CASE REPORT

Voluntary-assisted Upper Limb Training for Severe Cerebral Palsy Using Robotics Devices and Neuromuscular Electrical Stimulation: Three Case Reports
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Background: Constraint-induced movement therapy (CIMT) improves the motor function of paralyzed upper limbs of adults after stroke. However, in patients with severe spastic cerebral palsy (CP), the use of CIMT is not warranted. Our aim was to investigate the feasibility and effectiveness of repetitive voluntary-assisted upper limb training (VAUT) for three patients with severe CP using a combination of robotics [Hybrid Assistive Limb (HAL)] and functional electrical stimulation [Integrated Volitional Control Electrical Stimulation (IVES)]. Case: Three patients with CP were enrolled. Patients 1, 2, and 3 were 8-, 19-, and 18-year-old males, respectively. Patient 1 had spastic hemiplegia, while patients 2 and 3 had spastic quadriplegia. VAUT using single-joint HAL was performed for 1 or 2 sessions/month for 50 min/session over an 8-month period for 9–13 sessions in total. One patient’s voluntary hand movement was insufficient, affecting his upper limb exercise performance; therefore, IVES was required in addition to HAL. Outcome measures included motor function of the upper limbs and use of paralyzed hands, which were measured before and after intervention. No adverse events were observed during VAUT. After intervention, the Action Research Arm Test scores showed improvements in all three patients. The Children's Hand-use Experience Questionnaire showed improvements in two patients. Discussion: The use of VAUT, together with new systems such as HAL and IVES, for severe CP is safe and may be effective. Our study suggested that upper limb function can be improved for patients with severe CP.
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INTRODUCTION

Cerebral palsy (CP), a typical childhood-onset disease, is a lifelong neurological disorder that primarily impairs motor function secondary to disturbances in the developing fetal or infant brain.1) In patients with CP, a variety of movements are reduced, and selective motor control becomes difficult because abnormal movement patterns are strengthened as their primitive reflexes remain uncontrolled.2,3) When spastic paralysis occurs in the upper limbs, it becomes difficult to manipulate objects and tools in daily living activities (playing, learning, leisure activities, eating, changing clothes, etc.). In addition, the more affected limb tends to be disregarded. In CP patients, rehabilitation is important to improve affected
upper limb function, activities of daily living, and quality of life.

Constraint-induced movement therapy (CIMT) is a rehabilitation method aimed at improving the motor function and increasing the use of the affected upper limb in daily life for adults who have suffered a stroke.4,5 In patients with CP, the effectiveness of CIMT has been reported.6,7 CIMT consists of intensive and repetitive exercise using only the affected upper limb while the non-affected upper limbs are constrained. However, whether patients are able to perform CIMT by grasping, transporting, and releasing objects using only the affected hand depends on the remaining function of the affected hand. The Manual Ability Classification System (MACS) is a measure for evaluating the upper limb function of activities of daily living with CP (Table 1).8 In cases of severe CP with MACS levels III and IV, the upper limb tasks of CIMT that can be performed are limited because patients have difficulty moving their wrist and fingers. In such cases, CIMT cannot be effectively performed, and, unfortunately, there has been no successful intervention method for severe CP that does not meet the criteria for CIMT. Shierk et al. reported that CIMT is the most commonly reported therapeutic intervention to improve upper limb function for MACS level II, and the majority of participants across studies were MACS level II.9 Therefore, more research is needed on specific interventions for other severe MACS levels.

Currently, robot-assisted training is attracting attention in the field of adult and pediatric rehabilitation. The Hybrid Assistive Limb® (HAL; Cyberdyne, Tsukuba, Japan) is a novel wearable robot that can assist patients based on the intended movements of the wearer.10 When a single-joint-type HAL device (HAL-SJ; HAL-FS01) is used for the upper limbs, patients can repeat the flexion/extension movements of the elbow joint. Improvement of upper limb function using HAL-SJ has only been reported in adult patients.11,12 For patients with CP, use of HAL-SJ has been reported to reduce muscle co-contraction and improve upper limb function and performance of activities of daily living (ADL) by using simple exercises such as repeat flexion/extension movements of the elbow joint.13 However, in the previous report, only simple exercises such as elbow flexion and extension were performed using HAL-SJ. With regard to training using HAL-SJ, to the best of our knowledge, there has been no report on its combination with other therapies, such as CIMT.

