

Combined somatosensory and motor training to improve upper limb recovery after stroke

Urvashy Gopaul

BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, University of Mauritius, Mauritius

MSc Physiotherapy, University of Nottingham, UK

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Physiotherapy

December 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STATEMENT OF ORIGINALITY	xiii
ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF AUTHORSHIP	xiv
SUPERVISORS	xv
ACKNOWLEDGMENT.....	xvi
PUBLICATIONS ARISING FROM THIS THESIS	xviii
PRESENTATIONS ARISING FROM THIS THESIS	xix
PUBLISHED ABSTRACTS FROM THIS THESIS.....	xxi
AWARDS.....	xxii
CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT	xxiii
LIST OF TABLES.....	xxiv
LIST OF FIGURES.....	xxvii
COMMON ABBREVIATIONS	xxix
THESIS ABSTRACT.....	xxx
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 OVERVIEW	1
1.2 BACKGROUND	1
1.2.1 Aetiology of stroke	1
1.2.2 Epidemiology of stroke.....	1
1.2.3 Cost implications associated with stroke	2
1.2.4 Motor and somatosensory deficits after stroke.....	3
1.2.5 Stroke recovery and upper limb interventions	4
1.2.6 Framework for the development of rehabilitation interventions	5
1.2.7 Overarching research question	8
1.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS	8
1.4 RESEARCH AIMS	9

1.5 HYPOTHESIS.....	9
1.6 THESIS STRUCTURE.....	9
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	14
2.1 OVERVIEW	14
2.2 MOTOR AND SOMATOSENSORY SYSTEM OF THE UPPER LIMB.....	14
2.2.1 Upper limb motor system.....	14
2.2.2 Upper limb somatosensory control.....	15
2.3 REACH-TO-GRASP IN HEALTHY INDIVIDUALS.....	17
2.3.1 Transport phase.....	18
2.3.2 Grasp phase	20
2.4 DEFICITS IN REACH-TO-GRASP AFTER STROKE.....	23
2.4.1 Deficits in the transport phase (reach).....	23
2.4.2 Deficits in grasp phase	23
2.5 IMPACT OF DEFICITS IN TACTILE SOMATOSENSATION ON GRASP.....	24
2.6 FUNCTIONAL RECOVERY AND RESIDUAL IMPAIRMENTS POST-STROKE	25
2.7 NEUROPLASTICITY UNDERLYING SOMATOSENSORY AND MOTOR RECOVERY.....	26
2.8 STRATEGIES TO OPTIMISE UPPER LIMB INTERVENTIONS.....	28
2.8.1 Intensive repetitive practice.....	28
2.8.2 Augmented feedback	29
2.9 EVALUATION OF GRASP DEFICITS	32
2.10 EVALUATION OF TEST-RETEST RELIABILITY	34
2.11 CONCLUSION	36
CHAPTER 3: COMBINED SOMATOSENSORY AND MOTOR TRAINING TO IMPROVE UPPER LIMB FUNCTION FOLLOWING STROKE: A SYSTEMATIC SCOPING REVIEW.....	37
3.1 ABSTRACT	38
3.2 INTRODUCTION	40

3.2.1 Background	40
3.2.2 Objectives	41
3.3 METHODS	41
3.3.1 Identification of studies	42
3.3.2 Inclusion criteria	43
3.3.2.1 Design of Studies.....	43
3.3.2.2 Types of Participants.....	43
3.3.2.3 Interventions.....	43
3.3.2.4 Outcome measures.....	44
3.3.3 Selection of studies.....	44
3.3.4 Assessment of methodological quality.....	45
3.3.5 Data extraction and management.....	45
3.3.6 Data synthesis.....	46
3.4 RESULTS	46
3.4.1 Study designs	48
3.4.2 Methodological quality scores (SEQES) and level of evidence.....	48
3.4.3 Participants	50
3.4.4 Experimental interventions	50
3.4.5 Outcome measures	62
3.4.6 Efficacy of “combined somatosensory and motor training” interventions	62
3.5 DISCUSSION	64
3.5.1 Training component combinations	65
3.5.2 Augmented feedback	67
3.5.3 Dosage parameters.....	67
3.5.4 Varied tasks, grading complexity and progression of task difficulty.....	68
3.5.5 Severity of deficits and timing of rehabilitation.....	68

