A Combination of Constraint-Induced Therapy and Motor Control Retraining in the Treatment of Focal Hand Dystonia in Musicians – A Long-term Follow-up Study

Presented by: Patrice Berque BSc (Hons) MMACP MAACP MCSP HPC Chartered Physiotherapist, Glasgow UK

> MPPA July 2012 Snowmass - Colorado

#### Focal Hand Dystonia

(Elbert et al. 1998, Lederman 2002, Schuele & Lederman 2003, Brandfonbrener et al. 2004, Frucht 2004, Lim et al. 2004, Conti et al. 2008, Frucht 2009, Altenmuller & Jabusch 2010)

- Painless motor disorder.
- Involuntary loss of fine motor control and coordination of individual finger movements.
- Deterioration of sensorimotor skills, task-specific.
- Usually involving 3<sup>rd</sup> to 5<sup>th</sup> digits.
- Estimated prevalence of less than 1% of the population of professional musicians.

Focal Hand Dystonia – Neurological Changes (Ikoma et al 1996, Elbert et al. 1998, Hallett 1998, Bara-Jimenez et al. 2000, Hallett 2004, Rosenkranz et al 2005, Lin & Hallett 2009, Altenmuller & Jabusch 2010)

- Reduced inhibition and increased excitation at spinal cord, brainstem, and cortical levels, leading to excessive motor output with overflow into inappropriate muscles.
- This would explain co-contraction of agonist and antagonist muscles observed in FHD.
- · Altered sensory perception;
- Impaired sensorimotor integration;
- maladaptive cortical plasticity.



# FHD - Management Strategies

- Limb immobilisation (Priori et al., 2001);
- Learning-based sensory training (Byl et al., 2009);
- Sensory retraining Braille reading (Zeuner et al., 2002);
- Proprioceptive retraining (Rosenkranz et al., 2009);
- Constraint-induced therapy (Candia et al., 2002);
- Motor Control Retraining "Slow-Down Exercise" (Sakai, 2006).

# AIMS

- Investigate the long-term effects of a combined behavioural therapy in musicians affected by FHD, 3 years after completion of the initial 12-month study = 4-year follow-up:
  - Constraint-induced therapy.
  - Motor control retraining (Slow-Down Exercise).
- Subsidiary aim: reliability study of the outcome measures: ADDS, TCS, FAM scales.

#### A Combination of Constraint-induced Therapy and Motor Control Retraining in the Treatment of Focal Hand Dystonia in Musicians

Patrice Benque, BSc (Hons), MCSP, Heather Gray, MSc, MCSP, Cassandra Harkness, BSc, MCSP, and Angus McFadyen, PhD

Foch and dynamic (HHC) meansizane is a pailow trade-gotted motor desclared horizontal bar an investigation of the study was to intestiinglicitation of the study was to intestigate the study of the effect of an investigation of the study was to intestigate the effect of a minimum bar balancian dherapy intervention, HRI Aucheak-Eight musician volumeered to take part in the particular particular distribution of the study of the control means of the study of the study of the control means of the study of the study of the particular distribution of the study of narry loss of control and accordination of individual fugge assemment.<sup>14</sup> IR is a disperfer maximized with a maddrer with solution thereinstants of some intermetion with a subdrer maximized asses, only occurs in the context of interment planing.<sup>15</sup> moduntary spasms, cramping sensations, absormal hand onture, finger cutiling, loss of coordination during specific ingerings, ingers atsking on the keys of the instrument. Arr more other moves a digits  $\lambda_s$  and  $S(\Omega)$  is to D3) of the analysis of the solution of the solution of the instrument oblight precise of repla, laterating, and highly precise and and precise of repla, laterating, and highly precise blane means to cortain a more should nece  $^{10,000}$ .