Similar to HAL, neuromuscular electrical stimulation (NMES) has demonstrated its effectiveness in the neurorehabilitation of patients with stroke presenting with upper limb paralysis.14 An example of NMES is the use of Integrated Volitional Control Electrical Stimulation (IVES, OG Giken, Okayama, Japan), which outputs intense electrical stimulation in direct proportion to the amplitude of the voluntary monitor electromyogram (EMG) of the target muscles.15 It has been reported that NMES therapy using IVES is an effective treatment for patients with stroke presenting with severe upper limb paralysis.16

In this case series, we performed voluntary-assisted upper limb training (VAUT) to improve upper limb function and increase the frequency of its use in daily living. These patients presented with CP with severe upper limb paralysis and did not meet the criteria for CIMT. Our VAUT used a combination of HAL and IVES depending on the degree of upper limb paralysis. Our method is expected to improve upper limb function and ADL ability even in patients with severe CP. Our study is novel because we used upper-extremity-type robots instead of the lower limb types and we tested these devices in pediatric patients.

### CASE

#### Participants

Three patients with CP were enrolled in this study between May 2018 and January 2019 (Table 2). All patients and their parents provided written informed consent for the publication of individual patient data. One patient had spastic hemiplegia, whereas the other two had spastic quadriplegia. Using the MACS, one patient was classified as level III and

### Table 1. The Manual Ability Classification System

| Level | Description |
|-------|-------------|
| I     | Handles objects easily and successfully |
| II    | Handles most objects, but with somewhat reduced quality and/or speed of achievement |
| III   | Handles objects with difficulty; needs help to prepare or modify activities |
| IV    | Handles a limited selection of easily managed objects in adapted situations |
| V     | Does not handle objects and has severely limited ability to perform even simple actions |

From Eliasson et al.19
two patients were classified as level IV. The Brunnstrom stage (BrS) of the upper limb of the more affected side was III in two patients and IV in one patient. Finger BrS was IV in two patients and V in one patient. Patients 2 and 3 were unable to fully extend the metacarpophalangeal (MP) and interphalangeal (IP) joints at 10°, and the wrist at 20°. Case 1 met the CIMT criteria, but Cases 2 and 3 did not. Cases 1, 2, and 3 showed scores on the modified Ashworth Scale of 0, 2, and 1+, respectively, for the elbow flexor muscle. Cases 1, 2, and 3 had a Gross Motor Function Classification System (GMFCS) level of I, IV, and III, respectively. All patients were level I on the Communication Function Classification System (CFCS). The study used the following inclusion criteria: (i) MACS level II–IV; and (ii) the ability to express pain and anxiety through language, facial expressions, and gestures. The exclusion criteria were as follows: (i) patients who experienced difficulties in wearing HAL because of joint deformation/contracture; (ii) patients who did not cooperate and those who had difficulty following our instructions because of mental disabilities; (iii) patients whose upper limb did not fit in the devices used; (iv) patients who underwent botulinum toxin treatment in the previous 3 months; and (v) patients who had complications with a high level of risk management for physical therapy (severe hypersensitivity and marked ataxia).

Patient 1 was an 8-year-old male who presented with left hemiplegia caused by CP. He performed ADL using his non-paralyzed side, the shoulder of his paralyzed side, and his mouth as a substitute for his left hand.

Patient 2 was a 19-year-old male who presented with spastic quadriplegia caused by CP and severe right limb paralysis. He used an electric wheelchair for transportation. At the age of 17 years, he underwent orthopedic surgery of the upper limb; however, his voluntary upper limb movement was still insufficient. His shoulder flexion and abduction of active movements were 100°. He could achieve slight dorsiflexion of the wrist joint along with slight extension of the MP and IP joint. He could not grasp objects because of difficulty in voluntary thumb abduction.

Table 2. Patient characteristics

| Participant | 1   | 2   | 3   |
|-------------|-----|-----|-----|
| Age (years) | 8   | 19  | 18  |
| Sex         | M   | M   | M   |
| Height (cm) | 122 | 157 | 152 |
| Weight (kg) | 23  | 50  | 53  |
| Etiology    | CP  | CP  | CP  |
| MACS        | III | IV  | IV  |
| Brs (upper limb) | IV | III | III |
| Brs (finger) | V  | IV  | IV  |
| GMFCS       | I   | IV  | III |
| CFCS        | I   | I   | I   |

SQ, spastic quadriplegia; L, left; R, right.

