

Toward Defining Predictors of Upper Extremity Recovery Suitable for Inpatient Stroke Population at Methodist Rehabilitation Center

OVERVIEW OF CAPSTONE SITE

- Methodist Rehabilitation Center (MRC) is located in Jackson, Mississippi, is the state's only free-standing physical rehabilitation hospital center, and is accredited by both The Joint Commission and the Commission on Accreditation for Rehabilitation Facilities (CARF).
- Clinical services offered at MRC's 124-bed hospital are provided to patients suffering from one or more of the following: brain injury, spinal cord injury, stroke, post-amputation, neurological disease, joint and back pain, orthopedics, and other medical conditions that require specialized technologies and therapies.
- MRC is known for having Mississippi's only stroke-specific rehabilitation program that is able to provide patient's that suffered mild, moderate, and severe strokes with access to stroke research, treatment, and care.
- MRC's research efforts conducted through the Center for Neuroscience and Neurological Recovery (CNNR) are made up of three laboratories — the Human Neurophysiology Lab, the Motion Analysis Lab, and the NeuroRobotics Lab — along with several individual research offices, all of which are located inside the main hospital and can be found on the second floor (Methodist Rehab Research Center website, n.d.).

CNNR's Mission:

- Advance patient care and restore lives of people suffering from neurological conditions by conducting highquality research that enables increased knowledge about the changes in neurological functions that occur after injury or disease; the conduction of multidisciplinary, novel, and translational research with an emphasis on stroke, SCI, and TBI; and the application of new knowledge to improve diagnoses and treatments.
- 2. Disseminate research findings and provide professional development for neurorehabilitation researchers and practitioners of different backgrounds and at all stages within their careers.
- Increase awareness about the need for neurorehabilitation research in Mississippi.

PRELIMINARY LITERATURE SUMMARY

Guiding Theory: Motor Learning Theory Associated Frames of Reference (FORs): Biomechanical & Rehabilitative

Relevant Evidence:

- of routine clinical rehabilitation practice because standardized assessments can be utilized for determining patient prognosis and function over time ents within various clinical areas that provide relevant information about level of impairment, activity limitations, and restrictions in participation that play ar
- For post-stroke upper extremity motor impairments, research findings suggest frequent assessment utilizing more than one type of measurement can be an effective way to monitor whether any changes in treatment may better target the patient's current level of impairment ultimately resulting in more effective and personalized therapeutic interventions

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

The specific need of the Capstone site addressed through the Capstone project was proposed by the Capstone mentor as the following question:

"Which clinical evaluation instruments are the most useful for assessing the level of impairment and recovery of arm function during inpatient (and outpatient) rehabilitation after a recent stroke?"

The Capstone mentor provided sound evidence that a need exists for informing stroke rehab clinical practitioners on the latest clinical research recommendations for evidence-based practice (EBP). These findings are consistent with gaps in the literature identified in the Preliminary Literature Review.

PROJECT GOALS / OBJECTIVES

Overall Goal: Investigate and identify which clinical evaluation instruments would be the most useful for assessing and tracking the level of impairment and recovery of upper extremity (UE) function during initial 6 months of stroke recovery for inpatient rehab patients at Methodist Rehabilitation Center (MRC).

Objective One: Define the population of MRC stroke patients in terms of demographics (age, race, comorbidities, etc) and relevant clinical dates and time parameters (stroke onset, admission, discharge, etc.) as evidenced by completion of a patient population profile and data summary report

Objective Two: Analyze the literature to identify clinical assessments utilized as predictors/outcome measures of UE function following stroke as evidenced by completion of a literature matrix summary table. **Objective Three:** Aggregate and organize collected findings on MRC's defined patient population profile identified in Objective One with the post-stroke predictor/outcome UE assessment measures identified in Objective Two as evidenced by completion of various in-depth analyses spreadsheets.

Objective Four: Synthesize previous objects' findings into a culminating product with recommended selections of identified clinical assessments of UE function with assessment timepoints that are specific to MRC and best fit MRC to track patient progression during initial 6 months following stroke.

