

1 *Original article*

2 **Action observation intervention using three-dimensional**

3 **movies improves the usability of hands with distal radius**

4 **fractures in daily life: a nonrandomized controlled trial in**

5 **women**

6

7 **Short title:** Action motion observation for distal radius

8 fractures

9

10 Kengo Usuki^{1,2}, Hiroaki Ueda², Toshiya Yamaguchi³, Takako

11 Suzuki¹, Toyohiro Hamaguchi^{1*}

12 ¹ Department of Rehabilitation, Graduate School of Health

13 Sciences, Saitama Prefectural University, Saitama, Japan

14 ² Rehabilitation Center, Kitasato University Medical Center,

15 Saitama, Japan

16 ³Toda Chuo General Hospital, Honcho Toda, Saitama, Japan

17

18 *Corresponding author

19 Email: hamaguchi-toyohiro@spu.ac.jp (T.H.)

20 Clinical Trial registry: UMIN-CTR (UMIN 000039973)

21 **Abstract**

22 Prolonged immobilization of joints after distal radius fracture
23 (DRF) leads to cerebral disuse-dependent plasticity (DDP) and
24 deterioration of upper extremity function. Action observation
25 therapy (AOT) can improve DDP. This nonrandomized
26 controlled trial (UMIN 000039973) tested the hypothesis that
27 AOT improves hand-use difficulties during activities of daily
28 living in patients with DRF. Right-handed women with volar
29 locking plate fixation for DRF were divided into AOT and Non-
30 AOT groups for a 12-week intervention. The primary outcome
31 was the difficulty in using the fractured hand, as examined by
32 the Japanese version of the Patient-Related Wrist Evaluation

33 (PRWE). Secondary outcomes were (1) range of motion (ROM)
34 of the injured side and (2) difference between the measured
35 and patient-estimated ROM. The survey was conducted
36 immediately postoperatively and at 4, 8, and 12 weeks
37 postoperatively. The AOT groups used a head-mounted display
38 and three-dimensional video during ROM exercises, whereas
39 the Non-AOT group used active ROM exercises alone. A
40 generalized linear model (GLM) was used to confirm
41 interactions and main effects by group and time period, and
42 multiple comparisons were performed. In total, 35 patients
43 were assigned to the AOT (n=18, median age 74 years) and
44 Non-AOT (n=17, 70 years) groups. In the GLM, PRWE Total,

45 PRWE Specific, and PRWE Usual scores showed interactions
46 between groups and periods. A post-hoc test showed that the
47 PRWE Specific ($z=3.43$, $p=0.02$) and PRWE Usual ($z=7.53$,
48 $p<0.01$) scores were significantly lower in the AOT group than
49 in the Non-AOT group at 4 weeks postoperatively, whereas
50 PRWE Total scores ($z=3.29$, $p=0.04$) were lower at 8 weeks
51 postoperatively. These results suggest that AOT can improve
52 hand-use difficulties in right-handed women after DRF surgery.
53 AOT positively affects the motor imagery of patients with DRF
54 and can reverse the patient's perceived difficulty of using the
55 fractured hand during rehabilitation.

56

57 **Introduction**

58 Distal radius fracture (DRF) is a frequent diagnosis more
59 common in women, occurring in 16 men and 36 women per
60 10,000 population [1]. DRF occurs at a younger age than hip or
61 vertebral fractures and is known to be the first osteoporosis-
62 related disease. Women with DRFs have a 24% higher
63 prevalence of osteoporosis than those without. The prevalence
64 rates of osteoporosis in people aged 50 years and over are
65 reported to be 44% for women and 30% for men, and
66 osteoporosis is a factor contributing to DRFs being more
67 common in women [2].

68 Sports or traffic accidents are commonly responsible for

69 DRFs in young people, whereas falls from a standing position
70 mainly cause DRFs in older people [3, 4]. The DRF risk is 3.2
71 times higher in individuals who go outside at least once a day
72 than in those who do not [5]. DRF injury is likely caused by
73 increased activities due to roles such as housework and
74 occupation.

75 For patients with DRF, goals for rehabilitation and
76 activities of daily living (ADLs) are set one week after
77 surgery, and instrumental ADLs such as housework are set as
78 goals for 7-8 weeks after surgery [6]. Since patients with DRF
79 are often highly active in home and social roles before their
80 injury, rehabilitation is provided so that they can achieve their

81 goals in ADL and social life as soon as possible.

82 Patients with markedly displaced and unstable DRFs who
83 cannot maintain reduction undergo surgical treatment [7].

84 Range of motion (ROM) exercise can be performed in the early
85 postoperative period in patients whose bones are fixed with a

86 volar locking plate, but it takes time for patients who have
87 undergone surgery to be able to use the fractured hand for

88 ADLs. Bone union takes about 9 weeks in such patients [8, 9],

89 but they can use their hands for non-weight-bearing ADLs after

90 4 weeks. It is generally considered safe that patients exercise

91 their wrist muscles 6-8 weeks postoperatively [10, 11]. At 8

92 weeks postoperatively, approximately 80% of patients with

93 DRF experience difficulties in using their hands for ADLs,
94 whereas at 12 weeks, this percentage decreases to 50% [12].

95 Among factors that contribute to the difficulties of
96 patients with DRF in using their hands for ADLs are ROM
97 limitations [13, 14]. The ROMs of the wrist and forearm used
98 for ADLs have been reported to be 38° for volar flexion, 40°
99 for dorsiflexion, 13° for internal rotation, and 53° for external
100 rotation [13]. Patients with DRF require 4 weeks
101 postoperatively to recover to the level of ROM used for ADLs
102 [15]. In addition, at 4 and 8 weeks postoperatively,
103 dorsiflexion of the wrist joint was a factor contributing to the
104 perceived difficulty in using the operated hand for ADLs [14].

105 Fig 2 shows the change in wrist ROM after surgery.

106

107 **Fig 2. Range of motion of the wrist joint required for**

108 **activities of daily living.** The minimal angle for each

109 movement is indicated by a dashed line. According to prior

110 literature (Yang Z, 2018), patients with distal radius fractures

111 achieve that range of motion on average within one month after

112 surgery. ADL, activities of daily living; ROM, range of

113 motion; W, week.

114

115 Difficulty in using the affected hand in ADLs is one of

116 the reasons why this hand is not used in ADLs. Patients with

117 DRF underestimate their actual ROMs by -20° volar flexion,
118 -21° dorsiflexion, -31° internal rotation, and -24° external
119 rotation [16]. However, their ROM is limited because
120 immobilization of the joint results in peripheral degeneration
121 of sensory receptors [17, 18] and a decrease in superficial and
122 positional sensation [19]. When the hands of patients with
123 upper limb movement disorders are immobilized, the volume of
124 the motor-sensory cortex of the brain becomes smaller
125 approximately two weeks after injury [20], and the cerebral
126 blood flow of the motor-sensory cortex decreases after 24
127 hours of joint immobilization even in healthy individuals [21].
128 These findings are neurophysiological evidence that

129 immobilization of the wrist joint decreases the motor sensation
130 of patients with DRF, and even if the ROM has improved to the
131 angle required for ADL, patients who underestimate their ROM
132 may refrain from using their hands or subjectively experience
133 difficulties using them.