Therapy Device and Intervention

We performed VAUT using HAL-SJ for 1 or 2 sessions/month for 50 min/session over an 8-month period for a total of 9–13 sessions. We planned an intervention protocol of at least 8 sessions over an 8-month period. During this training, patients wore a HAL. The HAL-SJ uses a bio-electrical signal (BES)-based control system and demonstrates joint torque assist with the wearer’s voluntary drive. The HAL was attached to the side with greater paralysis of the upper limbs (patient 1, left limb; patients 2 and 3, right limb). First, training of repetitive elbow flexion/extension exercises during shoulder adduction and 90° shoulder abduction were performed 50–100 times each (Fig. 1). Subsequently, upper limb task practice was performed based on CIMT. Task practice was performed for five or six activities (reaching with shoulder, elbow movements using sticks and blocks, pinching, and gripping of coins and marbles). For each task, the level of difficulty, such as the number of items, speed, height, and shape of objects, was adjusted in a stepwise manner depending on the patient’s ability, which was based on the function of the paralyzed hand. In addition, as ADL practice, activities such as eating (spooning beans) and washing (hanging and folding a towel) were performed according to the abilities of the patients (Fig. 2). We also advised patients to perform task practice at home by themselves or with their family.
Outcome Measures

The Action Research Arm Test (ARAT) and Quality of Upper Extremity Skills Test (QUEST) were used to compare upper limb functions within 1 week pre- and post-intervention. In addition, for patients 1 and 2, we interviewed the patients’ mothers using the ABILHAND-Kids and Children’s Hands-Use Experience Questionnaire (CHEQ; CHEQ 2.0, http://www.cheq.se/questionnaire) regarding the use of paralyzed hands for ADL. The study protocol was approved by the ethics committee of Ibaraki Prefectural University of Health Sciences (approval number: 797; date of approval: 28 December 2017; approval update: approval number: e356; date of approval: 8 June 2022).

RESULTS

All three patients received 50-min sessions of HAL for 1 or 2 sessions/month over an 8-month period for 9–13 sessions in total. No adverse events were observed during VAUT. For patient 3, IVES was used in combination with HAL-SJ. The control mode of the HAL-SJ was Cybernic Voluntary Control (CVC)—Gentle mode. The gain settings were adjusted within the ranges of 5–40, 20–100, and 30–100 for patients 1, 2, and 3, respectively. The assist level was 1, 1–8, and 1 for patients 1, 2, and 3, respectively. The torque limit was adjusted within the ranges of 30%–40%, 50%–60%, and 50%–60% for patients 1, 2, and 3, respectively. The difficulty of the task varied according to patient ability. For example, the shape of the object to be handled was gradually made more difficult or the moving range of objects was expanded.

The ARAT results increased from 31, 9, and 17 points before the intervention to 49, 20, and 20 points after the intervention in the paralyzed hands of patients 1, 2, and 3, respectively. Comparing the subordinate items, increased scores were observed for grasp, grip, pinch, and gross move-
ments. The QUEST scores increased from 75.1, 40.0, and 49.9 points before the intervention to 82.8, 58.5, and 49.9 points after the intervention in patients 1, 2, and 3, respectively. Comparing the subordinate items, increased scores were observed for dissociated movements, grasp, weight bearing, and protective extension.

Regarding the use of paralyzed hands in daily living, we interviewed patients’ mothers using the ABILHAND-Kids and CHEQ for patients 1 and 2. The ABILHAND-Kids scores showed no change before and after intervention in both patients. However, the CHEQ score after intervention was increased from 25 to 26 points in “grasp efficacy” for patient 1, from 28 to 30 points in “time consumption” for patient 1, and from 42 to 45 points in “feeling bothered” for patient 2 (Table 3).

The following issues were identified in task practice: for patient 1, it was difficult to maintain motivation because of the subject’s young age. Therefore, we tried to maintain motivation by introducing game elements, such as table tennis and coin arrangement (Fig. 2C). For patient 2, compensatory movements, such as head rotation and shoulder elevation were seen during VAUT, and the patient complained of fatigue. Therefore, the assist gain and extension/flexion balance of the HAL-SJ were adjusted for each task so that compensatory movements did not frequently occur during VAUT. For patient 3, voluntary wrist joint dorsiflexion, finger extension, and thumb abduction direction were limited. In addition, the assistance provided by using HAL-SJ alone was limited by the shape and size of the object used in the task. Therefore, IVES was used in combination with the extensor muscles of the forearms to supplement voluntary hand and finger movements, while HAL-SJ assisted the elbow joints and IVES assisted with finger extension simultaneously. For this patient, we used the power-assist mode with a minimum power of 15%–25%, a maximum power of 35%–50%, and a sensitivity of 2.5–2.9. By adjusting HAL-SJ and IVES, thumb abduction and finger extension became possible, and the patient was able to perform fine tasks, such as pinching and gripping, and the range of task practices expanded (Fig. 2).