3.5.6 Strengths and limitations	69
3.5.7 Implications for rehabilitation	70
3.5.8 Future research	70
3.6 CONCLUSION	71
Appendix 3.1	72
Appendix 3.2	74
CHAPTER 4: COMBINED PHYSICAL AND SOMATOSENSORY TRAINING AFTER STROKE: DEVELOPMENT AND DESCRIPTION OF A NOVEL INTERVENTION TO IMPROVE UPPER LIMB FUNCTION	76
4.1 ABSTRACT	78
4.2 INTRODUCTION	79
4.2.1 Background	79
4.2.2 Objectives	81
4.3 METHODS	81
4.4 RESULTS	83
4.4.1 Item 1. Brief name	83
4.4.2 Item 2. Why: Rationale for the intervention	83
4.4.3 Item 3. What: Materials used in the intervention	85
4.4.4 Item 4. What: Procedures, activities, and/or processes used in the intervention	86
4.4.4.1 Critical components of the COMPoSE intervention	86
4.4.4.2 Matrix of specially designed training tasks with progressive and systematic grading of somatosensory-motor tasks according to specific parameters	86
4.4.4.3 Performance of goal-directed somatosensory-motor tasks (reach-to-grasp and lift-and-hold) under two conditions of practice (i.e., vision vs no vision)	89
4.4.4.4 Targeted feedback about both motor and somatosensory attributes of the task and performance	92
4.4.4.5 Varied and intensive practice	94

4.4.5 Item 5. Who provided: Description of the expertise, background, and training given to intervention provider	95
4.4.6 Item 6. How: Mode of intervention delivery.....	96
4.4.7 Item 7. Where: Location of intervention delivery	96
4.4.8 Item 8. When and How Much.....	96
4.4.9 Item 9. Tailoring: Individualising the intervention	98
4.5 DISCUSSION	98
4.6 CONCLUSION	100
Appendix 4.1	101
CHAPTER 5: THE COMBINED PHYSICAL AND SOMATOSENSORY TRAINING INTERVENTION TO IMPROVE UPPER LIMB RECOVERY AFTER STROKE: A FEASIBILITY STUDY.....	114
5.1 ABSTRACT	117
5.2 INTRODUCTION	119
5.2.1 Background	119
5.2.2 Objectives	119
5.3 METHODS	120
5.3.1 Objective 1.....	120
5.3.1.1 Participants	120
5.3.1.2 Ethics approval.....	121
5.3.1.3 Study design	121
5.3.1.4 Setting	124
5.3.1.5 COMPoSE intervention protocol.....	124
5.3.1.6 Laboratory and clinical assessments	126
5.3.2 Objective 2.....	130
5.3.2.1 Review of the intervention protocol and feasibility of the study design	130
5.3.2.2 Acceptability of the intervention and trial to the participants.....	131

5.3.3 Objective 3	132
5.3.4 Data analysis	132
5.4 RESULTS	134
5.4.1 Objective 1 and 2: Recruitment of participants	134
5.4.1.1 Recruitment of participants	134
5.4.1.2 Participant characteristics	136
5.4.2 Objective 2: Feasibility of conduct of the COMPoSE intervention trial	138
5.4.2.1 Review of the intervention protocol and feasibility of study design	138
5.4.2.2 Measures of fidelity	138
5.4.2.3 Participant's adherence	141
5.4.2.4 Participants' engagement	141
5.4.2.5 Participants' tolerability and adverse effects of the COMPoSE intervention	143
5.4.2.6 Acceptability of intervention and trial to participants	144
5.4.2.7 Appropriateness of data collection procedures	145
5.4.2.8 Evaluation of resources required to conduct the COMPoSE trial	148
5.4.3 Objective 3: Preliminary impact of intervention on participants.....	148
5.4.3.1 Individual participant analyses	155
5.4.3.2 Group analyses.....	161
5.5 DISCUSSION	168
5.5.1 Recruitment of participants	168
5.5.2 Contents of the COMPoSE intervention protocol	170
5.5.2.1 Specificity of training	171
5.5.2.2 Review of feedback delivery	171
5.5.2.3 Amount of practice and impact on somatosensory and motor learning	173
5.5.2.4 Use of visual conditions in somatosensory-motor training approaches	174
5.5.2.5 Use of the less affected hand for calibration.....	175

5.5.2.6 Observed limitations of the COMPoSE intervention protocol	175
5.5.2.7 Suggestions to make the COMPoSE intervention more challenging.....	176
5.5.2.8 Participants' engagement	177
5.5.2.9 Tolerability and acceptability of the COMPoSE intervention	178
5.5.2.10 Participants' experience of task performance.....	178
5.5.3 Data collection procedures and outcome measures	179
5.5.3.1 Selection of outcome measures	179
5.5.3.2 Impact of responsiveness of outcome measures	180
5.5.3.3 Burden of data collection procedures	181
5.5.3.4 Appropriateness of outcome measures	182
5.5.4 Preliminary impact of the intervention on participants.....	183
5.5.4.1 Impact of lack of stability of baseline measures.....	183
5.5.4.2 Impact of the COMPoSE intervention.....	185
5.5.4.3 Possible reasons for the varying impact of the COMPoSE intervention	186
5.5.5 Strengths and limitations	190
5.5.6 Implications for rehabilitation.....	191
5.5.7 Recommendations for future trial.....	191
5.6 CONCLUSION	192
Appendix 5.1	193
Appendix 5.2.	213
Appendix 5.3	219
Appendix 5.4	221
Appendix 5.5	223
CHAPTER 6: RELIABILITY OF MAXIMAL TACTILE PRESSURES AND FORCES OF A SUSTAINED GRASP TASK USING A TACTARRAY DEVICE IN HEALTHY PEOPLE AND IN PEOPLE WITH STROKE	225