134 A decrease in hand use causes a transient decrease in
135 local brain activity related to hand movements, which, if
136 persistent, alters the neural structure of the brain. This
137 phenomenon is called disuse-dependent plasticity (DDP) [22].
138 When a normal hand is immobilized for 2 weeks, the frequency
139 of its use is significantly reduced, its grip strength is reduced
140 by 36%, and its performance in an upper limb function test

141 using a Purdue peg board is reduced by 21.6%. Functional
142 magnetic resonance imaging of the brain at this time confirms
143 DDP, in which the motor-sensory cortex of the upper limb and
144 its surrounding network connections show reduced activity
145 [22].

146 If DDP occurs in patients with DRF and their ADLs are
147 restricted by perceived difficulties in using their hands,
148 training to correct this phenomenon should be considered.
149 Rehabilitation for DRF has been performed during
150 postoperative days 8 to 10, during which time the fracture is in
151 the hematogenous phase, and the patient receives bracing rest
152 and protective ROM exercises. From days 10 to 25

153 postoperatively, patients are in the early callus formation
154 stage, when they receive gentle ROM exercises and perform
155 ADLs such as eating. From postoperative days 20 to 60, the
156 patients are in the osteoblast-proliferative phase and receive
157 ADLs with a load of about 1 kg. From day 50 postoperatively,
158 the patients enter the osteosclerosis phase, and at 8 weeks
159 postoperatively, non-weight-bearing ADL exercises are
160 performed. The postoperative period from 4 to 12 months is
161 considered the remodeling phase, and rehabilitation is
162 completed in about 3 months [10, 11]. Action observation
163 therapy (AOT) is an effective means of preventing DDP in
164 patients. AOT takes advantage of the activation of the brain

165 cortex when observing the actions of others [23]. Rocca et al.
166 conducted AOT of upper limb function in 42 healthy
167 participants and reported that compared with the control group,
168 the gray matter of the cerebrum thickened, and the upper limb
169 function improved in the AOT group [24]. AOT in patients with
170 DRF may prevent or reverse postoperative DDP and eliminate
171 exacerbating factors of hand disuse. If the perceived difficulty
172 is decreased, patients with DRF may be encouraged to use their
173 hands for ADLs. There is no report of AOT for postoperative
174 hand use in patients with DRF. This study tested the
175 hypotheses that AOT in the early postoperative period of DRF
176 can (1) prevent underestimation of ROM, (2) attenuate hand-

177 use difficulty in ADL, and (3) improve joint ROM early in
178 patients with DRF (Fig 3).

179

180 **Fig 3. Research hypotheses.** AOT in the early postoperative
181 period improves hand use difficulty in patients with DRF from
182 4 weeks after surgery when patients are allowed to use their
183 hands. In DRF, bone fusion occurs at 9 weeks postoperatively,
184 and patients are allowed to exercise their muscles for ADLs at
185 6-8 weeks postoperatively. PRWE scores are shown on the
186 vertical axis. The horizontal axis indicates the time after
187 surgery. ADL, activities of daily living; AOT, action
188 observation therapy; DRF, distal radius fracture; PRWE,

189 Patient-Related Wrist Evaluation; ROM, range of motion; W,
190 week.

191

192 **Methods**

193 **Study design**

194 This study was a nonrandomized controlled trial conducted
195 between 2013.10.1 and 2021.6.1. The data collection was
196 concluded as the planned number of participants was reached.

197 **Ethical considerations**

198 Written informed consent was obtained from all patients. The
199 study was registered as a clinical trial (UMIN 000039973) and
200 approved by the Ethics Committees of Saitama Prefectural

201 University (25512, 27017) and Kitasato University Medical

202 Center (27-57).

203 **Participants**

204 The eligibility criteria for this study were women with DRF

205 who underwent volar locking plate fixation during the study

206 period. Exclusion criteria were (1) patients who did not wish

207 to participate, (2) patients under 18 years of age, (3) patients

208 with substantial soft tissue injuries in addition to fractures,

209 (4) patients with fractures due to tumors, (5) patients with

210 rheumatoid disorders, (6) patients with neurological diseases,

211 and (7) patients with cognitive dysfunctions. The data

212 collection was conducted at the Kitasato University Medical

213 Center, during the rehabilitation.

214 **Experimental procedures**

215 Study participants were assigned to two groups: one group

216 received AOT, and the other group received the usual

217 rehabilitation without AOT (Non-AOT). The allocation was not

218 randomized; 10 patients were assigned to the Non-AOT group

219 from September 2013 to August 2014 and to the AOT group

220 from January 2016 to October 2018 for adjustment of the

221 experimental equipment (Ghost) depending on the time of the

222 year. Thereafter, patients were assigned to the two groups

223 alternately in the order of their prescriptions until the sample

224 size was met in March 2021.

225 **Evaluation method**

226 In this study, the following 11 items were investigated: (1)
227 age, (2) dominant hand (Edinburgh Handedness Inventory), (3)
228 time from injury to start of rehabilitation (days), (4) fracture
229 severity according to the Arbeitsgemeinschaft für
230 Osteosynthesefragen (AO) classification, (5) body mass index,
231 (6) injured side, (7) healthy side active ROM, (8) affected side
232 active ROM, (9) patient's ROM estimate for the affected side
233 in relation to the maximum wrist ROM of the healthy side (%),
234 (10) patient's estimated active ROM (°), and (11) difficulty in
235 using the hand for ADLs based on the PRWE, Japanese version.
236 The survey was conducted at the time of initial rehabilitation,

237 4 weeks postoperatively, 8 weeks postoperatively, and 12
238 weeks postoperatively. The reason for this survey timing is
239 that patients with DRF have temporary bone formation at 3-4
240 weeks postoperatively, whereas the fracture site stabilizes at
241 6-8 weeks postoperatively, and the orthopedic surgeon gives
242 permission for patients to perform ADLs without restrictions.
243 In addition, rehabilitation is completed at 12 weeks [11].
244 Fig 4 shows the method of measuring the difference between
245 the patient's estimated ROM ($^{\circ}$) and the measured ROM ($^{\circ}$) of
246 the affected side, based on the maximum active ROM (100%)
247 on the healthy side as described previously [16]. The patient
248 was instructed to (1) "rest the hand on the table and close your

249 eyes” and (2) “estimate what percentage your hand moves
250 relative to your healthy hand, assuming the healthy hand is
251 100%.” The reasons why patients were asked to estimate the
252 angle percentage in comparison to the healthy side were that
253 they had difficulties determining absolute angles and to
254 prevent them from visually confirming their answers during the
255 estimation. Test runs were not performed as underestimation
256 might be corrected in multiple tests.

257

258 **Fig 4. Difference between estimated and measured ROM of**
259 **the affected side in wrist flexion.** Patients were asked to
260 report the estimated ROM (%) of the affected side when the

261 healthy side was set as 100%. The patient's estimated ROM (%)
262 was converted into the estimated ROM (°) of the affected side
263 based on the measured ROM (°) of the healthy side. The
264 difference (°) was obtained by subtracting the estimated ROM
265 from the measured ROM of the affected side. ROM, range of
266 motion.

