Supplementary material to article by M. Sivan et al. "Systematic review of outcome measures used in the evaluation of robot-assisted upper limb exercise in stroke"

REFERENCES S1–S37

S1. Ottenbacher KJ, Hsu Y, Granger CV, Fiedler RC. The reliability of the functional independence measure: a quantitative review. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 1996; 77: 1226–1232.

S2. Hsueh IP, Lin JH, Jeng JS, Hsieh CL. Comparison of the psychometric characteristics of the functional independence measure, 5 item Barthel index, and 10 item Barthel index in patients with stroke. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry 2002; 73: 188–190.

S3. Hobart JC, Lamping DL, Freeman JA, Langdon DW, McLellan DL, Greenwood RJ, et al. Evidence-based measurement: which disability scale for neurologic rehabilitation? Neurology 2001: 28; 57: 639–644.

S4. Brock JA, Goldie PA, Greenwood KM. Evaluating the effectiveness of stroke rehabilitation: choosing a discriminative measure. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2002; 83: 92–99.

S5. Cano SJ, O'Connor RJ, Thompson AJ, Hobart JC. Exploring disability rating scale responsiveness II: do more response options help? Neurology 2006; 67: 2056–2059.

S6. Lyle RC. A performance test for assessment of upper limb function in physical rehabilitation treatment and research. Int J Rehabil Res 1981; 4: 483–492.

S7. Hsieh CL, Hsueh IP, Chiang FM, Lin PH. Inter-rater reliability and validity of the action research arm test in stroke patients. Age Ageing 1998; 27: 107–113.

S8. Hsieh YW, Wu CY, Lin KC, Chang YF, Chen CL, Liu JS. Responsiveness and validity of three outcome measures of motor function after stroke rehabilitation. Stroke 2009; 40: 1386–1391.

S9. Wolf SL, Lecraw DE, Barton LA, Jann BB. Forced use of hemiplegic upper extremities to reverse the effect of learned nonuse among chronic stroke and head-injured patients. Exp Neurol 1989; 104: 125–132.

S10. Wolf SL, Catlin PA, Ellis M, Archer AL, Morgan B, Piacentino A. Assessing Wolf motor function test as outcome measure for research in patients after stroke. Stroke 2001; 32: 1635–1639.

S11. Whitall J, Savin DN, Jr., Harris-Love M, Waller SM. Psychometric properties of a modified Wolf Motor Function test for people with mild and moderate upper-extremity hemiparesis. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2006; 87: 656–660.

S12. Morris DM, Uswatte G, Crago JE, Cook EW, 3rd, Taub E. The reliability of the wolf motor function test for assessing upper extremity function after stroke. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2001; 82: 750–755.

S13. Lin KC, Hsieh YW, Wu CY, Chen CL, Jang Y, Liu JS. Minimal detectable change and clinically important difference of the Wolf Motor Function Test in stroke patients. Neurorehabil Neural Repair 2009; 23: 429–434.

S14. Fritz SL, Blanton S, Uswatte G, Taub E, Wolf SL. Minimal detectable change scores for the Wolf Motor Function Test. Neurorehabil Neural Repair 2009; 23: 662–667.

S15. Barreca SR, Stratford PW, Lambert CL, Masters LM, Streiner DL. Test-retest reliability, validity, and sensitivity of the Chedoke arm and hand activity inventory: a new measure of upper-limb function for survivors of stroke. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2005; 86: 1616–1622.

S16. McCulloch KL, Cook EWI, Fleming WC, Novack TA, Taub E. A reliable test of upper extremity ADL function. Arch Phvs Med Rehabil 1988; 69: 755.

S17. Kopp B, Kunkel A, Flor H, Platz T, Rose U, Mauritz KH, et al. The Arm Motor Ability Test: reliability, validity, and sensitivity to change of an instrument for assessing disabilities in activities of daily living. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 1997; 78: 615–620.

S18. Lincoln N, Leadbitter D. Assessment of motor function in stroke patients. Physiotherapy 1979; 65: 48–51.

S19. Adams SA, Pickering RM, Ashburn A, Lincoln NB. The scalability of the Rivermead Motor Assessment in nonacute stroke patients. Clin Rehabil 1997; 11: 52–59.