6.1 ABSTRACT	228
6.2 INTRODUCTION	230
6.2.1 Background	230
6.2.2 Objectives	233
6.3 METHODS	234
6.3.1 Design	234
6.3.2 Participants	234
6.3.2.1 Healthy participants.....	234
6.3.2.2 Participants with stroke	235
6.3.3 Data collection with TactArray device.....	236
6.3.3.1 Description of TactArray device.....	236
6.3.3.2 Procedure for assessing maximal tactile pressures.....	237
6.3.3.3 Data processing.....	239
6.3.4 Data analysis	242
6.3.4.1 Test–retest reliability analysis	242
6.3.4.2 Indices of reliability.....	242
6.3.4.3 Analysis of variance	244
6.4 RESULTS.....	244
6.4.1 Participants characteristics.....	244
6.4.2 Results of primary objectives	248
6.4.2.1 Reliability of values of maximal tactile pressures/forces in healthy participants	248
6.4.2.2 Reliability of values of maximal tactile pressures/forces in participants with stroke	260
6.4.2.3 Most reliable measures of maximal tactile pressures or forces.....	272
6.4.2.4 Systematic error.....	273

6.4.2.5 Heteroscedasticity	274
6.4.3 Results of secondary objectives	275
6.4.3.1 Differences in maximal tactile pressures between vision conditions and between hands	275
6.4.3.2 Investigation of values of maximal tactile pressures between healthy participants and participants with stroke	276
6.5 DISCUSSION	277
6.5.1 Changes in mean	278
6.5.2 Coefficients of variation	278
6.5.3 Smallest detectable change	282
6.5.4 ICCs	283
6.5.5 Complete grasp duration and plateau phase	283
6.5.6 Number of trials	284
6.5.7 Impact of testing with and without vision	284
6.5.8 Differences in values of maximal tactile pressures between sides in healthy participants and participants with stroke	285
6.5.9 Implications for research and clinical practice	286
6.5.10 Limitations	287
6.5.11 Recommendations for future trials	288
6.6 CONCLUSION	288
Appendix 6.1	289
Appendix 6.2	294
CHAPTER 7: THESIS DISCUSSION	296
7.1 OVERVIEW	296
7.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	298
7.2.1 Summary of findings from systematic scoping review	298

7.2.2 Summary of findings from the development and description of the COMPoSE intervention	299
7.2.3 Summary of findings from the feasibility study of the COMPoSE intervention to improve upper limb recovery after stroke	300
7.2.4 Summary of findings from an exploratory study on the reliability of maximal tactile pressures and forces during sustained grasp task using aTactArray device in healthy people and in people with stroke	302
7.3 OVERALL DISCUSSION	304
7.3.1 Strengths and limitations of intervention development.....	305
7.3.2 Strengths and limitations of single-case experimental designs	306
7.3.3 Strengths and limitations of participation selection criteria.....	307
7.3.4 Strengths and limitations of combined somatosensory and motor training interventions	307
7.3.5 Strengths and limitations of dosage parameters	309
7.3.6 Strengths and limitations of outcome measures	310
7.4 CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS.....	311
7.5 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH ON THE COMPOSE INTERVENTION...	311
7.5.1 Refinement of study design	312
7.5.2 Refinement of participants' selection criteria	312
7.5.3 Refinement of COMPoSE intervention protocol	313
7.5.4 Refinement of dosage parameters	313
7.5.5 Refinement of outcome measures	314
7.5.6 Refinement of data analysis	315
7.5.7 Refinement of overall hypothesis.....	316
7.6 CONCLUSION	316
REFERENCES	317

STATEMENT OF ORIGINALITY

I hereby certify that the work embodied in the thesis is my own work, conducted under normal supervision.

The thesis contains no material which has been accepted, or is being examined, for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made. I give consent to the final version of my thesis being made available worldwide when deposited in the University's Digital Repository, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968 and any approved embargo.