267

268 Afterward, the patient's estimated ROM of the affected side
269 (%) was converted into the estimated ROM (°) of the affected
270 side using Eq. (1):

271 Estimated ROM (°) = $\frac{x}{100} \times$ measured ROM on the healthy side • Eq. (1),

272 where x represents the patient's estimated ROM (%). The

273 difference between the patient's estimated ROM (°) and the
274 measured ROM (°) of the affected side was then calculated
275 using Eq. (2):

276 *Perceived ROM gap* (°)

277 = *Estimated ROM of the affected side* (°)

278 – *Measured ROM of the affected side* (°)

279 In this study, investigators were not blinded to treatment
280 methods.

281 **Intervention method**

282 The intervention was conducted for 40 minutes per session, at
283 least once a week, for 12 weeks after surgery. The intervention
284 consisted of 5 minutes of evaluation, 10 minutes of passive

285 ROM practice, another 10 minutes of active ROM practice, 10
286 minutes of upper limb function (ADL) practice, and 5 minutes
287 of icing. Participants in the AOT group performed active ROM
288 practice with the addition of AOT using a head-mounted
289 display (HMD) and first-person three-dimensional (3D) video.
290 AOT can consist of first-person and third-person action
291 observations, but the first-person motion illusion is easier to
292 produce than the third-person motion illusion, and the sense of
293 bodily ownership of the hand on the screen is higher, as
294 evidenced by the activity of the cerebral motor-related regions
295 in near-infrared spectroscopy [25]. Thus, we employed an
296 HMD-based first-person action observation system [26].

297 Participants in the Non-AOT group performed active ROM
298 exercises without AOT. Interventions were conducted by
299 physical or occupational therapists with at least three years of
300 experience. Fig 5 shows the posture and the equipment used
301 during the action observation using 3D moving images. We
302 chose 3D moving images because brain activity in response to
303 3D moving images is higher than that in response to 2D moving
304 images when the participant visualizes the movement after
305 action observation [27].

306

307 **Fig 5. Patient's posture during the Ghost intervention.** The
308 patient was fitted with an HMD, and AOT was performed using

309 first-person 3D images. During the AOT, the patient practiced
310 ROM with the fractured hand on the table in accordance with
311 the Ghost video. AOT, action observation therapy; HMD, head-
312 mounted display; ROM, range of motion.
313
314 AOT utilized an upper limb motor function learning device
315 (Code name: Ghost, patent number 6425335, Saitama
316 Prefectural University) [26]. Ghost comprises an HMD with
317 personal computer software. A 3D image of another person's
318 hand, which had been set in advance, was presented to the
319 patient by the HMD. The presented videos were finger flexion
320 and extension (20 seconds), volar flexion and dorsiflexion (5

321 minutes), and pronation and supination (5 minutes). Patients
322 were not instructed to perform active motor imagery during
323 AOT.

324 **Sample size calculation**

325 The sample size of this study was calculated by repeated
326 measures analysis of variance (Cohen effect size) for group
327 and time period, following a previous study [28], with the
328 difference in PRWE scores as the primary outcome, after
329 modeling the interaction between two PRWE groups and four
330 time periods as a pre-test using a generalized linear model
331 (GLM; $f=0.25$, error $\alpha=0.05$, $\beta=0.80$, correlation among
332 repeated measures=0.5, non-sphericity correction=1). The total

333 number of cases was calculated to be 24, with 12 in each
334 group. The number of participants prematurely terminating the
335 study was estimated to be 20%, and the final target sample size
336 was set to be 34 cases in total, 17 cases in each group.
337 G*Power software (V 3.1.9.6; Universität Kiel, Kiel, Germany)
338 was used for these calculations [29].

339 **Statistical analysis**

340 The primary outcome of this study was the PRWE score as a
341 measure of the difficulty in using hands for ADLs [30]. The
342 secondary outcome was the difference between the estimated
343 and measured ROM of the affected side.
344 The PRWE is a patient-oriented assessment of pain, difficulty

345 in using a hand, and difficulty in using it in ADLs specific to
346 disorders of the wrist joint. It consists of 15 questions, and
347 the total score ranges from 0 to 100. A higher score indicates a
348 higher degree of disability, and a score of 0 indicates no
349 disability at all [31]. The reliability and validity of the
350 Japanese version have been proven [32].

351 The Levene test was used for the test of equal variances for all
352 datasets, and the Shapiro–Wilk test was used to test for
353 normality. Descriptive statistics of the characteristics of the
354 AOT and Non-AOT groups and the primary and secondary
355 outcomes at baseline were compared using the Mann–Whitney U
356 test. For the primary and secondary outcomes, we used the

357 GLM to obtain the goodness of fit of the estimated models by
358 group and time period. When the outcome values fitted the
359 model, multiple comparisons were tested using the Bonferroni
360 test after checking the interaction between group and time. Age
361 [33], body mass index [34], side of injury [35], fracture
362 severity [36], and number of days between injury and start of
363 rehabilitation [37] have been reported to be associated with
364 functional outcomes, and these were used as covariates.
365 Outliers defined as values exceeding the first quartile –
366 quartile range \times 1.5 or the third quartile + quartile range \times 1.5
367 were excluded from statistical analyses [38]. Missing values of
368 measurements were assigned the mean value of the group and

369 time period [39]. Jamovi (Version 1.6.16.0) was used for data
370 analysis [40]. The significance level was set at 0.05.

371 **Results**

372 **Patient registration and analysis process**

373 Fig 1 shows the flowchart of participant enrollment. A
374 total of 89 patients with DRF presented during the study
375 period, and 46 patients met the study selection criteria. A total
376 of 11 patients were excluded from the statistical analysis
377 because they discontinued their participation and were unable
378 to attend the outpatient clinic. Therefore, data from 35
379 patients (18 in the AOT group and 17 in the Non-AOT group)
380 were statistically analyzed. In all patients, a fall caused the

381 injury. An outlier test was performed before further statistical
382 analyses, and the excluded data were: 14 in the AOT group and
383 17 in the Non-AOT group for the measured ROM of the injured
384 side (4 types, 4 time periods), 9 in the AOT group and 13 in
385 the Non-AOT group for the difference between estimated and
386 measured ROMs (4 types, 4 time periods), and 9 in the Non-
387 AOT group for the PRWE score (4 types, 4 time periods). Table
388 1 shows the characteristics of the AOT and Non-AOT groups.
389 The characteristics did not differ between the AOT and Non-
390 AOT groups.

391

392 **Fig 1. Flowchart of participant enrollment.** During the study

393 period, 89 postoperative DRF patients were admitted to the
394 hospital, and 46 of them met the eligibility criteria. Of these,
395 11 patients were excluded because they were no longer able to
396 attend the outpatient clinic. Finally, 35 patients were
397 followed up, and their data were statistically analyzed. AOT,
398 action observation therapy; DRF, distal radius fracture; HMD,
399 head-mounted display; PRWE, Patient-Related Wrist
400 Evaluation; ROM, range of motion.