#### valence Amongst M

TSD has been estimated to affect between 5% and 14% or maximum committing performing arts clinics in the US  $^{33/2}$ his would give an estimated prevalence of 0.2% to 0.5% in a population of professional massitians.<sup>2</sup> Tocal hand dymain (HD) occurs much more frequently in males than miles. One stubp<sup>120</sup> recoiled that 7% of intrumentarily freed were man, mo others reported  $80\%^4$  and 80%

| Subjects   |                      |      |                        |            |  |  |  |
|------------|----------------------|------|------------------------|------------|--|--|--|
| Instrument | Dystonia             | Side | Onset                  | Compliance |  |  |  |
| Guitar 1   | D3, D4, D5           | R    | 2006                   | 95%        |  |  |  |
| Guitar 2   | D3, D4, D5           | R    | 1982                   | 76%        |  |  |  |
| Flute 1    | D4, D5               | L    | 2002 (D5)<br>2006 (D4) | 95%        |  |  |  |
| Flute 2    | D4, D5               | R    | 2004                   | 95%        |  |  |  |
| Piper 1    | D5                   | R    | 2005                   | 77%        |  |  |  |
| Piper 2    | D3, D4               | R    | 1995                   | 40%        |  |  |  |
| Oboe       | D4, D5               | R    | 2006                   | 88%        |  |  |  |
| Accordeon  | D3, Wrist,<br>D2, D4 | R    | 2005                   | N/A        |  |  |  |

SubjectsImage: Subject sizeImage: Subject size<

#### **Outcome Measures**

- 2 test pieces: easy and medium difficulty;
- Frequency of Abnormal Movements (FAM) scale (Spector & Brandfonbrener, 2005);
- 2 ordinal Dystonia Evaluation Scales:
  Tubiana & Chamagne Scale (TCS),
  Arm Dystonia Disability Scale (ADDS);
- Change in metronome speed achieved during Slow-Down Exercise (Sakai, 2006).

# Hypothesis

Significant differences in FAM scores, ordinal scale scores, and metronome speeds at the 4-year follow-up.

## Study Design

- Repeated Measures Design: subjects tested at Day 1, Day 8, then every 2 months up to Month 12; and Year 4.
- Standardised protocol;
- Standardised metronome speed for each piece.





# Home Protocol

- Week 1: constraint-induced therapy only. 2 hours per day;
- Constraint-induced: <sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> hour to 1 hour per day;
- Slow-Down Exercise: <sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> hour per day;
- No monitoring of subjects between Month 12 and Year 4.

# Outcome Measures – Reliability

(Spector & Brandfonbrener 2005, Spector & Brandfonbrener, 2007)

- Lack of evaluation of the clinical utility of common outcome measures used in studies on FHD:
  - TCS never evaluated for reliability.
  - ADDS evaluated in one study only (Spector & Brandfonbrener, 2005).
  - FAM developed by Spector & Brandfonbrener and evaluated in their study (Spector & Brandfonbrener, 2005).