Signed:

Name: Urvashy Gopaul

Date: 31stDecember 2018

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF AUTHORSHIP

I hereby certify that the work embodied in this thesis contains published papers/scholarly work of which I am a joint author. I have included as part of the thesis a written declaration endorsed in writing by my supervisor, attesting to my contribution to the joint publications/scholarly work.

Chapters 1 and 2 were written with editorial support of my supervisors.

For Chapter 3, I conducted a systematic scoping review and write the first draft. This was followed by editorial support from my supervisors.

For Chapters 4, 5 and 6, I designed all aspects of the projects in collaboration with my supervisors. I conducted all outcome measures for Chapter 6, analysed all data for Chapter 5 and 6 and wrote the first draft of all three chapters. This was followed by editorial support from my supervisors.

Chapter 7 was written with editorial support of my supervisors.

By signing below I confirm that Urvashy Gopaul contributed to the following publications as stated above:

Gopaul U, van Vliet P, Callister R, Nilsson M & Carey L. COMbined Physical and somatoSEnsory training after stroke: Development and description of a novel intervention to improve upper limb function. *Physiotherapy Research International*. 2018;0(0):e1748.(Published)

Gopaul U, Carey LM, Callister R, Nilsson M, van Vliet P. Combined somatosensory and motor training to improve upper limb function following stroke: a systematic scoping review. *Physical Therapy Reviews*.DOI: 10.1080/10833196.2018.1553668 (In press)

Robin Callister

SUPERVISORS

Primary supervisor

Professor Robin Callister

Priority Research Centre for Physical Activity and Nutrition

School of Biomedical Sciences and Pharmacy

Faculty of Health and Medicine

University of Newcastle, Australia

Co-supervisors

Professor Paulette van Vliet

Priority Research Centre for Stroke and Brain Injury

University of Newcastle, Australia

Professor Michael Nilsson

Priority Research Centre for Stroke and Brain Injury

School of Medicine and Public Health

Faculty of Health and Medicine

University of Newcastle, Australia

Professor Leeanne Carey

Florey Institute of Neuroscience and Mental Health

La Trobe University

Melbourne, Australia

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

My research could not have been completed without the help and support of several people. Firstly, I am profoundly grateful to all my supervisors: Professor Robin Callister, Professor Paulette van Vliet, Professor Leeanne Carey and Professor Michael Nilsson for bringing me into this fabulous world of research. Each of you has contributed to making my journey, one of the best learning experiences in life. Thank you for sharing your experience, for guiding me and for inspiring me during this journey. You have been great mentors and had such a determinant impact on my growth, as a researcher but also at a personal level. Your constant encouragement and faith in me have been the driving force behind this research.

Professor Robin Callister, thank you for ‘adopting’ me as your student. I have learnt so much from you and I have immensely enjoyed all our discussions. This achievement would not have been possible without you. Your generosity and your countless support have touched me many times, for which I will be forever grateful. You have been an exemplary role model to me and inspired me to do even better when I get back to academia.

Professor Paulette van Vliet, thank you for seeing my potential as a researcher and for giving me the chance to work with you. Thank you for guiding me, questioning me and challenging me to think beyond my limits all the time.

Professor Leeanne Carey, thank you for sharing your knowledge with me and for the passionate discussions. Thank you for listening and being receptive to my ideas and thoughts. Your insight and attention to detail have been very pertinent every step of the way.

Professor Michael Nilsson, thank you for your ongoing support throughout this thesis. Thank you for always listening to me and guiding me in my career path. Your mentorship, kindness, generosity and critical eye for science have served as constant reminders of how to be a true scholar.

My heartfelt thanks go to all the participants in my studies. Without your dedication, resilience, invaluable support, and trust, none of this research would have been possible. Through each of you, I have gained invaluable knowledge about stroke, about humankind and about life. Thank you for keeping me grounded and inspiring me to pursue my career in stroke rehabilitation.

I would also like to thank Professor Derek Laver who has provided crucial support with MATLAB and Associate Professor Thomas Matyas for statistical support. I also wish to acknowledge the support of the Priority Research Centre Stroke and Brain Injury and the National Health and Medical Research Council Centre of Research Excellence in Stroke Rehabilitation and Brain Recovery for supporting my attendance at conferences. In addition, I would like to acknowledge the University of Newcastle for the Research Higher Degree post-graduate scholarship.

This thesis has not been a smooth ride but I was not alone in this. Thank you Sarah Valkenborghs for all the amazing, funny and random discussions about science and facts of life in general. All of it has made the rough ride entertaining and certainly more pleasant.

I also wish to sincerely thank my family members and friends in Australia and across the globe, who have always provided their support, love and constant encouragement during my journey in Australia. Thank you for listening and just being there whenever I needed you. A particular thanks to my sister and dad who have always had the kindest and most encouraging words.