401

402 **Table 1. Characteristics of the study participants.**

Characteristics	Group		Statistics				
	AOT (n=18)	Non-AOT (n=17)	df	U	p values	Shapiro -Wilk p	Levene p
Age	74 (66, 76)	70 (60, 78)	33	142	0.72	0.02	0.28
Body mass index	22 (19, 25)	23 (21, 28)	33	115	0.22	0.64	0.53
Handedness, right	100 (100, 100)	100 (100, 100)	-	-	-	-	-
Injured hand, right	9	5	33	113	0.13	<0.01	0.11
Start of rehabilitation after injury (days)	11 (9, 17)	10 (9, 15)	33	139	0.64	<0.01	0.70
Fracture severity	3 (2, 3)	3 (2, 3)	33	143	0.71	<0.01	0.57
Extra-articular (A)	0	1	-	-	-	-	-
Partially articular (B)	7	5	-	-	-	-	-
Completely articular (C)	11	11	-	-	-	-	-
Number of rehabilitation sessions	14 (10, 19)	17 (15, 24)	33	105	0.11	<0.01	0.39

403 Data are shown as median and quartile (25%, 75%).

404 Fracture severity: Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Osteosynthesefragen (AO) classification

405 Handedness: Edinburgh Handedness Inventory. All participants were right-handed.

406 AOT, action observation therapy.

407 **PRWE and ROM baseline data**

408 Table 2 shows the baseline values of the measured ROM
409 on the healthy side, measured ROM of the affected side,
410 estimated ROM of the affected side, difference between
411 estimated and measured ROM of the affected side, and PRWE
412 score in the AOT and Non-AOT groups. The values for the
413 measured ROM on the healthy side, measured ROM of the
414 affected side, estimated ROM of the affected side, difference
415 between estimated ROM and measured ROM of the affected
416 side, and PRWE scores were not significantly different between
417 the AOT and Non-AOT groups at baseline. The normality of the
418 baseline data was evaluated using the Shapiro–Wilk test; PRWE

419 Pain ($W=0.97$, $p=0.41$) and PRWE Total ($W=0.96$, $p=0.19$)
420 scores had a normal distribution, whereas PRWE Specific
421 ($W=0.75$, $p<0.01$) and PRWE Usual ($W=0.90$, $p<0.01$) scores
422 did not. Therefore, the tests for PRWE, ROM, and difference
423 between estimated and measured ROMs were conducted after
424 the GLM fit was confirmed.

425 **Table 2. Comparisons of gaps between conjectural and actual range of motions among groups**
 426 **at baseline.**

	Groups		df	Statistic s	R ²	Statistics		
	AOT (n=18)	Non-AOT (n=17)				p values	Shapiro- Wilk p	Levene p
VF_Actual_Healthy_side	73 (70, 80)	65 (60, 80)	33	104	0.32	0.10	0.05	0.25
DF_Actual_Healthy_side	75 (70, 80)	70 (70, 77)	32	129	0.1	0.60	<0.01	0.10
Pronation_Actual_Healthy_side	90 (90, 90)	90 (90, 90)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Supination_Actual_Healthy_side	90 (90, 90)	90 (90, 90)	-	-	-	-	-	-
VF_Actual_Affected_side	40 (30, 43)	35 (25, 40)	30	97	0.24	0.24	0.14	0.51
DF_Actual_Affected_side	38 (20, 40)	30 (25, 40)	33	130	0.15	0.44	0.21	0.29
Pronation_Actual_Affected_side	60 (46, 75)	50 (38, 55)	32	84	0.41	0.04	0.17	0.13
Supination_Actual_Affected_side	55 (40, 78)	50 (40, 70)	33	150	0.02	0.92	0.02	0.32
VF_Conjectural_Affected_side	24 (8, 30)	16 (12, 24)	33	138	0.62	0.10	0.23	0.19
DF_Conjectural_Affected_side	8 (4, 22)	14 (8, 35)	33	122	0.31	0.20	<0.01	0.48
Pronation_Conjectural_Affected_side	27 (6, 52)	27 (9, 45)	33	145	0.80	0.05	<0.01	0.42

Supination_Conj ctual_Affected_si de	27 (8, 61)	9 (9, 45)	33	123	0.33	0.20	0.01	0.14
VF_Gap	-13 (-28, -2)	-20 (-23, -10)	33	135	0.06	0.77	0.64	0.02
DF_Gap	-20 (-29, -11)	-13 (-22, 0)	33	113	0.26	0.19	0.64	0.30
Pronation_Gap	-15 (-33, -8)	-23 (-38, 5)	32	145	<0.01	1.00	0.89	0.41
Supination_Gap	-16 (-30, -9)	-28 (-50, -12)	31	99	0.28	0.18	0.83	0.05
PRWE_Total	73 (56, 79)	70 (61, 78)	30	124	0.02	0.89	0.29	0.02
PRWE_Pain	29 (19, 33)	27 (26, 30)	28	63.5	0.07	0.74	<0.01	<0.01
PRWE_Specific	60 (57, 60)	57 (49, 60)	33	142	0.38	0.06	<0.01	0.45
PRWE_Usual	31 (20, 38)	32 (23, 35)	33	125	0.92	0.92	<0.01	<0.01

427 Data are shown as median and quartile (25%, 75%).

428 AOT, action observation therapy; DF, dorsal flexion; VF, volar flexion.

429 Pronation_Actual_Healthy_side and Supination_Actual_Healthy_side scores are all 90 without variation.

430

431 **Variation of PRWE and ROM by group and time**

432 **period: GLM fit**

433 Table 3 shows the changes in measured ROM, estimated
434 ROM, difference between estimated and measured ROMs, and
435 PRWE scores of the AOT and Non-AOT groups over time. Table
436 4 shows the comparative results of the ROM of the affected
437 side, difference between estimated and measured ROMs, and
438 PRWE scores of the AOT and Non-AOT groups by GLM. Fig 6
439 shows the comparison of temporal PRWE changes between the
440 AOT and Non-AOT groups.

441

442 **Fig 6. Comparison of PRWE scores between the AOT and**

443 **Non-AOT groups.** (A, B) PRWE Total and PRWE Pain scores
444 did not differ between the AOT and Non-AOT groups. (C)The
445 PRWE Specific score was significantly lower in the AOT
446 group than in the Non-AOT group at 8 weeks postoperatively.
447 (D) PRWE Usual scores did not differ between the AOT and
448 Non-AOT groups. *Bonferroni, post-hoc test after GLM
449 fitting, $p < 0.05$. AOT, action observation therapy; GLM,
450 generalized linear model; PRWE, Patient-Related Wrist
451 Evaluation; W, week.

452 **Table 3. Group comparisons for actual ROM, conjectural ROM, gap between actual and**
453 **conjectural ROM, and PRWE score.**

	Baseline		Postop. 4W		Postop. 8W		Postop. 12W	
	AOT	Non-AOT	AOT	Non-AOT	AOT	Non-AOT	AOT	Non-AOT
	(n=18)	(n=17)	(n=18)	(n=17)	(n=18)	(n=17)	(n=18)	(n=17)
VF_Actual_Affected_side	40 (30, 43)	35 (25, 40)	55 (50, 60)	48 (40, 55)	60 (56, 65)	50 (45, 60)	63 (56, 70)	60 (50, 60)
DF_Actual_Affected_side	38 (20, 40)	30 (25, 40)	58 (54, 60)	55 (48, 60)	65 (60, 70)	60 (50, 60)	65 (60, 70)	60 (60, 60)
Pronation_Actual_Affected_side	60 (46, 75)	50 (38, 55)	90 (73, 90)	80 (75, 90)	90 (90, 90)	80 (70, 90)	90 (90, 90)	90 (70, 90)
Supination_Actual_Affected_side	55 (40, 78)	50 (40, 70)	90 (85, 90)	80 (60, 90)	90 (90, 90)	90 (86, 90)	90 (90, 90)	90 (90, 90)
VF_Conjectural_Affected_side	24 (8, 30)	16 (12, 24)	48 (35, 59)	48 (36, 52)	54 (48, 56)	49 (42, 56)	56 (48, 67)	56 (48, 65)
DF_Conjectural_Affected_side	8 (4, 22)	14 (8, 35)	43 (29, 56)	38 (24, 49)	51 (41, 72)	48 (42, 56)	56 (44, 63)	56 (49, 63)
Pronation_Conjectural_Affected_side	27 (6, 52)	27 (9, 45)	77 (45, 89)	63 (45, 72)	81 (72, 90)	72 (45, 81)	86 (81, 90)	86 (72, 90)
Supination_Conjectural_Affected_side	27 (8, 61)	9 (9, 45)	63 (48, 84)	68 (54, 72)	81 (72, 90)	81 (72, 90)	81 (72, 90)	81 (63, 90)
VF_Gap	-13 (-28, -2)	-20 (-23, -10)	-8 (-13, -2)	-4 (-6, 2)	-10 (-17, -2)	0 (-8, 5)	-2 (-14, 5)	1 (-6, 10)
DF_Gap	-20 (-29, -11)	-13 (-22, 0)	-16 (-24, -5)	-11 (-21, -9)	-10 (-24, 0)	-11 (-17, 0)	-13 (-19, 2)	-2 (-4, 0)
Pronation_Gap	-15 (-33, -8)	-23 (-38, 5)	-9 (-27, 0)	-16 (-18, -9)	0 (-18, 0)	-17 (-26, -9)	0 (-9, 0)	0 (-9, 0)
Supination_Gap	-16 (-30, -9)	-28 (-50, -12)	-18 (-31, 0)	-8 (-20, 0)	-9 (-17, 0)	-9 (-18, 0)	-9 (-17, 0)	0 (-12, 0)