Kaylee Saunders¹, Dr. Christy M. Morgan¹ and Dr. Dobrivoje S. Stokic, M.D., D.Sc.² University of Mississippi Medical Center¹ and Methodist Rehabilitation Center²



PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

The above figure is a graphical representation of the values provided in the tables provided to

7 Kwakkel, 2003 N=102 (Netherlands) @52:12wPS: MI_Moticity_index]: @6mPS: T1: ≤2wPS Dichotimized PVs & OV: OV: ARAT (<10/≥10)	
Stroke "Table1" 7 hospitals 1. MLArm (0-100) (<11/≥11) 2. ML-leg (0-100) (<25/>≤255 1. ARAT (<10/≥10) T2-11: 3.12wPS OV: ARAT (<10/≥10) PVs _ Cut-Offs 19/23 proba URL MCA pts received 2hrs byd, 5d/w, for 20w 1. MLArm (0-100) (<11/≥11) 2. ML-leg (0-100) (<25/>≤255 T2-11: 3.12wPS OV: ARAT (<10/≥10) WL-ag (<25/≥25)	LogRegr (*Table 2*):
Stroke *Table1* 7 hospitals 1. MI-Arm (0.100) {<11/≥11} 2. MI-Leg (0.100) {<25/≥25} Jrs. tg/d, 5d/w, for 20w T2.11: 3-12wPS PVs. Ult.arm (<11/≥11) MI-Leg {<25/≥25} proba- (C>0) URL MCA pts received 2hrs. tg/d, 5d/w, for 20w I. MI-Arm (0.100) {<25/≥25} (1/≥010) T2.11: 3-12wPS T2.11: 3-12wPS MI-Leg {<25/≥25} MI-Leg {<25/≥25}	3 PVs@≤2wPS sig relate
URL MCA pts received 2hrs tg/d, 5d/w, for 20w 2. Mi-Leg (0-100) {<25/2525} EMA-UE: 3. FMUA [UprAmp] (0-52) (<10/≥10}	ability of ARAT≥10@6m
URL MRCA pis received 2hrs ty/d, 5d/w, for 20w FMA-UE. 3. FMUA [LipAtron] (0-52) { T12: 6mPS MRL-leg (<20/22.9) FMUA { (1/2.10) MI-Leg 1 5d/w, for 20w 4. FMH [Hand] (0.14) {0/21} 5. FMUE [UpAtron:tland] (0-66) {<11/211} 6. FMLE [FMA-LE] (0-34) {<12/212}	w/ highest ORs (Table 2
2/15 420, 5d/w, for 20w 3. PMOA (20)/210) {<10/210}	<u></u>
$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 &$	UK 28.33
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	en 24.8
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	IA 22.7
δ. FMLE [FMA-LE] (0-34) Univ LogReg: FMUE {<12/≥12}	1 19.77*
$ \begin{cases} \langle 12 \geq 12 \\ 7. Bl (0-100) \\ 8. \#dPS to Admission \\ 9. Sex (M/F) \\ 10. Age \{<70 \geq 70 \} \\ 11. sSide (L/R) \\ 12. sType [OCSP] \\ (TACI/PACI/LACI) \\ 13. MMSE (0-30) \{<23 \geq 23 \} \\ 14. VisGazeDet \{abs/pres\} \\ 14. VisGazeDet \{abs/pres\} \\ 16. Visinatto \\ 17. TFT [[LhumbET]] (0-3) \\ 18. OPS, Orpington Progn \\ Scale (1 6-6 8) \\ \end{cases} $	JE 36.4
7. BI (0-100) 8. #dPS to Admission ORs w/ 95% CIs for all PVs "Pth" 9. Sex (M/F) 10. Age {<70/≥70}	iv LogR Models & 2WC