Last but not least, I dedicate this thesis to my lovely mother, who has taught me the true meaning of being strong and resilient. My passion and determination for improving care for any patient, I owe that to you Mum. I think you would have been proud of me.

PUBLICATIONS ARISING FROM THIS THESIS

This thesis is presented with the inclusion of four papers. I am the lead author on all papers. At the time of submission, one of these papers (Chapter 3) has been accepted in a peer-reviewed journal and another paper (Chapter 4) has been published in a peer-reviewed journal. At the time of submission, the other two chapters (Chapters 5 and 6) are being prepared for submission to peer-reviewed journals.

Manuscripts in peer-reviewed journals: Published

Gopaul U, van Vliet P, Callister R, Nilsson M & Carey L. COMbined Physical and somatoSEnsory training after stroke: Development and description of a novel intervention to improve upper limb function. *Physiotherapy Research International*. 2018;0(0):e1748.

Manuscripts in peer-reviewed journals: In press

Gopaul U, Carey L, Callister R, Nilsson M & van Vliet P. Combined somatosensory and motor training to improve upper limb function following stroke: a systematic scoping review. *Physical Therapy reviews*. DOI: 10.1080/10833196.2018.1553668

PRESENTATIONS ARISING FROM THIS THESIS

During my candidature, I presented results arising from this thesis at 6 conferences. This resulted in 4 oral platform presentations, 1 oral poster and 2 poster presentations. I was also invited to present at one research seminar.

Conference presentations

Gopaul U, Carey L, Callister R, Nilsson M & van Vliet P. Feasibility of the Combined Physical and somatoSEnsOry (COMPoSE) training to improve arm function after stroke: A single-case experimental study. *Presented at:*

World Stroke Congress Oct 2018, Canada. Oral presentation

Stroke Aug 2018, Australia. Oral poster presentation

Gopaul U, van Vliet P, Carey L, Hudson & Nilsson M. Description of a novel “Combined Physical and SEnsOry training” (COMPoSE) intervention to improve arm function after stroke, using TIDIER checklist. *Presented at:* **World Confederation of Physical Therapy** July 2017, South Africa. Oral presentation.

Combined Stroke Conference Aug 2016, Australia. Oral presentation.

Gopaul U, Carey L, Callister R, Nilsson M & van Vliet P. Combined interventions for improving sensory-motor function of the upper limb (UL) post-stroke: a systematic review. *Presented at:*

Smart Stroke conference Aug 2017, Australia. Oral presentation.

Stroke Society of Australasia conference Aug 2017, New Zealand. Poster presentation.

Gopaul U, Carey L, Callister R, Nilsson M & van Vliet P. Feasibility of TactArray: A novel method for evaluating and retraining of sensorimotor control of finger forces post-stroke: a case report. *Presented at:*

Stroke Society of Australasia conference Aug 2017, New Zealand. Poster presentation.

Research seminars

Gopaul U, Carey L, Callister R, Nilsson M & van Vliet P. Combined physical and somatosensory training intervention to improve arm function after stroke. **Scientific conference of the Centre for Interdisciplinary Research in Rehabilitation of Greater Montreal** May 2017, Canada

PUBLISHED ABSTRACTS FROM THIS THESIS

- **Gopaul U**, Callister R, Carey L, Nilsson M, Sampson C, P vV. Feasibility of TactArray: A novel method for evaluating and retraining of sensorimotor control of finger forces post-stroke: a case report. *International Journal of Stroke* 2017;12(3S):3–59.
- **Gopaul U**, Van Vliet P, Carey L, Hudson I, M N. Description of a novel “Combined Physical and SEnsOry training” (COMPoSE) intervention to improve arm function after stroke, using TIDIER checklist. *International Journal of Stroke*. 2016; 11(1S): 3–31.
- **Gopaul U**, Carey L, Hudson I, Nilsson M, Callister R, P vV, editors. Description of a novel COMBined Physical and SEnsory training (COMPoSE) intervention to improve arm function after stroke, using Tidier checklist. *World Confederation of Physical Therapy Congress 2017 conference proceedings; 2017; Capetown, South Africa: World Confederation of Physical Therapy*.
- **Gopaul U**, Callister R, Carey L, Nilsson M, van Vliet P. Combined interventions for improving sensorymotor function of the upper limb following stroke: A systematic review. *International Journal of Stroke*,. 2017;12(2S).
- **Gopaul U**, Carey L, Callister R, Nilsson M, van Vliet P. World Stroke Congress Abstracts, 2018. *International Journal of Stroke*. 2018;13(2_suppl):3-217.

AWARDS

Throughout my candidature, I have been supported by a University of Newcastle Research Scholarship and University of Newcastle Top-up Scholarship.