PRWE_Total	73 (56, 79)	70 (61, 78)	38 (27, 45)	50 (37, 68)	20 (11, 28)	37 (28, 54)	14 (6, 23)	18 (8, 37)
PRWE_Pain	29 (19, 33)	27 (26, 30)	17 (11, 21)	24 (13, 28)	9 (6, 15)	21 (9, 26)	7 (3, 11)	7 (4, 18)
PRWE_Specific	60 (57, 60)	57 (49, 60)	28 (21, 32)	40 (32, 52)	14 (7, 20)	26 (22, 32)	9 (1, 16)	11 (4, 27)
PRWE_Usual	31 (20, 38)	32 (23, 35)	10 (7, 14)	24 (23, 26)	4 (3, 8)	10 (6, 23)	4 (1, 6)	1 (0, 10)

454 Data are shown as median and quartile (25%, 75%).

455 AOT, action observation therapy; DF, dorsal flexion; postop., postoperative; PRWE, Patient-Related Wrist

456 Evaluation; ROM, range of motion; VF, volar flexion; W, week.

457 **Table 4. Comparisons of gaps between conjectural and actual range of motions between the**
 458 **study groups.**

459

460

	Model information		Model result		Effect size	95% CI		Statistics	
	R ²	AIC	χ^2	p	Exp(B)	Lower	Upper	z	p
PRWE_Total	0.66	1164	8.10	0.04	<0.01	-31.46	-2.84	-2.34	0.02
PRWE_Pain	0.45	979	2.38	0.50	0.08	-10.74	5.60	-6.2	0.54
PRWE_Specific	0.73	1038	16.79	<0.01	<0.01	-29.88	-9.12	-3.68	<0.01
PRWE_Usual	0.68	931	14.63	<0.01	<0.01	-20.00	-5.91	-3.61	<0.01
VF_Actual_Affected_side	0.58	998	2.35	0.49	293.19	-3.59	14.95	1.20	0.23
DF_Actual_Affected_side	0.71	975	2.12	0.55	3.05	-7.37	9.60	0.26	0.80
Pronation_Actual_Affected_side	0.53	1110	2.35	0.50	<0.01	-20.99	4.93	-1.21	0.23
Supination_Actual_Affected_side	0.54	1082	4.02	0.26	64193.96	-2.39	24.53	1.61	0.11
VF_Gap	0.27	1058	6.82	0.08	<0.01	-23.40	0.06	-1.95	0.05
DF_Gap	0.13	1100	1.58	0.67	429.34	-6.23	18.36	0.97	0.34
Pronation_Gap	0.17	1153	1.85	0.60	4.833	-15.77	18.91	1.25	0.21
Supination_Gap	0.23	1183	7.76	0.04	<0.01	-38.40	-4.58	-2.49	0.02

461 Data are shown as average and quartile (25%, 75%).

462 AIC, Akaike information criterion; CI, confidence interval; DF, dorsal flexion; VF, volar flexion.

463 Distribution: Gaussian

464 **Differences in PRWE scores between the AOT**
465 **and Non-AOT groups**

466 PRWE Total ($R^2=0.66$, Akaike information criterion
467 [AIC]=1164, $\chi^2=8.10$, $p=0.04$), PRWE Specific ($R^2=0.73$,
468 AIC=1038, $\chi^2=16.79$, $p<0.01$), and PRWE Usual ($R^2=0.68$,
469 AIC=931, $\chi^2=14.63$, $p<0.01$) showed a significant interaction
470 between group and time. There was no interaction between
471 group and time for PRWE Pain ($R^2=0.45$, AIC=979, $\chi^2=2.38$,
472 $p=0.50$).

473 Bonferroni post-hoc tests showed that the PRWE Total
474 score was 20 [11, 28] (median [25%, 75% quartile]) in the AOT
475 group and 37 [28, 54] in the Non-AOT group at 8 weeks

476 (Z=3.29, p=0.04), the PRWE Specific score was 28 [21, 32]
477 (median [25%, 75% quartile]) in the AOT group and 40 [32, 52]
478 in the Non-AOT group at 4 weeks (Z=3.42, p=0.02), and the
479 PRWE Usual score was 20 [7, 14] (median [25%, 75% quartile])
480 in the AOT group and 24 [23, 26] in the Non-AOT group at 4
481 weeks (Z=3.42, p=0.02).

482 **Differences in measured ROM of the affected**
483 **side between the AOT and Non-AOT groups**

484 The active ROMs of the affected side differed for volar
485 flexion ($R^2=0.58$, AIC=998, $\chi^2=2.35$, p=0.49), dorsiflexion
486 ($R^2=0.71$, AIC=975, $\chi^2=2.12$, p=0.49), pronation ($R^2=0.53$,
487 AIC=1110, $\chi^2=2.35$, p=0.50), and supination ($R^2=0.54$,

488 AIC=1182, $\chi^2=4.02$, $p=0.26$), without significant difference

489 between the AOT and Non-AOT groups.

490 **Difference between estimated ROM and measured**

491 **ROM in the AOT and Non-AOT groups**

492 Regarding the differences between the estimated and

493 measured ROM of the affected side, supination ($R^2=0.23$,

494 AIC=1183, $\chi^2=7.76$, $p=0.04$) showed a significant interaction

495 between group and time.

496 For volar flexion ($R^2=0.27$, AIC=1058, $\chi^2=6.82$,

497 $p=0.08$), dorsal flexion ($R^2=0.13$, AIC=1100, $\chi^2=1.58$,

498 $p=0.67$), and pronation ($R^2=0.17$, AIC=1153, $\chi^2=1.85$,

499 $p=0.60$), no difference was observed between the AOT and

500 Non-AOT groups.

501 The Bonferroni post-hoc test showed that supination
502 was not significantly different at any group and time.

503 **Discussion**

504 The results of this study suggest that when right-handed
505 women with DRF receive AOT using first-person 3D video
506 immediately after surgery, their perceived difficulty in using
507 the affected hand in daily life and their sense of difficulty in
508 daily life are significantly improved at 4 weeks
509 postoperatively compared with patients without AOT. Since
510 AOT can maintain the sense of use of the hand by affecting the
511 motor imagery of patients with DRF, it is expected to promote

512 the use of this hand in ADL during postoperative rehabilitation
513 after DRF surgery.