**DISCUSSION**

In this study, patients with severe CP were able to perform and repeat normal joint movements frequently over an extended period (50 min) by using a device with new methods of assisting with voluntary movements, such as HAL and IVES. To promote brain plasticity, it is desirable for the patient to perform voluntary and repeated movements, such as during CIMT. In this study, in addition to supporting elbow joint movements using HAL, it became possible to assist hand movements using IVES. Accordingly, even for patient 3, who had severe CP, it was possible to perform fine tasks of the upper limb requiring voluntary finger movement. As a result, this patient succeeded in upper limb training by handling various objects, similarly to patients 1 and 2.
a previous study of upper extremity assessments soon after stroke, minimal clinically important differences of 12 and 17 points were given for ARAT.25) The ARAT score in the paralyzed hands of patients 1, 2, and 3 increased by 18, 11, and 3 points from before the intervention, respectively. These cases cannot be compared in general because the patients have CP, but the effect of this intervention was suggested in patient 1, who was the youngest and had the mildest level of paralysis of the three patients.

There have been many reports of robot-assisted gait training of the lower limbs, but studies regarding its effectiveness in the upper limbs are limited.26) In previous reports using HAL-SJ, the training was limited to simple movements such as elbow flexion and extension, and there are no reports of upper limb training with combined movements of the shoulder, elbow, and finger, as in this study.11,12,26) In our patients, upper limb function and ADL ability improved through upper limb task practice using HAL, indicating its effectiveness. Moreover, for patient 3 with severe CP, who had insufficient ability to move his wrist and perform finger extension, we performed an intervention using a combination of IVES and HAL. IVES can increase agonist muscle activities by providing electrical stimulation when muscle activity occurs, which can assist with voluntary movement, similar to HAL. Improvement of voluntary finger movement ability and upper limb function has been reported in patients with severe hemiplegia, who had difficulty performing dorsiflexion of the wrist, after treatment by CIMT combined with IVES.27) Even for patients with CP, it was safe to perform upper limb task practice while assisting with voluntary movement of the fingers using IVES.

Upper limb function and ADL performance improved, similar to a previous report on CIMT for patients with CP. Abd El-Kafy et al.28) and DeLuca et al.29) reported that the exercise efficiency of patients with hemiplegic CP improved by performing CIMT for 3–4 weeks for 3–6 h/day. Our study demonstrated improvements in upper limb function and ADL performance despite low-frequency intervention of only once or twice a month in outpatient settings. Moreover, in previous reports using HAL-SJ, the training was limited to simple movements, such as elbow flexion and extension, and there have been no reports of upper limb training using the HAL-SJ for the elbow joint during task practices in various limb positions as demonstrated in the present study.12,13)

Therefore, this intervention was more effective because training focused on functional improvements by promoting brain plasticity through the use of HAL or IVES in assisting the voluntary movements of patients. In this study, VAUT using a combination of HAL and IVES was extremely effective as a new rehabilitation method. VAUT may provide a new breakthrough for functional improvements in patients with CP with severe upper limb spastic paralysis.

This study has some limitations. First, only three cases were included in our study; therefore, the generalizability of findings may be limited. Furthermore, the small sample size did not allow for statistical analysis. Second, this study was performed without a control group and did not compare the frequency of the intervention and implementation period. In the future, it will be necessary to elucidate the mechanisms of functional improvement by assessing brain organizational changes using techniques such as transcranial magnetic stimulation and diffusion magnetic resonance imaging.

**CONCLUSION**

VAUT using new systems such as HAL and IVES for patients with severe CP was safe and effective. The HAL was able to increase normal elbow joint movement of the paralyzed side under voluntary movement even for patients with severe upper limb paralysis who did not adequately fit the CIMT criteria. By combining IVES to assist with voluntary dorsiflexion of the wrist joint/finger extension, patients with more severe CP could perform fine upper limb exercises. VAUT using a combination of HAL and IVES according to the severity of paralysis may improve upper limb function and use of the affected hand in the daily life of patients with severe CP. In the future, it is expected that new small-sized devices will be developed to assist with the voluntary movements of young patients with severe CP in the early stages of development.

**ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

This work was supported in part by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science KAKENHI (grant numbers JP19H00478 and 19K11300), a Sasakawa Scientific Research Grant from The Japan Science Society (grant number 2018-6009), and a Grant-in-Aid for Project Research from the Ibaraki Prefectural University of Health Sciences. We thank the Physical Therapy Department at Ibaraki Prefectural University of Health Sciences, represented by Professor Kazuhide Tomita, manager of the Department of Rehabilitation, and Assistant Professor Tomoyuki Matsuda, manager of the Department of Physical Therapy. We also thank Editage (www.editage.jp) for English language editing.
CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest. The authors declare no competing interests.

REFERENCES

1. Rosenbaum P, Paneth N, Leviton A, Goldstein M, Bax M, Damiano D, Dan B, Jacobsson B: A report: the definition and classification of cerebral palsy April 2006. Dev Med Child Neurol Suppl 2007;109:8–14. PMID:17370477
2. Prechtl HF, Einspieler C, Cioni G, Bos AF, Ferrari F, Sontheimer D: An early marker for neurological deficits after perinatal brain lesions. Lancet 1997;349:1361–1363. DOI:10.1016/S0140-6736(96)10182-3, PMID:9149699
3. Østensjø S, Carlberg EB, Vøllestad NK: Motor impairments in young children with cerebral palsy: relationship to gross motor function and everyday activities. Dev Med Child Neurol 2004;46:580–589. DOI:10.1111/j.1469-8749.2004.tb01021.x, PMID:15344517
4. Taub E, Miller NE, Novack TA, Cook EW 3rd, Fleming WC, Nepomuceno CS, Connell JS, Crago JE: Technique to improve chronic motor deficit after stroke. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 1993;74:347–354. PMID:8466415
5. Taub E, Uswatte G, Pidikiti R: Constraint-Induced Movement Therapy: a new family of techniques with broad application to physical rehabilitation—a clinical review. J Rehabil Res Dev 1999;36:237–251. PMID:10659807
6. Geerdink Y, Aarts P, van der Burg J, Steenbergen B, Geurts A: Intensive upper limb intervention with self-management training is feasible and promising for older children and adolescents with unilateral cerebral palsy. Res Dev Disabil 2015;43:44:97–105. DOI:10.1016/j.ridd.2015.06.013, PMID:26164301
7. Oliveira AC, Freitas C, Eras-Garcia R, Matuti GS, Santos JF, Oliveira CB: Cerebral palsy in adult patients: constraint-induced movement therapy is effective to reverse the nonuse of the affected upper limb. Arq Neuropsiquiatr 2015;74:18–21. DOI:10.1590/0004-282X20150195, PMID:26690842
8. Eliasson AC, Krumlinde-Sundholm L, Rösladh B, Beckung E, Arner M, Öhrvall AM, Rosenbaum P: The Manual Ability Classification System (MACS) for children with cerebral palsy: scale development and evidence of validity and reliability. Dev Med Child Neurol 2006;48:549–554. DOI:10.1017/S0012162206001162, PMID:16780622
9. Shierk A, Lake A, Haas T: Review of therapeutic interventions for the upper limb classified by manual ability in children with cerebral palsy. Semin Plast Surg 2016;30:014–023. DOI:10.1055/s-0035-1571256, PMID:26869859
10. Kawamoto H, Sankai Y: Power assist method based on phase sequence and muscle force condition for HAL. Adv Robot 2005;19:717–734. DOI:10.1163/1568553054455103
11. Kubota S, Abe T, Koda M, Kadone H, Shimizu Y, Matsu Y, Noguchi H, Fujii K, Marushima A, Funayama T, Kawamoto H, Hada Y, Sankai Y, Yamazaki M: Application of a newly developed upper limb single-joint hybrid assistive limb for postoperative C5 paralysis: an initial case report indicating its safety and feasibility. J Clin Neurosci 2018;50:268–271. DOI:10.1016/j.jocn.2018.01.038, PMID:29402566
12. Kubota S, Kadone H, Shimizu Y, Haragyo T, Watanabe H, Hada Y, Ochiai N, Sankai Y, Yamazaki M: Robotic rehabilitation training with a newly developed upper limb single-joint Hybrid Assistive Limb (HAL-SJ) for elbow flexor reconstruction after brachial plexus injury: a report of two cases. J Orthop Surg (Hong Kong) 2018;26:2309499018777887. DOI:10.1177/2309499018777887, PMID:29874971
13. Shimizu Y, Kadone H, Kubota S, Ueno T, Sankai Y, Hada Y, Yamazaki M: Voluntary elbow extension-flexion using single joint Hybrid Assistive Limb (HAL) for patients of spastic cerebral palsy: two cases report. Front Neurol 2019;10:2. DOI:10.3389/fneur.2019.00002, PMID:30723447
14. de Kroon J, IJzerman M, Chae J, Lankhorst G, Zilvold G: Relation between stimulation characteristics and clinical outcome in studies using electrical stimulation to improve motor control of the upper extremity in stroke. J Rehabil Med 2005;37:65–74. DOI:10.1080/16501970410024190, PMID:15788340
15. Hara Y: Neuromuscular training with new functional electrical stimulation for hemiparetic upper extremity in stroke patients. J Nippon Med Sch 2008;75:4–14. DOI:10.1272/jnms.75.4, PMID:18360073
16. Shindo K, Fujiwara T, Hara J, Oba H, Hotta F, Tsuji T, Hase K, Liu M: Effectiveness of hybrid assistive neuromuscular dynamic stimulation therapy in patients with subacute stroke: a randomized controlled pilot trial. Neurorehabil Neural Repair 2011;25:830–837. DOI:10.1177/1545968311408917, PMID:21666139