In 2015, I was successful in acquiring a travel scholarship(AUD 5,000) from the National Health and Medical Research Council Centre of Research Excellence in Stroke Rehabilitation and Brain Recovery. I also won a research equipment grant (AUD 4,000) from the School of Health Sciences. I was also successful in acquiring a Research Higher Degree student exchange grant (AUD 4,500).

In 2016, I contributed to a successful Linkage pilot research grant (AUD 9,600) from the University of Newcastle as a co-investigator.

In 2017, I was awarded a Research Support grant (AUD 5,735) and a Clinical Research Design, Information Technology and Statistical Support grant (AUD 2,500) from the Priority Research Centre For Stroke And Brain Injury.

In 2018, I won travel a Travel Support Grant (AUD 2,000) from the Priority Research Centre for Stroke and Brain Injury.

CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT

The body of work presented in this thesis has produced four papers. I was the sole PhD student responsible for this project and was involved in all aspects of this project. A summary of my contributions and involvement is outlined at the beginning of each chapter.

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 3.1 Inclusion and exclusion criteria of somatosensory and motor training components	42
Table 3.2 Methodological quality scores (SEQES) and Oxford level of evidence	47
Table 3.3 Participant characteristics, description of training protocols and results	49-57
Table 3.4 Description of the training component categories	58
Table 4.1 Indices of difficulty in COMPoSE	87
Table 4.2 Examples of operationalisation of part of the training matrix	95
Table 5.1 Selection criteria for stroke participants	119
Table 5.2 Outcome measures used in COMPoSE trial	123
Table 5.3 Demographic data of participants	133
Table 5.4 Participants' characteristics at beginning of training	133
Table 5.5 Range of combinations practiced, repetitions performed, scheduled training duration and actual training duration	136
Table 5.6 Measures of participants' engagement across the intervention: self-report perceptions of difficulty and extent of engagement	137
Table 5.7 Measures of participants' engagement assessed by the treating therapist	138
Table 5.8 Perception of fatigue before and after intervention session	139
Table 5.9 Pain before and after intervention session	140
Table 5.10 Measures of participants' perceptions of the COMPoSE Intervention	141
Table 5.11 Perception of fatigue before and after the assessment sessions	143
Table 5.12 Maximum tactile pressures (kPa) at each assessment timepoint	146
Table 5.13 Change in slope and level across baseline and intervention phases	147
Table 5.14 Raw clinical measure scores at each assessment timepoint	148-150

Table 5.15	Changes in clinical measures scores across group	150
Table 6.1	Summary of maximal grasp measures and abbreviations	235
Table 6.2	Demographic data and characteristics of healthy participants	239
Table 6.3	Demographic data and characteristics of participants with stroke	240
Table 6.4	Clinical measures of the affected upper limb of participants with stroke	241
Table 6.5	Clinical measures of less affected upper limb of participants with stroke	242
Table 6.6	Measures of reliability in the dominant hand of healthy participants with vision during complete grasp duration (8s)	244
Table 6.7	Measures of reliability in the dominant hand of healthy participants without vision during complete grasp duration (8s)	245
Table 6.8	Measures of reliability in the dominant hand of healthy participants with vision during the plateau phase (5s)	246
Table 6.9	Measures of reliability in the dominant hand of healthy participants without vision during the plateau phase (5s)	247
Table 6.10	Measures of reliability in the nondominant hand of healthy participants with vision during complete grasp duration (8s)	248
Table 6.11	Measures of reliability in the nondominant hand of healthy participants without vision during complete grasp duration (8s)	249
Table 6.12	Measures of reliability in the nondominant hand of healthy participants with vision during the plateau phase (5s)	250
Table 6.13	Measures of reliability in the nondominant hand of healthy participants without vision during the plateau phase (5s)	251
Table 6.14	Summary of evaluation of measures of maximal tactile pressures and forces against the reliability criteria in the dominant hand of healthy participants	252
Table 6.15	Summary of reliability criteria in the non-dominant hand of healthy participants	253
Table 6.16	Measures of reliability in the affected hand of participants with stroke with vision during complete grasp duration (8s)	256

Table 6.17	Measures of reliability in the affected hand of participants with stroke without vision during complete grasp duration (8s)	257
Table 6.18	Measures of reliability in the affected hand of participants with stroke with vision during the plateau phase (5s)	258
Table 6.19	Measures of reliability in the affected hand of participants with stroke without vision during the plateau phase (5s)	259
Table 6.20	Measures of reliability in the less affected hand of participants with stroke with vision during complete grasp duration (8s)	260
Table 6.21	Measures of reliability in the less affected hand of participants with stroke without vision during complete grasp duration (8s)	261
Table 6.22	Measures of reliability in the less affected hand of participants with stroke with vision during the plateau phase (5s)	262
Table 6.23	Measures of reliability in the less affected hand of participants with stroke without vision during the plateau phase (5s)	263
Table 6.24	Summary of evaluation of measures of maximal tactile pressures/forces against reliability criteria in the affected hand of participants with stroke	264
Table 6.25	Summary of evaluation of measures of maximal tactile pressures/forces against reliability criteria in the less affected hand of participants with stroke	265
Table 6.26	Average difference between consecutive sessions	268