514 The results of neurological studies in which AOT improved the
515 perceived difficulty of using the injured hand in ADLs suggest
516 that AOT increases neural excitation from the primary motor
517 cortex to muscles via corticospinal tracts [41] and prevents
518 cortical DDP [24] even without actual movement. Rocca et al.
519 performed AOT for upper limb function in 42 healthy
520 participants and reported that compared with the control group,
521 the gray matter of the cerebrum thickened and the upper limb
522 function improved in the AOT group [24]. Fadiga et al. compared
523 the motor evoked potentials of the extensor digitorum communis,

524 flexor digitorum superficialis, first dorsal interosseus, and
525 opponens pollicis in 12 healthy individuals when they observed
526 someone holding and reaching for an object, as well as when
527 they observed a stationary object. Motor evoked potentials did
528 not increase during the observation of a stationary object but
529 during the observation of a hand releasing or reaching for an
530 object [41]. These studies support the neurophysiological point
531 of view that AOT is effective in preventing DDP even in the
532 early postoperative period when the pain is strong and the
533 patient is unable to use the affected hand due to bone fragility
534 limiting its use in ADLs.

535 Opie et al. restrained the dominant index finger of

536 healthy participants for 8 hours and found a decrease in
537 cortical excitability and a decrease in fine hand movements,
538 while motor skill learning was similar to that of participants
539 without 8 hours of restraint. The improvement in cortical
540 excitability and fine hand movements was greater following
541 immobilization [42]. van de Ruit et al. also investigated
542 cortical excitability after visual motor learning and reported
543 that the area of transcranial magnetic stimulation-induced
544 upper limb movements increased by 18-36% after motor
545 learning, indicating that brain plasticity had occurred [43].
546 DDP is a phenomenon in which cortical excitability is reduced
547 by fixation or disuse [20, 21], whereas use-dependent

548 plasticity is a phenomenon in which cortical excitability is
549 increased by upper limb function practice and motor learning
550 using vision, resulting in plasticity. We assume that the Ghost-
551 based action observation and active ROM exercises of the hand
552 joints were effective through use-dependent plasticity
553 preventing DDP.

554 In the present study, the patients' difficulties in using
555 the affected hand for ADLs improved at 4 weeks
556 postoperatively, when they began to actively use the hand. At 8
557 weeks after DRF surgery, the patient is allowed to use the
558 affected hand with weight bearing, suggesting that AOT
559 intervention effectively lowers the perceived difficulty in

560 using the hand for ADLs and social activities from this time
561 onward. Dilek et al. reported improvements in pain, ROM, and
562 ADL (Michigan Hand Questionnaire, Disability Arm Shoulder
563 and Hand) at 8 weeks after DRF surgery following motor
564 imagery tasks in addition to the usual rehabilitation program
565 [44]. Thus, AOT is effective as an early postoperative
566 intervention without exercise in the early postoperative period
567 after DRF surgery.

568 MacDermid et al. reported that median PRWE Total
569 scores after DRF surgery changed over time, with a score of
570 43.5 at 8 weeks postoperatively [12]. The AOT group in the
571 present study had a median PRWE Total score of 21 at 8 weeks,

572 suggesting an improvement compared with the results of the
573 previous study. However, the ROM underestimation was not
574 reduced by AOT indicating that AOT affects the perception of
575 hand use but does not affect the actual ROM and its estimated
576 value.

577 One of the reasons why AOT did not significantly
578 improve ROM underestimation in patients with DRF is the
579 influence of surgical intervention. It has been reported that the
580 flexor digitorum longus tendon, which is elongated during
581 dorsiflexion, is impaired after volar locking plate surgery
582 [45]. Regarding forearm rotation, the square iliacus muscle is
583 located at the site of the surgical wound, and the ROM may

584 have been influenced by the surgical manipulation.

585 DDP in patients with DRF may also be influenced by

586 changes in peripheral sensation after a fracture.

587 Karagiannopoulos et al. reported that the hands of patients

588 with DRF showed decreased superficial sensation and

589 proprioception compared with healthy hands [19]. Michinaka et

590 al. reported a decreased number of sensory receptors with

591 typical morphology and an increased number of those with

592 atypical morphology in the anterior cruciate ligament after 6

593 weeks of knee joint immobilization in rabbits. Following 24

594 weeks of subsequent mobilization, these numbers were not

595 significantly different from their baseline values although the

596 number of atypical nerve endings remained high [18]. Nencini
597 and Ivanusic found that the periosteum and bone marrow
598 contain many receptors for mechanical stimuli, receptors for
599 chemical stimuli, and receptors for pain and heat, which are
600 involved in somatosensory perception [46]. If types and
601 quantities of sensory receptors are similarly altered in patients
602 with DRF, it can be inferred that sensory information from the
603 periphery is mistakenly processed in the brain, possibly
604 causing DDP.

605 Recovery after DRF is divided into the inflammatory
606 phase, the bone fusion repair phase, and the remodeling phase.
607 Marsell and Einhorn state that the remodeling phase begins at

608 3 to 4 weeks in humans and animal models and may take up to
609 several years [47]. During the 12-week period investigated in
610 the present study, the peripheral nerve endings and the
611 periosteum of tissues related to somatosensory perception were
612 not completely repaired but remained impaired, suggesting that
613 AOT had little effect on the underestimation. AOT did not
614 influence the measured ROM of the affected side. Brehmer and
615 Husband compared 81 postoperative patients with volar locking
616 plate fixations divided into two groups starting passive ROM
617 and muscle strengthening exercises at 2 or 6 weeks
618 postoperatively. Compared with the group that started at 6
619 weeks postoperatively, the group that started at 2 weeks

620 improved in ROM, muscle strength, and ADLs (Disability Arm
621 Shoulder and Hand score) at 8 weeks [48]. In the present
622 study, no difference between the AOT and Non-AOT groups was
623 found regarding ROM and muscle strength with AOT alone,
624 suggesting the lack of an intervention effect on the actual
625 measured ROM in the affected hand.

626 **Study limitations**

627 This was a nonrandomized controlled trial, and
628 information bias cannot be completely eliminated. The
629 intervention was successful in older, right-handed women;
630 whether it is equally effective in younger women or men, or
631 left-handed patients, needs to be examined separately. Pain and

632 grip strength are factors affecting ADLs after DRF based on
633 the results of a study in patients immobilized for 6 weeks with
634 K-wire from weeks 6 to 24 [49]. Although previous studies
635 reported differences in sensation and grip strength, the present
636 study did not take patient-specific weight load into
637 consideration when collecting data. According to the
638 guidelines, maximal grip strength is not recommended until 4
639 weeks. In the pre-experiment, the sensation was not different
640 between fractured and nonfractured hands, indicating that
641 sensation is not a problem. It is known that motor imagery
642 abilities are decreased in older individuals [50, 51]. It is
643 possible that the elderly may not be able to adapt to the

644 changes in motor function caused by a DRF due to their
645 reduced motor imagery ability and that the approach in this
646 study may have facilitated improvement. Moreover, it remains
647 unclear whether the AOT-induced improvement in ADLs with
648 the affected hand was due to motor imagery effects or the
649 actual movements. The difference between the effects of 2D
650 and 3D images is also not clarified in this study. Furthermore,
651 differences in AOT effects in relation to cognitive function,
652 mental function, fracture severity, and the presence or absence
653 of periosteal damage were not clarified and should be
654 examined in future studies.