S20. Adams SA, Ashburn A, Pickering RM, Taylor D. The scalability of the Rivermead Motor Assessment in acute stroke patients. Clin Rehabil 1997; 11: 42–51.

S21. Van de Winckel A, Feys H, Lincoln N, De Weerdt W. Assessment of arm function in stroke patients: Rivermead Motor Assessment arm section revised with Rasch analysis. Clin Rehabil 2007; 21: 471–479.

S22. Salter K, Jutai JW, Teasell R, Foley NC, Bitensky J, Bayley M. Issues for selection of outcome measures in stroke rehabilitation: ICF activity. Disabil Rehabil 2005; 27: 315–340.

S23. Collin C, Wade D. Assessing motor impairment after stroke: a pilot reliability study. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry 1990; 53: 576–579.

S24. Endres M, Nyary I, Banhidi M, Deak G. Stroke rehabilitation: a method and evaluation. Int J Rehabil Res 1990; 13: 225-236.

S25. De Souza LH, Hewer RL, Miller S. Assessment of recovery of arm control in hemiplegic stroke patients. 1. Arm function tests. Int Rehabil Med 1980; 2: 3–9.

S26. Wade DT, Langton-Hewer R, Wood VA, Skilbeck CE, Ismail HM. The hemiplegic arm after stroke: measurement and recovery. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry 1983; 46: 521–524.

S27. Carr JH, Shepherd RB, Nordholm L, Lynne D. Investigation of a new motor assessment scale for stroke patients. Phys Ther 1985; 65: 175–180.

S28. Poole JL, Whitney SL. Motor assessment scale for stroke patients: concurrent validity and interrater reliability. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 1988; 69: 195–197.

S29. Penta M, Tesio L, Arnould C, Zancan A, Thonnard JL. The ABILHAND questionnaire as a measure of manual ability in chronic stroke patients: Rasch-based validation and relationship to upper limb impairment. Stroke 2001; 32: 1627–1634.

S30. Michielsen ME, de Niet M, Ribbers GM, Stam HJ, Bussmann JB. Evidence of a logarithmic relationship between motor capacity and actual performance in daily life of the paretic arm following stroke. J Rehabil Med 2009; 41: 327–331.

S31. Duncan PW, Wallace D, Lai SM, Johnson D, Embretson S, Laster LJ. The stroke impact scale version 2.0. Evaluation of reliability, validity, and sensitivity to change. Stroke 1999; 30: 2131–2140.

S32. Duncan PW, Lai SM, Tyler D, Perera S, Reker DM, Studenski S. Evaluation of proxy responses to the Stroke Impact Scale. Stroke. 2002; 33: 2593–2599.

S33. Salter K, Jutai JW, Teasell R, Foley NC, Bitensky J, Bayley M. Issues for selection of outcome measures in stroke rehabilitation: ICF Participation. Disabil Rehabil 2005; 27: 507–528.

S34. Duncan PW, Reker DM, Horner RD, Samsa GP, Hoenig H, LaClair BJ, Dudley TK. Performance of a mail-administered version of a stroke-specific outcome measure, the Stroke Impact Scale. Clin Rehabil 2002; 16: 493–505.

S35. TheEuroQolGroup. EuroQol-a new facility for the measurement of health-related quality of life. Health Policy 1990; 16: 199–208.

S36. Hurst NP, Kind P, Ruta D, Hunter M, Stubbings A. Measuring health-related quality of life in rheumatoid arthritis: validity, responsiveness and reliability of EuroQol (EQ-5D). Br J Rheumatol 1997; 36: 551–559.

S37. Dorman PJ, Waddell F, Slattery J, Dennis M, Sandercock P. Is the EuroQol a valid measure of health-related quality of life after stroke? Stroke 1997; 28: 1876–1882.

S38. Ashworth B. Preliminary trial of carisoprodol in multiple sclerosis. Practitioner 1964; 192: 540–542.

S39. Lincoln NB, Crow JL, Jackson JM, Waters GR, Adams SA, Hodgson P. The unreliability of sensory assessments. Clin Rehabil 1991; 5: 273–282.

S40. Wilson B, Cockburn J, Halligan PW. Behavioural Inattention Test. Titchfield, UK: Thames Valley Test Company; 1987.

S41. Kimberley TJ, Lewis SM. Understanding neuroimaging. Phys Ther 2007; 87: 670–683.