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Figure 1.1	13
Structure of thesis from overarching research question, specific research questions, thesis aims and thesis chapters	
Figure 3.1	45
PRISMA flow diagram of study selection	
Figure 4.1	86
COMPoSE Standardised training matrix	
Figure 4.2 a	89
Conditions of practice and number of repetitions with or without vision: Tactile pressure feedback task: Selected pressure - Maximum pressure variable	
Figure 4.2 b	89
Conditions of practice and number of repetitions with or without vision: Somatosensory-motor combination feedback task: Distance and Texture - Short distance parameter and texture	
Figure 4.3	93
Varied practice for somatosensory-motor combinations: with or without vision e.g. short distance variable and texture	
Figure 5.1	120
Timing of intervention sessions and outcome assessments	
Figure 5.2	122
TactArray cylinder device (5 cm diameter)	
Figure 5.3	122
Cylinders covered with materials used in COMPoSE	
Figure 5.4	131
Recruitment, participation and assessment	
Figure 5.5	158
Measures of maximal tactile pressures of affected with vision and without for all participants (ID1-ID5)	
Figure 5.6	158
A. WMFT scores; B. WMFT time for all participants (ID1-ID5)	
Figure 5.7	159
Box and block scores for all participants (ID1-ID5)	
Figure 5.8	159
Grip strength for all participants (ID1-ID5)	
Figure 5.9	159
A: MAL-how much score; B: how well for all participants (ID1-ID5)	
Figure 5.10	160
WPST score for all participants (ID1-ID5)	
Figure 5.11	160
TDT score for all participants (ID1-ID5)	
Figure 5.12	160
FMT score for all participants (ID1-ID5)	
Figure 5.13	160
FTORT score for all participants (ID1-ID5)	

Figure 5.14	A: SIS-strength score; B: SIS-ADL score; C: SIS-hand score; D: SIS-participation score and E: SIS-stroke recovery for all participants (ID1-ID5)	161-162
Figure 5.15	FAS score for all participants (ID1-ID5)	162
Figure 5.16	Mean slope of measures of maximal tactile pressures of affected with vision and without across group	163
Figure 6.1	TactArray cylinder device	230
Figure 6.2	Scatter plot of log-transformed data of dominant hand of healthy participants without vision during complete grasp duration(8s)	268
Figure 6.3	Scatter plot of log-transformed data of affected hand of participants with stroke without vision during complete grasp duration(8s)	268
Figure 6.4	Scatter plot of log-transformed data of dominant hand of healthy participants without vision during complete grasp duration(8s)	269
Figure 6.5	Scatter plot of log-transformed data of affected hand of participants with stroke without vision during complete grasp duration(8s)	269
Figure 6.6 a	Estimated marginal means of pressure measures in the group with stroke	271
Figure 6.6 b	Estimated marginal means of pressure measures in the healthy group	271

COMMON ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Meaning
ARAT	Action Research Arm Test
BBT	Box And Block Test
CI	Confidence interval
CV	Coefficient of variation
COMPoSE	COMbined Physical and somatoSEnsory training
FAS	Fatigue Assessment Scale
FMT	Fabric Matching Test
FMA-UL	Fugl Meyer assessment upper limb
FTORT	Functional Tactile Object Recognition Test
ICC	Intraclass correlation coefficient
MAL-AS	Motor Activity Log-Amount Scale
MAL-HW	Motor Activity Log-How Well
MOCA	Montreal Cognitive Assessment
MTS	Modified Tardieu Scale
RCT	Randomised Controlled Trial
RTG	Reach-to-grasp
PVAS	Pain visual analogue scale
PPS	Pressure Profile Systems
SD	Standard deviations
SIS	Stroke Impact Scale
SFVAS	Stanford fatigue visual analogue scale
SPSS	Statistical Package For The Social Sciences
TDT	Tactile Discrimination Test
UL	Upper limb
WFMT	Wolf Motor Function Test
WPST	Wrist Position Sense Test

THESIS ABSTRACT

Background

Stroke is a leading cause of disability worldwide. Upper limb motor and somatosensory impairments are common following stroke, making performance of everyday tasks difficult. Interventions directed at motor deficits have traditionally been separated from interventions directed at somatosensory deficits. By treating motor and somatosensory impairments separately, the potential beneficial effects of combining somatosensory training to further enhance sensorimotor function and action are not utilised. Hence, there is a critical need for the development of new and more effective treatments addressing both somatosensory and motor function to improve long-term disability after stroke. Also, there is a lack of objective outcome measures with good responsiveness to evaluate sustained grasp performance in people with stroke indicating a need for new outcome measures to quantify grasp deficits after stroke.