8. #dPS to AdmissionORs w/ 95% Cls for all PVs"Pch" @3w9. Sex (M/F) $0. Age \{<70/\geq 70\}$ Sig PVs ID for Multix LogReg. Models: FMUE & MI-LegCut-O11. sSide (L/R) $12. sLype [OCSP]$ Multix LogReg. Sig PVs@T2-11, OV@6mPSCut-O13. MMSE (0-30) {<23/≥23}	ble 3*)
9. Sex (W/F)Sig PVs ID for Multix LogReg. Models: FMUE & MI-Leg $@3w$ Cut-O10. Age {<70/>270}11. sSide (L/R)Nodels: FMUE & MI-LegCut-O11. sSide (L/R)12. stype [OCSP] (TACI/PACI/LACI)Multix LogReg: Sig PVs@T2-11, OV@6mPS $@4w$ 13. MMSE (0-30) {<23/>223}Sig PVs@T2-11, OV@6mPS Sig PVs@T2-11, OV@6mPSCut-O14. VisGazeDet {abs/pres}1 Model per timepoint (T2-11)Calculated: Model Eggs, w/ β coeff.s & Optimal PV Cut-Offs for each model's timepointCalculated: Model Eggs, w/ β coeff.s & Optimal PV Cut-Offs for each model's timepoint $@5w$ Cut-O	(" ARAT≥10 @6mPS
10. Age $\langle 70/ \geq 70 \rangle$ Sig PVs ID for Mutty LogReg.Cut-O11. sSide (L/R)12. sType [OCSP]Models: FMUE & MI-Leg12. sType [OCSP](TACI/PACI/LACI)Multiv LogReg:13. MMSE (0-30) {<23/ \geq 23}Sig PVs@T2-11, OV@6mPS14. VisGazeDef {abs/pres}1 Model per timepoint (T2-11)15. HomonHemianopiaCalculated: Model Egns.w/ β 16. VisInattnCalculated: Model Egns.w/ β 17. TFT [[JhumbET] (0-3)coeff.s & Optimal PV Cut-Offs for each model's timepointScale (1 6.6 8)Cut-O	/ FMUE MI-Leg
11. Ssüge (L/K) 12. Stype [OCSP] 12. stype [OCSP] (TACI/PACI/LACI) 13. MMSE (0-30) {<23/≥23}	Uπ(s) N/A ≥25
I2. StyPeCI/LACI) (TACI/PACI/LACI) Multiv_LogReg: @4w I3. MMSE (0-30) {<23}≥23}	N/A + U
13. MINSE (0-30) {<23}≥23}	v EMUE MILLON
14. VisGazeDef {abs/pres} 1 Model per timepoint (T2-11) 15. HomonHemianopia 1 Model per timepoint (T2-11) 16. VisInattn Calculated: Model Eggs w/ β 17. TFT [[humbET] (0-3) coeff.s & Optimal PV Cut-Offs for 18. OPS, Orpington Brogn scale (1.6.6.8)	Off(s) > 11 > 25
15. HomonHemianopia 15. HomonHemianopia 16. VisInatta Calculated: Model Egns w/ β 17. TFT [[humbET] (0-3) coeff.s & Optimal PV Cut-Offs for 18. OPS, Optington Progra each model's timepoint Scale (1 6.6 8) Cut-Offs for	+ + 0
16. VisInatin. Calculated: Model Eqns. w/ β 17. TFT [[humbET] (0-3) coeff.s & Optimal PV Cut-Offs for 18. OPS, Optington Progra each model's timepoint	+ - (
17. TFT [ThumbET] (0-3) 18. OPS, Orpington Progn Scale (1.6.6.8) Cut-Offs for each model's timepoint	- + (
18. OPS, Orpington Progn Scale (1.6.6.8) each model's timepoint	(
L Scale (16-68) Cut-O	/ FMUE MI-Leg
	Off(s) ≥13 ≥33
19. UrinIncont [BI item] {<2/2}	+ + (
20. ICI [[runkCottllest]: (2WCT9):	+ - (
{<25/25} Provided w/ each model for	- + (

