliott C, Alderson J, Lloyd D, Elliott B. Repeatability of upper limb kinematics for  
515 children with and without cerebral palsy. *Gait Posture*. 2010;32(1):10-7.
- 516 14. Mackey AH, Walt SE, Lobb GA, Stott NS. Reliability of upper and lower limb three-  
517 dimensional kinematics in children with hemiplegia. *Gait Posture*. 2005;22(1):1-9.
- 518 15. Schneiberg S, McKinley P, Gisel E, Sveistrup H, Levin MF. Reliability of kinematic measures of  
519 functional reaching in children with cerebral palsy. *Dev Med Child Neurol*. 2010;52(7):e167-73.
- 520 16. Rönqvist L, Rösblad B. Kinematic analysis of unimanual reaching and grasping movements  
521 in children with hemiplegic cerebral palsy. *Clinical biomechanics (Bristol, Avon)*. 2007;22(2):165-75.
- 522 17. Butler EE, Ladd AL, Louie SA, Lamont LE, Wong W, Rose J. Three-dimensional kinematics of  
523 the upper limb during a Reach and Grasp Cycle for children. *Gait Posture*. 2010;32(1):72-7.
- 524 18. Jaspers E, Feys H, Bruyninckx H, Cutti A, Harlaar J, Molenaers G, et al. The reliability of upper  
525 limb kinematics in children with hemiplegic cerebral palsy. *Gait Posture*. 2011;33(4):568-75.
- 526 19. Jaspers E, Feys H, Bruyninckx H, Harlaar J, Molenaers G, Desloovere K. Upper limb  
527 kinematics: development and reliability of a clinical protocol for children. *Gait Posture*.  
528 2011;33(2):279-85.
- 529 20. Jaspers E, Desloovere K, Bruyninckx H, Klingels K, Molenaers G, Aertbelien E, et al. Three-  
530 dimensional upper limb movement characteristics in children with hemiplegic cerebral palsy and  
531 typically developing children. *Res Dev Disabil*. 2011;32(6):2283-94.







- 532 21. Kreulen M, Smeulders MJ, Veeger HE, Hage JJ. Movement patterns of the upper extremity  
533 and trunk associated with impaired forearm rotation in patients with hemiplegic cerebral palsy  
534 compared to healthy controls. *Gait Posture*. 2007;25(3):485-92.
- 535 22. Mackey AH, Walt SE, Stott NS. Deficits in upper-limb task performance in children with  
536 hemiplegic cerebral palsy as defined by 3-dimensional kinematics. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*.  
537 2006;87(2):207-15.
- 538 23. Butler EE, Rose J. The pediatric upper limb motion index and a temporal-spatial logistic  
539 regression: quantitative analysis of upper limb movement disorders during the Reach & Grasp Cycle.  
540 *Journal of biomechanics*. 2012;45(6):945-51.
- 541 24. Eliasson AC, Krumlinde-Sundholm L, Rösblad B, Beckung E, Arner M, Ohrvall AM, et al. The  
542 Manual Ability Classification System (MACS) for children with cerebral palsy: scale development and  
543 evidence of validity and reliability. *Dev Med Child Neurol*. 2006;48(7):549-54.
- 544 25. Wu G, van der Helm FC, Veeger HE, Makhsous M, Van Roy P, Anglin C, et al. ISB  
545 recommendation on definitions of joint coordinate systems of various joints for the reporting of  
546 human joint motion--Part II: shoulder, elbow, wrist and hand. *Journal of biomechanics*.  
547 2005;38(5):981-92.
- 548 26. Weir JP. Quantifying test-retest reliability using the intraclass correlation coefficient and the  
549 SEM. *J Strength Cond Res*. 2005;19(1):231-40.
- 550 27. Steenbergen B, Thiel Ev, Hulstijn W, Meulenbroek RGJ. The coordination of reaching and  
551 grasping in spastic hemiparesis. *Human Movement Science*. 2000;19(1):75-105.
- 552 28. Simon-Martinez C, Dos Santos GL, Jaspers E, Vanderschueren R, Mailleux L, Klingels K, et al.  
553 Age-related changes in upper limb motion during typical development. *PLoS one*.  
554 2018;13(6):e0198524.





555






**A** TD - REACH FORWARD**B** TD - REACH AND GRASP VERTICAL**C** TD - REACH SIDEWAYS**D** DCP - REACH FORWARD**E** DCP - REACH AND GRASP VERTICAL**F** DCP - REACH SIDEWAYS






medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.22.22272632>; this version posted March 23, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.




**A**




## Intrinsic variability between S1 and S2

**B**


## Extrinsic variability between test and test-retest




bioRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.22.22272632>; this version posted March 23, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

**A****Reach forward****B****Reach and grasp vertical****C****Reach sideways**

### A Spatio-temporal parameters - Intrinsic variability between S1 and S2



### B Spatio-temporal parameters - Extrinsic variability between test and retest



### C Spatio-temporal parameters - Absolute difference vs between-session SEM