Overall aim

This thesis aimed to investigate whether combined somatosensory and motor training improves upper limb recovery after stroke.

Objectives

This thesis studied the effects of combining somatosensory and motor training to improve upper limb recovery after stroke. This thesis also investigated the reliability of measures of maximal tactile pressures and forces during grasping using the TactArray device in healthy people and people with stroke. There are four distinct but complementary studies included in this thesis to address these research objectives.

Methods

Study 1: A systematic scoping review was conducted to identify combined somatosensory and motor training interventions for the upper limb and their training components, and to review the efficacy of the combined interventions.

Study 2: This report describes the rationale and development of a new upper limb stroke rehabilitation intervention known as COMPoSE: “COMbined Physical and somatoSEnsory training” and, designed to improve somatosensory and motor deficits in the upper limb after stroke. A standardised training matrix was developed to facilitate intervention delivery.

Study 3: A trial was conducted to assess the feasibility of the COMPoSE trial using a single-case experimental study design. The outcomes from this feasibility trial included: 1) feasibility of the recruitment of participants; 2) review of intervention protocol and feasibility of study design; 3) acceptability of the intervention and trial; 4) appropriateness of data collection procedures; and the 5) evaluation of resources required. The preliminary impact of the COMPoSE intervention on somatosensory and motor deficits and upper limb function after stroke were also assessed.

Study 4: A test-retest reliability study was conducted to evaluate the reliability of measures of maximal tactile pressures and forces during sustained grasping using the TactArray device in healthy participants and participants with stroke.

Results

Study 1: Ten studies (n= 219) were included and the interventions consisted of combinations of tactile stimulation/discrimination, proprioceptive stimulation/discrimination, haptic object discrimination/recognition, movement training, and functional training. Only one group study (n=45), a non-randomized controlled study with multiple active components and the largest dose of treatment (72 hours), found significant improvements in fine motor and somatosensory measures.

Study 2: The essential features of COMPoSE include: combined somatosensory-motor training variables (grasp pressure, distance, object size, crushability, surface texture and friction),

feedback using a haptic device providing measures of grasp pressure, and high dose repetitive task practice with and without vision. It was planned for ten treatment sessions to be delivered over three weeks, using a standardised matrix for treatment delivery.

Study 3: Findings from this feasibility trial (n=5) indicated that training with the combination of somatosensory and motor variables synchronously, i.e., within the same task, was feasible. The delivery of the COMPoSE intervention using the standardised training matrix was feasible, however modifications to allow more specific tailoring to participant deficits is recommended. This trial identified components of the COMPoSE intervention such as the combinations of somatosensory-motor variables, amount of practice, and the duration of treatment, that would need to be modified in order to maximise improvement of upper limb function after stroke. Additionally, operational aspects of the trial methods, such as the number of outcome measures and timing of outcome measures were identified that would need to be addressed prior to subsequent trials.

Study 4: The TactArray device demonstrates satisfactory reliability for measures of maximal tactile pressures during complete grasp duration of 8s (from finger contact to grasp release) for within-day and between-day testing sessions using an average of three trials with and without vision, in healthy people and those with stroke. Measures of maximal tactile forces are less reliable than maximal tactile pressures.

Conclusion

Findings from this thesis makes an important contribution to advancing our understanding of various factors that influence the effects of combined somatosensory and motor training interventions. So far, there is little consistency across “combined somatosensory and motor training” interventions to improve upper limb function after stroke. The individual studies in the systematic scoping review and the COMPoSE trial provide preliminary evidence that combined somatosensory and motor training interventions have the potential to improve upper limb recovery after stroke, if they incorporate the appropriate active ingredients and dosage. Findings from this thesis identified research questions still to be answered with regards to active ingredients, recruitment capability, responsiveness of outcome measures for people with severe deficits after stroke, individualised somatosensory-

motor training, dosage and intensity of intervention. Furthermore, results from this thesis indicated that it could be beneficial to deliberately train for somatosensory and motor training synchronously to improve upper limb recovery after stroke. Additionally, a novel means of measuring maximal grasp pressures during a sustained grasp using the TactArray device has been evaluated, which can be further explored in larger trials. Recommendations have been provided on optimisation of the intervention contents and study design of the COMPoSE intervention and trial in the future.