#	Reference	Sample	Setting	PV(s)	OV(s)	TP(s)	Analysis	Res
30	Ann Clin Transl Neurol URL	(n _{S1} =50) (n _{S2} =157)	analysis of data from 2 previous studies	Chinear vsgyor 3. 1. SAFE [ΣMRC items ShABd & EingerExt] (0-10) {≥5,8/<5,8}	ARAT (0-57) Outcome Groups: 1. E [Excellent] ≤12 2. G [Good] 13-33 3. L [Limited] 34-50 4. P [Poor] ≥51	Median:3d Range: 1-4d T2: 5-7dPS T3: 10-14dPS T4: 3mPS	analysis of ARAT@3mPS to eval boundaries of 4 outcome groups CART [Class & Regr Tree]: Pruning & CrossVal if CCR improved for PREP2@2wPS CART decision tree is w/out user input for PV inclusion order <u>PREP2 items for CART:</u> SAFE {25,8/<5,8} Age {<80/≥80} NIHSS {<7/≥7} MEP {+/-} (MEP+ if SAFE>5) CART had max tree depth=3, min terminal node size=10 cases, & automated pruning to avoid over-fitting w/ max diff in risk of 1SE "Gini" to optimize homogeneity w/in terminal nodes Alternative CARTs removing TMS/MRI/both Results of CART reformatted & combined for PREP2 algorithm	PREP2: QverallA Acc{SAFE>5/<5}

PROJECT SUMMARY AND FUTURE RECOMMENDATIONS

Relevance of Capstone project findings:

- stroke recovery

Recommended Future Steps:

- therapy services provided at MRC
- **OT Implications:**



Objective Three: Synthesis of Objectives One & Two



		OUTCOME TIMEPOINT							TOTAL		
		w2	w2-4	m1	m2	m3	m6	y1	Ν	%	Cumm
	<d3< td=""><td>4</td><td>0</td><td>4</td><td>0</td><td>9</td><td>6</td><td>9</td><td>32</td><td>21%</td><td>21%</td></d3<>	4	0	4	0	9	6	9	32	21%	21%
	<w1< td=""><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>4</td><td>7</td><td>13</td><td>16</td><td>1</td><td>50</td><td>34%</td><td>55%</td></w1<>	4	5	4	7	13	16	1	50	34%	55%
	<w2< td=""><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>4</td><td>7</td><td>0</td><td>11</td><td>7%</td><td>62%</td></w2<>	0	0	0	0	4	7	0	11	7%	62%
	w3-4	0	0	2	15	9	8	5	39	26%	89%
	m2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4	11	7%	96%
	m3	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	5	3%	99%
	m6	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1%	100%
	TOTAL	8	5	10	22	36	48	20	149		
	%TOTAL	5%	3%	7%	15%	24%	32%	13%		100%	
	CumTOTAL	5%	9%	15%	30%	54%	87%	100%			

PLAN FOR PROJECT EVALUATION

The Capstone project was partly assessed through a semi-structured interview with the Capstone mentor during the final 14th week of the Capstone experience in order to obtain the mentor's expert and objective evaluation of the outcome and overall impact of the Capstone project.

The impact of the Capstone project also assessed during the final week of the Capstone experience using a participant feedback survey instrument administered after the Capstone student provided a formal presentation on the Capstone project's final culminating product to MRC leadership and appropriate staff (research team, stroke OTs, etc.) at the Capstone site. The participant feedback survey instrument will be used to obtain objective

feedback on usefulness of information presented and overall usability of the Capstone project at the Capstone site. Lastly, the outcome data collected from the semi-structured interview with the Capstone mentor and the feedback survey responses collected from the presentation audience members in order to complete an outcome assessment summary of overall Capstone project effectiveness.

Responses: Overall, responses were 4/5 to 5/5 ratings for question related to usefulness of information provided and overall usefulness of final product at the Capstone site.

Provides a detailed completion of initial steps necessary to expand the scope of addressing the identified need at MRC on an institutional level in the future

Provides a comprehensive selection of post-stroke UE assessments utilized as predictor/outcome measures of

Continue analyses on collected data provided from the Capstone project

Expand scope to MRC outpatient setting and services in order to fully envelope stroke patient continuum of

Provides a foundation of information to enhance clinician decision-making with UE outcome measure assessment selection within inpatient stroke rehab setting