655 **Conclusions**

656 In addition to the usual rehabilitation, AOT with first-
657 person 3D moving images in postoperative women with DRF
658 can improve the perceived difficulty in using hands for ADL
659 and daily life at 4 and 8 weeks postoperatively. As this study
660 was not a randomized controlled trial, the efficacy of this
661 intervention must be verified in follow-up studies, including
662 whether it is effective regardless of age and gender.

663 **Acknowledgments**

664 The authors would like to thank Associate Professor
665 Toshiyuki Ishioka and Professor Kenichi Tanaka of the
666 Graduate School of Saitama Prefectural University for their

667 guidance in the preparation of this paper. We thank the staff
668 of the Department of Orthopedics, Kitasato University
669 Medical Center, the Department of Physical Therapy and
670 Occupational Therapy, Rehabilitation Center, and Toda
671 Central Rehabilitation Clinic for their cooperation in this
672 study. This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant
673 Number 26750226 and 22K21243.

674 **Data and study protocol Availability**

675 **Statement.**

676 The data that support the findings of this study are
677 openly available in raw_data_usuki at
678 [DOI 10.17605/OSF.IO/869KR]. Study protocol are available in

679 supporting information file.

680 **References**

- 681 1. Larsen CF, Lauritsen J. Epidemiology of acute wrist
682 trauma. *Int J Epidemiol.* 1993; 22(5): 911–916.
- 683 2. Øyen J, Brudvik C, Gjesdal CG, Tell GS, Lie SA, Hove
684 LM. Osteoporosis as a risk factor for distal radial
685 fractures. A case-control study. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.*
686 2011; 93(4): 348–356.
- 687 3. Nellans KW, Kowalski E, Chung KC. The epidemiology
688 of distal radius fractures. *Hand Clin.* 2012; 28(2): 113–
689 125.
- 690 4. MacIntyre NJ, Dewan N. Epidemiology of distal radius

- 691 fractures and factors predicting risk and prognosis. J
692 Hand Ther. 2016; 29(2): 136–145.
- 693 5. Hagino H, Fujiwara S, Nakashima E, Nanjo Y, Teshima
694 R. Case-control study of risk factors for fractures of the
695 distal radius and proximal humerus among the Japanese
696 population. Osteoporos Int. 2004; 15(3): 226–230.
- 697 6. Ohno K, Saito K, Matsumoto H, Tomori K, Sawada T.
698 The clinical utility of a decision-aid to facilitate the use
699 of the hand in real-life activities of patients with distal
700 radius fractures: A case study. J Hand Ther. 2021; 34(3):
701 341–347.
- 702 7. American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons. The

703 treatment of distal radius fractures guideline and evidence
704 report. Adopted by the American Academy of Orthopaedic
705 Surgeons Board of Directors. 2009. Available from:
706 [https://www.aaos.org/globalassets/quality-and-practice-](https://www.aaos.org/globalassets/quality-and-practice-resources/distal-radius/distal-radius-fractures-clinical-practice-guideline.pdf)
707 [resources/distal-radius/distal-radius-fractures-clinical-](https://www.aaos.org/globalassets/quality-and-practice-resources/distal-radius/distal-radius-fractures-clinical-practice-guideline.pdf)
708 [practice-guideline.pdf](https://www.aaos.org/globalassets/quality-and-practice-resources/distal-radius/distal-radius-fractures-clinical-practice-guideline.pdf)
709 8. Kristiansen TK, Ryaby JP, McCabe J, Frey JJ, Roe LR.
710 Accelerated healing of distal radial fractures with the
711 use of specific, low-intensity ultrasound: A multicenter,
712 prospective, randomized, double-blind, placebo-
713 controlled study. J Bone Joint Surg Am. 1997; 79(7):
714 961–973.

- 715 9. Aspenberg P, Genant HK, Johansson T, Nino AJ, See K,
716 Krohn K, et al. Teriparatide for acceleration of fracture
717 repair in humans: A prospective, randomized, double-
718 blind study of 102 postmenopausal women with distal
719 radial fractures. *J Bone Miner Res.* 2010; 25(2): 404–
720 414.
- 721 10. Slutsky DJ, Herman M. Rehabilitation of distal radius
722 fractures: A biomechanical guide. *Hand Clin.* 2005;
723 21(3): 455–468.
- 724 11. Hoppenfeld S, Murthy VL. Treatment & rehabilitation of
725 fractures. Bronx: Lippincott Williams and Wilkins; 2000.
- 726 12. MacDermid JC, Roth JH, Richards RS. Pain and

727 disability reported in the year following a distal radius
728 fracture: A cohort study. BMC Musculoskelet Disord.
729 2003; 4(1): 24.

730 13. Gates DH, Walters LS, Cowley J, Wilken JM, Resnik L.
731 Range of motion requirements for upper-limb activities
732 of daily living. Am J Occup Ther. 2016; 70(1):
733 7001350010p1–7001350010p10.

734 14. Yang Z, Lim PPH, Teo SH, Chen H, Qiu H, Pua YH.
735 Association of wrist and forearm range of motion
736 measures with self-reported functional scores amongst
737 patients with distal radius fractures: a longitudinal
738 study. BMC Musculoskelet Disord. 2018; 19(1); 142.

- 739 15. Reid SA, Andersen JM, Vicenzino B. Adding
740 mobilisation with movement to exercise and advice
741 hastens the improvement in range, pain and function
742 after non-operative cast immobilisation for distal radius
743 fracture: a multicentre, randomised trial. *J Physiother.*
744 2020; 66(2): 105–112.
- 745 16. Usuki K, Suzuki T, Ueda H, Ishioka T, Hamaguchi T.
746 Underestimated active joint motions in patients with
747 distal radius fractures: An observational study. *J Ergon*
748 *Technology.* 2021; 21(1): 29–39.
- 749 17. Adachi N, Ochi M, Uchio Y, Iwasa J, Ryoke K, Kuriwaka
750 M. Mechanoreceptors in the anterior cruciate ligament

- 751 contribute to the joint position sense. *Acta Orthop*
- 752 *Scand.* 2002; 73(3): 330–334.
- 753 18. Michinaka Y, Yamamoto H, Kawakami T, Morisawa Y,
- 754 Uemura H. Effect of immobilization of the knee joint on
- 755 mechanoreceptors in anterior cruciate ligament of the
- 756 rabbit. *J Orthop Sci.* 1997; 2(4): 259–265.
- 757 19. Karagiannopoulos C, Sitler M, Michlovitz S, Tierney R.
- 758 A descriptive study on wrist and hand sensori-motor
- 759 impairment and function following distal radius fracture
- 760 intervention. *J Hand Ther.* 2013; 26(3): 204–215.
- 761 20. Langer N, Hänggi J, Müller NA, Simmen HP, Jäncke L.
- 762 Effects of limb immobilization on brain plasticity.