17. Wood E, Rosenbaum P: The Gross Motor Function Classification System for Cerebral Palsy: a study of reliability and stability over time. Dev Med Child Neurol 2000;42:292–296. DOI:10.1017/S0012162200000529, PMID:10855648

18. Taub E, Uswatte G, Bowman MH, Mark VW, Delgado A, Bryson C, Morris D, Bishop-McKay S: Constraint-induced movement therapy combined with conventional neurorehabilitation techniques in chronic stroke patients with plegic hands: a case series. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2013;94:86–94. DOI:10.1016/j.apmr.2012.07.029, PMID:22922823

19. Platz T, Pinkowski C, van Wijck F, Kim IH, di Bella P, Johnson G: Reliability and validity of arm function assessment with standardized guidelines for the Fugl-Meyer Test, Action Research Arm Test and Box and Block Test: a multicentre study. Clin Rehabil 2005;19:404–411. DOI:10.1191/0269215505cr832oa, PMID:15929509

20. Haga N, van der Heijden-Maessen HC, van Hoorn JF, Boonstra AM, Hadders-Algra M: Test–retest and inter- and intrareliability of the quality of the upper-extremity skills test in preschool-age children with cerebral palsy. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2007;88:1686–1689. DOI:10.1016/j.apmr.2007.07.030, PMID:18047886

21. Mohammadkhani-Pordanjani E, Arnould C, Raji P, Nakhostin Ansari N, Hasson S: Validity and reliability of the Persian ABILHAND-Kids in a sample of Iranian children with cerebral palsy. Disabil Rehabil 2020;42:1744–1752. DOI:10.1080/09638288.2018.1530307, PMID:30777463

22. Amer A, Eliasson AC, Peny-Dahlstrand M, Hermansson L: Validity and test–retest reliability of Children’s Hand-use Experience Questionnaire in children with unilateral cerebral palsy. Dev Med Child Neurol 2016;58:743–749. DOI:10.1111/dmcn.12991, PMID:26610725

23. Liepert J, Miltner WH, Bauder H, Sommer M, Detmers C, Taub E, Weiller C: Motor cortex plasticity during constraint-induced movement therapy in stroke patients. Neurosci Lett 1998;250:5–8. DOI:10.1016/S0304-3940(98)00386-3, PMID:9696052

24. Haggard P, Clark S, Kalogeras J: Voluntary action and conscious awareness. Nat Neurosci 2002;5:382–385. DOI:10.1038/nn827, PMID:11896397

25. Lang CE, Edwards DF, Birkenmeier RL, Dromerick AW: Estimating minimal clinically important differences of upper-extremity measures early after stroke. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2008;89:1693–1700. DOI:10.1016/j.apmr.2008.02.022, PMID:18760153

26. Chen YP, Howard AM: Effects of robotic therapy on upper-extremity function in children with cerebral palsy: a systematic review. Dev Neurorehabil 2016;19:64–23. DOI:10.3233/PRM-2012-0206, PMID:22699104