| Intra-rater (PB)<br>Day 1 TCS     0.70     0.023     0.04-0.93       Day 1 ADDS     0.92     <0.001     0.67-0.98       Month 2 TCS     0.90     <0.001     0.60-0.98       Month 2 TCS     0.90     <0.001     0.60-0.98       Intra-rater (RH)     0.76     0.010     0.20-0.95       Day 1 ADDS     0.93     <0.001     0.72-0.99       Month 2 ADDS     0.94     <0.001     0.73-0.99       Month 2 ADDS     0.94     <0.001     0.73-0.99       Inter-rater     0.94     <0.001     0.73-0.99       Inter-rater     0.90     <0.001     0.55-0.98       Month 2 TCS     0.90     <0.001     0.55-0.98       Month 2 TCS     0.76     0.003     0.16-0.98 | Test             | ICC  | p-value | 95% CI    |
|---|------------------|------|---------|-----------|
| Day I TCS     0.70     0.023     0.044.93       Day I ADDS     0.92     <0.001  | Intra-rater (PB) |      |         |           |
| Day 1 ADDS     0.92     <0.001     0.67-0.98       Month 2 TCS     0.90     <0.001  | Day 1 TCS        | 0.70 | 0.023   | 0.04-0.93 |
| Month 2 TCS     0.90     <0.001     0.60-0.98       Month 2 ADDS     1.00     <0.001  | Day 1 ADDS       | 0.92 | < 0.001 | 0.67-0.98 |
| Month 2 ADDS     1.00     <0.001     -       Intra-rater (RH)     0.76     0.010     0.20-0.95       Day 1 TCS     0.93     <0.001  | Month 2 TCS      | 0.90 | < 0.001 | 0.60-0.98 |
| Intra-rater (RH)     0.76     0.010     0.20-0.95       Day 1 ADDS     0.93     <0.001  | Month 2 ADDS     | 1.00 | < 0.001 | -         |
| Intra-rater (RH)     0.76     0.010     0.20-0.95       Day 1 TCS     0.93     <0.001   |                  |      |         |           |
| Day 1 TCS     0.76     0.010     0.20-0.95       Day 1 ADDS     0.93     <0.001   | Intra-rater (RH) |      |         |           |
| Day 1 ADDS     0.93     <0.001     0.72-0.99       Month 2 TCS     0.90     <0.001  | Day 1 TCS        | 0.76 | 0.010   | 0.20-0.95 |
| Month 2 TCS     0.90     <0.001     0.60-0.98       Month 2 ADDS     0.94     <0.001  | Day 1 ADDS       | 0.93 | < 0.001 | 0.72-0.99 |
| Month 2 ADDS     0.94     <0.001     0.73-0.99       Inter-rater     0.90     <0.001  | Month 2 TCS      | 0.90 | < 0.001 | 0.60-0.98 |
| Inter-rater     0.90     <0.001     0.39-0.98       Day 1 TCS     0.88     0.001     0.55-0.98       Month 2 TCS     0.76     0.003     0.16-0.95   | Month 2 ADDS     | 0.94 | < 0.001 | 0.73-0.99 |
| Inter-rater     0.90     <0.001     0.39-0.98       Day I TCS     0.88     0.001     0.55-0.98       Month 2 TCS     0.76     0.003     0.16-0.95   |                  |      |         |           |
| Day 1 TCS     0.90     <0.001     0.39-0.98       Day 1 ADDS     0.88     0.001     0.55-0.98       Month 2 TCS     0.76     0.003     0.16-0.95  | Inter-rater      |      |         |           |
| Day 1 ADDS     0.88     0.001     0.55-0.98       Month 2 TCS     0.76     0.003     0.16-0.95  | Day 1 TCS        | 0.90 | < 0.001 | 0.39-0.98 |
| Month 2 TCS 0.76 0.003 0.16-0.95  | Day 1 ADDS       | 0.88 | 0.001   | 0.55-0.98 |
|   | Month 2 TCS      | 0.76 | 0.003   | 0.16-0.95 |

| TCS     | Stage Definition  |
|---------|---|
| Stage 0 | Unable to play  |
| Stage 1 | Plays several notes but stops because of<br>blockage or lack of facility            |
| Stage 2 | Plays short sequences without rapidity and with unsteady fingering                  |
| Stage 3 | Plays easy pieces but is unable to perform<br>more technically challenging pieces   |
| Stage 4 | Plays almost normally but difficult passages are avoided for fear of motor problems |
| Stage 5 | Returns to concert performances   |

# Patrice Berque





| Question   | 5.1 | 0.2 | 5.5 | 0.4 |  |
|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|
| On average, how many days per week did<br>you practise your specific exercises?  | 5   | 4   | 4   | 6   |  |
| On average, how many practice sessions<br>would you normally do per day for your<br>specific exercises?  | 1   | 1   | 1   | 2   |  |
| How long have your average practice<br>sessions been for your specific exercises:<br>- Less than 15 minutes?<br>- Between 15 minutes and half an hour?<br>- Between half an hour and one hour? | V   |     | V   | √ . |  |







# Limitations

- No control group;
- Small sample;
- Skewed follow-up results for the medium difficulty piece;
- Two strategies were used.

#### Clinical Recommendations

- A 1-year retraining protocol may lead to long-term benefits for musicians with FHD;
- Progress maintained with only 15 to 30 minutes of daily specific practice;
- Intensive retraining for more than 6 months;
- The FAM scale is a useful and valid clinical tool;
- The TCS and ADDS showed good to very good intra- and inter- reliability.

## Co-authors

- Heather Gray, Senior Lecturer, Glasgow Caledonian University.
- Angus McFadyen, Statistical Consultant, formerly Reader in Health Statistics at Glasgow Caledonian University.