- 763 Neurology. 2012; 78(3): 182–188.
- 764 21. Burianová H, Sowman PF, Marstaller L, Rich AN,
765 Williams MA, Savage G, et al. Adaptive motor imagery:
766 A multimodal study of immobilization-induced brain
767 plasticity. Cereb Cortex. 2016; 26(3): 1072–1080.
- 768 22. Newbold DJ, Laumann TO, Hoyt CR, Hampton JM,
769 Montez DF, Raut RV., et al. Plasticity and spontaneous
770 activity pulses in disused human brain circuits. Neuron.
771 2020; 107(3): 580–589.e6.
- 772 23. Plata-Bello J. The study of action observation therapy in
773 neurological diseases: A few technical considerations.
774 In: Suzuki T (ed.) Neurological Physical Therapy.

775 InTechOpen; 2017.

776 24. Rocca MA, Fumagalli S, Pagani E, Gatti R, Riccitelli

777 GC, Preziosa P, et al. Action observation training

778 modifies brain gray matter structure in healthy adult

779 individuals. *Brain Imaging Behav.* 2017; 11(5): 1343–

780 1352.

781 25. Sakai K, Goto K, Watanabe R, Tanabe J, Amimoto K,

782 Kumai K, et al. Immediate effects of visual–motor

783 illusion on resting-state functional connectivity. *Brain*

784 *Cogn.* 2020; 146: 105632.

785 26. Hamaguchi T, Thomas HN. Mechanism of the developed

786 sensorimotor therapy device: Synchronous inputs of

- 787 visual stimuli and vibration to improve recovery of
788 distal radius fractures. *Biomed J Sci Tech Res*. 2021;
789 38(2): 30152–30155.
- 790 27. Sollfrank T, Hart D, Goodsell R, Foster J, Tan T. 3D
791 visualization of movements can amplify motor cortex
792 activation during subsequent motor imagery. *Front Hum*
793 *Neurosci*. 2015; 9: 463.
- 794 28. Schott N, Korbus H. Preventing functional loss during
795 immobilization after osteoporotic wrist fractures in
796 elderly patients : a randomized clinical trial. *BMC*
797 *Musculoskelet Disord*. 2014; 15: 287.
- 798 29. Faul F, Erdfelder E, Lang AG, Buchner A. *G*Power 3: A*

- 799 flexible statistical power analysis program for the
800 social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. Behav Res
801 Methods. 2007; 39(2): 175–191.
- 802 30. Mehta SP, MacDermid JC, Richardson J, MacIntyre NJ,
803 Grewal R. A systematic review of the measurement
804 properties of the patient-rated wrist evaluation. J Orthop
805 Sports Phys Ther. 2015; 45(4): 289–298.
- 806 31. MacDermid JC, Turgeon T, Richards RS, Beadle M, Roth
807 JH. Patient rating of wrist pain and disability: a reliable
808 and valid measurement tool. J Orthop Trauma. 1998;
809 12(8): 577–586.
- 810 32. Imaeda T, Uchiyama S, Wada T, Okinaga S, Sawaizumi T,

- 811 Omokawa S, et al. Reliability, validity, and
812 responsiveness of the Japanese version of the Patient-
813 Rated Wrist Evaluation. J Orthop Sci. 2010; 15(4): 509–
814 517.
- 815 33. Mishra P, Iqbal M, Faraj A. Functional outcome of distal
816 radial fractures in patients with a mean age of 75 years
817 at a mean follow-up of 5.4 years. Cureus. 2020; 12(12):
818 e11959.
- 819 34. Jeong Y, Heo S, Lee G, Park W. Pre-obesity and obesity
820 impacts on passive joint range of motion. Ergonomics.
821 2018; 61(9): 1223–1231.
- 822 35. Lassila H. Laterality affects PRWE and QuickDASH

823 scores after distal radius fractures : A prospective
824 multicentre study. Thesis, University of Turku. 2017.
825 Available from:
826 <https://helda.helsinki.fi/bitstream/handle/10138/229556/>
827 Tutkielma_HenriLassila.pdf
828 36. Stewart HD, Innes AR, Burke FD. Factors affecting the
829 outcome of Colles' fracture: an anatomical and
830 functional study. *Injury*. 1985; 16(5): 289–295.
831 37. Quadlbauer S, Pezzei C, Jurkowitsch J, Kolmayr B,
832 Keuchel T, Simon D, et al. Early rehabilitation of distal
833 radius fractures stabilized by volar locking plate: A
834 prospective randomized pilot study. *J Wrist Surg*. 2017;

835 6(2): 102–112.

836 38. Walfish S. A review of statistical outlier methods. Pharm

837 Technol. 2006; 30: 82–86.

838 39. Miller J. Another warning about median reaction time. J

839 Exp Psychol Hum Percept Perform. 1988; 14(3): 539–543.

840 40. The jamovi project. jamovi (Version 2.3). Available

841 from: <https://www.jamovi.org/>

842 41. Fadiga L, Fogassi L, Pavesi G, Rizzolatti G. Motor

843 facilitation during action observation: A magnetic

844 stimulation study. J Neurophysiol. 1995; 73(6): 2608–

845 2611.

846 42. Opie GM, Evans A, Ridding MC, Semmler JG. Short-term

- 847 immobilization influences use-dependent cortical
848 plasticity and fine motor performance. *Neuroscience*.
849 2016; 330: 247–256.
- 850 43. van de Ruit M, Grey MJ. Interindividual variability in
851 use-dependent plasticity following visuomotor learning:
852 The effect of handedness and muscle trained. *J Mot
853 Behav*. 2019; 51(2): 171–184.
- 854 44. Dilek B, Ayhan C, Yagci G, Yakut Y. Effectiveness of
855 the graded motor imagery to improve hand function in
856 patients with distal radius fracture : A randomized
857 controlled trial. *J Hand Ther*. 2018; 31(1): 2–9.e1.
- 858 45. Lee JH, Lee JK, Park JS, Kim DH, Baek JH, Kim YJ, et

- 859 al. Complications associated with volar locking plate
860 fixation for distal radius fractures in 1955 cases: A
861 multicentre retrospective study. *Int Orthop*. 2020;
862 44(10): 2057–2067.
- 863 46. Nencini S, Ivanusic JJ. The physiology of bone pain.
864 How much do we really know? *Front Physiol*. 2016; 7:
865 157.
- 866 47. Marsell R, Einhorn TA. The biology of fracture healing.
867 *Injury*. 2011; 42(6): 551–555.
- 868 48. Brehmer JL, Husband JB. Accelerated rehabilitation
869 compared with a standard protocol after distal radial
870 fractures treated with volar open reduction and internal

- 871 fixation: A prospective, randomized, controlled study. J
872 Bone Joint Surg Am. 2014; 96(19): 1621–1630.
- 873 49. Karnezis IA, Fragkiadakis EG. Association between
874 objective clinical variables and patient-rated disability
875 of the wrist. J Bone Joint Surg Br. 2002; 84(7): 967–970.
- 876 50. Subirats L, Allali G, Briansoulet M, Salle JY, Perrochon
877 A. Age and gender differences in motor imagery. J
878 Neurol Sci. 2018; 391: 114–117.
- 879 51. Mulder T, Hochstenbach JBH, van Heuvelen MJG, den
880 Otter AR. Motor imagery: The relation between age and
881 imagery capacity. Hum Mov Sci. 2007; 26(2): 203–211.

Fig. 1





Fig. 2

Fig. 3

Hypothesis: Early Treatment of DRF with AOT improves patients' perceived difficulty of using hands with ADL.







Fig. 4





Head mount display,
Oculus DK2

